

Budgeting for Result Commission

Friday, April 6, 2018

1:30PM-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, Nelson Gerew

Springfield: Kathy Saltmarsh, Curt Clemons-Mosby, Jennifer Butler, Nana Mkhaidze, Adam Groner

Phone: Representative William Davis, Senator Heather Steans, Various state agency representatives including Chief Results Officers (CROs) were also in attendance in Springfield, Chicago and by phone.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Introductions by the Commission and state agencies were made.

2. Review and Approval of Minutes – Jim Lewis

The February 23, 2018, Budgeting For Results (BFR) meeting minutes were approved with no comments or edits.

3. Status of BFR Bills

Curt provided a status of Senate Bill 1936, which contains the Commission's mandate recommendations from 2017. He anticipates the Senate will concur with the House Amendment and the bill will become law. Curt stated that Senate Bill 3186, which includes 17 mandates that were removed from the SB 1936, is moving through the Senate. Senate Bill 1008, which contains 4 mandates removed from SB 1936 by advice of legislative staff, is proceeding in the senate.

4. Updates on Results First and SPART

Adam Groner updated the progress of the Results First and SPART performance evaluations. Adam said that the BFR Unit has worked with the Department of Corrections to complete five program evaluations within the Results First Adult Crime policy domain. The Unit is completing two additional program evaluations in Adult Crime: Electronic monitoring and GPS monitoring. Both programs are operated by IDOC with input from the Illinois Prisoner Review Board. The Unit anticipates a final draft for the Commissions review before summer 2018.

The BFR Unit is also working with the Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ), the Sentencing Policy Advisory Council (SPAC) and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) on gathering and calculating the data needed to run the Results First Juvenile Justice Domain benefit-cost model. The information includes probability of each type of crime committed and the attached resource use (local detention pretrial, IDJJ + aftercare, local probation, local detention posttrial), also the length of stay in juvenile facilities. All these components are necessary inputs to generate a benefit-cost analysis using the model. IDJJ, SPAC and BFRU are also completing the juvenile cohort recidivism

analysis, the number of adjudications each year post initial adjudication and the probability of each crime type.

The BFR Unit and IDJJ have created an inventory of juvenile justice programs needed for the Results First model and SPART. The inventory includes program descriptions, program costs, target populations, service providers, annual capacity and whether there is a state or federal mandate. Efforts are ongoing to calculate the specific marginal program costs using IDJJ service provider contract information.

Work with IDJJ will soon begin on targets and goals for each program to complete the SPART evaluations that provide context and background for the Results First benefit-cost reports.

Jesse Elam asked if the Cost-Benefit Working Group is still active. Curt responded that the working group is currently dormant because efforts are focused in the targeted policy domains. Jesse inquired about a long term plan after the criminal justice domain. Curt said the next prioritized area for evaluation is Substance Use Disorder (SUD) because it utilizes data gathered from the Adult Crime and Juvenile Justice policy domains. The Results First model builds upon itself using this format. SUD will also be the first domain that will encompass programs from across multiple state agencies. Curt said Adult Crime and Juvenile Justice have been a great opportunity to learn the pitfalls in the process better preparing us to move into the more complicated SUD policy domain.

Jennifer Butler added that Curt has been very effective engaging key stakeholders at the right time to promote meaningful, collaborative efforts. It will take a lot more planning and coordination with multiple state agencies to bring everything together. Adam emphasized the intentional efforts to work closely with all relevant state agencies, stakeholders and Results First. Jennifer said that all planning must keep in mind stakeholder engagement. Curt concluded that the lessons learned and knowledge gained were necessary to enable program assessment to move on to SUD and other domains like Workforce Development and Child Welfare in the future.

5. Planning for summer BFR Hearings

Panel participants in Chicago and Springfield were discussed. Jim contacted potential panelists for the Chicago hearing focusing on healthcare analytics. Jim reached out to Jose Sanchez and Professor Meltzer from Northwestern University and Professor Dranove at University of Chicago. The two speakers in Springfield will be Kathy Saltmarsh and Adam Groner. Results First has committed to send a representative to each hearing.

Curt is preparing the BFR annual overview which will be provided at both Hearings. Jim asked if the Governor could be invited. Curt responded affirmatively stating the Governor will be invited to both events again; last year he had a schedule conflict. Curt will work with the University of Illinois Springfield to do media outreach utilizing their radio station and other university mass-communication tools. A press release will be generated to promote the Hearings as well.

Curt reminded everyone that the hearings are June 20th in Springfield and June 27th in Chicago. Jim added that June is a great time to get people engaged to come to the event. Gia Orr asked

permission to circulate meeting flyers to colleges and universities. Curt responded affirmatively. We welcome and encourage commissioners and CROs to spread the word and promote the Hearings.

Jim Lewis asked if the BFR Unit was following up on the University of Chicago's request to assist the commission. Curt said we agreed to work on a proposal with the University of Chicago in the fall to examine options for their Spring 2019 semester.

6. IPRS Update

IPRS is the State's centralized database of nearly 400 programs. The core functionality is built around a logic model, program information and performance data. IPRS was built in 2012 and enhanced with additional functionality and reporting capabilities. Information in IPRS is reported on a quarterly basis. Curt discussed how the IPRS system is used at GOMB and the process state agency CROs utilize to input and manage program specific data, goals and targets.

Curt reviewed an IPRS report from the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO). It included descriptions, appropriations and key performance metrics of agency programs. Illinois budgets by line item not by program. Analysts and CROs tie budget line items to agency programs. When the budget is presented in bill form, those programs are converted back into line items. Many agencies have legacy measures in IPRS dating prior to 2012. Legacy measures typically report outputs instead of outcomes. As the BFR Unit works through each state agency, measures will be updated and refined. Additionally, the Cost-Benefit Working Group reviewed performance measures in the summer of 2017 and recommended modifications. Some changes have been implemented and some are in process.

Jesse Elam asked if the numbers reported are benchmarks or minimums. John O'Conner, CRO at DCEO answered that benchmarks should match fiscal year estimates. However, at the end of the fiscal year, the number is updated based on actuals and the next fiscal year's benchmark is entered. Jim asked for clarification regarding the purpose of the benchmark. John said the IPRS metrics are not intended as minimum or maximum outcome, but instead realistically achievable goals based on anticipated funding levels. CROs use the IPRS data to identify and explain data trends.

Jim asked how IPRS data aligns with the data needed to run the Results First model. Adam responded that program information in IPRS is necessary for the model and the SPART, including program description, usage rates and appropriations. IPRS data is becoming more and more applicable. Curt agreed that as we continue to work with Results First we are refining data in IPRS. Jennifer acknowledged work by state agencies to derive the IPRS data. Jesse said that appropriations data is a reflection of budget priorities. Curt agreed that IPRS shows what has been achieved with the resources allocated to a particular program over time. Curt said that resource allocation combined with overall program effectiveness is powerful information to help make funding decisions. Jim asked what kind of guidance is given to agencies. Curt referenced the IPRS manual which provides guidance on each element to be completed by CROs. Additional guidance comes through the BFR Unit's completion of the performance evaluation on agency programs.

Representative Davis talked about IPRS data and how that information could be used to make decisions about whether agencies are funded properly to meet their goals. Jim and Representative

Davis discussed using the term “benchmark goal” instead of “benchmark” within IPRS. Jesse asked whether there is a strategic plan for IPRS. Jim stressed the need to set benchmarks to ensure performance measurements are meaningful. Curt clarified that strategically, CROs use IPRS to report program data and the BFR Unit utilizes IPRS within the Results First and SPART processes. Jennifer noted the objective of the Commission to make better use of IPRS data to inform the budget process. Curt agreed that the BFR Unit can discuss strategy setting around IPRS data, potentially incorporating recommendations from the Commission into the annual report.

John Webber, CRO of Central Management Services spoke about former Commission Chairman Steve Schnorf, saying Steve would be pleased to hear the IPRS conversation and the direction Budgeting for Results is heading. John emphasized that this is how strategic management is done. It is more difficult in the public sector because strategy is often complicated by political concerns. IPRS is an agreed upon standard database, and until you can adequately analyze the measures, it's difficult to make decisions on how to evaluate programs going forward. He further stated that the old adage is, it is easier to start a program in the state than it is to end one. He recommended the reinstatement of a 2-year budget. Representative Davis noted appreciation for John's comments and said this process is showing what we should be doing, not what our political ideology is. Curt said that a 2-year budget was a BFR recommendation in the initial annual report

John noted duplication of effort between the Public Accountability Report mandated by the comptroller's office and IPRS reporting. It was suggested that the BFR Unit work with IOC to strive to eliminate or minimize dual reporting requirements and ease the burden on state agencies.

7. New Business

Jennifer updated the GANT chart for calendar year 2018.

8. Adjournment

BFR Public meeting adjourned at 3:20