

LINDA LINGLE
GOVERNOR



GEORGINA K. KAWAMURA
DIRECTOR

STANLEY SHIRAKI
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM
HAWAII EMPLOYER-UNION HEALTH BENEFITS TRUST FUND
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC DEFENDER
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
P.O. BOX 150
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96810-0150

ADMINISTRATIVE AND RESEARCH OFFICE
BUDGET, PROGRAM PLANNING AND
MANAGEMENT DIVISION
FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION DIVISION

May 4, 2006

FINANCE MEMORANDUM

MEMO NO. 06-02

TO: All Department Heads

FROM: Georgina K. Kawamura
Director of Finance

SUBJECT: Review of the Program Structure and Performance Measures

In preparation for the Executive Budget for FB 2008-09 and the 2010-13 planning period, and as a follow-up to our FB 2006-07 review, all departments are requested to review their program structure and performance measures, with emphasis on the following:

1. Consolidation of program ID's along organizational structure.
2. Renaming program ID's to reflect organizational entities.
3. Development of performance measures that indicate efficiency and program effectiveness.

The goal of this effort is the development of meaningful objective statements and performance measures for all programs. Because of the importance of these statements and measures in understanding and evaluating State programs for persons in, as well as outside of, State government, we must do our utmost to successfully achieve this goal.

The emphasis on aligning program ID's with organizational entities will contribute to better understanding of our budget documents and the appropriations act. For example, instead of BUF 101, Program Planning, Analysis and Budgeting, the new description may be BUF 101, Departmental Administration and Budget, Planning, and Management Division. The Forestry Division of the Department of Land and Natural Resources currently appears in three different program ID's. The feasibility of consolidating this division into one program ID should be examined.

The review shall encompass:

1. Revisions to existing objectives, measures of effectiveness, target groups and activity indicators at the program ID level. The measures of effectiveness, target groups and activity indicators are limited to ten each at the program ID level.
2. Addition, consolidation or deletion of program IDs. New or amended program objectives, target groups, measures of effectiveness and activity measures must be submitted with the addition of new, or the consolidation of existing program IDs.
3. Addition, consolidation or deletion of organization codes. Titles for the new or consolidated organization codes must be submitted. Corrections to the titles of existing organization codes can also be made.
4. Changes in the placement of a program ID in the program structure.
5. Changes to the program objectives or measures of effectiveness at the intermediate and highest levels of the program structure (target groups and activity indicators are not required at the intermediate and highest levels). There is a limit of ten measures of effectiveness at each intermediate and highest level of the program structure.

Please have your staff review the State of Hawaii Program Structure effective July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2007, which is available online on the Department of Budget and Finance (B&F) website. Each program area may be downloaded as a Word document file. Appropriate sections of the program area files should be used as the base documents for all proposed changes.

All proposed changes should be discussed with the B&F budget analyst assigned to your department. In addition to discussing proposed changes to the performance measures, your staff should be prepared to discuss the problems and costs that may be associated with collecting data for the measures. It is expected that data will be available for the measures chosen, including those at the intermediate and highest levels, and that a mechanism is available, or can be established, to ensure that the data will be collected.

A copy of Section V, Program Objectives, Measures of Program Effectiveness and Program Size Indicators from "The State of Hawaii's Executive Budget System" is attached to aid in your staff's review. A copy of your department's organization codes and descriptions is also attached for review and update.

Changes to the program structure, performance measures and other program size indicators (i.e., target group and activities) will become effective on July 1, 2007, for the FB 2008-09 budget. The development of the FB 2008-09 budget will be based on the new approved program structure, performance measures and program size indicators. However, data for the new performance measures and program size indicators should be collected starting July 1, 2006 for FY 07. FY 07 data for these new measures and program indicators will be required for the variance report that will be prepared in October 2007.

Please submit a hard copy of your proposed changes on or before June 16, 2006. A Word document e-file of your proposed changes should also be e-mailed to the B&F budget analyst assigned to your department and to Ms. Sharon Kotaka (sharon.y.kotaka@hawaii.gov). Data for new performance measures and program indicators will not be due at that time; however, upon approval of the performance measure and program size indicator changes, the data will be required on Tables A, B and C which will be part of your FB 2008-09 budget submission.

Your cooperation in this effort is greatly appreciated.

Attachments

SECTION V

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES, MEASURES OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND PROGRAM SIZE INDICATORS

INTRODUCTION

This section briefly describes three important components of the State's Executive Budget System: the program objectives, measures of program effectiveness and program size indicators. Some principles and concepts which were followed in the development of the objective statements, measures of program effectiveness and program size indicators, and clear examples of each are contained in the following discussion.

STATEMENTS OF OBJECTIVES

The program objective represents a statement of the end result or product or state of condition desired. It should not be a statement of what activities are carried out by the program or the size of those activities, but what those activities are expected to accomplish if they are carried out.

For most programs, the desired results can be stated without difficulty. Some examples include: the minimization of losses to property from floods; reduction in levels of pollution; and reduction in the prevalence of particular conditions in a target group, such as disease or unemployment.

Some of the principles, concepts and ground rules which were followed in developing statements of objectives for the programs at each level are as follows:

1. Objectives should be stated in such a way as to suggest appropriate program structures which can be developed therefrom and should also create the potential for quantifying the degree of their achievement. A strenuous effort has been made to follow this principle throughout the statewide program structure.
2. In general, an attempt has been made to have all of the statements of objectives follow the form: "To achieve ... (a desired condition or goal), for ... (a target group or clientele), by ... (a means or technique)."

It has not always been possible to follow this formula, but it proved a useful guide in avoiding "input-oriented" statements of (alleged) objectives. In the case, however, of a number of fifth level programs where the higher level objective was completely unchanged and quite clear from the context, the opening phraseology was omitted and the "objective" was stated in the abbreviated form of "...to perform some action or deliver some service."

3. Related to the above point is the simple fact that objectives do not necessarily change from one level to another. A review of the statements of objectives contained herein clearly illustrates this phenomenon -- and, indeed, it is highly desirable to have as few and as all-encompassing objective statements for as many particular programs as possible.

The overall objective of the State Government of Hawaii is to enhance all aspects of the welfare of all the people of Hawaii. This global (and somewhat platitudinous!) objective did serve, however, as the starting point for the development of the program structure presented herein. It was disaggregated into a series of eleven specific major objectives, each of which is related to a major area of functional activity with which the State Government is concerned. These major objectives were chosen after much careful thought so as to reflect the most basic and stable goals of a State Government -- thus minimizing the need for subsequent shifts in the basic structure as well as the frequency with which cross-program problems would be encountered.

The eleven major program objectives specified for the State of Hawaii and contained in the eleven Program Memoranda submitted to the Eighth State Legislature are as follows:

1. Major Program: Economic Development

Objective: To assist in maintaining the State's economy in a strong and competitive condition by providing policies, operations, facilities, services, advice and information so as to achieve appropriate rates of growth, high levels of employment, reasonable returns on investments and steady gains in real personal incomes in a balanced fashion in all sectors of the economy and areas of the State.

II. Major Program: Employment

Objective: To assure all workers full and equal opportunity to work, decent working conditions, fair treatment on the job, equitable compensation and assistance in work-related difficulties.

III. Major Program: Transportation Facilities

Objective: To facilitate the rapid, safe and economical movement of people, goods and mail into, within and out of the State by providing and operating transportation facilities and supporting services.

IV. Major Program: Environmental Protection

Objective: To protect, restore and enhance, where appropriate, the natural and man-made physical environment.

V. Major Program: Health

Objective: To improve the health of all the people by reducing the incidence of, and disability due to, physical and mental illness by assuring an adequate supply of high quality health facilities and services for individuals and a healthful environment for the general public.

VI. Major Program: Social Problems

Objective: To enable individuals and families in need of aid to attain a minimally adequate standard of living and to achieve the social and psychological adjustments necessary to successful living in modern society.

VII. Major Program: Formal Education

Objective: To maximize the realization of each individual's intellectual potential, to contribute to his personal development, enhance his social effectiveness and provide the basis for satisfying vocations by making available a graduated and integrated series of high quality formal educational programs; to add to the sum of human knowledge by conducting basic and applied research; and to enhance the welfare of the community by offering instruction and other services of benefit to the general public.

VIII. Major Program: Culture and Recreation

Objective: To enrich the lives of people of all ages by providing and preserving opportunities and facilities for cultural and recreational activities.

IX. Major Program: Public Safety

Objective: To protect the individual and his property from injury and loss caused by criminal actions, accidents, physical hazards and natural and man-made disasters.

X. Major Program: Individual Rights

Objective: To ensure that the individual is provided with services and products meeting acceptable standards of quality, dependability and safety; is given equitable and responsive treatment by public agencies; and is afforded equal protection of his legal and civil rights and interests.

XI. Major Program: Government-Wide Support

Objective: To enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of State programs by providing executive direction, program coordination and policy development as well as a wide variety of services supporting the work of the State Government as a whole or common to all or most programs.

Following this disaggregation, the major programs were further broken down into sub-programs in relation to still more specifically defined sub-objectives. This process was carried on through four and five levels of disaggregation. While in some cases there were additional meaningful levels of program disaggregation which could be identified below the fifth, these have not been shown in the present version of the structure.

MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS

Measures of program effectiveness specifies the degree to which results are expected. They do not measure the size of the program necessary to achieve those results. For example, levels of effectiveness should not be stated in terms of man-years expended or number of cases processed, since these describe the program activities which will achieve

some result, rather than provide information on the result itself. Quite often, crude indicators of desired results must be accepted as the basis for establishing effectiveness (e.g., test scores for education programs).

Developing good measures of effectiveness is perhaps the hardest and most important part of the whole program structuring process. They posit certain quantitative indicators which, if maximized (or minimized as the case may be), represent actual operational achievement of the objectives of the program. In actual practice, therefore, program managers tend to lose sight of the goal statement as such and to fixate on simply maximizing or minimizing the numerical indicator which represents their measure of effectiveness. If this has been well chosen and truly and unambiguously reflects achievement of the real objective, then all is well. But, if the measure of effectiveness is not wholly and exactly congruent with the objective, then seriously wrong program decisions can result from single-minded pursuit of the measure of effectiveness. All of this, of course, is simply by way of saying that the specification of measures of effectiveness is extraordinarily important.

While they often are highly biasing on the actions of program managers, measures of effectiveness also are frequently extremely difficult to define. There are a number of problems:

1. The most satisfactory form of a measure of effectiveness would be to have a single measure of ultimate benefit for an entire major program which subsumed all of the particular lower-level measures of effectiveness and which was, itself, measurable in economic terms so that direct marginal analysis of program benefits and costs would be possible. This is seldom realizable, but every effort should be made to move in the direction of this ideal. This means using measures of ultimate benefit wherever possible rather than lower level narrow measures of effectiveness; it means using economic measures where valid instead of physical measures; it means using a few integrating measures rather than a large number of discrete and disparate measures.
2. Lower level generally physical measures of program effectiveness must be analytically derivable from higher level measures of ultimate benefit. For example, in the Plant Pest and Disease Control

program, the ultimate measure of benefit is the reduction in the dollar value of crop losses. A lower level measure of program effectiveness which might be specified for a program manager or field operational personnel is the reduction in the number of fruit flies per acre in sugar cane fields. However, in all of these cases, the ability to specify unique measures of physical effectiveness implies a complete understanding of the economic/physical production function which links the two outcomes (i.e., dollar reductions in losses and reduced pest incidence). In many cases, such analytic insight is either incomplete or absent and hence it is difficult -- and dangerous -- to attempt to specify unique measures of program effectiveness for all of the lower level programs.

3. In most major programs, there are a number (sometimes very large) of measures of program benefit or effectiveness, no one of which subsumes the others or which is itself dominant. In these cases, all of the measures must be considered simultaneously in making judgments about the value or "effectiveness" of the program.
4. In some cases, there are higher level measures of program benefit which reflect in a major way accomplishment of the program's objectives, but for which no one sub-group, or group of individual sub-programs, can be held accountable. They all contribute in some degree to the overall effect, but each is either individually small or linked by a little-understood chain of causal effects to the larger measure. For example, in the major program, Employment, a good overall measure of program effectiveness is the unemployment rate; but none of the sub-programs within that overall program can be fairly held accountable for changes in the rate. Each is partially responsible but in a way which is not yet ascertainable analytically.
5. As noted above, measures of effectiveness do not necessarily (and ideally should not) change from one level to another. Thus, there is a large measure of redundancy in the present structure because of the requirement of the Act that measures be identified at each level of the structural hierarchy.

6. In some programs, a large variety of measures of effectiveness was developed for lower level programs. Where there were synthesizing overall measures of effectiveness, these were used at the higher levels and all of the lower level measures were not carried to the higher levels. Similarly, where the heterogeneity of the sub-program produced a large number of conceptually "non-integrable" measures, only a selection of the more significant measures was carried up to the higher level programs.
7. Conceptually correct measures of effectiveness should be identified even where the necessary data are not currently available. This stimulates good analytic thinking, provides a better judgmental basis for correct program choices, and provides guidance for the development of information systems. This principle has been strictly followed in the program structure for the State even though large portions of the data are not now available and may well require many years and considerable costs to develop.

PROGRAM SIZE INDICATORS

Program size indicator means a measure to indicate the magnitude of a program. Program size indicators are made up of target groups and beneficiary groups. The target group pertains to the group to which the activities of the program are directed. The group may or may not be comprised of individuals. As an example, the target group may be the number of school-age children in Hawaii -- or it may be the number of school buildings requiring a certain type of maintenance. In a crime control program, the target groups would be the kinds of criminals of interest. In a consumer protection program, it might be the kinds of stores and their locations which will be inspected. In a health program, the target groups might be those with a particular illness or those in a high-risk group. In general, the data should distinguish between the numbers of those currently actually in the target groups and the numbers who might, potentially, be included. For example, in a welfare program, the actual target group is composed of all of those currently receiving welfare and those who would normally be expected to claim such benefits in the future. However, the total potential number of claimants under current laws and policies should also be estimated.

For both the actual and potential target groups, the estimates should cover all six years of the planning period, by year.

The beneficiary group always represents the various groups of people who will benefit from the activities of programs or whose welfare will be enhanced as a result of solving the problem which is under analysis. For example, while it is criminals of various kinds who are the target groups for a law enforcement program, it is the victims and potential victims of crime who will be the beneficiaries of the activities of the law enforcement program or the solution of some acute law enforcement problem. Similarly, while cheating merchants are the target group for a consumer protection program, it is the consumers who are or would be cheated who are the beneficiaries of the program.

In some cases, the target and beneficiary groups will overlap-- or even be identical. In the case of a communicable disease, the target group will be those who have the disease or who are highly likely to contract it; the beneficiary group will include all of those persons plus that segment of the general public which might otherwise be exposed to it. On the other hand, for a condition such as heart disease, the target groups and beneficiary groups will be identical.

In all cases, quantitative estimates of the size of the various affected target groups should be given for at least each of the six years in the planning period.

The question of the incidence of benefits and costs is central to the resolution of all public policy problems and issues; hence, it is particularly important to clearly and carefully identify relevant target groups and beneficiary groups.

DEPARTMENTAL ATTACHMENTS ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST.