

**Addendum to
U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration Reference Book One:
The Essential Guide For Writing An Earmark Grant Proposal (Revised April 2008)**

The Performance Table on pages 48 and 49 of the above-referenced guide was intended as a *guide* to assist grantees and not a format to be utilized without revision or further clarification. As such, it is recognized that the sample table provided may not readily or satisfactorily conform to each specific project. For instance, some “earmark grantees” may be proposing a project with specific *deliverables* not readily captured by metrics utilized in the case of participants/enrollees. For this reason, we are offering an addendum that is not meant to confuse, but rather clarify, and that is likewise not intended to supplant, but rather support, the Reference Guide.

In each and every case, the output/deliverable or performance measure should reflect the grantee’s proposed project and **should provide enough specificity to adequately and accurately determine to what extent the “goal” was attained.** The SMART acronym may be helpful in terms of clarifying goals/deliverables and planned levels of performance or output, i.e., goals should be specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely.

Sample Project Outputs/Deliverables and/or Performance Measures	Explanation and/or Definition/Formula	Planned Level of Performance (whether pertaining to Outputs/Deliverables and/or Participant Performance)
Sample Project Output or Deliverable 1— Curriculum Development Targeting Rural Communities	A possible explanation might be: Development and implementation of an instructional modality that utilizes distance learning, e-learning and virtual laboratories to reach rural areas (perhaps going further and stating that, “all three are needed components in the design/creation of this instructional modality/content.”)	Grantees should clarify their planned level of performance with as much specificity as possible (using the SMART acronym may assist in this regard). A possible planned level of performance for this project deliverable might be: Fully-functional curriculum by the end of the grant period that can be applied and replicated in rural areas and that encompasses distance learning, e-learning and virtual labs.
Sample Project Output or Deliverable 2— Promotional Material for the [Occupation]	A possible explanation for this deliverable might simply be: Digital billboards and employer informational packets will be developed using grant funds.	A possible planned level of performance for this project deliverable might be: 2 digital billboards will be produced with signage software, as well as 30-40 employer toolkits including brochures by [date].
Sample Performance Measure 1— Recruitment or Recruitment Rate	Here, <i>Recruitment</i> could simply mean the number of individuals recruited for potential project participation. A <i>Recruitment Rate</i> , which implies a percentage (with numerator and denominator), could mean the number of individuals successfully recruited (defined by the grantee) divided by the number of individuals who received promotional or other outreach-related materials.	If using simply <i>Recruitment</i> , an example of a planned level of performance might be: At least 75 individuals will be recruited for project participation. If using a <i>Recruitment Rate</i> , it might read: Recruitment Rate of ___% (of the X amount who received project literature, Y will be recruited for a determination of project eligibility and related assessment).
Sample Performance Measure 2— Enrollment or Enrollment Rate	<i>Enrollment</i> could simply mean the number of individuals enrolled into the program (for instance, after a determination of eligibility and an appropriate assessment). An <i>Enrollment Rate</i> implies a percentage (with numerator and denominator) and could mean the number of individuals accepted into the project divided by the number of individuals recruited for the project.	If using <i>Enrollment</i> , an example of a planned level of performance might be: Enrollment of 50 individuals (the project can accommodate 50 participants in total). If using an <i>Enrollment Rate</i> , it might read: Enrollment Rate of 67% (of the 75 individuals recruited, 50 will be enrolled into the project).
Sample Performance Measure 3— Completion Rate	Grantees should determine what “completion” means within the context and/or framework of their proposed project. For example, this could be described as the number of participants	One example might be: Completion Rate of 85% (of the 100 participants, 85 will successfully complete all 3 components). With additional specificity, this could be: Completion

	who successfully complete all project components or the <i>percentage</i> of participants who successfully complete all project components. (If the project consists of “3” classes or 3 classes and 1 internship, for instance, ideally that should be clarified.	Rate of 85% (of the 100 participants who begin the project, 85 will successfully complete all 3 mandatory components with at least a 3.0 GPA (i.e., a B grade)). Grantees should determine the appropriate level of specificity.
Sample Performance Measure 4— Placement Rate	It this is an appropriate measure, grantees should clarify what they mean by <i>Placement Rate</i> , which is subject to interpretation. For instance, a placement rate could mean the percentage of individuals placed at any point after completion of project participation up to the grant end date. Conversely, it could mean the percentage of individuals who are placed in jobs within specific parameters (e.g., specified industry, specified wages) based on the total number who participated in the project. (The next column contains some possibilities, which each grantee must determine as appropriate or not based on their proposed project.)	An example might be: “Placement Rate of 85%, such that 85 of the 100 successful completers will be placed in employment within 2 months of project completion. An alternative might be: Placement Rate of 85% (85 of 100 participants who complete all project components with at least a 3.0 GPA will attain training-related employment within 3 months of project completion or until the grant period ends, whichever is later). Note: Grantees should think through their proposed metrics along these and similar lines. Again, using the SMART acronym may be helpful.
Sample Performance Measure 5— Earnings Change	This measure looks at whether participants were able to increase their earnings as a result of participating in the grant-funded project. If this is an appropriate measure, it implies a “before and after comparison,” which means that the grantee must clarify “pre-project earnings” as well as “post-project earnings.”	An appropriate earnings change might be \$3.00 per hour, or it might be \$175 per week, or some other figure <i>that makes sense for the project</i> .
Sample Performance Measure 6— Average Earnings	This measure looks at the average earnings of participants and does not imply a before/after comparison, but rather a post-project assessment of <i>average</i> earnings. For instance, if a project served 10 individuals, 5 of whom earned gross monthly earnings (grantees would determine the timeframe) of \$4000 and 5 of whom earned gross monthly earnings of \$4800 <i>then the average earnings would be [20,000+24,000]/10 or \$4,400.</i>	The SMART acronym is appropriate here as well and grantees must determine, for instance, if an earnings measure (whether an earnings change or average earnings) is appropriate for their project and target population and at what level of performance. In all cases, there should be a rationale for the measure utilized and the level of performance.
Sample Performance Measure 7— Employer Satisfaction Rate	This may be an appropriate measure depending of the project and can be determined utilizing a survey, for instance. However, grantees should specify the “population” to be surveyed (for instance, is it all employers recruited for project participation? All employers with whom the project had <i>any</i> relationship? Only employers who received a specified service?) Ideally, the survey instrument should also be clarified.	One example might be: Employers who received at least one service from the project will report a 90% satisfaction rate based on a 3-question survey that addresses overall satisfaction, satisfaction based on level of expectation, and satisfaction based on an “ideal” service.