

Budgeting for Results Commission

Friday, June 24th, 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: Senator Heather Steans, Representative William Davis, Steve Schnorf, Jim Lewis, John Maki, Nelson Herew, Paula Worthington, Gia Orr, Peter Matuszak.

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

Phone: Various state agency representatives including Chief Results Officers (CROs) were also in attendance.

Agenda

1. **Welcome and Introductions** – Curt Clemons-Mosby
2. **Review and Approval of Minutes** – Curt Clemons-Mosby

The April 29th, 2016 meeting minutes were approved with no comments or edits.

3. **Mandates Legislation Report** – Curt Clemons-Mosby
 - a. Passage of SB 2657 – The senate bill passed both chambers of legislature and is on the Governor's desk.
 - b. Status of SB 2884 and Next Steps – Senate Bill 2884 passed the Senate and waiting for passage in the House of Representatives. GOMB believes the bill will pass either during the summer or in veto session in November.
4. **Update and Discussion on SPART Tool** - Curt Clemons-Mosby
 - a. A new question format for the SPART was presented as an Exhibit to the meeting agenda.

During the April BFR Commission business meeting, the Commission discussed the way questions were weighed for the State Program Assessment Tool (SPART) using a binary method of yes and no questions. In response to Commission dialog, and with the help of professors of the Public Administration department at University of Illinois Springfield (UIS), a new method was proposed to the Commission. The new method is a nested binary scale. Jim Lewis suggested that a three option response system be developed for each question to provide the rater more flexibility when review a program where the

results are marginal. Jim suggested a scale of “fully meets requirements,” “partially meets requirements, and “does not meet requirements.”

Representative William Davis asked if SPART will evaluate the program as a whole at the agency level or if individual, community-based providers and grantees will be evaluated by the SPART. Curt responded that the SPART is designed to evaluate the entire program as a whole at the agency level. Individual community based providers and grantees are evaluated by SPART only insofar as their success contributes to the success of the program overall. Their contribution is measured in SPART through the program performance information they submit to the state agency program managers.

Gia Orr, of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, suggested key terms for IPRS and SPART be checked and aligned. Steve Schnorf stated that the SPART evaluation should be ongoing and that various idiosyncrasies that may affect the analysis of the program should be noted. John Maki added that there also needs to be prioritization of outcomes evaluated. Steve stated that the analysis should include the background of the program. Knowing that a program is a mandate adds perspective to the analysis.

- b. The Commission discussed the new cost / benefit component of the program evaluation model. Curt introduced and thanked Dr. Richard Funderburg, David Racine and Dr. Beverley Bunch for their assistance providing research and guidance on this component of the SPART.

Jim Lewis stated that the analysis of the programs, including the cost / benefit assessment, should provide information on resource allocations. Jim Lewis and Paula Worthington agree that there should be a working group to guide the Commission in developing a cost / benefit assessment capability. After additional dialog regarding SPART analysis, the Commission agreed to form a BFR Cost / Benefit working group to address issues regarding SPART analysis. The inclusion of a cost / benefit assessment will make the over-all program analysis more robust. This new working groups will attempt to establish parameters around the costs and benefits to be evaluated. It will consider other parties that may be indirectly affected by the program and which costs have an actual effect? Chariman Schnorf supported the utilization of the working group and asked the working group to consider how a “value” calculation should be analyzed. The dialog noted that values can be changed with circumstance through cultures and administrations. The Commissioners agreed that the value calculation needs to be flexible enough to account for change in circumstances.

Curt and Jennifer Butler stated that they will recruit people to be part of the new working group. Steve added that the working group should provide information of what can be done to improve or better fine tune the SPART tool by the next commission meeting. Curt encouraged Commissioners to submit suggestions for the framework to the BFR staff. Jennifer requested Commissioners notify Nana Mkheidze by email if they wish to be part of the working group.

5. Report of Performance Measure Discussion Curt Clemons-Mosby

In response to dialog from the June meeting, BFR staff conducted a conference call with the Chief Results Officers (CRO). Because the CRO position tends to be somewhat transitional within the agency, BFR staff reiterated that IPRS programs and performance measures are set by the agency. Neither the BFR Commission nor BFR staff set agency-level programs or measures. CROs in attendance gained awareness that the programs the agencies identified and performances measured may not accurately reflect the focus of the agency or the measurements that most accurately evaluate the results of the agency. CRO left the call understanding that continual work is needed to improve agency program mix and performance measures.

CROs understood that they have the authority to change the IPRS measurements and indicated that they are aware of legacy measurements issues. However, to create new programs and measure requires resources that may not be available CROs and BFR staff will continue to dialogue on this topic and utilize tools such as SharePoint to share best practices. The IPRS is meant to tell a story, and provide historical context. If the agencies are using programs and measurements that do not provide meaningful, useful management data, the information is less valued and the SPART and cost / benefit assessments will be skewed accordingly. Agencies need to take ownership in their IPRS programs and performance measures and can do so with the advice and support of GOMB.

6. Planning for BFR Commission Public Hearings, Curt Clemons-Mosby
Initiating Agency Requests for Mandate Relief

There are two BFR public hearings per year, one in Chicago and one in Springfield. An email will be sent to determine best dates for the Commission in each location.

The mandates reduction working group will begin the mandate relief process in early or mid-July. The BFR staff will send instructions to state agencies.. The BFR staff will do the initial review of responses. In early August the mandates working group will convene with the same members as last year, to review and discuss the master list as submitted by the agencies. The list will be presented to the full Commission during the September meeting and included in the Annual Report in November.

New Business:

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

7. **Next Meeting** – Steve Schnorf

Friday, September 30th 1:30 to 3:30 PM. JRTC 16-100 500 ½ STRATTON

8. Meeting Adjourned

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.