A BILL TO BE ENTITLED
AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR MEASURABILITY ASSESSMENTS OF STATE PROGRAMS.
The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts:

SECTION 1. The North Carolina General Statutes are amended by adding a new Chapter to read:

"Chapter 143E,


§ 143E-1. Title.
This Chapter shall be known and may be cited as the "North Carolina Measurability Assessment Act of 2015."

§ 143E-2. Request for measurability assessment.
The General Assembly may require a measurability assessment of any proposed or existing State program to determine whether the program is or will be capable of reporting performance and return on investment.

§ 143E-3. Definition of measurability assessment.
(a) A measurability assessment is an independent evaluation conducted on a new or existing State program.

(b) A measurability assessment must include or determine all of the following:
(1) Whether and to what degree the program is unique and does not duplicate or negate results of another public or private program or enterprise.
(2) The local, regional, or statewide problems or needs that the program is intended to address.
(3) Whether there is a program design portrayed by a logic model as defined by the Logic Model Development Guide by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, including an evaluation of that logic model.
(4) Whether there is evidence that the program produces results attributable to the program to remedy the problem or need.
   a. For a proposed program, whether the evidence stems from a formative evaluation of proposed activities through a field trial using a valid and reliable instrument or method to measure changes in a randomized control group that was not subjected to the proposed activities to changes in a randomized group that did receive the proposed activities.
b. For an existing program asserting existence of evidence, whether the evidence stemmed from a post-program summative evaluation using an experimental or quasi-experimental research design.

c. For both proposed and existing programs, if the evidence had been subjected to alternative interpretations and peer review.

(5) The capacity of the administering entity to expand the program based upon existing evidence or results.

(6) How the program proposes to engage in strategic planning.

(7) How the program proposes to measure performance, including measurement of:

a. Total costs of program services with costs separately reported for each activity associated with each service.

b. Outputs or counts of units of services and for individual activities associated with each service.

c. Costs per unit of service and for individual activities associated with each service.

d. Outcomes or results attributable to each program service including results upon completion of program service; results still evident one, two, and three years after completion; ultimate or permanent results; and when and how permanent results will be determined by the program.

e. Customer or client satisfaction with program services.

f. Statewide impacts of program outcomes as evidenced by census data or other statewide data.

g. Performance compared to standards and what standards the program intends to use.

(8) How the program will continuously improve quality of program services and consistency with the strategic plan.

(9) Whether the administering entity has conducted an assessment to identify financial and legal risks to the entity or the State and has plans for minimizing risk exposure.

(10) Whether the program conducts five-year forecasts of annual recurring costs and sources of funding for each year.

(11) Whether the program proposes to share costs with primary beneficiaries through a fee-for-service, co-payment, or tuition basis and the extent to which any expected cost-sharing is or will be means-tested and by what method.

(12) How program staffing requirements are determined and an evaluation of those requirements.

(13) Whether the program has or proposes to have a financial accounting system capable of accounting for all assets, liabilities, receipts, and disbursements.

(14) Whether the program is or will be postaudited and if there are any potential impediments to audits or evaluations by the State Auditor, agency internal auditors, or the Program Evaluation Division of the General Assembly.

(c) The assessor must submit a written report containing the results of the measurability assessment to the Office of State Budget and Management (OSBM) at a time and in a format required by OSBM.


(a) OSBM must use a competitive process to prequalify independent measurability assessors. The assessors will be independent contractors compensated through a uniform fee system established by OSBM, and there will be no guarantee that any prequalified assessor will
receive assessment assignments. OSBM shall not assign an assessor to a measurability
assessment if the assessor has been employed by or contracted with the entity within five years
preceding the assessment.

(b) OSBM shall establish standards for assessor qualifications, independence, and for
cconducting and reporting measurability assessments. Individuals who do not meet the
qualifications may not be used to conduct measurability assessments.

(c) Whenever a measurability assessment is required, OSBM shall select the assessor
and require the agency or institution to reimburse OSBM for the assessor's costs and for a share
of OSBM costs for administering the measurability assessment program."

SECTION 2. This act becomes effective October 1, 2015.