EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OPERATIONS – OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES

SOCIAL SERVICES APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
STAFF: STEPHEN JARDINE

ISSUE BRIEF

SUMMARY

As part of a Human Services In-depth Budget Review (found at http://le.utah.gov/interim/2010/pdf/00001613.pdf), the Department of Human Services reported a six year history of output and outcome measures and benchmarking information if it existed. The department has updated this information and included an additional year. A six year history of measures is included in the appendix. The brief highlights changes from information presented a year ago and identifies measures that have improved or declined by more than 5 percent. Fiscal Analyst recommendations for Legislative action are also included.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The Fiscal Analyst recommends:

1. EDO further develop outcome measures for its Administrative Hearings and the Public Guardians program (currently only providing output measures) that comply with the general principles of performance measurement where you measure things that matter, measure outcomes first, and measure internally and against other states.

HUMAN SERVICES IN-DEPTH BUDGET REVIEW RECOMMENDATION REGARDING OUTCOMES

The Human Services In-depth Budget Review (found at http://le.utah.gov/interim/2010/pdf/00001613.pdf) was assigned by the Executive Appropriations Committee (EAC) and later heard by EAC and the Social Services and Executive Offices and Criminal Justice Appropriations Subcommittees. The in-depth review included 15 major recommendations and 14 other additional recommendations. The two subcommittees passed intent language to have Human Services report back on the progress and status of the review's recommendations during the 2012 General Session. One of the major 15 recommendations was:

> *All department divisions [should] follow best practices for performance measures:*
> - *Measure things that matter*
> - *Focus on outcomes, then outputs*
> - *Compare internally and against other states*

The in-depth budget review identified the best internal department examples for outcome measures. The review stated, "For outcome measures of state provided services, DCFS [Division of Child and Family Services] is the best example. They have meaningful measures, compare different regions, publish them on their public website, and benchmark against other states. . . For outcome measures of contract-provided services, DSAMH [Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health] is the best example in the department. They have meaningful measures, compare different providers, publish them on their public website, and benchmark against other states."

HUMAN SERVICES OVERALL GOALS

As part of its FY 2013 budget submission, the Department of Human Services provided the following four department-wide goals:

- *collaborate with community partners and within the Department on issues that cut across divisions*
- *maintain and improve transparency regarding Department finances and operations in the community*
- *foster creativity, innovation and adoption of best models and practices*
- *improve outcomes and results by using measures which lead to good decisions that drive success*

ANALYSIS OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OPERATIONS OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES

Executive Director Operations (EDO) has made no changes to the measures it presented in the fall of 2010 as part of the in-depth budget review. Analysis at that time regarding the output and outcome measures of EDO stated, "the Analyst

believes these measures are providing helpful information. However, more and better outcome measures will help assess the extent to which programs are achieving their intended results . . . ."

The Fiscal Analyst recommends EDO further develop outcome measures for Administrative Hearings and the Public Guardian program (currently only providing output measures) that comply with the general principles of performance measurement where you measure things that matter, measure outcomes first, and measure internally and against other states.

EDO measures showing greater than 5% improvement

#5 - Finance - percent of reported fiscal issues now corrected (+32%)
#10 - Children's Ombudsman reviews completed (+10%)

EDO measures showing greater than 5% decline

#2 - Child Visitation Grant - percent of noncustodial parents served who saw their parenting time increase (-13%)
#6 - Contract Monitoring - percent of department contracts reviewed for contract compliance during each fiscal Year (-25%)
#7 - Contract Monitoring - percent of contracts completed on or before the contract effective date (-52%)
#16 - Licensing - issue of a license within 30 days after complying with licensing rules (-8%)
#17 - Licensing - complete background screenings within 15 days of receipt of application (-9%)

APPENDIX: HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES

As part of the Department of Human Services In-depth Budget Review, agencies within Human Services were asked to provide a six year history of accountability measures along with any indications if benchmarking was being used, and if so, who was being used to benchmark against (see the Department of Human Services In-depth Budget Review Appendix 3, pages 65 through 74 found at: http://le.utah.gov/interim/2010/pdf/00001615.pdf). The table included in the appendix for Executive Director Operations updates information from the in-depth review and adds measures for one additional year.

Executive Director Operations - Output and Outcome Measures - FY05 Through FY 11: EDO

FY10 Total Expenditures	FY11 Total Expenditures	Appropriation Unit	Unit		Performance Measure	Measure Target	Measure FY 05	Measure FY 06	Measure FY 07	Measure FY 08	Measure FY 09	Measure FY 10	Measure FY 11	Measure can be benchmarked to performance by others?	If yes, who are you using to benchmark against?
$15,530,939	**$15,274,600**	**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OPERATIONS:**													
$1,261,350	**$1,138,000**	**KAA DHS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**	1101 DHS EDO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S OFFICE	**1**	The department has seven department-wide goals. The department publishes an annual report outlining accomplishments.										
			1104 DHS EDO CHILD VISITATION GRANT	**2**	Percent of noncustodial parents served who saw their parenting time increase	No target set	59%	62%	71%	78%	70%	71%	62%	Yes	National Indicator
$1,336,995	**$1,299,500**	**KAB LEGAL AFFAIRS**	1401 DHS EDO ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS	**3**	Administrative Hearings held	No target set	750	891	892	841	902	1,094	990	No	
			1403 DHS EDO OFFICE OF LEGAL AFFAIRS												
			1404 DHS EDO PUBLIC GUARDIAN	**4**	Number of people provided with guardianship/conservatorship services	275	230	230	239	210	214	233	238	No	
$2,320,372	**$2,455,000**	**KAC INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**	1411 DHS EDO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION												
$3,338,894	**$3,255,900**	**KAE FISCAL OPERATIONS**	1111 DHS EDO OFO DIRECTOR												
			1112 DHS EDO FINANCE	**5**	With assistance from the Bureau of Internal Review and Audit: Percent of reported fiscal issues now corrected (per June 30 quarterly report)	42%	23%	11%	56%	42%	52%	44%	58%	No	
			1114 DHS EDO INTERNAL REVIEW												
			1115 DHS EDO CONTRACT MONITORING	**6**	Percent of Department contracts reviewed for contract compliance during each fiscal year	98%	98%	98%	95%	94%	96%	84%	63%	No	
				7	Percent of contracts completed on or before the contract effective date	50%	28%	33%	39%	30%	48%	58%	28%	No	
			1131 DHS EDO ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	**8**	Percent of building maintenance functions performed timely and well	95%	93%	95%	100%	96%	96%	96%	96%	Yes	Utah DFCM standard
			1132 DHS EDO GENERAL SERVICES												
$1,737,569	**$1,539,600**	**KAF HUMAN RESOURCES**	1122 DHS EDO HUMAN RESOURCES												
$1,232,775	**$1,218,900**	**KAG LOCAL DISCRETIONARY**	1621 DHS EDO LOCAL DISCRETIONARY												
$1,047,027	**$1,104,600**	**KAK SERVICES REVIEW**	1161 DHS EDO CHILDREN'S OMBUDSMAN	**9**	Children's Ombudsman: Complaints Handled	No target set	465	389	393	389	317	407	393	No	
				10	Children's Ombudsman: Ombudsman reviews completed	No target set		77	73	83	67	98	108	No	
				11	Children's Ombudsman: Number Investigations completed / Number recommendations / % implemented	No target set			49 /136 / 100%	30 / 72 / 100%	32 / 128 / 100%	22 / 46 / 100%	28 / 17 / 100%	No	
			1162 DHS EDO SERVICES REVIEW	**12**	Qualitative Case Reviews % QCR judged satisfactory	85%	91%	94%	96%	91%	91%	89%	89%	Yes	David C. lawsuit agreement
				13	Case Process Reviews: Accuracy of CPR double read reviews	90%	97%	96%	97%	98%	98%	98%	97%	Yes	David C. lawsuit agreement
				14	Fatality Reviews: The department reviews client fatalities in a timely manner	95%	93%	93%	100%	94%	97%	96%	100%	No	
				15	Fatality Reviews: The department implements recommendations to improve practice.	95%	55%	100%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	No	
$2,675,157	**$2,654,100**	**KAL OFFICE OF LICENSING**		**16**	Issue a license within 30 days after complying with licensing rules. (% compliance)	90%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	No	
				17	Complete background screenings within 15 days of receipt of application (% compliance)	80%	83%	71%	60%	40%	76%	87%	79%	No	
			1151 DHS EDO CENTRAL LICENSING												
			1154 DHS EDO FOSTER CARE LICENSING												
$580,800	**$609,000**	**KAM DISABILITIES COUNCIL**	1611 DHS EDO UDDC ADMINISTRATION												
			1612 DHS EDO UDDC EMPLOYMENT	**18**	People with disabilities with real jobs: Number of clients served	No target set			50 (SFY)	76 (FFY)	158	206	222	No	
			1613 DHS EDO UDDC HOUSING	**19**	Number of clients who have their own home	No target set			5 (SFY)	5	9	13	19	No	
			1614 DHS EDO UDDC TRANSPORTATION	**20**	People with disabilities with access to and take advantage of transportation for social and economic opportunities: (# Self advocates)	No target set			5 (SFY)	60 (FFY)	60	20	8,525 *See note	No	
			1615 DHS EDO UDDC COMMUNITY SUPPORT	**21**	Clients served	No target set				1,250 (FFY)	1,275	2300	3924	No	
			1617 DHS EDO ACCESS UTAH NETWORK												
			1619 DHS EDO UDDC QUALITY ASSURANCE SELF ADVOCATE	**22**	Clients served	No target set				1,133 (FFY)	1,611	239	494	No	

NOTE: 1614 DHS EDO UDDC Transportation Unit: In May, 2011, the Basin Transit Authority started a bus line between Duchesne and Vernal.