

# Budgeting for Results 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Commission Report

---

*November 1, 2018*

## Contents

A Letter from the BFR Co-Chairs .....	3
Budgeting for Results Commission .....	4
Staff Support .....	5
Executive Summary.....	6
Introduction .....	8
Progress Report.....	10
Program Assessment.....	10
Illinois Performance Reporting System.....	10
Results First.....	11
State Program Assessment Rating Tool (SPART) .....	12
Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA).....	17
Stakeholder Engagement: Public Hearings .....	18
Chief Results Officers (CROs) .....	19
Commission Working Groups .....	19
Mandates Review Working Group.....	19
Progress Update on 2017 Commission Recommendations .....	20
Expanding the Implementation of Results First and SPART .....	20
Incorporating BFR Program Evaluations into the Budget Process.....	21
Incorporating Results First Clearinghouse Data into Legislative Process .....	21
2018 Commission Recommendations .....	22
Explore efficiencies in program assessment.....	22
Explore feasibility of an “Impact Note” attached to legislation .....	22
Work with the Illinois Office of the Comptroller to merge BFR and PAR reporting .....	23
Addition of a Geo-Spatial component to BFR Analysis .....	23
Continued Investment in BFR .....	23
Mandatory Program Evaluations for Programs Receiving 49 or Less in SPART.....	24
Conclusion.....	24
Appendix A.....	26
Appendix B.....	30
Appendix C .....	32

## A Letter from the BFR Co-Chairs

November 1, 2018

To Governor Rauner and Members of the General Assembly:

On behalf of the Budgeting for Results (BFR) Commission, we are pleased to submit our eighth annual report.

The past year saw a significant expansion of BFR's work. After years of supporting the development of the infrastructure to collect state agency program and performance data, the BFR Commission is now supporting production of program assessments to help inform resource allocation decisions. The BFR Unit at the Governor's Office of Management and Budget (GOMB) was able to build capacity to perform more advanced data analysis in collaboration with state agencies. BFR's use of the State Program Assessment Rating Tool (SPART) along with the Results First benefit-cost analysis tool, provided in partnership with the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative, provides a substantial program assessment platform that will continue to be built out over time. Additionally, the Commission recommended 81 state mandates it deemed obsolete that were subsequently repealed by the legislature.

Through collaborative efforts, we have the potential to guide Illinois into a more informed performance-based budgeting process. However, progress does not come without investment. BFR was an unfunded mandate until State Fiscal Year 2019. With financial support, the BFR Unit was able to add two staff members with a dedicated focus on program analytics and benefit-cost computations. BFR work products are a value-added component of state agency program administration and a credible source of quantifiable data regarding Illinois' use of public funds. Continued investment is needed to ensure BFR is able to meet its mandate to assess statewide programs thereby enhancing accountability and transparency within the Illinois budgeting process.

The Commission utilizes this report to promote a year full of tangible accomplishments. The program assessment framework envisioned by the Executive and Legislative branches when BFR was established is now operational. We present this annual report to convey key gains realized and outline the challenges and steps ahead.

We thank you for your support for this important work.

Sincerely,

Jim Lewis  
Co-Chair

Heather Steans  
Co-Chair

## Budgeting for Results Commission

**Co-Chair: Jim Lewis Ph.D.**

Senior Researcher, University of Illinois at Chicago

**Co-Chair: Honorable Heather Steans**

State Senator

**Honorable Pamela Althoff**

State Senator

**Honorable William Davis**

State Representative

**Honorable David Harris**

State Representative

**Curt Clemons-Mosby**

Unit Director, Governor's Office of Management and Budget

**Ruth Coffman**

Executive Director, University of Chicago Urban Labs

**Jesse Elam**

Deputy Executive Director, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

**Mischa Fisher**

Chief Economist, Office of Governor Bruce Rauner

**Nelson Gerew**

Director of Program Investment, Chicago Public Education Fund

**Kathy Saltmarsh**

Executive Director, Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council

**Jose Sanchez**

President, Norwegian American Hospital

## Staff Support

### Governor's Office of Management and Budget

**Hans Zigmund**

Director

**Jennifer Butler**

Deputy Director, Accountability and Results

**Curt Clemons-Mosby**

Director, Budgeting for Results

**Adam Groner**

Budgeting for Results Economist

**Kate Mayer**

Budgeting for Results Data Analyst

**Sophia Ronis**

Administrative Assistant

## Executive Summary

- Established under State Budget Law (15 ILCS 20/50-25), the Budgeting for Results Commission is appointed by Governor Rauner to provide advice in setting statewide outcomes and goals, and best practices in program performance evaluation and benefit-cost analysis.
- The Commission and BFR Unit of the Governor's Office of Management and Budget continue to refine and implement a comprehensive methodology to evaluate program performance. The objective of statewide program analysis is to aid in quantifying program impacts and to inform decision makers as programs are compared across Result Areas.
- The program evaluation framework developed under the BFR Commission utilizes three tools: (1) Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS), (2) Pew-MacArthur Results First benefit-cost methodology and data analytics, and (3) State Program Assessment Rating Tool (SPART).
  - IPRS is the state's web-based database for collecting program performance data from over 400 state agency programs. State agencies utilize IPRS to report programmatic level data to GOMB on a regular basis.
  - The Results First Initiative utilizes clearinghouses on hundreds of evidence-based programs and national best practices in state-level programming. The Results First model provides vetted data analytics to compute quantitative program assessments and benefit-cost computations at a program level.
  - The SPART is an integrated program evaluation tool that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative elements. The SPART analyzes program performance to assign overall program ratings which allow policy makers to compare programs within and across statewide Result Areas.
- At the direction of the BFR Commission, the BFR Unit continued the analysis of the Results First Adult Crime policy domain, begun in 2017. Full program assessment reports are available via the GOMB website at [Budget.Illinois.gov](http://Budget.Illinois.gov).
  - Seven (7) programs within the Illinois Department of Corrections were selected for analysis utilizing the Results First benefit-cost model and SPART:
    - Housing Assistance – Placement programs
    - Correctional Post-Secondary Education
    - Incarceration-Based Therapeutic Communities
    - GPS Monitoring
    - Electronic Monitoring
    - Correctional Adult Basic Education/GED
    - Vocational Education in Prison
  - Quantitative program analysis predicts that the optimal return on investment from the seven (7) programs will be greater than the program cost, if the programs are implemented with fidelity to evidence-based best practices. The analysis also quantifies an anticipated reduction in recidivism correlated with the completion each program, based on the programs being implemented with fidelity to best practices.
  - From a qualitative perspective, program analysis supports the determination that five (5) program are rated as effective or moderately effective as implemented in the State of Illinois as compared to national best practices. Two programs, GPS Monitoring and Electronic Monitoring, were found to be marginally effective as implemented in Illinois when compared to national evidence-based best practices.
  - The Results First benefit-cost tool and the SPART have significantly enhanced the State's ability to perform program analytics. The potential to better inform the state budget process

through fact-based program assessment reports creates a tangible deliverable from the BFR mandate. The BFR Commission further recognizes the opportunity to incorporate evidence-based program reports into all aspects of the budget process.

- To date, the Commission identified and the General Assembly passed legislation to modify or repeal 210 statutory mandates. Seventeen (17) more mandates were identified for repeal or modification in 2018. In addition, the Commission with the assistance of GOMB approved a list of forty (40) cleanup items for funds within the State Treasury. A list of mandates and fund cleanup items is provided as Appendix C.
- This report also includes updates on three recommendations from the 2017 BFR Annual Report. Six recommendations have been identified by the BFR Commission to be addressed during calendar year 2019. They include efficiencies in program assessment, consideration of an “Impact Note” attached to legislation, collaborating with the Illinois Office of the Comptroller to eliminate duplication between BFR and PAR reporting, incorporating a Geo-Spatial component to BFR Analysis, continued investment in BFR, and mandatory program evaluations for programs with an SPART score of 49 or less.

## Introduction

Over the past year there have been many strides in the implementation of the Budgeting for Results statute. In particular, efforts have focused on transforming raw data into information that policymakers can use to inform budgetary decisions. This report highlights the BFR accomplishments over the past year and outlines the strategic priorities identified by the BFR Commission for the future.

BFR is “a method of budgeting where each priority must be justified each year according to merit rather than according to the amount appropriated for the preceding year” (Public Act 96-958). BFR is targeted at moving the state budget process towards measuring the performance of each government program within a set of predefined statewide priority outcomes and informing budgetary allocation decisions to optimize the achievement of these outcomes.

The goals of BFR are to help the public and government decision-makers understand:

- The allocation of tax dollars to fund programs rather than line items;
- If funded programs are operating as designed;
- If funded programs are achieving performance goals;
- If funded programs are achieving statewide outcome goals; and
- How to utilize program performance data as a supporting element in funding determinations.

A chronology of the significant events in the Budgeting for Results process over the preceding seven years can be found in Appendix A of this report.

### **BFR Quick Facts:**

- State spending is classified into seven statewide Result Areas.
- The statewide result areas are further delineated into nine statewide priority outcomes, as identified by Governor Rauner and the Commission.
- There are more than 60 state agencies under the Governor.
- State agencies have defined over 400 distinct programs across state government.
- Over 1,200 performance measures have been identified for state agency programs.

The following table shows the seven statewide result areas along with their associated nine outcome areas and definitions.

Result Area	Statewide Outcome	Definition
<b>Education</b>	Improve School Readiness and Student Success for All	Increase percentage of Illinoisans equipped with skills and knowledge needed for postsecondary and workforce success.
<b>Economic Development</b>	Increase Employment and Attract, Retain and Grow Businesses	Close the opportunity gap in Illinois by ensuring the labor force has the skills necessary to meet the needs of employers and maximize earning potential. Increase business investment and entrepreneurship in Illinois.
<b>Public Safety</b>	Create Safer Communities	Reduce incidence of death, violence, injury, exploitation and fraud.
	Improve Infrastructure	Improve the condition of infrastructure to protect citizens and support commerce.
<b>Human Services</b>	Meet the Needs of the Most Vulnerable	Ensure all residents—but particularly children, the elderly, and persons with disabilities—are able to experience a quality life by meeting basic living needs, and providing protection from abuse and discrimination.
	Increase Individual and Family Stability and Self-Sufficiency	Reduce demand on the human service system by providing services to help individuals and families better support themselves.
<b>Healthcare</b>	Improve Overall Health of Illinoisans	Lower healthcare costs by improving the health of Illinoisans.
<b>Environment and Culture</b>	Strengthen Cultural and Environmental Vitality	Strengthen and preserve our natural, historic, and cultural resources to make Illinois a more attractive place for people to visit, live and work.
<b>Government Services</b>	Support Basic Functions of Government	Improve the basic infrastructure of state government and provide the tools necessary to operate more efficiently and achieve statewide outcomes.

A glossary of BFR terms can be found in Appendix B of this report.

## Progress Report

### Program Assessment

The statute that created Budgeting for Results (BFR) states that in Illinois, budgets submitted and appropriations made must adhere to a method of budgeting where each priority is justified every year according to merit. The BFR Commission has worked since 2011 to create and implement a merit based framework for data-driven program assessment useful to decision makers in the state. In 2017, BFR piloted a three stage process for producing reports on Illinois funded programs to inform the Governor, General Assembly, state agencies and stakeholders.

BFR's program assessment framework utilizes three tools: the (1) Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS), the (2) Pew-MacArthur Results First benefit-cost methodology and data analytics, and the (3) State Program Assessment Rating Tool (SPART). These tools have very distinct purposes and interact collectively enabling BFR to produce comprehensive program analysis.

The Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS) is an inventory of State funded programs. Over a six-year period, BFR built the infrastructure to provide periodic raw program performance data on nearly 1,200 specific performance measures across over 400 state programs. IPRS data promotes transparency by offering publically available performance resources. BFR's partnership with Pew-MacArthur Results First allows Illinois access to a powerful cutting-edge benefit-cost model that helps quantify the return on the investment Illinois gets from the programs it supports. Finally, the BFR developed the State Program Assessment Rating Tool (SPART), updated from the federal version. SPART uses the data collected in IPRS and analyzed in the benefit-cost model to generate a program score and rating. The program score and rating enables decision makers to draw comparisons between programs and evaluate impacts within and across Result Areas

The following sections discuss these three tools in greater detail.

#### **Illinois Performance Reporting System**

The Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS) is the state's web-based database for collecting program performance data from over 400 state agency programs. The IPRS database allows agencies to report programmatic level data to GOMB on a regular basis. Performance data collection utilizing the IPRS database began in fiscal year 2015. In the spring of calendar year 2015, the GOMB information technology team enhanced the IPRS with the ability to export program performance reports from the IPRS database in the form of PDFs. The PDFs contain summary program information, appropriations, and key performance measure information associated with the program.

In August 2015, GOMB improved government transparency for performance data by making the IPRS PDFs for all agencies under the authority of the Governor public by posting them to the GOMB public website. The PDFs can be accessed by visiting the “Budgeting for Results” tab on the GOMB public website at [www.Budget.Illinois.gov](http://www.Budget.Illinois.gov). GOMB updates the performance data quarterly.

During 2017, BFR utilized a program analysis work group consisting of BFR Commissioners, academic program analysis subject matter experts, Chief Results Officer (CRO) representatives and the BFR Unit to review IPRS data and make recommendations for how programs and program performance could be better articulated through the IPRS. The work group recognized prevalence of “legacy” program measures focused on traditional outputs vs. service or delivery based outcomes which provide more meaningful program measurements. The work group further noted the need for more refined program descriptions and targets. Because the work group included external consumers of IPRS data, the importance of accuracy and clarity within the program narratives became apparent. Through the efforts of the work group, CROs were instructed to review IPRS program inventories from an external perspective to ensure IPRS accurately conveys the intended information for each program. The evolution of IPRS program data will strengthen the applicability of IPRS data to the benefit-cost modeling calculations and the SPART qualitative assessment.

## **Results First**

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative and the State of Illinois executed a letter of intent in April 2017 BFR adopted the Results First benefit-cost model for statewide use in the spring of 2017 at no cost the State of Illinois.<sup>1</sup>

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy developed the benefit-cost model offered by the Results First Initiative. Results First works with dozens of states and local governments to implement this innovative evidence-based policy framework to help inform investment decisions to prioritize policies and programs that are proven to work.

The Results First benefit-cost model uses validated research to predict the outcomes of each program taking into account the state’s unique population characteristics. The model, which utilizes Illinois-specific data, calculates the cost to produce outcomes, including separate projections for benefits that would be realized by taxpayers, victims of crime, and others in society when program goals are realized. The Results First model is currently applicable in nine policy

---

<sup>1</sup> The State of Illinois has been using the Results First model for criminal justice policy analysis since 2011 through the Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council (SPAC).

domains: adult crime, K-12 education, general prevention, health, higher education, juvenile justice, mental health, substance use disorders, and workforce development.

The Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative created a database of national clearinghouses which lists and describes hundreds of vetted evidence-based programs in the nine (9) domains. The database contains program reviews and summary information from the clearinghouses which rate the effectiveness of the interventions.<sup>2</sup>

### **State Program Assessment Rating Tool (SPART)**

The SPART is the culmination of six years of research and development to create an integrated program evaluation tool that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative elements. As documented in the 2016 BFR annual report, GOMB engaged in an intensive search of academic literature and identified best practices from the federal government and other states. The most viable option identified in the search was the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), which had been successfully implemented and utilized by the federal government.

PART was developed by the President's Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2002 to assess federal program performance. The PART places a greater weight on the quality measurement of program *outcomes* rather than program *outputs*.

In 2011 the BFR Commission determined that the PART would serve as the basis of a modified questionnaire for Illinois' program analysis. GOMB collaborated with Dr. Patrick Mullen, the creator of federal PART, to adapt it for state use. The name of the Illinois-specific tool is the State Program Assessment Rating Tool (SPART).

The introductory section of the SPART contains summary program information as context for the report: historical and current budgetary information, the statutory authority for the program, performance goals and performance measures. An evaluability summary highlights factors external to the program which may affect the ability of the program to function and achieve results as designed. This summary aids in determining if Illinois implemented the program with fidelity to program best practices. An extensive literature review of program studies, research and analysis is created and used to accurately understand the program implemented as a best practice.

The SPART tool consists of weighted questions, which tally to give a program a numerical score of 1-100. Numerical scores are converted into qualitative assessments of program performance: effective, moderately effective, adequate and not effective. The results of the federal PART

---

<sup>2</sup> An intervention is defined as a combination of program elements or strategies designed to produce behavior changes or outcomes among individuals or an entire population.

program reviews are available on the archived website ExpectMore.gov, which can be found at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/omb/expectmore/index.html>.

Each SPART question is worth up to ten points and has three (3) possible answers: Yes, No, and Partial. The full ten (10) points are awarded for a “yes” answer. Zero (0) points are awarded for a “no” answer, and five (5) points are awarded for a “partial” answer. To obtain a “yes” answer, the program must meet all elements of the question. Partial points are awarded if the program meets the majority of the elements of a “yes” answer or if the program manager(s) have developed and implemented a plan to correct deficiencies so that the majority of the elements will obtain a “yes” answer within the next fiscal year. Once the points awarded for each question are tallied, a final program score is computed.

PART questions were modified to analyze key components of state programs in the SPART. The SPART contains ten (10) questions in four (4) sections. The sections evaluate:

- Evidenced-based practices,
- Strategic planning,
- Program management, and
- Program results.

The table below contains the SPART program ratings and their score ranges.

<b>Performing Programs</b>		
<b>Effective</b>	<b>75-100</b>	<b>Programs that set ambitious goals, achieve results, are well-managed and improve efficiency.</b>
<b>Moderately Effective</b>	<b>50-74</b>	<b>Programs that set ambitious goals and are well-managed. Moderately Effective programs likely need to improve their efficiency or address other problems in the programs' design or management in order to achieve better results.</b>
<b>Marginal</b>	<b>25-49</b>	<b>Programs that need to set more ambitious goals, achieve better results, improve accountability or strengthen management practices.</b>
<b>Not Performing Programs</b>		
<b>Ineffective</b>	<b>0-24</b>	<b>Programs receiving an “ineffective” rating are not using tax dollars effectively. Ineffective programs have been unable to achieve results due to a lack of clarity regarding the program's purpose, design, goals, poor management, or some other significant weakness.</b>
<b>Results Not Demonstrated</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Programs which have not developed acceptable performance goals or have not gathered data necessary to determine how the program is performing.</b>

The SPART provides a universal rating classification to allow policy makers and the public to more easily compare programs and their performance based on qualitative analysis.

The SPART questionnaire is designed for completion by a BFR Program Analyst in collaboration with the applicable GOMB budget analyst. The SPART is based on information compiled by the state agencies that administer the program and external program evaluations, when available. To minimize speculative evaluations, answers to the SPART questions must be evidence-based. Each answer requires supporting documentation to substantiate the points awarded and the overall evaluation rating. Once the initial SPART review is completed and documented, the state agency reviews the results and provides further evidence and clarifying information. As necessary, changes to SPART answers are reexamined in light of new information, and the final SPART review

and score is posted along with the Results First analysis to GOMB's website for the benefit of policymakers and the public.

In the last two (2) years, the BFR Commission has reshaped SPART as an objective assessment tool. The mix of questions and weighting of scores have been modified as BFR's program assessment parameters have evolved through the addition of Results First. Currently, the questions are designed to evaluate the overall delivery and function of state programs. SPART has two-fold potential: to assess the degree to which program design aligns with best practices to achieve a positive return on investment, and to assess the degree to which the program was implemented to achieve maximum positive outcomes. As qualitative analysis evolves, the scope of the SPART questions will expand to include assessments of program design and program implementation.

The SPART is designed to be implemented in tandem with programs that undergo a Results First benefit-cost evaluation. Because the SPART has been structured with an emphasis on evidence-based practices, it is not recommended that SPART be administered independently of the Results First model. The qualitative and quantitative analysis of a program should be conducted to facilitate a comprehensive assessment of the program.

### **Adult Criminal Justice**

BFR continues to build upon the work of SPAC by expanding their benefit-cost modeling data for additional programs under the adult crime domain. As the BFR Unit expands into other State funded programs, program assessment processes, collaboration and stakeholder engagements have been refined and program-specific outcomes are becoming better defined. Process assessments have become more thorough and efficient providing more valuable information to inform the budgeting process. Since publication of the 2017 Annual Report, BFR has completed four more program assessments in the Adult Crime policy domain; Housing Assistance post-incarceration, Incarceration-Based Therapeutic Communities, GPS Monitoring and Electronic Monitoring. These programs are run by the Illinois Department of Corrections. For each program, a description of the program costs, services and assessment is available from the BFR website.

The incarceration-based Therapeutic Communities program is offered at two correctional facilities, Sheridan Correctional Center and Southwestern Illinois Correctional Center (SWICC). Incarceration-based therapeutic communities are residential drug treatment programs in prisons to treat offenders with serious substance use disorder. The Illinois Therapeutic Communities program has both pre- and post-release clinical services, a specialized Methamphetamine Treatment Unit and community support groups and advocacy services made available to parolees. November of 2017 through January of 2018, BFR completed the three-stage assessment of this program.

The Housing Assistance program is operated by the Illinois Department of Corrections and administered by the Illinois Parole Re-Entry Group. The Housing Assistance program provides housing and supportive services to homeless offenders being released from The Illinois Department of Corrections. The average stay is 60 days. The program combats homelessness and provides resources for self-sufficiency. In FY2017, 16,196 homeless offenders were provided services upon release. Throughout February and March of 2018, BFR completed the three-stage assessment of this program.

The GPS monitoring program is operated by the Illinois Department of Corrections and administered by the Illinois Prisoner Review Board. The program is based on a statutory mandate that requires an increased level of supervision for parolees on mandatory supervised release. The parolees were convicted of certain sex offenses and violations of orders of protection. This level of monitoring is also utilized as a sanction for individuals who do not comply with the conditions of supervision. The program provides active (near real-time monitoring) of parolee movement. Throughout April and May of 2018, BFR completed the three-stage assessment of this program.

The Electronic monitoring program is also operated by the Illinois Department of Corrections and administered by the Illinois Prisoner Review Board. Electronic monitoring serves as an increased level of monitoring for higher risk parolees. Parolees who have violated the terms of their parole may be placed on electronic monitoring as a form of increased supervision or diversion from incarceration. This form of monitoring allows parole agents to schedule curfew parameters for parolees and the equipment provides alerts when parolees are not in compliance. Throughout May and June of 2018, BFR completed the three-stage assessment of this program.

The Results First benefit-cost model calculates the optimal return on investment (OROI) for programs run according to best practices of program core principles determined by evidence. The SPART assessment score provides a rating out of 100 to help understand how likely the program is to achieve it's OROI. Together, the Results First benefit-cost model and the SPART deliver a quantitative and qualitative assessment of a program, providing a more complete picture of the programs impact on its intended outcome.

The chart below lists the program assessments completed by BFR with their prospective optimal return on investment and their effectiveness at achieving their intended outcomes.

<b>Program</b>	<b>OROI<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Assessment</b>
Incarceration-based Therapeutic Communities	\$1.61	100/100 Effective
Housing Assistance	\$1.52	75/100 Effective
GPS Monitoring	\$5.95	45/100 Marginal
Electronic Monitoring	\$10.75	45/100 Marginal

**Juvenile Justice Domain**

This summer BFR began working on a second policy domain, Juvenile Justice. In June 2018, BFR met with the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ) to begin the process of updating and refining their data in IPRS, and compiling a detailed program inventory of funded programs. IDJJ operates a variety of needs-based programs such as recreation services, library programs, community volunteer-led activities, and health services including medical care and mental health treatment. IDJJ also operates its own school district. For each program, BFR works with IDJJ to collect specific program descriptions, program durations, frequency and intensity, delivery setting, credentials of program providers, and participant information. We also help create program logic models to determine the most useful program outcome measures.

While BFR continued the IDJJ program inventory, Illinois’ Juvenile Justice programs were compared with literature reviews of national program studies to determine the evidential strength of each program. The inventory and matching process enable the BFR Unit to determine which Illinois programs are evidence-based and how much fidelity each program has to established best practices. We currently are working to complete the program assessments in the Juvenile Justice policy domain.

**Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA)**

Both BFR and GATA focus on performance, accountability and transparency in the use of public funds. In State government, the mission of a state agency is carried out through the programs and services the agency provides. Approximately two-thirds of the state’s budget is made up of federal and federal pass-through grant funds. Grants fund the majority of the programs documented in IPRS. State agency programs included in IPRS are executed, in part, through grants

---

<sup>3</sup> Optimal Return on Investment (OROI) reflects program best practices. Net program cost are equal to the program cost minus comparison cost.

between state agencies and grants state grant-making agencies award to external grant recipients.

By current definition, BFR encompasses higher-level state agency programs inventoried through IPRS. Under BFR, State agencies have discretion to categorize similar initiatives into an agency-defined IPRS program. In contrast, GATA classifies programs at the funding level. A federal, federal pass-through or state funded award received by the state agency equates to a program in the GATA Catalog of State Financial Assistance (CSFA).

Conceptually, program measures reported in IPRS represent the federally-required performance measures of the related CSFA program(s). The crosswalk of programs in the CSFA to programs in IPRS will be a natural evolution of these two statutorily driven, statewide initiatives - BFR and GATA.

### **Stakeholder Engagement: Public Hearings**

The Commission's 2018 BFR public engagement efforts included public hearings held at the following locations:

- Chicago – James R. Thompson Center on June 27, 2018, and
- Springfield – University of Illinois Springfield on June 20, 2018.

The goal of the hearings was to gather feedback and testimony to help Commissioners better understand stakeholder needs and opinions relative to program performance assessment and the advancement of the BFR initiative. The hearings encompassed three (3) components: highlights of BFR accomplishments, testimony from subject matter experts on the application of program performance assessment tools, and open engagement from the public regarding BFR initiatives.

In Springfield, Commissioner Kathy Saltmarsh, Executive Director at the Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council; Alyssa Doom and Elizabeth Ryder of the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative; and Adam Groner, Economist with the Governor's Office of Management and Budget provided testimony on benefit-cost analysis as it applies to state government programs. In Chicago, Commissioner Jose Sanchez, President/CEO of Norwegian American Hospital; Ruth Coffman, Executive Director of Urban Health Labs at the University of Chicago; David Meltzer, Chief of the Section of Hospital Medicine/Director of the Center for Health and the Social Sciences and Chair of the Committee on Clinical and Translational Science at the University of Chicago provided testimony regarding program assessment and benefit-cost analysis in state healthcare programs. The Commission would like to thank of the panel members for their time and their informative testimony.

The hearings were attended by private and not-for-profit representatives and stakeholders, State agency CROs and program personnel. Individuals from diverse sectors including human services,

education, information technology, media relations, transportation and economic development also participated.

Commissioners engaged with stakeholders and agency representatives through a frank, open and informative exchange of ideas. For the third consecutive year, the hearings were broadcast live over the Internet, allowing the Commissioners to respond to questions submitted by online participants. The Commission thanks the staff and campus community of the University of Illinois at Springfield for hosting the hearing for the fifth consecutive year.

## Chief Results Officers (CROs)

On September 25, 2018, BFR held its first CRO Convening for training and dialogue around the work of BFR. Over 60 CROs, CFOs, and other agency stakeholders attended, as well as staff from GOMB and Pew-MacArthur Results First, and several members of the BFR Commission.

BFR staff gave an overview of the BFR Commission, the goals of BFR, and the CRO role. They explained how IPRS, SPART and the Pew-MacArthur Results First benefit-cost model work together to create a full picture of agency programs, performance, and outcomes.

Pew-MacArthur Results First staff presented on the value of understanding, accessing, and applying data to make informed decisions. They explained how different types of evidence are used to evaluate programs, how to locate evidence and evaluate its quality and applicability. Finally, they discussed different approaches to monitor program outcomes and report on performance. They emphasized the use of performance measures to effectively improve decision-making and program implementation.

To conclude the convening, CROs broke into groups by the outcome area their agencies primarily serve: education, economic development, public safety, human services, healthcare, environment and culture, and government services. Groups discussed strategies and challenges in defining programs and outcome measures and identified areas where multiple agencies work toward common outcomes and could benefit from sharing data.

## Commission Working Groups

### Mandates Review Working Group

State Budget Law (15 ILCS 20/50-25) requires that the Budgeting for Results Commission “review existing mandated expenditures and include in its [November 1st] report recommendations for the termination of mandated expenditures.” State agencies are asked to identify statutory mandates that are outdated, duplicative, or unduly burdensome on agency operations.

The mandates identified for repeal or modification by the Commission in its November 2016 Annual Report were included in Senate Bill (SB)1936, which became law in the spring of 2018. In addition to SB 1936, Senate Bill 1008, containing two mandates from the Illinois State Police passed the General Assembly in spring 2018. As a result of these efforts, to date The Commission has recommended and the General Assembly has passed legislation to modify or repeal a total of 210 statutory mandates.

In the summer of 2018, the Budgeting for Results Mandates working group comprised of BFR Commissioners Lewis, Steans, Althoff, Davis, Elam and Saltmarsh asked agencies to identify unduly burdensome statutory mandates. Seventeen state agencies, universities, boards and commissions responded with mandate recommendations. The agency-submitted list of mandates was compiled by GOMB and included 22 mandates.

The Budgeting for Results Mandates working group met in late August 2018 to conduct an initial review of agency recommendations for the elimination or modification of mandates. The Commission is grateful for the participation of the Budget Directors and staff from each of the four caucuses of the General Assembly. Following the review, the working group recommended 17 mandates to the full BFR Commission for approval. The mandates that were removed from the list for consideration by the full commission were primarily policy changes, which are not within in the statutory authority of this Commission to address. In addition to the statutory mandate review, the Commission also considered and approved a list to clean-up 40 funds of the state treasury, which are now defunct. The Commission-approved list of mandates recommended for modification or repeal, and state fund clean-up items is included as Appendix D of this report.

## **Progress Update on 2017 Commission Recommendations**

### **Expanding the Implementation of Results First and SPART**

In 2017 the Commission recommended that the BFR Unit continue to conduct program evaluations utilizing Results First and SPART by expanding assessment of state programs covered by other policy domains established under the Results First model. The Commission noted that additional staff and resources will be needed to fully implement Results First and SPART on a statewide basis. Funding for BFR was included in the FY19 budget, and two additional staff will be hired.

Since the publication of last year's report the BFR Unit has successfully completed seven SPART/Results First assessments of programs housed at the Illinois Department of Corrections

(see discussion above). In the spring of 2018, the Unit expanded into the Juvenile Criminal Justice policy domain. As the staff work to complete the assessments of programs within the Juvenile Justice Policy domain, planning to expand program analysis into the Substance Use Disorder policy domain is underway. The Substance Use Disorder domain will be a new challenge because the scope of programs will span several State agencies. This is will be a first step toward breaking down the silo effect of programming within a single agency. The cross-agency collaboration will help promote state agencies as program incubators / support structures. Efforts will emphasize that programs / interventions should be the core unit of analysis for policymakers and the public in general.

### **Incorporating BFR Program Evaluations into the Budget Process**

In 2017 the Commission recommended that the BFR Unit integrate BFR program assessment reports into the annual budget development process. “Program analysis reports inclusive of Results First benefit-cost modeling summaries and the completed SPART program rating sheet should be included as supporting information for state budget discussions.” The BFR Unit has worked to incorporate the information generated from the program assessments into the budget making process, and to generally foster a culture of data and evidence-based decision-making across state government. The Governor’s Office of Management and Budget has fully embraced the addition of performance data into the budget development process. The State Fiscal Year 2020 budget letter instructed State agencies to support their budget requests with outcome related evidence and data.

In the FY 2019 budget development process, IDOC utilized the educational program assessments in its budget request. The assessments showed a positive return on investment for tax dollars spent and concomitant reductions in recidivism to justify a funding increase. This applied analysis is the fruit of the culture shift BFR has been working toward since its inception. As the benefits of evidence-based decision-making become more apparent, the process will become even more embedded in budget development.

### **Incorporating Results First Clearinghouse Data into Legislative Process**

In 2017, The Commission recommended that the BFR Unit work with BFR legislative Commission members to determine the most effective way to incorporate program evaluation information into the legislative budget process. In the summer of 2017, the BFR Unit met with legislative members of the Commission and staff representing each of the four caucuses of the General Assembly. The primary purpose of this dialog was to emphasize the Results First Clearinghouse which includes information on hundreds of evidence-based programs and provides a wealth of information regarding national best practices in state programming. The clearinghouse was

presented as an opportunity for legislators and staff to vet proposed legislation within an evidence-based context. The legislative members recommended that the clearinghouse be administered by the BFR Unit and be available to legislators and staff upon request.

In addition, legislative members have proposed a joint hearing of the appropriations committees of both chambers in the spring of 2019. The purpose of the hearing will be to inform legislative partners about the BFR statutory mandate, highlight progress of BFR implementation, and promote BFR potential to engage and inform legislative stakeholders. The BFR Commission and the BFR Unit welcome this joint hearing and look forward to more opportunities to engage legislative partners over the coming year.

## 2018 Commission Recommendations

### Explore efficiencies in program assessment

The Pew-MacArthur Results First methodology provides a strong methodology and a nationally adopted means of estimating the impact and value of programs operated by State governments. Illinois, and Budgeting for Results, are challenged by the large number of programs (over 400) whose impact should be assessed. Because program and performance data has limited availability, and there can be a significant amount of time and resources required to complete highly technical program assessments, attaining scale on a statewide program assessment initiative is extremely difficult. The generation of program assessment deliverables within a reasonable amount of time may require utilizing additional assessment methods beyond Results First. Professor David Meltzer of the University of Chicago, testifying in the 2018 BFR public hearing in Chicago, suggested the possibility of utilizing existing evaluations to fill gaps in Results First capability and achieve scale legislatively envisioned of this mandate. The Commission recommends that during the coming year it works with GOMB staff to explore additional means of obtaining program impact assessments that could supplement those developed and/or documented through Results First and its associated clearinghouses.

### Explore feasibility of an “Impact Note” attached to legislation

The GOMB prioritization to implement BFR, a previously unfunded mandate, has resulted in a staffing increase and the identification of efficient ways to estimate the impact of state operated programs. The Commission believes the General Assembly’s legislative decisions should be informed by data wherever possible. Program assessments and the evidence brought to bear through the assessment could be applied to legislative proposals as an “Impact Note”. For instance, an “Impact Note” could be attached by either a bill’s sponsor or at the request of a legislator in committee. The Commission recommends further discussion with regard to the feasibility of developing brief “Impact Notes”, similar in concept to the “Fiscal Notes” that are attached to bills that have potential financial impacts on the state budget.

## **Work with the Illinois Office of the Comptroller to merge BFR and PAR reporting**

State agencies are currently statutorily required to report program performance annually under two separate mandates: BFR data to GOMB via IPRS and program performance data to the Illinois Office of the Comptroller (IOC) for publication in the Public Accountability Report (PAR). The performance data for these two reports are based on different approaches to program performance assessment. Consequently, the information in the two reports is often significantly different and burdensome to complete. This results in State agency staff spending a great deal of time fulfilling two mandates with a similar purpose, but divergent approaches. The Commission recommends that the BFR Unit work with IOC staff to identify a way to merge this reporting to avoid duplication and satisfy the spirit of the statutory mandates that govern both processes.

## **Addition of a Geo-Spatial component to BFR Analysis**

Analyzing data in an evidence-based environment is vital to making sound resource allocation decisions. However, utilizing only a cost-benefit approach, without reference to how need and resources are distributed geo-spatially in our state places decision makers in the position of making judgments without all the facts. To ensure that tax dollars are put to the best and most efficient use, it is important to understand the gaps between needs and resource concentrations within our state. Informed application of resources in the geographical areas with the most need will, by necessity, result in more efficient use of resources on a statewide basis.

The Commission recommends that the BFR Unit explore opportunities to utilize Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and other technologies to enhance the data available to decision makers by communicating in a geographical context. The Commission recommends the Unit partner with the University of Illinois System and other colleges and universities to leverage resources and advances already available outside the State government spectrum.

## **Continued Investment in BFR**

From its inception in State Fiscal Year 2011 until the State Fiscal Year 2019 budget process, BFR had not received any appropriations to support the staff or technology necessary to fully implement BFR the state budget process. During that time, tremendous work was done by the GOMB BFR Unit to create a state program inventory and build the Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS). During most of this period, only one GOMB full-time equivalent was dedicated to BFR. BFR received its first appropriation, \$300,000, State Fiscal Year 2019 with special thanks to the legislative members of the BFR Commission for their tireless efforts to secure this funding. The BFR Unit was able to hire two additional staff and plans to fill two vacant positions. These staffing levels have allowed the BFR Unit to expand program assessments in response to the expectations of the BFR Commission. In the last year and a half, BFR has made tremendous strides. Continued appropriations are needed to enable the work of BFR to maintain its current pace. It is vital that the Governor propose and the legislature appropriate funding for BFR equal to or greater than the State Fiscal Year 2019 appropriation level.

The BFR Commission recommends a continued investment in staff and technology for BFR in the State Fiscal Year 2020 budget development process. Prioritization of this investment will pay for itself through greater efficiencies in the budget making process. Knowledge is power. A more informed, evidence-based approach to State budgeting allows for more targeted utilization of scarce public resources which will generate a greater return for Illinois taxpayers.

### **Mandatory Program Evaluations for Programs Receiving 49 or Less in SPART**

During 2019, the Commission should explore the feasibility of requiring programs with an SPART score of “marginal” (49 or less out of 100) to undergo a comprehensive program evaluation to more fully assess program design and implementation. By necessity the SPART assessment is a high-level review of the program. Lower SPART ratings indicate a need for further action to more specifically identify and remediate root-cause problems. Program administrators will benefit by applying knowledge regarding specific program improvements and the ability to seek additional resources where necessary or cutting ineffective components. Full program evaluations conducted by professional program evaluators often consume a great deal of time and resources. As the Commission considers a mandatory requirement for program evaluations triggered by a threshold score, it should take into account the availability of program evaluators statewide, the cost of evaluations, and how the evaluations would be funded.

## **Conclusion**

The BFR Commission is committed to using program assessments to inform State budget dialog. The Commission is extremely proud of Illinois’ progress in performance-based data analytics. The utilization of the Results First benefit-cost tool and the improvements to the SPART have led to significant enhancement in analytical ability. The potential to better inform the state budget process through fact-based program assessment reports creates a very tangible deliverable from the BFR mandate. Evidence-based programming has the potential to provide a higher return on taxpayer dollars. The Commission commends state agency partners, the Pew-MacArthur Results First initiative and GOMB for continuing to advance the vision of comprehensive program evaluation.

A significant amount of work remains to implement Results First and SPART across the nine (9) policy domains currently built out in the Results First model. In addition, further domains must be expanded to ensure the model encompasses all Result Areas of the State of Illinois budget. The Commission is committed to ongoing statewide implementation of the Results First and SPART tools.

In October 2018, the BFR Unit added a full-time data analyst, bringing this statewide initiative to a staff of 3.5 full time equivalents. The BFR unit continues to refine its work in program analysis.

In September 2018, Illinois was recognized by the Pew-MacArthur Results First Initiative as an exemplary state in the application of performance-based budgeting. Leadership of the BFR Commission, comprehensive efforts of the BFR Unit and prioritized funding from our legislative partners, position Illinois for even more significant accomplishments in performance-based budgeting.

The Commission looks forward to working with legislators, state agencies, community-based organizations and stakeholders at large to advance progress of the BFR initiative. Working together, we can achieve much for the people of this great state.

## Appendix A

### Chronology

The following lists chronologically the significant events in the Budgeting for Results process over the preceding six years.

- July 2010  
Public Act 96-0958 establishing the Budgeting for Results (BFR) process was signed into law by Governor Quinn.
- August 2010-January 2011,  
Governor's Office of Management and Budget (GOMB) in conjunction with the Governor's Office established the first six statewide result areas to evaluate the impact/success of state funds.
- February 2011  
GOMB presented the Governor's fiscal year (FY) 2012 budget which included state spending divided into six statewide result areas: Education, Economic Development, Public Safety and Regulation, Human Services, Quality of Life, and Government Services.
- February 2011  
Public Act 96-1529 establishing the Budgeting for Results Commission was signed into law by Governor Quinn.
- March 2011-January 2012  
GOMB worked with over 70 state agencies, universities, boards and commissions to delineate discrete programs linked to line item appropriations. Each program was assigned to one of the statewide result areas to facilitate future performance measurement.

The Budgeting for Results Commission conducted its first meeting. Among the Commission's many activities, it established the seventh statewide result area, Healthcare.

- February 2012  
GOMB presented the Governor's FY 2013 budget with state agency spending delineated by program. Each program was assigned to one of the seven statewide result areas.
- March 2012-Janary 2013  
To establish basic performance measures for each state agency program, GOMB in conjunction with the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) provided training to state agency personnel on the development of program logic models. Each agency produced a logic model for each program. The logic model helped identify the potential performance measures for each program.

In addition, during the period of July to September 2012, GFOA in conjunction with GOMB engaged experts and stakeholders from across the spectrum of result areas to engage in strategy mapping.

- March 2013

GOMB presented the Governor's FY 2014 budget, including performance measures, to each agency narrative submission.

- April 2013-February 2014

GOMB in conjunction with state agencies worked to refine agency program inventories and performance measures. GOMB, worked with agencies, to identify agency Chief Results Officers (CROs). CROs are senior level agency staff with responsibility for performance and change management at the agency. They serve as conduit for BFR information between the agency and GOMB. In late 2013, GOMB began the process of developing the Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS), a SharePoint database that allows for the centralized reporting of program performance measures and summary program information.

In October 2013, GOMB partnered with Mission Measurement, a performance measurement consulting firm, to complete a pilot around one outcome area of BFR. The pilot developed and tested a methodology for evaluating the performance of State of Illinois programs within the Education result area. Funding for the pilot was provided by a number of private foundations including generous contributions from the Chicago Community Trust, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the Steans Family Foundation, along with pro bono support from Mission Measurement Corp.

- March 2014

GOMB presented the Governor's FY 2015 budget with at least one performance measure for each agency program.

- April 2014-January 2015

State agencies were trained on the use of IPRS and begin the process of collecting a full fiscal year's program performance data.

In late 2014, GOMB developed a reporting function in IPRS utilizing a PDF format. This reporting capability enhanced transparency because it allowed the performance measure to be publicly posted to the GOMB website.

- February 2015

GOMB presented the FY 2016 budget with a full year of performance measure data for each agency program.

- February 2015-August 2015

GOMB continued to work with agencies to refine programs and metrics. In August, GOMB posted the first set of IPRS program performance PDFs to the GOMB website: [Budget.Illinois.gov](http://Budget.Illinois.gov).

- September 2015-July-2016

GOMB with support from experts in the academic community began the development and pilot process for the State Program Analysis Reporting Tool (SPART) and the cost-benefit analysis tool.

- July 2016-January-2017

In July, 2106 the BFR Commission established the Cost-Benefit Analysis Working Group. The working group was tasked to examine the catalog of state programs to identify significant gaps in the data

available to conduct cost-benefit analysis, and to make recommendations to remediate the deficiencies. Furthermore, the working group was assigned the responsibility to identify a methodology or methodologies that could be applied across the universe of state programs to produce a valid and meaningful cost-benefit analysis. The Working Group met throughout the summer and fall.

- February 2017  
Based upon the recommendation of the Cost-benefit Analysis (CBA) Working Group, the BFR Commission passed unanimously a resolution encouraging GOMB to adopt the Results First cost-benefit analysis model, developed by Pew-MacArthur Foundation, as the standard CBA model to be implemented as a component of the SPART. The Commission further recommended that GOMB add at least one additional FTE to implement the model.
- March 2017  
GOMB signed a letter of intent with the Pew-MacArthur Results First initiative to begin use of the Results First model in Illinois.
- April 2017  
GOMB worked with Legislative members of the BFR Commission to move the 2017 BFR Mandates Relief bill (SB1936) through the legislative process. SB 1936 passed the Senate and is on third reading in the House of Representatives. It is anticipated that the bill will pass during veto session.
- June 2017  
GOMB hired a full-time data analyst to oversee the implementation of the Results First CBA model. In addition, GOMB in conjunction with the Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council (SPAC) identified the adult criminal justice domain as the first area to employ the Results First Model to general analysis of programs.
- July 2017  
GOMB, SPAC, and IDOC participated in in-depth training and discussion on the Results First Model with representatives from the Pew-MacArthur Results First initiative. Staff engaged with SPAC and IDOC to begin collecting the initial data necessary to conduct a CBA analysis.
- August 2017 - September 2017  
BFR worked with IDOC to compile a program inventory of the Adult Criminal Justice policy domain. Once completed, BFR matched Illinois state funded programs to the evidence-based programs in the Results First Clearinghouse Database. BFR and IDOC identified three programs operated in adult prison facilities in Illinois from the program inventory for further analysis: Adult Basic Education/GED, Vocational Education, and Post-Secondary Education. BFR determined through the clearinghouse matching process that the design of these three program match established best practices that rigorous research has shown to reduce criminal recidivism.
- September 2017 – October 2017  
BFR collected and calculated all the data needed to run the Results First benefit-cost analysis model on the three pilot programs. BFR also conducted an SPART evaluation for each program.

- October 2017  
BFR completed three separate benefit-cost analyses and three SPART program evaluation reports for the Adult Criminal Justice policy domain on Adult Basic Education/GED, Vocational Education, and Post-Secondary Education.
- November 2017 – January 2018  
BFR completed the three stage assessment of the incarceration-based Therapeutic Communities program run by the Illinois Department of Corrections at two facilities, Sheridan Correctional Center and Southwestern Illinois Correctional Center (SWICC).
- February 2018 - March 2018  
BFR completed the three stage assessment of the Housing Assistance/Placements program run by the Illinois Department of Corrections and administered by the Illinois Parole Re-Entry Group.
- April 2018 - May 2018  
BFR completed the three stage assessment of the GPS monitoring program run by the Illinois Department of Corrections and administered by the Illinois Prisoner Review Board.
- May 2018 – June 2018  
BFR completed the three stage assessment of the Electronic monitoring program run by the Illinois Department of Corrections and administered by the Illinois Prisoner Review Board.
- September 2018  
BFR in conjunction with Pew-MacArthur Results First held its first annual convening of CROs in Springfield Illinois.
- October 2018  
BFR hired a Data Analyst.

## Appendix B

### Glossary

**Best Practices:** Policies or activities that have been identified through evidence-based research to be most effective in achieving positive outcomes.

**Budgeting for Results Commission:** Established under the Budgeting for Results law (15 ILCS 20/50-25), the Commission is appointed by the Governor to provide advice in setting statewide outcomes and goals, and best practices in program performance evaluation and benefit-cost analysis.

**Budgeting for Results Unit:** A unit established within the Governor's Office of Management and Budget to implement the Budgeting for Results law (15 ILCS 20/50-25). The Unit coordinates the collection of program performance data from state agencies under the authority of the Governor. The unit conducts program performance and benefit-cost evaluations of state programs. The Unit also serves as support and research staff for the Budgeting for Results Commission.

**Chief Results Officer (CRO):** CROs are the conduit for dissemination of BFR information and process through their agencies. CROs also serve as the central point for change management within the agencies. CROs are generally agency senior staff, with the authority to initiate change and implement new BFR oriented initiatives. One of the primary responsibilities of CROs is to review and update the agency's performance measures and provide performance measure data to GOMB on a quarterly basis via IPRS.

**Effect Size:** The extent of the influence of a program or policy on outcomes.

**Evidence-Based:** Programs or interventions that have undergone multiple rigorous evaluations which demonstrate the efficacy of the program's theory of change and theory of action.

**Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS):** The state's web-based database for collecting program performance data. The IPRS database allows agencies to report programmatic level data to the Governor's Office of Management and Budget on a regular basis.

**Intervention:** An intervention is a combination of program elements or strategies designed to produce behavior changes or outcomes among individuals or an entire population.

**Outcome Measures:** Outcomes describe the intended result of carrying out a program or activity. They define an event or condition that is external to the program or activity and that is of direct importance to the intended beneficiaries and/or the general public. For example, one outcome measure of a program aimed to prevent the acquisition and transmission of HIV infection is the number (reduction) of new HIV infections in the state.

**Output Measures:** Outputs describe the level of activity that will be provided over a period of time, including a description of the characteristics (e.g., timeliness) established as standards for the activity. Outputs refer to the internal activities of a program (i.e., the products and services delivered). For example, an output could be the percentage of warnings that occur more than 20 minutes before a tornado forms.

**Output Measures:** Outputs describe the level of activity that will be provided over a period of time, including a description of the characteristics (e.g., timeliness) established as standards for the activity. Outputs refer to the internal activities of a program (i.e., the products and services delivered). For example, an output could be the percentage of warnings that occur more than 20 minutes before a tornado forms

**Program:** A separately identifiable and managerially discrete function within an organization designed to meet a statutory requirement or a defined need; a set of activities undertaken to realize one common purpose with an identifiable end result or outcome.

**Recidivism:** Reconviction after a release from prison or sentence to probation.

**Results First Clearinghouse Database:** One-stop online resource providing policymakers with an easy way to find information on the effectiveness of various interventions as rated by eight nation research clearinghouses which conduct systematic research reviews to identify which policies and interventions work.

**Target:** A quantifiable metric established by program managers or the funding entity established as a minimum threshold of performance (outcome or output) the program should attain within a specified timeframe. Program results are evaluated against the program target.

**Theory Informed:** A program where a lesser amount of evidence and/or rigor exists to validate the efficacy of the program's theory of change and theory of action than an evidence-based program.

**Theory of Change:** The central processes or drives by which a change comes about for individuals, groups and communities

**Theory of Action:** How programs or other interventions are constructed to activate theories of change.

## Appendix C

### 2018 Commission Mandate Repeal or Modification Recommendations

2018 BFR Agency Mandates -Working Group Recommendations 9-27-18						
Agency Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)	Comments and Recommendations
1 601 - Board of Higher Ed	Graduation Incentive Grant- The IBHE must annually submit a recommendation for funding of the graduation incentive grant to the Governor. Due to ever changing funding needs of the Illinois public universities, the available dollars need to be prioritized. The grant has not been funded since 2004 and only 3 public universities applied for the grant funds in its last year of funding. Requiring the IBHE to recommend a grant, which may not be needed or even requested by Illinois public universities, is an unnecessary burden on the IBHE. The IBHE has received previous immaterial audit findings for not recommending this grant for funding.	110 ILCS 205/9.28	The intent of the grant was to encourage public universities to develop various areas which enable students to graduate within 4 years. The mandate was enacted in P.A 90-750 effective 8-14-98 The IBHE has not recommended a funding level for this grant since 2004. Public Universities have developed ways to encourage students to graduate in 4 years without the need to apply or recommend these grants for funding.	110 ILCS 205/9.28 should be repealed.	Cost is dependent on funding. Grant has not been recommended for funding since 2004.	YES
2 444 - DHS	The mandate requires IDHS to enter into intergovernmental agreements with each Sheriff in Illinois so that IDHS can ensure jail inmates are not inappropriately receiving SNAP and/or cash benefits from IDHS. The mandate requires IDHS to enter into intergovernmental agreements with all Illinois Sheriffs, but does not require the sheriffs to comply with IDHS request to enter into the agreements. Many sheriffs have been reluctant to comply in IDHS' requests of them to sign the agreements as there is no requirement for them to do so. With no requirement for the sheriffs to comply, IDHS compliance with the mandate is significantly hindered. IDHS has incurred several audit findings as a result of the non-compliance with the statute, the most recent being the 2017 Compliance Audit, performed by the Auditor General's Office and the external audit firm, RSM. The finding recommendation states: We recommend Department management execute all interagency agreements as required by law. In addition, all parties to the IGAs should sign the agreement prior to the effective date. Further, Department management should enter into interagency agreements with HFS, other State agencies, and the sheriffs' offices of every Illinois County which do not have signed agreements.	305 ILCS 5/12-4.7b. Exchange of information; inmates	Genesis of mandate and sponsor is unknown. The agency has not completed the requirements of the mandate, as most of the Sheriff's Offices in IL have chosen not to comply.	Provide language that requires the Sheriff's Departments to honor the request of IDHS to enter into an intergovernmental agreement, and provide DHS with the necessary incarceration data.	Unknown. The cost would be staff time in processing the requests to sheriff's offices, and matching the jail rosters sent in by the sheriffs to the IDHS client database.	Yes/ Place in Stand alone Bill
3 546 - ICJIA	Subject to appropriation, establish and operate four custodial interview pilot programs. One program shall be in Cook County and 3 shall be distributed throughout the state. Each agency shall promulgate procedures for recording custodial interviews of suspects during first degree murder investigations by video and audio, and promulgate procedures for maintaining and storing video and audio recordings. The law requiring custodial recording of homicide interviews has been in effect for 15 years (see below). In 2018, it is now standard practice for law enforcement agencies to use electronic recording equipment for interrogations. Accordingly, this mandate is now obsolete and creates confusion by remaining on ICJIA's list of statutory duties.	20 ILCS 3930/7.2 Custodial Interview Pilot Program	This mandate was passed in 2003, as part of The Capital Punishment Reform Study Committee Act (Public Act 93-0605/ SB472) requiring the recording of homicide interrogations. Senate sponsors were John Cullerton, Barack Obama, Emil Jones, Jr., Jeffrey Schoenberg, Don Harmon, Kirk Dillard, Peter Roskam, Donne Trotter, Mattie Hunter and Jacqueline Collins. ICJIA was able to fund this mandate in 2003 through 3 federal grants to the Illinois State Police using federal funds under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act (ADAA) of 1988. To our knowledge, ICJIA has never received appropriations to fund this mandate since then. A 2013 state law (Public 98-0547/SB1006) added this recording requirement for eight violent felonies. This 2013 law did not contain funding, or seek to institute pilot programs for the establishment of procedures or rules. The intent of the 2003 law was to promote the use of available technology to record murder interrogations.	Repealed. This mandate is "subject to appropriations," appropriations that ICJIA has not received for 15 years. And as indicated above, this mandate is now unnecessary and obsolete. With today's technology, law enforcement is likely well beyond needing a "pilot program" for recording custodial interrogations. According to a 2015 survey by the Innocence Project of surveyed Massachusetts and Wisconsin law enforcement agencies, 94% said that officers were trained on how to operate recording and storage equipment and 81% reported recording interviews with closed circuit camera systems in conjunction with other equipment. See The Innocence Project, Implementing Electronic Recording of Custodial Interviews, A Primer for Law Enforcement (2015). Further, this mandate has also led to audit findings, which expend time and resources, and negatively reflect the agency to the public. In ICJIA's current compliance audit, an exception was noted for this mandate. See attached, ICJIA's Compliance with 20 ILCS 3930/7.	N/A	YES

2018 BFR Agency Mandates -Working Group Recommendations 9-27-18						
Agency Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)	Comments and Recommendations
4 546 - ICJIA	From appropriations made to it for that purpose, ICJIA shall make grants – and promulgate implementing rules - to local law enforcement agencies for the purpose of purchasing equipment for the electronic recoding of interrogations. The law requiring custodial recording of homicide interviews has been in effect for 15 years (see below). In 2018, it is now standard practice for law enforcement agencies to use electronic recording equipment for interrogations. Accordingly, this mandate is now obsolete and creates confusion by remaining on ICJIA's list of statutory duties.	20 ILCS 3930/7.5 Grants for Electronic Recording Equipment	This mandate was passed in 2003 (Public Act 93-0206/HB0223) requiring the recording of custodial interrogations of minors for homicide and certain sex offenses. House sponsors were Monique D. Davis, Michael J. Madigan, Barbara Flynn Currie, Mary E. Flowers, Lovana Jones, Paul D. Froehlich, Sara Feigenholtz, Lou Lang, Patricia R. Bellock, James H. Meyer, Robert S. Molaro, Harry Osterman, Larry McKeon, John A. Fritchey and Julie Hamos. The Act also mandated that the Illinois Police Training Board administer and conduct training programs for police officers on conducting electronic recordings of interrogations. To our knowledge, ICJIA has never received appropriations to fund this mandate.	Repealed. This mandate is "from appropriations," appropriations that ICJIA has not received for 15 years. And as indicated above, this mandate is now unnecessary and obsolete. By 2018, the vast majority of law enforcement agencies have by now secured funding for electronic recording equipment. According to a 2015 survey by the Innocence Project of surveyed law enforcement agencies, 81% reported recording interviews with closed circuit camera systems in conjunction with other equipment. See The Innocence Project, Implementing Electronic Recording of Custodial Interviews, A Primer for Law Enforcement (2015). Further, this mandate has also led to audit findings, which expend time and resources, and negatively reflect the agency to the public. In ICJIA's current compliance audit, an exception was noted: "The Authority is not in compliance with mandate [20 ILCS 3930/7.5]." See attached, ICJIA's Compliance with 20 ILCS 3930/7.	N/A	YES
5 452 - DOL	The prevailing wage law requires local governments across Illinois to investigate the local prevailing rate of wages and pass a resolution certifying the wages. A copy of the resolution must then be filed with the Department of Labor. Local governments may also adopt rates established by the Illinois Department of Labor. In practice, all or nearly all local governments adopt the IDOL rates. The resolutions are unnecessary and place a record keeping burden on the Department as well as burdening local governments. If a local government does pass a resolution, it does not need to be sent to the Department as it is typically already publicly available from the local body, usually on their website. The impact on the agency is that we must receive, verify, and store records which have no programmatic or public use value. This is a burden in both labor hours and wasted filing space. Additionally, there is a financial burden on local public bodies which have costs for paper, printing, and postage. And internal estimate from the division which receives the resolutions estimated state wide savings of \$388,360 to local governments.	Prevailing Wage Ordinance Resolutions	The Illinois Department of Labor is responsible for enforcing the prevailing rate of wages. The statute envisioned two methods through which the prevailing rate of wages could be established: by the Department or by each local body individually. In practice, the Department sets all rates for all counties and publishes them on its website. Local governments pass resolutions accepting the rates and then send the Department a listing of the rates we originally published in their resolution.	The mandate should be modified to exclude local governments which adopt IDOL rates by default. Only local governments which establish their own rates should be required to pass an ordinance. If local governments choose to investigate and ascertain local prevailing wage rates, they may be in a better position to do so than the Department, and this option should be preserved. However, where no different local prevailing wage is established, the Department's rates are presumed established and no resolution should be necessary.	\$388,360 to local governments.	YES/ Stand Alone Bill
6 588 - IEMA	The Nuclear Safety Law of 2004 (20 ILCS 3310/75) requires the Agency, in cooperation with the Department of Natural Resources, to: • Study (i) the impact and cost of nuclear power and compare these to the impact and cost of alternative sources of energy, (ii) the potential effects on the public health and safety of all radioactive emissions from nuclear power plants, and (iii) all other factors that bear on the use of nuclear power or on nuclear safety; • Formulate a general nuclear policy for the State based on the findings of the study; and, • Publicize the findings of all studies and make the publications reasonably available to the public.  Audit Finding: "The Illinois Emergency Management Agency (Agency) has not conducted a study on the use of nuclear power or on nuclear safety or formulated the State's general nuclear policy." "During testing, we noted the Agency has not worked with the Department of Natural Resources to study nuclear power and safety or formulate the State's general nuclear policy. Further, we noted the Agency had pursued legislation to repeal this requirement, which has not been adopted by the General Assembly." IEMA has not been required to take any action or perform any activities related to this requirement because the Public Utilities Act (220 ILCS 5/8-406(c)), which became effective in 1987, prohibits any future construction of nuclear steam-generating facilities until a way to dispose of high-level nuclear waste is identified or the General Assembly authorizes new construction. Additionally, IEMA does not have the expertise for such a study and would likely bid out the study to a contractor, which would have a fiscal impact on the Agency.	20 ILCS 3310/75	During the restructuring of multiple state agencies in the early 2000s, the Department of Nuclear Safety and Department of Emergency Management were merged. During the drafting of the new act that established the Department of Nuclear Safety under the Illinois Emergency Management Agency, lawmakers included the report provision. To common knowledge, there was no request by external stakeholders, agency personnel or industry to have the provision included. Therefore, it is difficult to determine the reasoning for including the provision at all, especially given that there are other agencies better equipped to handle the requirements of the report (e.g. IEPA, ICC, etc.).	Given the agencies previous attempts to repeal this measure, IEMA recommends modifying the provision to make the requirement subject to appropriation, which would eliminate the audit finding as the onus would be on the General Assembly to provide the funding necessary to adequately execute the requirements of the statute.	There is currently no fiscal impact to the agency given its inability to comply. The agency has not examined the costs of outsourcing the required duties.	YES

2018 BFR Agency Mandates -Working Group Recommendations 9-27-18							
	Agency Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)	Comments and Recommendations
7	586 - ISBE	Section 34-21.4 of the School Code allows Chicago Public Schools to file applications with the State Board of Education to receive funds for the purpose of conducting year round school feasibility studies. CPS may also be reimbursed by ISBE for costs associated with the transition to operating schools within the district on a year round program. This mandate is out of date. The original PA was signed into law during the 81st General Assembly. It is unknown if CPS has ever taken advantage of this section of statute.	105 ILCS 5/34-21.4	Representative Chapman sponsored the measure. Specific background is unknown. It is assumed that the sponsors of the bill wanted to support / increase the number of schools that operate on a year round calendar in Chicago.	Recommend Repeal	\$0.00	YES/ Pending Follow-up answer from Agency
8	493 - ISP	The Department of State Police shall establish a pilot program from moneys available under which Cyber Gang Units shall be created in the Lake County Metropolitan Enforcement Group and the Cook County Sheriff's Office. Under the pilot program for the operation of Cyber Gang Units, 50% shall be allocated to the Lake County Metropolitan Enforcement Group and 50% shall be allocated to the Cook County Sheriff's Office. Under the pilot program, the Cyber Gang Units shall investigate criminal activities of organized gangs that involve the use of the Internet. For the duration of the pilot program and in accordance with protocols for inter-jurisdictional cooperation established by the Department of State Police, peace officers in each Cyber Gang Unit shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, have extra-jurisdictional authority to conduct investigations and make arrests anywhere in the State of Illinois regarding criminal activities of organized gangs that involve the use of the Internet. The pilot program shall terminate on July 1, 2012. Non-compliant.	20 ILCS 2605/2605-580	Public Act 95-0423, SB1014, Sen. Michael Bond and Rep. Ed Sullivan, Jr	The Cyber Gang program was to start when monies were made available from the State and no monies were ever appropriated. With expressway shootings in the Chicagoland area and our focus on the East St Louis area, it is a better use of ISP resources to dedicate officers to actual crimes and crime victims rather than this pilot program. This pilot program creates a unduly burdensome mandate that only addresses a small component of the overall gang and crime problem. In 2017, Public Act 100-3 was enacted, which created a statewide multi-jurisdictional Violent Crime Intelligence Task Force led by the Department of State Police dedicated to combating gun violence, gun-trafficking, and other violent crime with the primary mission of preservation of life and reducing the occurrence and the fear of crime.	The estimated annual salary for two Master Sergeants, two Sergeants and 10 Troopers.  The estimated annual amount of overtime funds for two sergeants and 10 Troopers is \$55,000."	YES
9	493 - ISP	In order to encourage graduate students to enter the field of forensic science and continue their careers as forensic scientists with the Department of State Police in one of the specialty areas of forensic sciences that is considered a shortage specialty area, the Commission (ISAC) shall, subject to appropriation, establish and administer a forensic science grant program... The Commission and the Department of State Police shall adopt all rules that are necessary for the implementation and administration of this Section. Non-compliant (see below). This is a potential audit finding.	110 ILCS 947/65.80	Public Act 94-1020, SB 931, Sen. M. Maggie Crotty and Rep. Lou Lang	This legislation fails to consider the Illinois Personnel Code, CMS testing, collective bargaining agreements, ISP background checks, etc. While we believe this law (grant program) was inspired by television programs geared towards forensic science and crime scene, higher education scholarships should be "need based," not based upon a possibility they may be eligible for employment with the Illinois State Police.	According to the liaison at ISAC, they had an appropriation of \$500K for the program in FY07, but it otherwise hasn't been funded. Paragraph (c) also limited the program to just a few years. ("The Commission shall, on an annual basis until July 1, 2010, receive and consider applications for grant assistance under the program.")	YES/ Stand Alone Bill
10	493 - ISP	Methamphetamine Manufacturer Registry Act. Generally this mandate provides, "the Department of State Police shall establish and maintain a methamphetamine Manufacturer Database for the purpose of identifying methamphetamine manufacturers and making that information available to law enforcement and the general public." The ISP spends approximately 1-2 hours per month compiling the list and adding new offenders to the Manufacturer Registry website. With other higher priority IT challenges, it is difficult at times to effectively update the Meth site/database with expungements or corrections.	730 ILCS 180/	Public Act 94-831 by Rep. Roger Eddy and Sen. William Haine	YES, the agency has completed the requirements of the mandate. Since the effective date of this Public Act on June 5, 2006, the Illinois State Police has been maintaining this registry. The Illinois State Police also adopted applicable administrative rules. There are currently 1,300 persons registered for meth manufacturing.  First, this registry was arguably a reaction by the Governor and General Assembly to the influx of methamphetamine manufacturers 15 years ago. Since this time, heroin has arguably become a more significant problem. Second, in the spirit of criminal justice reform, the General Assembly is evaluating the effectiveness and need for certain offender registries. Third, law enforcement does not need a database of this nature to monitor persons who have drug convictions. Furthermore, the general public rarely uses this information. Between January 1, 2016, and July 14, 2016, this website had a total of 3,225 sessions, averaging 460 hits per month. Compared to the Sex Offender Registry which had nearly 600,000 sessions, averaging 85,000 monthly visits. Abolishing this registry would assist the State Police in focusing on our IT priorities, such as LEADS, LIMMS, conceal carry, FOID, Sex Offender Registry, etc.	\$25,000 Annual Maintenance \$75,000 Annually .5 FTE (fully loaded) in house tech staff support	YES/ Stand Alone Bill

2018 BFR Agency Mandates -Working Group Recommendations 9-27-18							Comments and Recommendations
Agency Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)		
11 493 - ISP	The ISP Budget Office would seek to clean-up various fee funds scattered throughout statute. The goal would be to streamline and better organize our funds. (1) State Police Street gang-Related Crime Fund should be abolished and consolidated into the existing State Police Operations Assistance Fund. (2) Since 1983 the Illinois State Police has been allowed to charge for furnishing copies of crash (accident) reports, \$5 or \$20 for reconstruction reports. The Illinois State Police would seek to designate these funds to the State Police Services Fund. (3) The Illinois State Police is mandated to provide the Sex Offender Registry and the Murderer and Violent Offender against Youth Registry. There are three funds surrounding these two registries, the (30 ILCS 105/5.462) the Sex Offender Registration Fund, (30 ILCS 105/5.694) Sex Offender Investigation Fund, and the (30 ILCS 105/5.669) the Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth Registration Fund. The Illinois State Police would seek to abolish these three funds and create a new Offender Registration Fund beginning in FY 18.	Omnibus fee fund cleanup	Public Act 96-1029, SB 3695, Sen. Lightford and Rep. Mendoza (created the Street gang-Related Crime Fund) Public Act 84-1308 created the fees for Furnishing copies (Accident Reports)	Impact on agency: This would streamline our funds for auditing purposes.  The purpose of this initiative is to consolidate and streamline our funds in the State Finance Act. In various accounts there is either no spending authority or appropriation; low balance and limited to certain areas of the state.	Again this is accounting/clean-up legislation.	YES/ Stand Alone Bill	
12 493 - ISP	Parole Agents and parole supervisors; off-duty firearms. "The parole agent or parole supervisor shall purchase such firearm at his or her own expense and shall register the firearm with the Department of State Police." This is currently an unfunded mandate on the Illinois State Police.	730 ILCS 5/3-14-1.5	Public Act 96-0230, HB 202, Rep. Joseph M. Lyons and Sen. John J. Millner.	Yes, the Illinois State Police is in compliance.  This mandate should have never been imposed on the Illinois State Police. The Illinois State Police does not register any firearms. The Illinois State Police does not want register Parole Agents and parole supervisor firearms. We have no control or check and balance over this system, as these are not employees of the Illinois State Police.	This will allow us to more appropriately focus ISP employees on ISP missions and mandates, which have a public safety nexus.	YES/ Stand Alone Bill	
13 493 - ISP	Mandates the Illinois State Police to have a toxicology lab located in both the City of Springfield and the City of Chicago. Where the law states, "Division of Forensic Services. The Division of Forensic Services shall exercise the following functions (6) Establish and operate a forensic science laboratory system, including a forensic toxicological laboratory service, for the purpose of testing specimens submitted by coroners and other law enforcement officers in their efforts to determine whether alcohol, drugs, or poisonous or other toxic substances have been involved in deaths, accidents, or illness. Forensic toxicological laboratories shall be established in Springfield, Chicago, and elsewhere in the State as needed." The Illinois State Police is in compliance of this mandate.	20 ILCS 2605/2605-40	This language has been in statute since the late 70's.	If applicable, has your agency completed the requirements of the Mandate: Yes.  This is the only area in statute where the Illinois State Police is required to have laboratories in specified cities. This mandate provides the department no flexibility. Furthermore, these two laboratories are in rented/leased buildings. The Illinois State Police have a CDB priority for a new state of the art Joliet laboratory. Eliminating the mandate to have toxicology labs in two specified cities, will still mandate the Department of State Police maintains toxicological services for the law enforcement agencies in the state of Illinois. It should also be known, if we move a toxicology lab the employees in these labs would be given the option of retraining into a different discipline (DNA, etc.) Chicago and Springfield are both homes to DNA labs. Toxicology will always remain a priority with the Illinois State Police.	For FY16, we had the following lease payments for Toxicology lab facilities: Chicago Toxicology Lab \$149,016 Springfield Toxicology Lab \$154,654.56	YES/ Stand Alone Bill	
14 156 - Architect of the Office	The Evaluation of change orders for a project and recommendations to accept changes offered from contractors.  FY12/FY13 Audit Finding "non-compliance with Construction Evaluation Act" Council has not met or performed duties as required by the Act. OAC already has a process in place for proposed changes on projects and the contractors overhead and profit (OH&P) are determined by the contract on bid date.	20 ILCS 3015/ Illinois Construction Evaluation Act	This is an Executive Branch Action. Enacted P.A. 84-859 OAC has completed one requirement due to the audit finding. OAC called to order the first meeting to elect Chairman on June 17, 2015. No one has any recollection of the "Council" every meeting prior. Council recommended to have the "Act" repealed at the meeting.	Repealed. OAC has a process in place to compensate the contractors for change orders on projects.	Unable to put a dollar amount, but this "Act" will not provide any savings for the State of IL.	Yes	

2018 BFR Agency Mandates -Working Group Recommendations 9-27-18						
Agency Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)	Comments and Recommendations
15 579 - Racing Board	<p>Section 27(f) of the Illinois Racing Act of 1975 ("Act") requires inter-track wagering location licensees ("OTBs") to remit admission tax payments to the Illinois Racing Board ("IRB"), so the IRB can then pay such amounts to local governments (counties or municipalities) without the IRB retaining any portion of such funds. This results in additional costs to the IRB and State to pass-through to each county or municipality. There are currently 22 licensed OTBs in Illinois, however, only 7 are located within a county or municipality that require payment of admission taxes (each county and municipality is required to pass an ordinance, which requires such tax to be charged). Currently, 7 OTBs which are located in Chicago or Cook County are required to collect and remit such admission taxes to the IRB for the IRB to pass-through such payments to Cook County or Chicago.</p> <p>This mandate is out of date, is inconsistent with other provisions of the Act and negatively impacts the IRB, as it is a pass-through payment. The IRB does not receive any funds or benefit from such payments, yet expends approximately 125 hours per year administering section 27(f) of the Act (2.5 hours of time per week the IRB dedicates to receipt and transfer of funds from the OTBs to the IRB and the IRB to each county and municipality where each OTB is located). This does not account for the time spent by the fiscal department monitoring and auditing the payments from the OTBs to the IRB to ensure they are correct. Even if modified, the payments would continue to be monitored and audited by IRB staff.</p> <p>Furthermore, the admission tax payment required by section 27(f) by the OTBs to the IRB conflicts with section 26(h)(10.1) of the Act. Section 26(h)(10.1) requires OTBs to pay 1% of its pari-mutuel handle to each county or municipality each OTB is located within, if no municipality, then 2% to the county. Unlike, section 27(f), section 26(h)(10.1) states 1% of pari-mutuel handle shall be paid to each county or municipality each OTB is located within. Thus, the OTBs currently make one payment for section 27(f) purposes to the IRB, while it makes another payment pursuant to section 26(h)(10.1) directly to each county or municipality each OTB is located within.</p>	230 ILCS 5/27(f) – Inter-track wagering location licensee admission tax to local governments	The legislation (P.A. 84-1468, HB2486 (84th GA) which included the admission fee and 48-hour remittance of the fees to the Board, was the result of a Special Horse Racing Investigative Committee report. P.A. 84-1468 was signed on January 16, 1987, this Act included revenue sources for municipalities and counties where OTB's are located and the expectation that the tax monies that were collected from IRB licensees would be verified by the IRB before being transferred to the recipients. The IRB has requested the above bill and P.A. from archives, but has not received it with sponsor names and information at this time. The IRB will supplement its response once received.	The mandate should be modified. Section 27(f) of the Act should be amended to allow for the payment directly from the OTBs to each county or municipality each OTB is located within. See attached proposed amendment. The payments to each county or municipality each OTB is located within would still be monitored and audited by IRB staff. This practice would alleviate approximately 125 hours per year (2.5 hours of time per week the IRB dedicates to receipt and transfer of funds from the OTBs to the IRB and the IRB to each county or municipality each OTB is located within). Furthermore, this modification would further align section 27(f) with Section 26(h)(10.1) of the Act regarding the 1% of pari-mutuel handle to each county or municipality in which the OTB is located. Unlike, section 27(f), section 26(h)(10.1) states 1% of pari-mutuel handle shall be paid to each county or municipality each OTB is located within. Thus, the OTBs would make one payment to each county or municipality each OTB is located within (for both sections 27(f) and 26(h)(10.1)) and eliminate an additional payment to the IRB, which then must transfer the funds to each county or municipality each OTB is located within.	The IRB would realize annual savings of approximately \$12,500 (CFO = 125hrs/year).	Yes, Conditional on no opposition report from agency
16 494 -IDOT	Under current law, the Department's authority to reserve cash from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund for the Vehicle Inspection Fund expired at the end of FY2015. Modifying this mandate will give IDOTs Bureau of Business Services the statutory authority to carry out the allocation of Motor Fuel Tax Funds under the new appropriation to the Vehicle Inspection Fund.	30 ILCS 505/8.4(d).	Under current law, the Department's authority to reserve cash from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund for the Vehicle Inspection Fund expired at the end of FY2015. In recent budgets, the IEPA was given a direct appropriation from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund (MFTF) for payment into the Vehicle Inspection Fund (VIF)(\$30M each for FY 2016, FY2017, and FY2018). This proposal would give the Department authority to account for the change in monthly Motor Fuel Tax allotment process assuming that the direct appropriation from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund becomes the new method of distribution indefinitely.	This mandate should be modified because it will clarify existing law.	None.	YES
17 494 -IDOT	Under current law, all monies deposited into the Public Transportation Fund must be paid to the RTA. As a result, there are no monies available to support annual appropriations to the Office of Executive Inspector General from the Public Transportation Fund.	70 ILCS 3615/4.03.3(h), 70 ILCS 3615/4.09(i).		Amend 70 ILCS 3615/4.09(5)(b)(1) to specify that the amount from the Public Transportation Fund paid to the RTA would be net of the amounts paid to the Audit Expense Fund and the amounts used by the OEIG from their appropriations from the fund.	None.	YES/Place in BIMP

**Proposed Fund Cleanup/Amendatory Items for Fall 2018 BFR Submission**

Items are numbered 'fca-xx' in sequence for reference. Highlighted items were included in SB2884 sam1 (99th GA).

Item Number	Statutory Reference	Affected Fund Number	Affected Fund Name	Change and Rationale	Original Public Act	Sponsor	Date of Dissolution	Current Balance
-------------	---------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------	---------------------	---------	---------------------	-----------------

**Technical Changes**

fca-1	20 ILCS 607/3-15; 20 ILCS 607/3-20	0320	South Suburban Brownfields Redevelopment Fund	These Sections inconsistently list the fund name both with and without the word "Zone". The references including "Zone" are inconsistent with other references at 30 ILCS 105/5.854, at 20 ILCS 607/3-25, at 20 ILCS 607/3-30, at 20 ILCS 607/3-45, and by IOC.	P.A. 98-109	Hutchinson	no activity since inception	#N/A
fca-2	30 ILCS 105/5.794 rep.	0710	Homeland Security Emergency Preparedness Trust Fund	This fund was reclassified as a federal trust fund by P.A. 99-36 and thus should no longer be designated as a special fund in the state treasury. The fund's underlying enabling authority at 20 ILCS 3305/17.5 will remain in effect.	P.A. 97-116	Crespo	active fund	\$2,512.3
fca-3	70 ILCS 1605/35	0717	State Metro-East Park and Recreation District Fund	This Section omits the word "State" from the fund name, which is inconsistent with other references at 70 ILCS 1605/30 and by IOC.	P.A. 91-103	Hoffman	active fund	\$781.6
fca-4	305 ILCS 5/12-10.10	0211	DHS Technology Initiative Fund	This Section omits the word "Initiative" from the fund name in one instance, which is inconsistent with other references in this same Section and by IOC.	P.A. 98-24	Kotowski	active fund	\$7,030.0

**Funds That Have Run Their Course**

fca-5	20 ILCS 405/405-292; 30 ILCS 105/5.615 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/6p-5 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/6z-27.1 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/8.16c rep.	0315	Efficiency Initiatives Revolving Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2009 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund, but will retain CMS' authority to recommend business process re-engineering to achieve state savings.	P.A. 93-25	Trotter		\$0.0
fca-6	20 ILCS 2310/2310-352 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.460 rep.	old # has been recycled by IOC	Children's Cancer Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY1999 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund. IOC has since assigned this abolished fund's old fund number to a new fund in the state treasury.	P.A. 90-171	Parker		#N/A
fca-7	20 ILCS 2310/2310-357 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.606 rep.; 35 ILCS 5/507CC rep.	0691	Leukemia Treatment and Education Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2005 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 93-324	Link		\$0.0
fca-8	20 ILCS 2310/2310-359 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.660 rep.; 35 ILCS 5/507LL rep.	0264	Illinois Brain Tumor Research Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2007 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 94-649	Harmon		#N/A
fca-9	20 ILCS 2310/2310-361 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.687 rep.; 35 ILCS 5/507PP rep.	0456	Lung Cancer Research Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2009 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 95-434	Cullerton		\$0.0
fca-10	20 ILCS 2310/2310-399 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.639 rep.; 35 ILCS 5/507II rep.	0275	Vince Demuzio Memorial Colon Cancer Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2011 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 94-142	D. Demuzio	1/23/2013	\$0.0

**Proposed Fund Cleanup/Amendatory Items for Fall 2018 BFR Submission**

Items are numbered 'fca-xx' in sequence for reference. Highlighted items were included in SB2884 sam1 (99th GA).

Item Number	Statutory Reference	Affected Fund Number	Affected Fund Name	Change and Rationale	Original Public Act	Sponsor	Date of Dissolution	Current Balance
fca-11	20 ILCS 2310/2310-403 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.647 rep.; 35 ILCS 5/507HH rep.	0268	Sarcoidosis Research Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2007 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 94-141	Howard		#N/A
fca-12	20 ILCS 2310/2310-612 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.658 rep.; 35 ILCS 5/507KK rep.	0250	Blindness Prevention Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2007 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 94-602	Hoffman		#N/A
fca-13	20 ILCS 3958/Act rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.614 rep.	0306	I-FLY Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2015 and has been closed out by IOC. IDOT has no plans to revive the program. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund and program.	P.A. 93-585	Sullivan	9/14/2016	\$0.0
fca-14	25 ILCS 130/4-9 rep.	old # has been recycled by IOC	Intergovernmental Cooperation Conference Fund	This fund has had no activity during the SAMS era. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund. IOC has since assigned this abolished fund's old fund number to a new fund in the state treasury.	P.A. 85-491	Barnes		#N/A
fca-15	30 ILCS 105/25; 30 ILCS 105/6z-8a rep.; 305 ILCS 5/12-5	old # has been recycled by IOC	Immigration Reform and Control Fund	This fund has had no activity during the SAMS era, and DHS has no plans to use the fund. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund. IOC has since assigned this abolished fund's old fund number to a new fund in the state treasury.	P.A. 85-707	Watson		#N/A
fca-16	30 ILCS 105/5.95 rep.	0713	Asthma and Lung Research Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2005 and has been closed out by IOC. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 93-292	Maloney	6/29/2009	\$0.0
fca-17	30 ILCS 105/5.231 rep.; 505 ILCS 35/Art. IV rep.	no fund # in SAMS	Reinvest in Illinois Natural Resources Fund	This fund has had no activity during the SAMS era, and neither Agriculture nor DNR has any plans to use the fund. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 85-960	Madigan		#N/A
fca-18	30 ILCS 105/5.290 rep.; 730 ILCS 5/3-2-2.2 rep.	no fund # in SAMS	County Juvenile Detention Center Revolving Loan Fund	This fund has had no activity during the SAMS era, and DOC has no plans to use the fund. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 86-1327	Rea		#N/A
fca-19	30 ILCS 105/5.298 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/8.32 rep.	0352	Minority and Female Business Enterprise Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2006 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 86-1482	Currie	4/3/2014	\$0.0
fca-20	30 ILCS 105/5.622 rep.; 30 ILCS 340/3	0367	Medicaid Provider Relief Fund	This fund and the corresponding Section of the Short Term Borrowing Act were enacted specifically to allow the state to capture enhanced federal Medicaid match that expired on 6/30/2004; the fund's enabling language sunset on 6/30/2005. Since the fund has run its course, this item repeals the fund's remaining statutory authority.	P.A. 93-674	Madigan	6/1/2005	#N/A
fca-21	30 ILCS 105/5.701 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/6z-69 rep.	0406	Comprehensive Regional Planning Fund	This fund was abolished by P.A. 97-72. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 95-677	Halvorson	2/10/2012	\$0.0
fca-22	30 ILCS 105/5.722 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/6z-73 rep.; 205 ILCS 5/48	0679	Financial Institutions Settlement of 2008 Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY2009 and has been closed out by IOC. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 95-1047	Link	6/8/2011	\$0.0
fca-23	30 ILCS 105/6u rep.	0625	Matured Bond and Coupon Fund	This fund was abolished by P.A. 97-935. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 79-281	Lechowicz	10/1/2012	\$0.0
fca-24	30 ILCS 105/6z rep.	0839	Medical Center Commission Income Fund	The fund last received revenue in FY1998 and has been closed out by IOC. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 81-1495	McPike	6/30/2000	#N/A

**Proposed Fund Cleanup/Amendatory Items for Fall 2018 BFR Submission**

Items are numbered 'fca-xx' in sequence for reference. Highlighted items were included in SB2884 sam1 (99th GA).

Item Number	Statutory Reference	Affected Fund Number	Affected Fund Name	Change and Rationale	Original Public Act	Sponsor	Date of Dissolution	Current Balance
fca-25	30 ILCS 105/6z-1 rep.	no fund # in SAMS	Federal Public Works and Economic Development Trust Fund	This fund has had no activity during the SAMS era, and DCEO has no plans to use the fund. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund; the fund's naming reference was repealed by P.A. 85-1440 in 1989.	P.A. 81-1509	Hallock		#N/A
fca-26	30 ILCS 105/6z-33 rep.	old # has been recycled by IOC	State Universities Athletic Capital Improvement Fund	This fund has had no activity during the SAMS era, and BHE has no plans to use the fund. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund. IOC has since assigned this abolished fund's old fund number to a new fund in the state treasury.	P.A. 89-133	Weaver		#N/A
fca-27	305 ILCS 10/Act rep.	no fund # in SAMS	Illinois Food and Housing Assistance Fund	This fund has had no activity during the SAMS era. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 83-1412	E. Collins		#N/A

**Funds That Were Never Utilized**

fca-28	20 ILCS 605/605-416 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.738 rep.	0806	Ex-Offender Fund	This fund never received any revenue, and DCEO has no plans to operate the program. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund and program.	P.A. 96-656	Ford		#N/A
fca-29	20 ILCS 720/35 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/5.807 rep.	0511	Illinois Main Street Fund	This fund never received any revenue, and DCEO has no plans to utilize the fund. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 97-573	Verschoore		#N/A
fca-30	30 ILCS 105/5.633 rep.	old # has been recycled by IOC	Food Animal Institute Fund	This fund never received any revenue, and the fund's enabling authority was repealed by P.A. 100-116. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund. IOC has since assigned this abolished fund's old fund number to a new fund in the state treasury.	P.A. 93-883	Pritchard		#N/A
fca-31	30 ILCS 105/5.641 rep.	0180	Fund for Child Care for Deployed Military Personnel	This fund never received any revenue, and the fund's enabling authority sunset on 7/1/2010 as provided in P.A. 94-35. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 94-35	Wilhelmi		#N/A
fca-32	30 ILCS 105/5.649 rep.; 30 ILCS 780/5-55 rep.	0221	Computer Investment Program Fund	This fund never received any revenue, and DCEO has no plans to use the fund. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund. The program's underlying enabling authority at 30 ILCS 780/5-50 will remain in effect.	P.A. 94-262	M. Davis		#N/A
fca-33	30 ILCS 105/5.803 rep.; 30 ILCS 105/6z-91 rep.; 705 ILCS 105/27.3a	0563	Illinois Law Enforcement Alarm Systems Fund	This fund never received any revenue, and ISP has no plans to transfer cash into the fund. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 97-453	Dugan		#N/A
fca-34	30 ILCS 105/6z-46 rep.	old # has been recycled by IOC	Right to Read Fund	This fund never received any revenue, and ISBE has no plans to use the fund. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund. IOC has since assigned this abolished fund's old fund number to a new fund in the state treasury.	P.A. 90-757	Lang		#N/A
fca-35	30 ILCS 177/Act rep.; 55 ILCS 5/5-1006.5; 55 ILCS 5/5-1035.1	0809	Transportation Development Partnership Trust Fund	This fund never received any revenue, and IDOT has no plans to utilize the fund. These changes will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 96-845	Tryon		#N/A

**Other Cleanup Issues**

**Proposed Fund Cleanup/Amendatory Items for Fall 2018 BFR Submission**

Items are numbered 'fca-xx' in sequence for reference. Highlighted items were included in SB2884 sam1 (99th GA).

Item Number	Statutory Reference	Affected Fund Number	Affected Fund Name	Change and Rationale	Original Public Act	Sponsor	Date of Dissolution	Current Balance
fca-36	25 ILCS 130/4-4 rep.; 25 ILCS 130/4-5 rep.; 25 ILCS 130/4-6 rep.		not applicable	This item, which originated with Sen. Althoff in SB2884 (99th GA) as introduced, repeals an obsolete legislative Advisory Committee on Block Grants.	P.A. 83-1257	Daniels		

**Align Law with IOC Implementation - Whistleblower Funds (Article)**

fca-37	5 ILCS 283/10; 30 ILCS 105/5.886 new; 740 ILCS 175/8	0600	Attorney General Whistleblower Reward and Protection Fund	Current law allocates 1/6 of State Whistleblower Reward and Protection Fund proceeds to be paid to the Attorney General, but does not specify a fund. In practice, this is executed through a non-appropriated fund deposit to the Attorney General Whistleblower Reward and Protection Fund, from which annual appropriations are made. These changes will codify current practice, specify the fund's name in law, and designate the fund as a special state fund. This also changes the "Attorney General's" fund name established in P.A. 96-1019 for consistency with the name listed by IOC and in annual appropriation bills.	P.A. 87-662	McAfee	active fund	\$5,192.2
fca-38	30 ILCS 105/5.317; 740 ILCS 175/8	0703	State Whistleblower Reward and Protection Fund	Current law directs the state share of Illinois False Claims Act (formerly Whistleblower Reward and Protection Act) proceeds, settlements, and recoveries to the Whistleblower Reward and Protection Fund, which in practice is this fund. This fund then makes non-appropriated fund deposits to the other 2 Whistleblower funds in the state treasury. These changes will retain the current practice of cash flows, while clarifying which of the 3 Whistleblower funds actually receives the initial proceeds.	P.A. 87-662	McAfee	active fund	\$282.3
fca-39	30 ILCS 105/5.887 new; 740 ILCS 175/8	0705	State Police Whistleblower Reward and Protection Fund	Current law allocates 1/6 of State Whistleblower Reward and Protection Fund proceeds to be paid to the Department of State Police, but does not specify a fund. In practice, this is executed through a non-appropriated fund deposit to the State Police Whistleblower Reward and Protection Fund, from which annual appropriations are made. These changes will codify current practice, specify the fund's name in law, and designate the fund as a special state fund.	P.A. 87-662	McAfee	active fund	\$11,059.1

**Funds That Have Run Their Course - Capital Litigation Trust Fund (Article)**

fca-40	30 ILCS 105/13.2; 30 ILCS 105/5.518 rep.; 55 ILCS 5/3-9005; 55 ILCS 5/3-4006.1 rep.	0614	Capital Litigation Trust Fund	This fund was abolished by P.A. 96-1543. This change will repeal unused statutory authority for the fund.	P.A. 91-589	Hawkinson	2/23/2012	\$0.0
--------	--	------	-------------------------------	---	-------------	-----------	-----------	-------