

MINUTES

KANSAS PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COMMISSION

July 18, 2008
Room 423-S—Statehouse

Members Present

Senator Anthony Hensley
Senator Roger Reitz
Representative Ann Mah
Representative Marc Rhoades
Representative Jeff Whitham
Ms. Laura Howard, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS)
Mr. Jerry Younger, Department of Transportation (KDOT)
Ms. Diane Duffy, Board of Regents
Ms. Patricia Henshall, Judicial Branch

Members Absent

Senator Jean Schodorf
Mr. Duane Goossen, Department of Administration

Staff Present

Alan Conroy, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Cindy Lash, Kansas Legislative Research Department
Ken Wilke, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Mike Heim, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Melissa Doeblin, Office of the Revisor of Statutes
Shirley Jepson, Committee Secretary

Conferees

Representative Mike Burgess
Barbara Hinton, Legislative Post Audit

The July 18, 2008, organizational meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m., in Room 423-S of the Statehouse by Representative Jeff Whitham, for the purpose of electing a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson; introduction of appointed members to the Commission and staff; as well as discussion on the charge to the Commission as provided by HB 2802 passed during the 2008 Legislative Session. Representative Whitham noted that the 11-member Commission is composed of 5 Republicans, 5 Democrats, and 1 Independent.

Nominations for Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson were conducted, with the following being elected by the members present following a show of hands: Chairperson – Representative Jeff Whitham and Vice-Chairperson – Mr. Jerry Younger.

Chairperson Whitham recognized Alan Conroy, Kansas Legislative Research Department, who provided an overview of the charge of HB 2802 to the Commission to design a performance management system for the State of Kansas (Attachment 1). The statute requires the system have the following characteristics:

- Be data driven to allow the generation of information for the Legislature to help legislators evaluate the effectiveness of state programs;
- Contain recommendations to implement long-range planning for state programs;
- Include an assessment of the current efficiency and effectiveness of state programs; and
- Include an assessment of the degree to which state program activities are consistent with the mission of the agency.

The Chairperson recognized Representative Mike Burgess, who provided an overview of background information on the enactment of HB 2802 and the intent of the legislation (Attachment 2). Representative Burgess noted that the purpose of the legislation is to provide the Legislature with better and more consistent data for the appropriations process. He indicated that it is important to have cooperation from the state agencies to make the process successful. In response to a question from the Commission, Representative Burgess stated that it is not necessarily the objective of the legislation to eliminate agencies or programs, and that HB 2802 did not address the issue of Sunset. He noted, however, that in the process of evaluating state government for efficiency, duplication may become apparent. Representative Burgess stated that Texas and Florida both have performance measurement systems in place at the present time and could provide valuable information to the Commission. Representative Burgess felt the legislation anticipates the involvement of the Division of Budget and Legislative Post Audit in the performance measurement process. He noted that the Legislature did not appropriate funds to secure the assistance of an outside consultant. The Commission noted that it is important to look at what currently is being done.

Chairperson Whitham recognized Barbara Hinton, Legislative Post Auditor, who provided the Commission with a framework for understanding performance measurement in government. In addition, she discussed and provided copies of information concerning performance-based programs in Florida, Utah, Texas, and Arizona; strategic planning and performance measures of the Kansas Division of the Budget; historical information on performance measures reliability; and potential sources of performance measurement consulting services (Attachment 3).

Ms. Hinton reviewed the process used by Legislative Post Audit when they are requested to perform an audit of a specific topic within a state agency, and explained how auditors determine the

measures they will use to quantify outputs and outcomes. She also reviewed the current system of performance measurement in the State of Kansas. Ms. Hinton noted that Texas is a leader in this area, with a system in place to monitor performance measures and to look at government by function to identify areas where services overlap and duplication occurs.

Ms. Hinton indicated that it is important for agencies to understand the importance and the role of performance measures, the expectations of the Legislature, the characteristic of a good performance measurement system and acceptable results in outputs and outcomes. She said there is a need to determine what should be measured, to have accurate data, and to determine targets and how the data is to be evaluated. Performance measures should indicate to an agency if it is doing a good job.

Some issues brought forth by members of the Commission during discussion included:

- Is there a need for basic and management training for agency supervisors to develop the skills to use a performance measurement system?
- Is there duplication of information technology services in state government? Could some of these services be combined for several agencies?
- Will the Commission be in a position to make a final report to the 2009 Legislature on a performance measurement system, or should its goal be to submit an interim report?

The Commission requested that the Legislative Research Department provide a report to each member before the next meeting on “what state government looks like” – the number of state agencies and their missions.

Topics to be discussed at future meetings include:

- Examples of agency budgets submitted to the Division of the Budget that outline agencies’ missions, goals, and objectives, and that show the relevant performance data used to measure whether objectives are being met.
- Presentations by several state agencies on their current use of performance measures.
- Determination of the direction the Commission will take in arriving at recommendations for an interim report.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m. The Chairperson will develop a schedule for future meetings.

Prepared by Shirley Jepson
Edited by Cindy Lash

Approved by Commission on:

August 28, 2008
(date)