

Budgeting for Results Commission

Friday, April 29, 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, John Maki, Dr. Jim Lewis, Jesse Elam, Sophia Ronis, Bobbie Wanzo, Adam Miliszewski, Dr. Ewa Ewa, Matt Coyne, Brittany Groot, Steve Gyabil, Gia Orr, and Megan Alderden

Springfield: Curt Clemons-Mosby, Jennifer Butler, Nana Mkheidze, Kevin Kulvic, Alexis White, Courtney Bott, Deborah Miller, Roma Larson.

Phone: Senator Pam Althoff, Ruth Coffman, Paula Worthington. Various agency representatives including Chief Results Officers (CROs) were also in attendance.

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions – Steve Schnorf

Steve Schnorf welcomed everyone to the meeting and had everyone present introduce themselves.

2. Mandates Legislation Report – Curt Clemons-Mosby

Curt gave the status of BFR mandates reduction legislation, Senate Bill 2884 and 2657. Both bills have passed through the Senate, with the support of Senator Heather Steans and Senator Pamela Althoff. In the House both bills are sponsored by Representative William Davis and Representative David Harris

Curt explained that the mandates subject to appropriation will be held until next year due to time constraints imposed by the legislative process.

Curt will be working with Representative Harris and Representative Davis to move both bills through the House. Furthermore, Curt stated that the process of identifying unduly burdensome mandates, for next year, within state agencies will begin this summer.

3. **Review and Approval of Minutes** – Steve Schnorf

The March 25, 2016 meeting minutes were approved with no comments or edits.

4. **New Business**

Jennifer Butler stated that the BFR Commission should adopt a policy in compliance with the Open Meeting Act, to allow the Commissioners to fully participate telephonically in BFR Commission meetings. BFR Commissioners participating telephonically will assume all rights of a Commissioner including the right to vote on BFR Commission matters. Roma Larson, BFR's Ethics Officer, added that the policy must stipulate that Commissioners may participate by phone when extenuating circumstances (e.g., family emergency, illness or proximity to the meeting location) will not allow the Commissioners to be physically present. Commissioners should make every attempt to be physically present at either the Springfield or Chicago meeting location. Telephonic participation will be permitted in lieu of physical presence under the conditions specified. Quorum requirements can be met by a combination of telephonic and physically presented BFR Commissioners. The proposal was approved with no comments or edits.

5. **Update and Discussion on SPART Pilot** – Curt Clemons-Mosby

Steve Schnorf gave an overview of the State Program Assessment Tool (SPART) process and mentioned that in the previous meeting Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) had volunteered to test the process on one of their programs.

Curt gave background information on the SPART process and how it was developed from the federal PART process. SPART emphasizes the relationship between outcome, output, and efficiency measures in regards to program performance. ICJIA volunteered their Adult Redeploy Program (ARI) for a pilot review of the SPART process. The SPART process uses a questionnaire composed of 10 yes or no questions. Megan Alderden explained the background of the ARI program and its objectives. ARI is designed to be a data driven program.

The ARI program seeks to safely divert non-violent offenders from prison to a more effective and less expensive community-based supervision. Costs are being reduced by not housing these individuals at the Department of Corrections facilities. Funding is provided to local entities for programming to address the risks and needs of the offenders in a more productive environment.

Megan responded to questions concerning the basis for calculation the SPART score and addressed questions about program effectiveness. She responded that the number of crimes have declined by 25% (year to year comparison) in the locations where this program is taking place. Megan further stated non-violent offenders are encouraged to go through the program. This program also indirectly assists in relieving the overpopulation of the prison system.

Jim Lewis asked about the objective of the program and other goals the program may be trying to achieve, such as cost savings. Curt stated if the program is achieving its core goals then by definition, the program must be functioning. The SPART process is not a cost-benefit analysis but is about measuring program level performance. Curt added that the cost-benefit analysis is something that can be analyzed after the SPART phase is completed.

Steve inquired if GATA would include performance measures and Jennifer Butler responded that performance reporting is required for all grants. An agency representative asked about the use and application of IPRS performance measures. Curt responded that the IPRS measures are developed by agencies for each program annually. Those measures are then utilized in the annual budget book process by the Governor's Office of Management and Budget (GOMB).

Debbie Miller, Chief Financial Officer and Chief Results Officer for the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA), explained how the measures are developed by the agency and to show quantitative results. The metrics should be a reflection of what the program is trying to achieve through more qualitative measures. Curt agreed to convene a Chief Results Officers (CRO) meeting to address the identification, reporting and management of IPRS performance measures.

Steve inquired about the ARI results from the SPART process, which came back as 100 out of 100. Curt responded that these are binary questions with a yes or no response. In the current format, if a program such as ARI is able to achieve a yes answer on all the questions, it receives a 100 point or perfect score for the entire review. In this instance, ARI was able to meet the criteria for a yes answer on each of the 10 questions. Jim Lewis stated that the scoring system could be improved with a scaled differential that allows more degree of response other than yes or no. Other BFR members agreed that some weighting of response was needed.

6. Next Steps for the BFR Commission – Curt Clemons-Mosby

Based on the feedback provided and additional research, Curt will update the SPART questionnaire to incorporate more weighted questions so the programmatic assessment further assess the degree of program effectiveness.

Curt and Jennifer will begin drafting a framework for a program-based cost / benefit assessment that can be integrated with the SPART tool. The framework must account for the nuances among programs while offering a standard methodology that can be uniformly applied for state-wide cost comparisons.

Curt reminded everyone that by statute the BFR commission is required to have two public hearings each year, one in Chicago and one in Springfield. The commission needs to discuss optional dates for those hearings. The Commission needs to initiate its request for agencies to submit unduly burdensome mandates to be considered for a repeal. An annual report is

drafted each year after the public hearings and after the mandate recommendations have been voted upon. Curt recommended that the mandates process begin in the summer and the hearings be held at the end of summer and/or beginning of fall.

Curt stated that the BFR Commission needs to send a headshot along with a short biography to Nana Mkheidze so that GOMB can update the BFR Commission website.

7. Next Meeting – Steve Schnorf

Friday, June 24th 1:30 to 3:30 PM; Chicago: JRTC 16-100 Springfield: 500 ½ STRATTON

8. Meeting Adjourned

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25PM