STATE OF UTAH
Office of the Legislative Auditor General

315 HOUSE BUILDING • PO BOX 145315 • SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84114-5315
(801) 538-1033 • FAX (801) 538-1063

JOHN M. SCHAFF, CIA
AUDITOR GENERAL

Report on Performance Notes and New Programs Activity For the 2012 and 2013 Legislative Sessions

After each General Session, passed bills with performance notes that create new programs move into OLAG's ongoing Best Practices program. Early in the new fiscal year, OLAG sends an email to new program administrators, explaining the best practices follow-up and review process and providing a link to the *Best Practices for Good Management* document on OLAG's web page. Programs receive a self-evaluation survey at the end of their first year of operations. At the end of the second year, program managers will be asked for detailed information and performance reporting. For more information on the full performance note/best practices process, please refer to Joint Rule 4-2-404 to 405.

Performance Note Bills *2012* Legislative General Session		
Total bills with performance notes:	23	
Total that passed:	13	
-- Best practices document provided to		12
-- Bill dropped from tracking		1
Passed performance note bills start ongoing best practices process:		
Best practices year one survey sent to:	12	
-- Year one survey returned by		7
-- No response yet		5

NOTE: OLAG follow-up contacts are underway to the programs that did not respond to the best practices year one self-evaluation survey

OLAG's review of the 13 passed bills with performance notes found that one bill (HB 125, Access to Dental Health Care) did not appear to create a new program. The bill was dropped from tracking because it has not yet been implemented; tracking will begin when the program is implemented. In cases like this one, we will proceed using the discretion granted by the joint rule.

A second point we want to make is that a number of the performance notes submitted by agencies either lacked performance measures or had incomplete measures. In response, we modified our first contact with new programs to require submission of complete performance measures from programs whose performance notes lacked them.

Performance Note Bills ***2013* Legislative General Session**		
Total bills with performance notes:	23	
Total that passed:	12	
-- Best practices document provided to		9
-- Bill dropped from tracking		2
-- Bill already in follow-up process		1
Passed performance note bills start ongoing best practices process:		
Best practices year one survey sent to:	Scheduled for July 2014	
-- Year one survey returned by		
-- No response		

In 2013, OLAG's review of the 12 passed bills requiring performance notes found that 2 passed bills did not appear to create new programs. These bills were dropped from OLAG tracking.

- One bill (HB 118, Automatic External Defibrillator Restricted Account) provided only onetime funding of $150,000 for additional grants in an existing program to political subdivisions and public safety entities

- One bill (HB 194, State Employee Benefits Amendments) capped unused accumulated sick leave, had no appropriation but estimated a reduction in state expenditures

In addition, SB 284, Educational Technology Amendments, amended a 2012 bill that created the Smart School Technology Program. The 2012 bill was already in the Best Practices review process, so OLAG did not send the introductory information a second time.

PERFORMANCE NOTE: AGENCY FORM

H.B.

SHORT TITLE: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Action Center

Joint Rule 4-2-404 requires a Performance Review Note anytime the legislature significantly increases funding for: ☐ New agency ☐ New services or benefits ☐ Serving a new or larger population

DUE TO THE FISCAL ANALYST: Monday, March 18, 2013

CONTACT INFORMATION RESPONDENT:

Title: Agency:

Cell: Office: e-mail:

HOW WILL THE PUBLIC BENEFIT?

1 What is the purpose and the duties of the new program, agency, services, or population served? JR4-2-404(4)(c)(i)

2 What services are provided by the funding increase? JR4-2-404(4)(c)(ii)

3 What are the expected outcomes of the new or expanded program and how will the public benefit? JR4-2-404(4)(c)(iii)

4 How will the bill be implemented and what resources are available to achieve the expected outcomes? JR4-2-404(4)(c)(iv)

5 How will the proposed agency activities cause the expected outcomes and public benefit in 3?

2. PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

What measures will managers and policymakers use to know if the new or expanded program is providing the expected outcomes and public benefits? Provide one, two, and three year goals or targets, actual results and measures if available to serve as a baseline, and outcomes.

Goal (public benefit):

Measure Title:

Description:

Fiscal Year:	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Target or Benchmark:					
Baseline:					

How will program managers collect this performance information and ensure its reliability?

Goal (public benefit):

Measure Title:

Description:

Fiscal Year:	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Target or Benchmark:					
Baseline:					

How will program managers collect this performance information and ensure its reliability?

Goal (public benefit):

Measure Title:

Description:

Fiscal Year:	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
Target or Benchmark:					
Baseline:					

How will program managers collect this performance information and ensure its reliability?