SECTION 5: EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following pages include the criteria the Council used to assist them in evaluating the state's compliance and enforcement programs. EQC members filled out a similar set of questions after hearing information from each program. The answers to the questions were used to prepare the findings discussed in the *HJR 10 Compliance and Enforcement Study Final Report*.

Reviewers were asked to rate programs using the following criteria.

COMPLIANCE/ENFORCEMENT EVALUATION CRITERIA

Draft -- 10/27/95

Program: _____   **Presenter:**_____

Timeliness -- *Happening or done at an appropriate time, especially at such a time as to be of help or service.*

> **Considerations:** Are applications/requests/complaints/questions processed quickly? Are they resolved in a reasonable timeframe? Are violation notices issued soon after the situation is identified? . . .
>
> **Notes on Presentations**:

> **Rating (circle one):**   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**
>   unacceptable   poor   fair   good   excellent

> **Comments on Rating**:

Equity -- *Fairness; impartiality; justice.*

> **Considerations:** Are all who interact with the program treated with equal consideration and respect? Are penalties determined in a systematic manner, to yield consistent results regardless of "status" of violator? . . .
>
> **Notes on Presentations:**

> **Rating (circle one):**   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5**
>   unacceptable   poor   fair   good   excellent

> **Comments on Rating:**

Consistency -- *Agreement with what has already been done or expressed; conformity with previous practice.*

Considerations: Have similar violations generated similar responses over the last few years? Are variations justified and equitable? . . .

Notes on Presentations:

Rating (circle one):	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	unacceptable	poor	fair	good	excellent

Comments on Rating:

Effectiveness -- *Having an effect; producing a result. Active, not merely potential or theoretical.*

Considerations: Is the program's compliance/enforcement workload decreasing, stable, or increasing? What are the trends in numbers of non-compliances? What are the trends in severity of non-compliances? . . .

Notes on Presentations:

Rating (circle one):	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	unacceptable	poor	fair	good	excellent

Comments on Rating:

Efficiency -- *Ability to produce a desired effect, product, etc., with a minumum of effort, expense, or waste.*

Considerations: Are enforcement tools (including information and education) being used at the right time and place to minimize overlap, confusion, and expense? . . .

Notes on Presentations:

Rating (circle one):	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	unacceptable	poor	fair	good	excellent

Comments on Rating:

OVERALL "APPROPRIATENESS" -- *Right for the purpose; suitable; fit; proper.*

BY PROGRAM -- Has the program achieved a proper balance among enforcement tools to create an effective and efficient compliance program? . . .

Rating (circle one):	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	unacceptable	poor	fair	good	excellent

Comments on Rating:

ACROSS PROGRAMS -- Are the approaches this program uses appropriately consistent with other agencies/programs, considering relative risk to public health and the environment? . . .

Rating (circle one):	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	unacceptable	poor	fair	good	excellent

Comments on Rating:

BY STATUTORY GOAL -- Is the program meeting relevant statutory goals? Are the goals appropriate? . . .

Rating (circle one):	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	unacceptable	poor	fair	good	excellent

Comments on Rating: