

Potential BFR Commission Recommendations for the November 2012 Report (10/11/12)

Representative Will Davis

Representative David Harris

Larry Joseph

Jim Lewis

Roger Myerson

Maria de Jesus Prado

Lyle Logan

John Bouman

Cristal Thomas

Greg Wass

Ben Winick

Public Engagement

- The BFR Commission should make a concerted effort over the next year to proactively engage stakeholders in all seven of the BFR Result areas, including obtaining input on statewide outcomes, program outcomes, strategies and metrics.
- The BFR Commission should have more public hearings over the course of the next year, including public hearings held after regular business hours to encourage broader participation.
- GOMB should establish a user-friendly, public-facing website that includes materials from BFR Commission hearings, the BFR table from the annual budget, and performance measures and outcomes to the program level.
- The BFR Commission needs to develop a mechanism to collect feedback on government functions that are not delivered through grants/contracts but directly from government (i.e. local DHS and IDHS offices, etc.).
- State agencies and stakeholders should utilize social media and existing communications with their customers and members to further engage the public in BFR.
- The BFR Commission should engage legislators to ensure that they are fully informed about BFR.

BFR Implementation

- The Governor and General Assembly should pursue needed investments in technology and data infrastructure to support an outcome-driven budget and evaluate program performance.
- State agencies, in cooperation with private partners/funders, should develop a plan to help grantees build capacity for BFR.
- GOMB, DHS, and other state agencies should review the information the State currently collects from providers and other agents and eliminate duplicative, unnecessary or unhelpful reporting to reduce administrative burden.

Budget Allocation

- Illinois should establish spending priorities to avoid BFR becoming a “value-less” model, in which two effective, well-run programs are valued equally without regard to the social benefits they produce.
- The General Assembly should use reliable, consensus revenue estimates as the basis for appropriable funds each year.
- After agreeing on state budget priorities for the Fiscal Year, the General Assembly should approve revenue allocation to programs that support those priorities, and adjust spending based on achievement of program objectives rather than incremental changes to budget lines.
- The State should assess real program costs and needs in determining funding amounts rather than the historical allocations the State currently employs.
- Budgeting for Results should be fully integrated into the annual appropriations process.
- Appropriations or allocations should be based on the outcomes the State wants to purchase and how effective programs are at achieving those outcomes, rather than historic expenditure levels.
- The Commission should develop a strategy to effectively communicate tradeoffs with legislators on an ongoing basis.
- During their presentations before House and Senate appropriations committees, state agencies should be prepared to: discuss which line items make up each program (or which programs are included in a single line item); explain the objectives of at least one program; identify performance metrics for at least one program; and report on program performance against those metrics.

Mandates

- The BFR Commission should request information from state agencies and commissions on unfunded, outdated, unnecessary or burdensome mandates, review the Auditor General’s annual audit reports, and recommend the elimination of such mandates as appropriate.
- Mandates should be subject to the same performance evaluation standards as other state programs.

Pension Reform

- The General Assembly should address the unsustainable crowding out of funding priorities by growing pension obligations.