Fish Habitat Partnership Performance Evaluation

Process, Timeline, and Evaluation Form

September 14, 2011

Background

The National Fish Habitat Action Plan (NFHAP) is an unprecedented national effort to build and support strategic partnerships for fish habitat conservation. The Action Plan establishes principles that challenge Fish Habitat Partnerships (FHP) to address conservation priorities, as well as measure and report on their progress. A high level of commitment to these principles distinguishes the Action Plan and its Partnerships from other fish habitat conservation efforts.

To uphold the high standards set by NFHAP, the National Fish Habitat Board (Board) is requesting that each recognized FHP demonstrate its level of performance in support of priority fish habitat conservation projects and accomplishing core operational functions (i.e. coordination, scientific assessment, strategic planning, data management, project administration, communications, and outreach).

At its July 2011 meeting, the Board conditionally approved a set of FHP performance measures, and initiated a "test drive" of the evaluation process. **It's important to note this test drive is not focused on generating an overall rating or comparison of FHP performance levels but rather it's intended to provide:**

a) An assessment of the overall FHP performance evaluation process;

b) An evaluation of the relevance of the FHP performance measures and the scoring system; and,

c) Input from FHPs that will help the Board finalize the performance measures and process used to complete the evaluations.

Included in this packet is an overview of the performance evaluation process and its timeline (Part I) and an evaluation form that includes the individual performance measures and the criteria that will be used to guide the assessment of an FHP's level of performance for each measure (Part II).

Part I. Fish Habitat Partnership Performance Evaluation Process and Timeline

Step 1: A performance evaluation packet will be sent to the coordinator or Steering Committee Chair of each Fish Habitat Partnership by September 30, 2011.

Step 2: Between October and mid-November, 2011, the Chair of the Criteria Development Committee will hold regional conference calls with representatives from each of the associated FHPs to discuss any questions they may have regarding completing the performance evaluation form.

New Step 3: FHPs will complete the performance evaluation forms and email them to the Criteria Development Committee's Chair Stephen Perry (stephen.perry@wildlife.nh.gov) by December 31, 2011.

Step 4: The Board will establish a 5-person review team, who will independently review the completed evaluation forms and determine the FHP's level of performance for each measure using a scale of 1 to 4 (low to high). Once the review team completes the independent scoring task, the scores will be averaged for each of the measures. The review team will collectively discuss each FHP's performance evaluation outcome and where warranted, make recommendations on how an FHP might improve their level of performance for specific measures. All components of this step will be completed by early-February, 2012.

Step 5: The performance evaluation outcomes and any associated recommendations for improvement will be sent to each FHP for their review and considerations by late-February, 2012.

Step 6: The review team will schedule conference calls with representatives of each FHP to discuss the performance evaluation outcomes and to solicit FHP feedback on all facets of the evaluation process during March and early-April, 2012.

Step 7: The review team will brief the Criteria Development Committee on the lessons learned from test driving the evaluation of FHP performance and make recommendations on how the measures and the process can be improved by late-April, 2012.

Step 8: The Criteria Development Committee will present a report on the outcomes from the FHP performance evaluation test drive to the Board for their considerations and actions during their summer 2012 meeting.

Part II. Fish Habitat Partnership Performance Evaluation Form

Instructions: The ten performance measures listed on the following pages are being "test driven" at the request of the Board. Please be aware that these measures are not aimed at evaluating the fish habitat conservation projects themselves, but rather the processes by which your FHP selects the projects it supports in conjunction with how your partnership executes its core operational functions (i.e. coordination, scientific assessment, strategic planning, data management, project administration, communications, and outreach). Please provide a complete description of the information requested for each performance measures as the review team will rely on your responses when assessing your FHP's level of performance, using a scale of 1 to 4 (low to high). The time period that is being covered by this performance evaluation test drive is the 2011 calendar year (Jan 1 – Dec 31).

Performance Measures

1. List the title of each of your FHP's fish habitat conservation projects approved for funding during calendar year 2011 and identify the specific strategic priority (i.e. geographic focus areas, habitat types, key stressors or impairments) and/or the NFHAP Final Interim Strategies & Targets each project addresses.

Note: The intent of this measure #1 is to evaluate the level to which an FHP is addressing its strategic priorities and/or NFHAP Final Interim Strategies & Targets with fish habitat conservation projects. The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

a. Less than 70% of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly focused on addressing FHP strategic priorities and/or NFHAP Final Interim Strategies & Targets (1 point).
b. 70% to 79% of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly focused on addressing FHP strategic priorities and/or NFHAP Final Interim Strategies & Targets (2 points).
c. 80% to 89% of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly focused on addressing FHP strategic priorities and/or NFHAP Final Interim Strategies & Targets (3 points).
d. 90% or more of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly focused on addressing FHP strategic priorities and/or NFHAP Final Interim Strategies & Targets (4 points).

---

2. Describe the indicators that are being used to measure short and long term progress toward achieving desired conservation outcomes (effectiveness measures) for each of fish habitat conservation projects identified under #1.

Note: The intent of measure #2 is to evaluate the level to which an FHP is using indicators that measure short and long term progress toward achieving desired conservation outcomes for its fish habitat conservation projects. The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

a. Less than 50% of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly identified and employed effectiveness measures (1 point).
b. 50% to 69% of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly identified and employed effectiveness measures (2 points).
c. 70% to 89% of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly identified and employed effectiveness measures (3 points).
d. 90% or more of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly identified and employed effectiveness measures (4 points).

---

3. Describe the vulnerable fish habitat that is protected or the causes and processes behind fish habitat decline that are being addressed by each of each of fish habitat conservation projects identified under #1.

Note: The intent of measure #3 is to evaluate the level to which an FHP focuses on conservation projects that protect vulnerable fish habitats or address causes and processes behind fish habitat decline. The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

a. Less than 50% of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly focus on protecting vulnerable fish habitats or addressing the causes and processes behind fish habitat decline (1 point).
b. 50% to 69% of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly focus on protecting vulnerable fish habitats or addressing the causes and processes behind fish habitat decline (2 points).
c. 70% to 89% of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly focus on protecting vulnerable fish habitats or addressing the causes and processes behind fish habitat decline (3 points).
d. 90% or more of the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year clearly focus on protecting vulnerable fish habitats or addressing the causes and processes behind fish habitat decline (4 points).

---

4. In aggregate for all the projects listed under #1, what is the total amount of NFHAP funds (i.e. US Fish and Wildlife Service NFHAP funds) allocated in support of these projects and what is the total amount of funding from all other sources?

NFHAP Funds =

All Other Funds =

Note: The intent of measure #4 is to evaluate the level to which an FHP is leveraging NFHAP funds in the fish habitat conservation projects it supports. The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

a. In aggregate, the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year were supported by less than a 1:1 match for the NFHAP funds (1 point).
b. In aggregate, the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year were supported by a 1:1 to 1.5:1 match for the NFHAP funds (2 points).
c. In aggregate, the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year were supported by a 1.6:1 to 2:1 match for the NFHAP funds (3 points).
d. In aggregate, the FHP's fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year were supported by more than a 2:1 match for the NFHAP funds (4 points).

---

5. Describe the process and the criteria your FHP used to prioritize the fish habitat conservation projects listed under #1.

Note: The intent of measure #5 is to evaluate the process an FHP is using to prioritize fish habitat conservation projects for NFHAP funding. The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

a. The FHP's process for prioritizing fish habitat conservation projects for NFHAP funding during the 2011 calendar year had no clear rating standards in place (1 point).
b. The FHP's process for prioritizing fish habitat conservation projects for NFHAP funding during the 2011 calendar year had clear rating standards in place but they only partially meet the criteria listed under 1.10 in FWS Manual 717 FW1 (2 points).
c. The FHP's process for prioritizing fish habitat conservation projects during the 2011 calendar year had clear rating standards in place that meet all the criteria listed under 1.10 in FWS Manual 717 FW1 (3 points).
d. The FHP's process for prioritizing fish habitat conservation projects for NFHAP funding during the 2011 calendar year has clear rating standards in place that are more comprehensive than the criteria listed under 1.10 in FWS Manual 717 FW1 (4 points).

---

6. Describe the ways your FHP engaged (i.e. coordinated, collaborated, cooperated, consulted) with neighboring or overlapping FHPs and other regional habitat conservation entities during the 2011 calendar year.

Note: The intent of measure #6 is to evaluate the level to which an FHP is engaging (i.e. consultation, coordination, collaboration) neighboring or overlapping FHPs and other regional habitat conservation entities. The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

a. The level of engagement with neighboring or overlapping FHPs and other regional habitat conservation entities during the 2011 calendar year only included consultations (1 point).
b. The level of engagement with neighboring or overlapping FHPs and other regional habitat conservation entities during the 2011 calendar year included consultation and coordination (2 points).
c. The level of engagement with neighboring or overlapping FHPs and other regional habitat conservation entities during the 2011 calendar year included collaboration on a joint project (3 points).
d. The level of engagement with neighboring or overlapping FHPs and other regional habitat conservation entities during the 2011 calendar year included collaboration on multiple joint projects (4 points).

---

7. Describe your FHP's use of science-based resource condition assessments and/or analysis to identify the priority conservation actions undertaken during the 2011 calendar year.

Note: The intent of measure #7 is to evaluate the level to which an FHP is using science-based resource condition assessments and/or analysis to identify its priority conservation actions. The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

a. The FHP's use of science-based resource condition assessments and/or analysis assisted with identifying no more than one priority conservation action during the 2011 calendar year (1 point).
b. The FHP's use of science-based resource condition assessments and/or analysis assisted with identifying two to three priority conservation actions during the 2011 calendar year (2 points).
c. The FHP's use of science-based resource condition assessments and/or analysis assisted with identifying four to five priority conservation actions during the 2011 calendar year (3 points).
d. The FHP's use of science-based resource condition assessments and/or analysis assisted with identifying more than five priority conservation actions during the 2011 calendar year (4 points).

---

8. Describe the outreach aimed at raising awareness and understanding of your FHP's strategic priorities (i.e. geographic focus areas, habitat types, key stressors or impairments), its conservation activities, and changes in habitat conditions that occurred during the 2011 calendar year.

Note: The intent of measure #8 is to evaluate the quality and quantity of outreach an FHP aims towards raising awareness and understanding of the FHP's strategic priorities, its conservation activities, and changes in habitat conditions. The Performance Review Team will use the criteria listed below to guide its assessment of performance for this measure.

a. The FHP's outreach effort during the 2011 calendar year was limited to information sharing (1 point).
b. The FHP's outreach effort during the 2011 calendar year included information sharing and building broader visibility among local and regional partners (2 points).
c. The FHP's outreach effort during the 2011 calendar year included information sharing, building broader visibility among local and regional partners, and tailoring activities and events to garner media coverage (3 points).
d. The FHP's outreach effort during the 2011 calendar year included information sharing, building broader visibility among local and regional partners, tailoring activities and events to garner media coverage and developing strategic communications aimed at strengthening relationships among policy-makers (4 points).

---

9. Describe the ways that your FHP coordinated its aquatic resource data and regional assessment information with the NFHAP Science and Data Committee during the 2011 calendar year.

Note: The intent of measure #9 is to evaluate the level to which an FHP is coordinating its aquatic resources data and/or regional assessment information with the NFHAP Science and Data Committee for use with the national information system:

a. The FHP's efforts to facilitate information exchange with the NFHAP Science and Data Committee during the 2011 calendar year were minimal (1 point).
b. The FHP facilitated information exchange with the NFHAP Science and Data Committee during the 2011 calendar year by providing regional data sets or project outcomes for integration into the NFHAP National Assessment (2 points).
c. The FHP facilitated information exchange with the NFHAP Science and Data Committee during the 2011 calendar year by providing regional data sets and project outcomes for integration into the NFHAP National Assessment (3 points).
d. The FHP facilitated information exchange with the NFHAP Science and Data Committee during the 2011 calendar by providing regional data sets and project outcomes for integration into the NFHAP National Assessment; and, the information and data related to project evaluations were described in an annual report (4 points).

---

10. List your FHP's strategic priorities (i.e. geographic focus areas, habitat types, key stressors or impairments) and describe the progress that has been made toward achieving these priorities during the 2011 calendar year. Also include an assessment on whether your FHP feels it's on track with the anticipated schedule for accomplishing each of these priorities.

Note: The intent of measure #10 is to evaluate the level to which an FHP is measuring progress towards achieving its strategic priorities.

a. The FHP made limited progress toward achieving its strategic priorities during the 2011 calendar year (1 point).
b. The FHP made progress toward achieving its strategic priorities during the 2011 calendar year, but is behind its anticipated schedule for completion (2 points).
c. The FHP made progress towards achieving its strategic priorities during the 2011 calendar year and is on track or ahead of its anticipated schedule for completion (3 points).
d. The FHP has achieved one ore more of its strategic priorities during the 2011 calendar year (4 points).