



Priorities of Government

Result Team Process Guide

Spring 2008

This Guide Includes:

POG Description

Tollgate I Instructions

Tollgate II Instructions

Key Dates and Contacts

Tollgate I Dates	
Early May 2008	Core Results Team begin POG review
May 30, 2008	Tollgate #1 Recommendations due
June 27, 2008	Tollgate #2 Recommendations due

<p>Priorities of Government – an Overview</p>	<p>The Priorities of Government (POG) approach to the budget was initiated in 2002, as the Governor began development of the 2003-05 biennial budget. The 2002 supplemental represented a serious recalibration of the existing budget to adjust for revenue shortfalls created by the post 9/11 economy. Based on that experience, it was recognized that gimmicks and across-the-board cuts would not suffice for the upcoming biennial budget. We needed a mechanism to help decide on reprioritization of programs.</p> <p>POG is a top-down approach to the budget that starts with statewide results rather than agency budget requests. The premise is that state activities, regardless of the agency involved, need to prove their effectiveness in achieving statewide results and strategies before they deserve inclusion in the budget.</p> <p>It is important to note that POG is intended as advisory to the executive budget process, rather than actual decision-making. A result and performance-based assessment of state services is a critical perspective on budget investments, but fund sources, existing statute, federal rules, Governor’s highest priorities and multiple other factors also influence the final product. Furthermore, despite significant progress in both quality and quantity, performance measures are not always an ideal indicator of program effectiveness.</p> <p>Although the POG priorities derived from the biennial process are applicable, the process itself has not been implemented for supplemental budgets. The upcoming 2009-11 budget will represent the fourth time that POG has been used for a biennial budget. We have re-designed the schedule to shorten it for more efficiency, while still providing initial guidance prior to agency budget submittals. We have also initiated a two-tier Result Team structure that focuses internal (budget, policy and GMAP) staff on the initial tasks, and brings in agencies for the next phases.</p>
--	---

POG Core Results Team Members – Spring 2008

<p>Increase student achievement in elementary, middle and high schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julie Salvi, Budget • Amy Skei, Budget • Adam Aaseby, Budget • Judy Hartman, Policy • Bruce Botka, GMAP • Leslie Goldstein, Policy • Carol Jenner, Forecasting 	<p>Improve the value of postsecondary learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Webster, Budget • Bruce Botka, GMAP • Christopher Alejano, Policy • Pat Tasanasanta, Forecasting • Deb Came, Forecasting
<p>Improve the economic vitality of business and individuals throughout the state</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Antolin, Budget • Regan Hesse, Budget • John Shepherd, Budget • Scott Merriman, OFM • Marc Baldwin, Policy • Bruce Botka, GMAP • Jim Schmidt, Forecasting 	<p>Improve the security of Washington’s vulnerable children and adults</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carole Holland, Budget • Eric Mandt, Budget • Tammy Hay, Budget • Kari Burrell, Policy • Robin Campbell, GMAP • Deron Ferguson, Forecasting
<p>Improve the safety of people and property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Enslow, Budget • Mike Woods, Budget • John Lane Policy • Joseph Archuleta, GMAP • Thea Mounts, Forecasting 	<p>Improve the health of Washingtonians</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nick Lutes, Budget • Mike Steenhout, Budget • Christina Hulet, Policy • Jonathan Seib, Policy • Joseph Archuleta, GMAP • Harold Nelson, Forecasting
<p>Improve the mobility of people, goods, and services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robin Rettew, OFM Budget • Geri Beardsley, Budget • Jill Satran, Policy • Jennifer Ziegler, Policy • Michael Bezanson, GMAP • Lorrie Brown, Forecasting 	<p>Improve the quality of Washington’s natural resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kirstan Arestad, Budget • Linda Steinmann, Budget • Keith Phillips, Policy • Michael Bezanson, GMAP • Bob Baker, Forecasting
<p>Improve cultural and recreational opportunities throughout the state</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deborah Feinstein, Budget • Adam Aaseby, Budget • David Giglio, Budget • Kathleen Drew, Policy • Wei Yen, Forecasting 	<p>Strengthen the ability of state government to achieve results efficiently and effectively</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pam Davidson, Budget • Jane Sakson or Ryan Black, Budget • Scott Heinze, Policy • Karen Sampson, GMAP • Irv Lefberg, Forecasting

Bold indicates Team lead.

Tools for Tollgate I

Statewide Result Indicators

In past POG efforts, teams identified three to five key indicators they believed would provide the best evidence to citizen about progress toward their assigned result. These indicators have been refined and baseline data for most is now available on the OFM web site at <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/fiscal/pog/indicators/> .

High-Level Strategies

Prior POG result teams have identified the proven or most promising strategies for achieving results, based on research and experience. These strategies provide a statewide strategic framework for investment decisions. At the links below are the strategies and indicators identified for each result area
<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget/pog/strategies.htm>

Causal Factor Maps

POG teams also developed a diagram to depict the causal factors that most influence the result. The most recent causal maps can be found on the OFM web site at
<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget/pog/strategies.htm>.

Team Responsibilities

- Create the products required for the three tollgates.
- Follow the “rules of the game” for the POG process. The intent is to create an evidenced-based framework that becomes the criteria for a purchase plan based on expected performance toward results.
- Think beyond the scope and interests of your own agency to take a statewide, citizen-centered perspective of your result area. In the end your task is to be a “purchasing agent” for citizens.
- Contribute and study research and evidence about the actions that contribute to results.
- For this purpose, temporarily set aside the traditional constraints (federal rules, prior policy decisions, restrictions on dedicated funds, etc.) that don’t relate to the POG logic model.

POG Resources

You can find more information on the POG website at <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget/pog/default.htm> .or:

at the POG sharepoint site which will serve as a clearing house for POG related information and instructions. For access contact Jeffrey

Showman at 902-7536.

http://sharepoint.dis.wa.gov/ofm/projects/POG_Team_2008/default.aspx

Guidance Team The Governor will invite leaders from business, labor, non-profit organizations, local government and state government to serve on the Guidance Team for POG. The Guidance Team reviews the work of the Result Teams, providing an executive perspective. The Guidance Team is asked to provide advice, and monitor whether the recommendations are evidence-based and consistent with the POG framework (indicators and strategies).

Tollgate Sessions A “tollgate” refers to a check-in with the Guidance and Staff teams. Result Teams are expected to achieve certain deliverables at a certain time. This helps ensure that each team is on schedule, and also demonstrates that they’ve walked through each of the POG process steps in the appropriate sequence. Tollgate #3 is the only in-person presentation, although the Guidance Team or Staff Team might communicate questions and/or feedback relating to the first two tollgates.

Tollgate #1: Evaluate High-Level Indicators, Strategies and Causal Maps

The Goal of Tollgate #1 Tollgate #1 is an evaluation and confirmation (or revision) of the high level indicators, causal maps and strategies that currently exist for each result area.

(Tollgate #1 is not about activities, priorities, or dollars. That comes later.)

Evaluate High-Level Indicators Indicators are those few high-level measures that most people would see as a gauge of success in achieving a particular result. Teams should determine if the current level indicators are still appropriate.

Points to consider:

- Indicators should be understandable to the average citizen.
- Focus on what’s most important, not just what’s easiest to measure.
- Additional or better indicators might have evolved through performance assessments, PMTS, GMAP, or citizen forums.

Review Causal Map and High-Level Strategies

Previous Result Teams developed a cause-and-effect diagram to depict the primary factors that affect the statewide result. Teams were asked to consider all factors, not just those influenced by state government or connected to existing state services. These “causes” translate into strategies for achieving the result.

Teams should examine their causal maps and determine if they still appropriately describe what works. Although its not expected that basic strategies are likely to change, new strategies could emerge because of better data about causal factors or program effectiveness, recent research, or changing demographics.

Tollgate #1 deliverables

Make recommended changes to the High-Level Indicators by submitting (to Garry Austin) a marked-up a copy of the current indicators noting any revisions. If new indicators are recommended, the team must indicate a source of time series data.

Similarly, any revisions to the causal/strategy map can be submitted as mark-up's to the current map (Operations will see that the map is re-drawn in a standard format).

A link to Word versions of the high level strategies has been posted on the POG sharepoint site. Recommended changes should be submitted in Word mark-up format.

Tollgate #2: Develop an Initial Prioritization of Activities

Goal of Tollgate #2	Tollgate #2 creates an initial list of prioritized activities that best support the indicators and strategies from Tollgate #1. The intent is to use existing data (budget choices; costs; performance measures; research; GMAP, Auditor and JLARC evaluations, etc.) to arrive at initial priorities and to communicate that information to agencies prior to their budget submittal.
Evaluate past POG purchase plans and the current activity list	The three previous POG's developed "purchase plans" that represented activity priorities within the dollars assigned. The question for Tollgate #2 is whether those priority choices still make sense, given the current indicator/strategy framework and the investment choices represented by the current budget. Performance may play a big role in determining whether previous investment choices achieved what was intended.
What would you like to tell (or ask) agencies?	This prioritization is intended to signal to agencies the Result Team's perception of program performance, as well as those areas where there needs to be more data or research – or a better argument for keeping some activity.

Tollgate #2: Deliverables

Create a list of the activities related to each individual result area. These activities should be prioritized in the following categories:

- Category 1: Activities with a proven track record of performance, and a direct, demonstrated contribution to the strategies connected with this result.
- Category 2: Activities that do not perform well, have a high cost relative to their contribution to the result, or where we do not have the data to directly connect them to one of the chosen strategies.
- Category 3: New Ideas - Activities that do not currently exist but seem to hold promise or significant changes to current activities.

Operations will provide a simple Excel prioritization tool to each team.

These are not purchase plans. You are not assigned a dollar limit at this stage (that's Tollgate #3).