

## **Budgeting for Results Commission**

Friday, March 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016

1:30PM – 3:30pm

### **Meeting Location**

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

Springfield – Stratton Building 500 ½

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

### **Attendance**

Chicago: Senator Heather Steans, Steve Schnorf, Nelson Gerew, John Maki, Paula Worthington, Dr. Jim Lewis, Jesse Elam, Sophia Ronis, Ruth Coffman.

Springfield: Curt Clemons-Mosby, Jennifer Butler, Nana Mkheidze, Cory Burris, Kevin Kulvik, Beverley Bunch.

Phone: Senator Pam Althoff and Layla Suleman Gonzalez.

### **Agenda**

#### **1. Welcome and Introductions – Steve Schnorf**

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

#### **2. Review and Approval of Minutes – Steve Schnorf**

The December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2015 meeting minutes were approved with no comments or edits.

#### **3. Mandates Legislation Report – Steve Schnorf**

Curt explained that questions related to technical language changes could not be answered within the allotted time frame, therefore, 57 out of 84 mandates approved by the BFR Commission were added to Senate Bill 2884.

Steve emphasized that agencies seeking the repeal of mandates should submit draft language along with the request.

Curt stated that the Governor's Office of Management and Budget (GOMB) added fund cleanup language to the bill to address years of neglected statutory changes. Curt and Jennifer Butler also recognized Cory Burris of GOMB for his assistance identifying fund cleanup items and drafting SB2884. Jennifer stated that GOMB is committed to open communication while the bill advances through the legislative process.

#### 4. **Proposed Framework for Program Performance** – Curt Clemons-Mosby

Curt provided background on prior research for a framework for program performance. In 2011 when BFR was enacted into law, the Commission began to examine options to review and evaluate state programs and assign qualitative and quantitative ratings. There are limited tools that evaluate program performance. The Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) that is used on the federal level at the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Curt added that PART was suspended at the federal level after administrative changes in 2008.

Patrick R. Mullen, Ph.D., a creator of the PART process was teaching at the University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS) and provided assistance to the BFR Commission in 2011 to help create a tool similar to PART with a state focus, SPART. Dr. Mullen agreed to work pro bono. Curt, Dr. Mullen and a small group of GOMB and UIS staff developed an initial process for the state-level assessment. Due to time and resource constraints, the state-level assessment was not completed. The research and process work done under the 2011 SPART initiative is still applicable and could be continued under the current BFR Commission.

Curt explained how PART could be modeled for the state level. GOMB would start from the state-version of the PART questionnaire developed in 2011 and refine as needed. SPART examines how a program delivers services. The questionnaire is organized around four components: purpose, planning, management and results. The questionnaire evaluates the program's ability to achieve its own goals based on fact-based evidence. To prevent a subjective evaluation, GOMB analysts would be required to work with the agency staff to perform the analysis.

Program evaluations could be performed on a rolling schedule so that GOMB budget analyst resources were not over extended.

Steve stressed that the presented framework gets to the heart of what the BFR Commission was established to do. It is a cost efficient and valid means of comparing program outcomes and costs. Steve suggested the Commission pilot one program in an agency using the SPART questionnaire that was previously prepared by BFR. Curt estimated it would take about 2 to 3 weeks for a pilot assessment. Curt proposed to engage GOMB budget analysts in the analysis of their assigned agency. Jennifer noted that the pilot approach would allow for lessons learned, inform the evolution of the questionnaire, and position the Commission to provide feedback in the broader application for the tool for all programs.

The Commission agreed that GOMB would perform the pilot assessment before the April BFR Commission business meeting. An online discussion board was agreed upon to engage Commissioners and refine questions and methodology under the pilot.

Curt added, that the process needs to be reviewed and validated so stakeholders are comfortable with the key components of the assessment, the weight of the questions, perceive the process to be fair. The evaluation must take into account the different aspects of programs, and the agency needs to have confidence in the results of the analysis and perceive that the evaluation was fair.

Steve stressed that the Commission existed three and a half years before the change in administration. In three and a half years, the Commission has not evaluated a single program. Steve emphasized that the Commission should set realistic but ambitious goals for program assessments. He stated that evaluating the process and results is the single most difficult part. Results must be thought of in terms of outcomes. Curt explained that BFR is guiding agencies to improve programmatic reporting to BFR/GOMB. Program analysis will highlight weaknesses in goals and outcomes. Curt agreed that a majority of programs need to rework their measurements. Programs need to be further defined and better articulate objectives John Maki concurred that state agencies must think about their programs differently and re-work measurement definitions, in some cases.

John offered Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) as the pilot agency for the SPART process. Jim Lewis stated that there are some outcomes that can be measured without too many issues. For example, Illinois Department of Transportation outcomes can be connected to miles of roads to build or the ease of getting from point a to b. Jim continued, evaluating outcomes and success of program poses challenges to the evaluation process. Jim concluded that it would be interesting to see what the SPART process could add to the discussion on measuring programs. How and if the SPART process will bring meaningful results can only be answered by testing it out.

Paula added a concern about the level of abstraction, and questioned if the SPART process needs hand holding when evaluating early childhood education or criminal justice, for example. We need to be thoughtful about the outcome measures. If the outcome is not enough then we need to look at and analyze the impact. The extent to which PART is able to evaluate “impact” is unclear.

Paula asked how PART compares to PEW. Curt explained that PART and the Results First Model used by PEW are similar, but Results First takes a more predictive cost-benefit model approach to program evaluation. PART at the federal level and Results First appear to be the only tools that have been implemented to measure program outcomes. All other models are variations on the PART or Results First.

Jesse Elam commented that this is a good starting place to use SPART. Layla identified the pilot as an opportunity to bring a case example to the Commission.

She believes this process offers transparency and could establish outcomes tied to a benchmark.

Curt affirmed that BFR/GOMB staff along with John will work through the specifics and apply the SPART questionnaire towards evaluating an ICJIA program before the April BFR Commission business meeting.

**5. Mandates Subject to Appropriation, Exhibit 2 – Steve Schnorf**

Curt gave a background on the Mandates Committee and explained that the committee met and reviewed twenty-seven mandates subject appropriations. The original sponsors of these mandates were identified. Senator Althoff stated that the Mandates Committee gave consideration to currently serving sponsor of legislation. Senator Steans requested that the summer intern program be maintained. Cory Burriss noted that some of these mandates had been addressed in the fund cleanup portion of SB 2884.

Sixteen mandates subject to appropriation remain. GOMB was able to find the original sponsors for most of these mandates.

Steve made a motion, authorizing the staff to proceed with the remaining mandates subject to confirmation from original sponsors of the mandates. This motion was approved by the BFR commission.

**New Business:**

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

**6. Next Meeting – Steve Schnorf**

Friday, April 29th 1:30 to 3:30 PM

JRTC 16-100 500 ½ STRATTON

**7. Meeting Adjourned**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.