

Budgeting for Results Commission

Friday, September 30th, 2016

1:30PM – 3:30pm

Meeting Location

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

Springfield – Stratton Building 500 ½

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

Attendance

Chicago: Steve Schnorf, Jim Lewis, Jesse Elam, Nelson Gerew, Paula Worthington, Jose Sanchez, Mischa Fisher.

Springfield: Curt Clemons-Mosby, Jennifer Butler, Nana Mkheidze, John O'Conner, Dianne Barghouti.

Phone: Senator Heather Steans, Senator Pamela Althoff, and various state agency representatives including Chief Results Officers (CROs) were also in attendance.

Review and Approval of Minutes

The June 24th, 2016 meeting minutes were approved with no comments or edits.

Update from the BFR Public Hearings

The BFR public hearing were held on August 31, 2016 at University of Illinois at Springfield and on September 7th, 2016 at James R. Thompson Center at Chicago. Steve reported that both hearings were well attended, over 80 and 100 attendees respectfully. Public comments from hearings highlighted consolidations of private not-for-profits necessitated by funding limitations, the ongoing need for state agency coordination as the Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA) is implemented, concerns about procurement reform, and various comments about program analysis at the state and grantee level.

Speakers reiterated the need for procurement reform to increase efficiency and reduce cost. Commissions agreed that the need for procurement reform is great and acknowledged in-process legislation efforts. The Commission agreed to emphasize public sentiment for procurement reform within its annual report.

During the hearings, not-for-profits expressed concern about time allotted to comply with new GATA requirements for fiscal year 2017 (FY17) grant awards. Jennifer Butler clarified what is perceived as "GATA" requirements are actually Federal requirements that have been in place for some time. Prior to GATA, state agencies carried out the requirements independently. GATA provides a statewide compliance framework. Senator Althoff requested that the Grant

Accountability and Transparency Unit be informed of GATA-related comments raised during the hearings. She noted that the GATA team has accomplished a lot and is committed to process improvement. Jennifer Butler stated that the Grant Accountability and Transparency Unit (GATU) was aware of the BFR hearing comments. She thanked the Senator for her assessment of GATA implementation and noted that FY17 was a transitional first year for both state agencies and grantees.

Recommended Mandates from Workgroup Review

Curt explained that each year the BFR Commission is required by statute (15 ILCS 20/50-25) to “review existing mandated expenditures and include in its annual report recommendations for the termination of mandated expenditures.” The Commission, via GOMB, gathers these recommendations from state agencies and provides recommendations to the commission.

The Mandate Workgroup reviews the mandate recommendations and determines which recommendations to recommend to the Commission. The workgroup identified 30 mandates for recommendation. The Commission reviewed the 30 mandates recommended by the working group and voted to include the entire group in the Commission’s 2016 annual report. (During the meeting one DCEO recommendation was flagged for verification and was subsequently cleared.)

The Commission directed staff to continue gathering information on mandate recommendations that lacked sufficient clarification for the Mandate Workgroup to form a recommendation. BFR staff will return those mandates to the respective state agencies and schedule a follow-up with the state agency and the Mandate Workgroup to address specific clarification points. The Workgroup anticipates submitting another set of mandate relief recommendations to the Commission at a subsequent meeting.

Update from the Cost/Benefit Working Group

Jim restated the Cost/Benefit Workgroup’s scope which is to develop a methodology for a standardized cost / benefit model applicable to all state programs utilizing available IPRS data. Jim explained that a review of IPRS data was performed so that the Workgroup could understand how state agencies were presenting their programs, program goals and program measures. This review resulted in consensus that a significant amount of the IPRS PRS program information needs to be restated to ensure that the program goals are an accurate reflection of the program’s intent. The Workgroup confirmed the need for agencies to re-evaluate program inventory. The Workgroup identified programs that have a defined methodology and data versus programs that lacked methodology, data or both.

The Workgroup focused on select agencies to perform a comprehensive review of each IPRS program write-up and how to best analyze the program. Four agencies were selected to pilot the evolution of the agency’s IPRS data: DCEO, Aging, DHS – Mental Health, and ICJIA. The

pilot agencies worked with the Workgroup to restate goals and measures and participated in dialog to determine data availability and agree on a methodology for evaluating each program.

Jim highlighted the Workgroup's accomplishments to date. He emphasized that process of developing a structure for program assessments is an evolution of sequential steps. Deliberate efforts are needed at each stage to ensure that this work establishes a foundation for future success with statewide program assessments and program comparisons. Curt stated that there were several key lessons learned during this process including identifying programs that need to rework their measurements in IPRS. Jim recognized the Commission's desire to begin evaluating and comparing programs as soon as possible. He restated that the work in process is critical to ensure the program analysis is based on a solid foundation.

Curt affirmed that the State Program Assessment Tool (SPART) and the Cost/Benefit tool will be used together to complete the comprehensive program assessment. Doing the SPART or Cost/Benefit alone will produce a partial program assessment. The Commission agreed with this dual approach for program assessments.

Discussion - BFR Commission Annual Report

Curt reminded the Commission of the 11/1/16 BFR Annual Report due date. Revisions to the version of the report distributed for the 9/30 meeting are due to BFR staff by 10/14/16.

A revised report will be distributed in advance of the upcoming 10/28/16 meeting and additional changes will be incorporated for a final report sign-off at the 10/28/16 meeting.

New Business

No questions or statements of new business were brought before the Commission.

Next Meeting

Friday, October 28 from 1:30 to 3:30 PM. JRTC 16-100 500 ½ STRATTON

Meeting Adjourned

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.