Budgeting For Results Commission
Friday, October 26, 2018
1:30PM-3:30PM

Chicago – James R. Thompson Center, 100 W Randolph, 16th floor, Room 16-100
Springfield – Stratton Building, 500 ½
Dial-in: 888-806-4788 Access Code: 895-685-1121

Attendance:

Springfield: Jennifer Butler, Curt Clemons-Mosby, Kate Mayer

Chicago: Jesse Elam, Adam Groner, Jim Lewis, Sophia Ronis, Paula Worthington

Phone: Mischa Fisher, Senator Heather Steans

Various state agency representatives including Chief Results Officers (CROs) were also in attendance in Springfield, Chicago and by phone.

1. **Welcome and Introductions (Jim Lewis)**
   Chairman Lewis welcomed everyone to the meeting. Curt took roll call of Commissioners. A quorum was confirmed.

2. **Review and Approval of Minutes (Jim)**
   The minutes were approved without comment.

3. **BFR Commission Annual Report (Curt Clemons-Mosby)**
   On Friday, October 19th, the Commission had a phone call to discuss recommended changes to be made to the draft annual report. Those changes have all been made. The more substantive modifications are:
   - A paragraph was added to the SPART progress report, clarifying that the Results First benefit-cost model calculates an Optimal Return on Investment (OROI) for a given program, and that this represents the expected ROI the program will achieve if all the conditions of the program's core principles are met.
   - A recommendation was added to the 2018 recommendations, stating that the Commission should discuss the possibility of adding a mandatory program evaluation

requirement, to be triggered if a program receives a score of 49/100 or below on its SPART evaluation.

Additional changes will later be made to update the table of contents, review section headings for accuracy and consistency, and insert an executive summary based on the final draft. The 2018 mandates recommended for repeal or modification will also be added as an appendix.

There were no further questions or comments on the annual report.

Motion to approve the annual report, pending the additional changes described above. Vote passed.

The BFR Unit will make the final changes and file the report on November 1st. The final report will be circulated to commissioners when it is filed.

4. Update on Results First and SPART (Adam Groner)

Update on DJJ Reports:

The BFR Unit has been working with DJJ to gather program costs through their contracts, and to calculate variable costs and step costs to understand the marginal costs of DJJ programming per child. The Unit has been engaged for several months in conversations with DJJ about the content of their substance use disorder (SUD) program, its core principles, and its relation to aftercare support, among other aspects.

Several BFR staff visited the DJJ facility at Pere Marquette last week to see DJJ's programming in action. The staff were able to sit in on a mental health group session with some of the youth, see one of the Interactive Journals the youth work through to address motivation and behavioral problems and gain cognitive skill. Seeing DJJ's holistic programming approach at Pere Marquette was very helpful. The SUD program is delivered in conjunction with mental health sessions and classes on anger management, parenting, and other topics depending on the needs of the youth. This holistic approach does create difficulties in separating the SUD program from other DJJ programming for the purpose of assessment. These challenges will be explained in the SPART, and will provide important context for the benefit-cost analysis.

The BFR Unit is currently working with DJJ to draft a logic model for their SUD program. The assessment of the SUD program will be complete by the next BFR meeting. After completing the SUD program assessment, reports on the next several programs in DJJ will move more quickly because the ancillary cost information has already been collected, so only the specific program costs will need to be added.

Updating the SPART Template:

BFR staff are in the process of updating the SPART to make it easier to understand it and its role, and to better enable it to clarify how different programs fit in with other, at DJJ and elsewhere. BFR staff are making revisions to both the questions and the score weighting of the SPART to better reflect how it relates to the benefit-cost analysis from Results First, and to more

accurately depict a program's design and implementation, and how these contribute to achieving the program's OROI.

The revised SPART will have a reduced number of questions, with increased weight on questions relating to program design and implementation. The original SPART questions were designed to operate as a stand-alone program assessment, independent of the Results First benefit-cost analysis. The original question weights were more oriented towards program management. In the SPART's current iteration as a companion to the benefit-cost analysis, a better is to weight design and implementation more heavily.

The first step is to look at program design, to see how it intends to activate the program's theory of change and theory of action. The second step is to see if the program is implemented globally according to its design. Adam used the example that if a program's stated theory of change is that playing basketball will reduce drug use among youth, then playing basketball is the program design. If what they are actually doing is playing baseball, that is poor implementation that does not correspond to the program's theory of change.

This SPART redesign will enhance the SPART's relation with the Results First benefit-cost analysis to show what the program is actually achieving. Additionally, the revised version changes some wording from program evaluation to program assessment, as what BFR does is not a full evaluation. As discussed earlier, the Commission will be considering a recommendation that poor (marginal) SPART results should trigger a more intense evaluation process.

The revised SPART draft will be discussed in more depth at the next SPART meeting.

Adam also noted how quickly evidence-based standards for programming can change. For instance, the DJJ SUD program was considered evidence-based when it was adopted in 2011, but new research since then has cast doubt on that assessment. DJJ has tried to adapt its program based on new research, but this process is time-consuming.

Jim expressed that the Commission looks forward to discussing these topics at the next meeting.

5. **Update on U of I request for electronic database access (Curt)**
   The letter from Co-chairs Steans and Lewis has been transmitted to the president of the U of I system. A representative from U of I government relations has reached out to Curt to say that they are working on the request. They will set up a meeting between the BFR co-chairs and leaders from university system, and hope to come to agreement in the very near future. Curt will bring more updates as things develop.

   Jim clarified that Curt should also be present at the meeting, and Curt agreed.

6. **Planning for December 14, 2018 meeting (Jim/Curt)**
   The last Commission meeting of the year is an important opportunity to make preparations and to discuss topics for upcoming year. At the December meeting, the Commission will look at

commissioners' schedules and try to plan the first couple of meetings in 2019. At those meetings, the Commission will plan the full 2019 meeting calendar. Commissioners should come to the December meeting ready with their availability for the first few months of 2019; the Commission will still aim to meet the last Friday of the month at 1:30pm, every second month. The December meeting usually also includes discussion of year's accomplishments, and goals for coming year. As many commissioners as possible should attend.

Curt will send out a proposed work plan ahead of the next meeting, as well as the revised SPART for review.

7. **New Business**

From Curt: Roma Larson, the Commission Ethics Officer, has circulated the annual sexual harassment training which commissioners are statutorily obligated to complete. Commissioners are requested to complete the training, and to mail or email a scan of their completion certificate to Roma. Commissioners who have not completed the training by December 31st cannot participate in meetings until it has been completed. Roma has also sent out the annual ethics training that also must be completed by December 31st. Commissioners should reach out to Curt if they have not received it. The training was sent out via email.

Jim expressed that he had not received the ethics training. Curt said he would look into it.

From Curt: Commissioner reappointments are being processed by the governor's office for this year's slate of commissioners. Commissioners are requested to reach out to Curt if they have not yet received their reappointment packets. The packet contains an oath of office which needs to be signed and notarized, then returned to appointments office. Two reappointment confirmations have been filed already, for Pamela Althoff and Paula Worthington.

Curt welcomed Commissioner Worthington back to the Commission.

Adjournment

The BFR Commission public meeting was adjourned at 1:58 pm.