



Budgeting for Results Commission

Friday, August 24, 2018: 1:30 – 3:30pm

Meeting Location

Chicago – James R. Thompson Center, 100 W Randolph, Governor's Office 16th Floor

Springfield – Stratton Building 500 1/2

Dial-In: 888-806-4788 Access Code: 895-685-1121#

Attendance

Chicago: Jim Lewis, Jesse Elam

Springfield: Curt Clemons-Mosby, Nana Mkheidze, Adam Groner, Courtney Peterson

Phone: Senator Pamela Althoff, Mischa Fisher, Jennifer Butler

Various state agency representatives including Chief Results Officers (CROs) attended in Springfield, Chicago, and by phone.

1. Welcome and Introductions (Jim Lewis)

Introductions by the Commission and state agencies were made.

2. Review and Approval of Minutes (Jim Lewis)

The minutes were approved without comment. Sanchez provided proxy to Curt thereby achieving a quorum.

3. Recap of Annual BFR Public Hearings (Jim Lewis/ Adam Groner)

Adam recapped the hearings in Springfield and Chicago. He noted those who spoke at the hearings.

Hearings Takeaways

The process matters as we move forward with BFR implementation. Actions must continue to be deliberate and justified. We need to continue to get stakeholder buy-in to ensure they feel included along the way. Curt emphasized that there was good attendance at both hearings and attendees offered helpful input.

Jennifer B. said the format of the hearing has adapted to be more of a true hearing structure. Hearings have become more aligned with the legislative intent. Jim agreed.

Hearings used to be held in the fall and have been switched to the summer. The following observations are note: Overall attendance has decreased in part because fewer students are on campus during the summer. The UIS facility hosts the Springfield hearing. We should continue to

strive to have the right people in attendance. Independent of the date, in the past, attendance was up because the public was more apt to express budget-related concerns. As the hearings have become more strategically focused on program evaluation and assessments, the mix of attendees has shifted. Summer scheduling appears to be the right timing given the BFR Commissioners' fall commitments of mandate review and the annual report drafting.

Emily from Public Health asked how members of the community are informed about the hearings. Curt responded that we use state agencies and chief results officers to notify the public about hearings. They contact their lists of community members. This year we utilized both a press release for the governor's press office and various contacts through UIS and other universities and local public radio. It was suggested that the BFR Unit utilize Facebook to create an event to inform the community about the hearings.

4. Planning for CRO meeting on 9/25/18 (Curt Clemons-Mosby)

CRO meeting will be held in Springfield on Sept. 25th

Full day discussion for CROs (new and old) to teach them the BFR framework and our program assessments. We will partner with PEW MacArthur Results First.

Rough Agenda

- Overview of the BFR process
- Roles and duties of CROs
- Overview of the IPRS
- Overview of the Results First cost-benefit analysis tool
- Overview of SPART
- Summary of accomplishments and future activities
- Description of the program assessment process
- Presentations on evidence in decision-making by PEW MacArthur

Lunch will be provided for CROs. All commissioners are invited. CROs can learn from the commissioners' guidance.

Questions from meeting attendees:

- How many CRO's are new to the process? Curt stated that we have about 70 CRO's and about a third are new to the process.
- Will the meeting kick off the budget process? Curt stated the meeting will highlight the importance of knowing their program inventory which is a key component of the budget process. We will discuss performance measures and ways to improve them. The meeting should prepare CROs for the FY2020 budget process.

5. Update on Results First and SPART (Adam Groner)

Adam discussed that efforts have been underway to fill in the model for the recidivism and crime rates for DJJ and create the DJJ program inventory. We are currently evaluating their Substance Use Disorder

(SUD) program. We are working with their CFO to quantify program costs at the individual facilities. The first evaluation should be completed by the November meeting.

After Juvenile Justice, our next domain will be Substance Use Disorder (SUD). Multiple CROs will work with us to create a statewide program inventory for the SUD. We'll work to avoid lag periods between activities.

Curt is making modifications to SPART. Additional questions are being added to better determine if the program is meeting core concepts. Points will be awarded in the analysis process. We have learned from the previous assessments. Several studies underline the meta-analysis that would be beneficial for us to access to learn program-specific core concepts. For GOMB, the challenge is getting access to the underlying studies.

Adam noted that literature reviews are necessary for thoroughly evaluating each program e.g. best practices, changes in the research, etc. There are many substance abuse programs to analyze. It is difficult to access research articles. The Illinois Criminal Justice Authority has done a lot of research for us. Curt stated that getting access to research is time-consuming and cumbersome. We need login information to be able to access research databases remotely.

Jim suggested we ask the chancellor at U of I or another public university to give GOMB access to their research database. Megan from ICJIA commented that all agencies struggle with accessing the information they need that universities have. "We all need access so we should have a conversation in the future to talk about gaining access for everyone who needs research information." Another attendee stated that legislature should require public agencies to allow state agencies to access their research databases. A third individual asked what the Secretary of State's office uses. Curt replied that the Illinois State Library is their source but their information is not necessarily, what is needed for these program assessments. It was suggested that the Rapid Results team might be able to help identify how to implement this in a cost-effective way.

Two recommendations were offered to solve the issue of a lack of access to research databases:

- 1) Approach someone in the university system to get GOMB access immediately, or
- 2) Draft legislation for wider access to CROs and other agency officers.

6. Annual Mandates Reduction Process (Curt)

Curt stated that one of the most important functions BFR does is to ask state agencies to submit a list of the annual legislative mandates that are out of date. GOMB sifts through them and moves them through legislative action.

Overview of the Mandates Working Group Process

- We received 51 mandate requests across 19 agencies.
- After GOMB review, we have 22 mandates requests across 11 agencies that are ready for review by the mandates working group.
- During the first week of September, the 22 mandates will be circulated to the members of the working group, legislative staff, and to the 11 agencies' CROs. They have until Sept 21st to review them and formulate questions.

- Via telephone conference, all applicable parties including the agency representatives responsible for drafting the mandate recommendation will address questions about the submitted mandates. Representatives of legislative caucuses and working group members can veto any mandates.
- A final vote will take place on October 5th by the full commission.

Curt read the list of the members of the working groups.

Megan asked what the process is for including/excluding mandates. Curt stated that mandates that are larger policy issues cannot be included in these mandate relief effort. They are excluded. Examples include reforms to the procurement process. Megan said she received an email that all four of her recommendations were rejected. Curt and Nana said the emailed stated two were excluded and two are still under review. Megan said she will review the email again.

Curt clarified that in the past we submitted an omnibus BFR bill. We have determined that is more effective to submit a package that lumps like items together. This makes it easier for legislative review. We want to ensure as many mandate recommendations move forward as possible to realize the greatest impact for the state agencies. Curt further emphasized that legislative staff will be represented in the process of drafting a bill from the start. The previous process was less effective for the review/submission stage. Members of the working group will reach out to legislative staff representatives, members of the commission, and agency CROs.

7. Commission Annual Report (Curt)

Curt said the primary drafting of the annual report takes place toward the end of September. The BFR Unit drafts the report. Annual recommendations are made to the Governor and legislators. Members of the commission should start thinking about their recommendations now so that the recommendations can be discussed during the October 5 meeting. Curt asked for recommendations in writing via email a week before October 5.

If necessary, we have meeting on October 19 via conference call to work out the final draft of the report. We will have one more meeting on October 26 to formally adopt the final draft.

Senator Althoff suggested that when BFR submits annual reports, we should send letters to caucus leaders, legislators, etc. stating that these are our legislative recommendations. We should copy the chiefs of staff.

8. New Business (Jim and Curt)

Curt announced that Nana is moving to a new position in Chicago. Nana has been with BFR for three years and has done a stellar job. She has brought efficiency and order to our process. Jim offered kudos to Nana for handling responsibilities beyond her BFR work. Nana stated she just received her Master's in Computer Science from UIS and will be working with Levy.

Curt acknowledged that the Unit will be filling Nana's position and has two other positions open. He noted that several resumes from very qualified people have been received. We hope to fill the open positions quickly so we can work on more programs concurrently generating more program assessments.

The BFR Unit also shared that it has been able to leverage a contract with Tableau data visualization software at GOMB to analyze budget data. DoIT has installed the software and we'll be producing a data visualization of the FY19 proposed and enacted budget. Our deliverable will be similar to the State of Ohio's interactive budget visualization.

Over time, IPRS data will be visualized through Tableau. We will link the performance measures to it. We will be able view data over time. We plan to apply common language before we display the data to the public and will use the GOMB style guide. As we learn more about Tableau's functionality, we'll determine what additional data we may need to capture. CROs are encouraged to think outside of the box with how they capture and display data.

Adam recently attended a NASBO meeting and reported that NASBO applauded Illinois and BFR for making significant contributions toward results-based budgeting in general.

9. Adjournment

BFR Public meeting adjourned at 2:38 pm.