

Government Accountability Committee

January Report on Government Restructuring

To the
Vermont General Assembly
January 15, 2011

Committee Members

SEN. DIANE SNELLING, CHAIR (SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS)
REP. DONNA SWEANEY, VICE CHAIR (HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS)
REP. CYNTHIA BROWNING (HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CORRECTIONS AND INSTITUTIONS)
SEN. ANN CUMMINGS (SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE)
REP. JOHANNAH LEDDY DONOVAN (HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION)
SEN. BILL DOYLE (SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS)
REP. SANDY HAAS (HOUSE COMMITTEE ON HUMAN SERVICES)
SEN. VIRGINIA "GINNY" LYONS (SENATE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND WELFARE)
REP. ANN MANWARING (HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS)
REP. MICHAEL J. OBUCHOWSKI (HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS)
SEN. ROBERT STARR (SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION)
SEN. JEANETTE K. WHITE (SENATE COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONS)

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. History of the Joint Legislative Government Accountability Committee (JLGAC) and the Government Accountability Committee (GAC) and How Vermont's Government Reform Efforts Began	6
3. Charge of the Government Accountability Committee (2 V.S.A. § 970(a))	8
4. Building on Experience	
5. GAC Recommendations to the General Assembly of 2011	10
A. Investment in Change	10
B. Redesign	10
C. Improving Performance Measures	12
6. GAC Schedule and Work Plan Ideas	15
7. Glossary	16
8. Listing of Links to Documents	17

1. INTRODUCTION

January 2011

To the Members of the 2011 Vermont General Assembly
The State House

Dear Colleagues,

The Government Accountability Committee (GAC) is pleased to present this January Report to the General Assembly of 2011. We hope that this report will help familiarize new and returning legislators with the premise and progress of government restructuring begun with the “Challenges for Change.”

The GAC is the committee of jurisdiction for government restructuring and has represented the legislature in guiding the process for change. In this report, the “Challenges” shall be defined as the specific series of actions initiated as determined by Act 68 (See List of Links, p 18, # 12)

Recognizing the Need for Restructuring

In Act 68, the legislature agreed to set in law policy priorities or outcomes and in Act 146, required the administration to implement redesign with investments to “achieve the same or better outcomes for less money” in specific policy areas. The Administration also agreed to be held accountable through Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR) of performance measures data, which demonstrate progress transparently.

This represented a fundamental shift in how the legislature and the executive branch usually work. The current budget process is based on reviewing the budget of the prior year and adding or subtracting appropriations. This approach fails to incorporate strategic planning and frequently leads to overlaps in services, overlaps that don’t meet policy priorities. In these economic times, every dollar must be spent wisely and to the greatest benefit of Vermont citizens.

In Act 68 and Act 146, the legislature reduced \$37.8 million from a total of \$2.1 billion FY 10 state funds and challenged the executive branch to achieve better measurable outcomes by redesigning services.

Acknowledging that the Past is Not the Future

The committee acknowledges the success and failures of the “Challenges” to date. We believe this is necessary to build on the accomplishments without continuing the mistakes.

1. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

In October 2010, the administration provided an interim summary of spending reductions that had been allocated to broad program areas. These estimated allocations totaled about \$34.4 million, with \$3.1 million worth of spending reductions to be determined.

Later in October, the administration released a summary of investments in the “Challenges” totaling \$876,000 (\$660,000 in General Funds). This is far short of the \$12 million the legislature appropriated to be invested in technology and redesign. Without redesign, the \$37.8 million in reductions are just cuts. The promise of the challenge was to get better measurable results even when we spend less money.

It is clear that the intended process of investment, redesign, and inclusive conversations haven’t happened yet in many areas. We also emphasize that cuts, consolidation, and centralization are not the same as redesign.

Vermont State Government and its relationship with communities is complex which is why citizen engagement in the process is essential. The “Challenges” in Education, Economic Development, and Human Services have been difficult and still require extensive community conversation to succeed. In other areas of more autonomous state government, Charter Units and Performance Contracts have shown great progress.

Performance Measurement

The GAC approved a set of performance measures in September 2010 (See Links, p 17, #3) to track change, but many baselines (See Links, p 17, #4) are still needed to make the system fully accountable. **Are the outcomes measures improving?** The “Challenges” were designed as a two-year process, and it is important to understand it will take more time to see movement in the measures. However, the GAC is expecting the third Quarterly Progress Report from the Administration on January 3, 2011. In the last six months, the Administration and the GAC have worked collaboratively with Joint Fiscal Office staff, to refine and simplify the QPR format.

The GAC expects the January 2011 QPR to begin to demonstrate accountability. This system will let Vermonters, their elected officials, and those providing services know exactly which outcomes are being maintained or improved by program changes.

Steps to Move Forward

The GAC still has substantial questions about the past and future of the program changes proposed or being implemented as part of “Challenges” and about how savings or reductions have been allocated. Many legislators, stakeholders, and citizens are concerned about the impact of certain decisions and how they will be resolved by the new administration. The GAC plans to hold a public hearing early in January to listen to all concerns and hear ideas for going forward.

1. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

The GAC strongly recommends that the process for change continue, but with a renewed emphasis on:

- **Investments in Change**
- **Redesign**
- **Improved Performance Measurement**

Conclusion

We must create a culture of shared learning and a common vocabulary to succeed. Innovation doesn't happen in isolation; the best ideas need full and open conversation. The opportunities for positive change through restructuring still exist, and we believe Vermont must continue to seek the best, most effective, and most compassionate government possible.

It has been a primary goal of the GAC to create a forum for open conversation on the process of the "Challenges." We take pride in the history of the committee and its record of inclusion through the extensive testimony and public comment received. We have also made online public access to all materials a priority. This report contains a listing of links to the many documents and reports associated with our work.

The members of the Government Accountability Committee look forward to working with you, the members of the General Assembly, as well as with legislative leadership, the new administration, state employees and the public to continue this important process dedicated to improving outcomes for Vermonters and creating more accountable government.

Sincerely,

Senator Diane Snelling
Chair, Government Accountability Committee

2. HISTORY

History of the Joint Legislative Government Accountability Committee (JLGAC) and the Government Accountability Committee (GAC) and How Vermont's Government Reform Efforts Began

After several years of extreme budget reductions and position eliminations, a small group of legislators asked for a comprehensive review of all the existing studies and reports on achieving greater effectiveness and efficiencies in Vermont state government. The goal was to make recommendations for better long-term planning and on how to implement successful "lean" business strategies into government.

This effort led to the creation of the Joint Legislative Government Accountability Committee (JLGAC) by the legislature in Sec. 5 of No. 206 of the Acts of 2008 to "recommend mechanisms for state government to be more forward-thinking, strategic, and responsive to the long-term needs of Vermonters."

At the end of the 2009 session, when the state was facing another substantial deficit of at least \$100 million, the Speaker of the House and the Senate President Pro Tempore asked the JLGAC to help identify up to \$30 million in reductions for the 2011 budget.

This necessarily shifted the central focus of the JLGAC. Previously the committee had reviewed and heard testimony from many citizens and experts on effective and efficient strategies applied long term. (Links to committee timelines may be found on p.17) The committee had also heard significant testimony about what other states were doing. After an RFP process, the JLGAC engaged the services of the Public Strategies Group (PSG), a consulting firm that has guided the states of Iowa and Washington as well as many cities to achieve significant spending reductions using innovative redesign principles.

JLGAC appointed a three-member liaison group to become part of a steering team, to work together with the secretary of administration and commissioner of finance and management, and PSG to determine areas for review for redesign. The JLGAC continued to hear testimony from many citizens and state employees with ideas for change. The steering team worked from October to December of 2009 to narrow the focus to programs and services that presented possible opportunities "for redesign to deliver the same or better outcomes at reduced cost."

In January 2010, the Joint Legislative Government Accountability Committee proposed a series of "Challenges for Change," eight program areas for redesign with a potential to save \$37.8 million in 2011. It was acknowledged then, as it is now, that these proposals and the new process of accountability through performance measurement would require time to work.

In March 2010, Vermont became the first state to create legislation requiring the executive branch to deliver specific outcomes according to law. This was a bold move to begin reform

2. HISTORY (Continued)

of bureaucracy leading to more effective accountable government. It was also an ambitious and difficult agreement between the legislature and administration. The “Challenges for Change” were introduced in a time of extreme budget pressures and an historic lack of trust between the general assembly and the governor.

Despite the odds, the legislature and Governor Douglas agreed and passed two major bills which became Act 68 and Act 146 of the 2010 session. The initiatives to engage performance measures, long-term thinking, and innovation also required substantial adaptation in legislative oversight practices. It takes significant time, energy, and relearning to move from Vermont’s traditional budgeting process to outcomes-based budgeting.

The 2010 session ended with concern and optimism. The JLGAC, the legislative committees of jurisdiction, and the administration were collaboratively developing a set of performance measures. The Committee continued to hear testimony from legislators, the administration, state employees, citizens, and advocates. Some members of the Committee agreed to meet personally with state employees in their districts and received many valuable suggestions for the improvement of state government.

The JLGAC was dissolved as of July 1, 2010 by the Budget Act of 2010, and a new Committee, the Government Accountability Committee (**GAC**) was created, codified in 2 V.S.A. § 970. *See Sec. H2 of No. 146 of the Acts of the 2009 Adj. Sess. (2010), and Sec. 21d of No. 153 of the Acts of the 2009 Adj. Sess. (2010).* The mission of GAC is the same as the JLGAC; however the charge and membership of the committee have been expanded. The GAC is made up of 12 members: six from the House and six from the Senate, with a nonvoting liaison member appointed by the governor.

The GAC is the committee of jurisdiction for oversight of how the administration reports its progress in achieving outcomes and for approving performance measures that will provide the data necessary to demonstrate results. The executive branch is required to submit Quarterly Progress Reports to the GAC and it has issued two, on July 1, 2010 and on October 1, 2010. (See Links, p 17, #1 and #2) **Note: Another Quarterly Progress Report is due on January 3, 2011. The GAC has not reviewed any part of the administration’s 2011 January Quarterly Progress Report in preparing this Report to the General Assembly.**

The GAC has met six times since forming in July, 2010. Meetings were held on July 12, August 2, September 13, October 4, November 8, and December 6. The committee has issued comments in response to the July and October Quarterly Progress Reports. It has been a primary objective of the GAC throughout this process to make all data and materials available to the public online and to always offer opportunity for public comment. Minutes of each meeting are attached in the Links to Documents. The committee has continued to retain the services of the Public Strategies Group and has incorporated PSG’s recommendations into this report. (Links to Minutes, Documents Distributed to the Committee, and Timelines are on p.17)

3. CHARGE of the Government Accountability Committee (2 V.S.A. § 970(a))

The committee shall recommend mechanisms for state government to be more forward-thinking, strategic, and responsive to the long-term needs of Vermonters.

In pursuit of this goal, the committee shall:

- (1) Propose areas for the review of statutory mandates for public services that may result in service duplication and to review the alignment of financial and staff resources required to carry out those mandates
- (2) Review the legislative process for the creation and elimination of positions and programs and make recommendations for enhancements to the process that support greater long-range planning and responsiveness to the needs of Vermonters.
- (3) Recommend strategies and tools which permit all branches of state government to prioritize the investment of federal, state, and local resources in programs that respond to the needs of the citizens of Vermont in a collaborative, cost-effective, and efficient manner. Pursuant to those strategies and tools, functions which are not critical to an agency or department mission may be recommended for combination or elimination, while other functions may be optimized.
- (4) Review strategies with similar aims in other jurisdictions in the context of federal, state, and local relationships.
- (5) Determine that data-based performance measures have been adopted for each agency and department.
- (6) Determine whether each agency and department is taking actions to achieve the required outcomes, as shown by application of the data-based performance measures.
- (7) Ensure that outcomes, measures, performance data, and descriptions of actions taken, or proposed to be taken, are transparent and readily accessible to the public via electronic publication.
- (8) Assess the effectiveness of the performance measures for measuring progress in achieving outcomes.
- (9) Recommend the addition, amendment, or elimination of any performance measures.
- (10) By November 1 of each year, report to the general assembly its findings.

* * *

- (g) At least annually, by January 15, the committee shall report its activities, together with recommendations, if any, to the general assembly. The report shall be in brief summary form.

4. BUILDING ON EXPERIENCE

Our Experience

The successes and failures of our effort to date have been identified in the sections in which we have made recommendations. It is valuable to summarize these experiences into learning, both from those things that we can build upon and those that we can improve upon. In the spirit of constant improvement, the following lists of “learnings” are provided.

Build on Success

1. The committees of jurisdiction put into law the outcomes citizens expect state government to achieve by the appropriations in the committees’ purview. These outcomes, adopted by the general assembly and signed into law by the governor, will transcend administrations and legislatures.
2. Performance measures have been tied to appropriations and linked to outcomes adopted by the general assembly.
3. State government is being held accountable for achieving measurable results through quarterly performance reporting to the general assembly and Vermont citizens.
4. A solicitation open to all Vermonters has been made to suggest opportunities for state government to improve results while spending less money.
5. Never before in Vermont or anywhere else have bipartisan leaders of both the legislative and executive branches of government stood next to each other on the first day of a legislative session and pledged to spend millions less while improving results for citizens in areas of government, including education, corrections, human services, economic development, regulatory reform, and performance contracting.

Recognize New Approaches

1. It is clear that investment and redesign have not happened yet in many “Challenges.” We must review all aspects of the good ideas, and what needs to be modified, but also acknowledge that the main promise of redesign is still possible and necessary.
2. There are many ways to restructure government. Legislative leadership, the new governor, the general assembly, and the GAC must continue to investigate all methods of reform to clarify priorities and reduce spending. The review of government must be comprehensive and strategic to produce significant change.

5. GAC RECOMMENDATIONS to the General Assembly of 2011

The GAC has grouped its recommendations into three areas:

- (A) Investment in Change
- (B) Redesign
- (C) Improving Performance Measurement

A. Investment in Change

In establishing the basic premise for necessary structural change, it was clear that a one-time source of money would be necessary to support the process. The legislature appropriated about \$12 million for this purpose. The money was to be used for communication about the process, engaging stakeholders, designing and building measurement infrastructure, setting up processes to collect and report on measurement data, assistance with redesign, assistance with managing the substantial change that redesign will engender, installing new technology that supports redesigned systems, retraining and smoothing the transition of employees affected by redesign, and other such investments.

According to the administration's October 2010 update (See Links, p 17, #2), only \$876,000 (\$660,000 General Fund) of the \$12 million appropriated for the purpose of making one-time investments have been used.

The GAC understands that under investing is the number one reason why transformational change efforts fail. One cannot expect things to change if all the money is invested in the status quo approach. The funds appropriated to support Challenges for Change need to be invested wisely and aggressively over the next six months.

B. Redesign

Redesign is a specific approach aimed at finding ways to deliver services that produce better results even when less money is spent on those services.

Readers unfamiliar with redesign are encouraged to review the National Governors' Association Issue Brief (See Links, p 17, #13) on redesign that comprehensively describes redesign work in various states.

The Vermont Challenges for Change were based on successful best practices from other jurisdictions, redesign principles that could be effectively applied in Vermont.

5. GAC RECOMMENDATIONS / REDESIGN (Continued)

Redesign is complementary to but totally different from finding efficiencies. Redesign differs from more commonly understood approaches such as process improvement in these ways:

Process Improvement & Other Efficiency Measures	Redesign
Make the existing system work better	Change the system
If well implemented, usually produce gains of 1%—3%	Produces double-digit percentage gains 10% or more
Asks: “How can we improve this system?”	Asks: “How can we design a system that maximizes outcomes with the resources available?”

Redesign starts without making assumptions about which elements of the present system will remain in the new design.

Some redesign activity has already taken place in the human services area and it is critical to build on those particular new elements. Outcomes are already established as well as the resources available to achieve those outcomes. Redesign explicitly challenges basic assumptions about how services might be delivered. The key to achieving better results for the money lies in undoing some of those assumptions.

Redesign involves setting aside 2 to 3 days for a group of designers to get away from day-to-day work and “play” with ideas that lead them to a new design and to do thought experiments. This is in sharp contrast to a planning meeting. For example, in a planning meeting, “that wouldn’t work” might be the first response to an idea suggested. In a design lab, “how could we make that work?” might be a more typical response.

Very little redesign—the main tool for achieving the Challenges—has taken place in Vermont.

Most managers in Vermont’s executive branch are familiar with budget-cutting, finding savings, and producing efficiencies. They have been successfully doing that for many years.

However, experience with the outcomes-based Challenges process shows that redesign is a new and different concept for most managers and executives.

5. GAC RECOMMENDATIONS / REDESIGN (Continued)

Given this lack of knowledge and experience with redesign, the intense pressure of time, and the absence of using investment funds appropriated for getting outside help with redesign, managers responded to the Challenges by using tools with which they were already familiar. They found places to make savings, and they looked for efficiencies. These tools have proven to be very inadequate to meet the structural change requirements of the Challenges.

To realize productive change, the tool of redesign must be learned, practiced, and mastered.

Agencies struggling with the redesign process should immediately be given extensive training and support. All stakeholders need to understand the ground rules and the new way of thinking. There is still time to meet the expectations of Challenges if executive branch personnel and legislators master the redesign process.

The general assembly should actively engage the executive branch and any entity or agency that receives state funds to encourage the use of redesign methods.

C. Improving Performance Measures

GAC has spent considerable time and energy working with the administration to develop measures and baselines. Data-based performance measures have been determined within the Challenges areas. However, no measures have been adopted for agencies and departments outside that process.

For maximum transparency, the data infrastructure created for Challenges should be expanded to all areas of state government.

The GAC has made significant progress toward the establishment of a performance measurement system that will give Vermonters and their elected representatives the information necessary to evaluate state performance.

- Measuring the performance of state government is an essential aspect of the entire outcomes-based Challenges for Change effort.
- A reliable performance measurement infrastructure will allow the legislature to clearly monitor the administration's progress toward producing outcomes for Vermonters that are the same as or better than previous outcomes, even while spending less money.
- In September, GAC formally adopted a slate of performance measures related to each of the Outcomes established in Act 68. The selected performance measures were the product of an extensive process that incorporated input from legislators, legislative committees, legislative staff, administrative staff, and policy advocates.

5. GAC RECOMMENDATIONS/ IMPROVING PERFORMANCE MEASURES (Continued)

Baselines

The administration's October progress report included baseline data for many performance measures. These baselines set the standard against which future performance can be compared and allow the legislature to determine the effectiveness of the administration's attempts to redesign services to be more cost-effective. For a variety of performance measures, the administration was unable to report baseline data in October.

GAC has requested that a complete collection of baseline data for all performance measures be included in the administration's January progress report. (See Links, p 17, #4)

A major obstacle in the process has been the lack of a vehicle to provide Vermonters with accountability for the outcomes of the process.

Without accountability, the process lacks credibility. The intended accountability arrangement is simple:

1. Identify two or three measures for each outcome established by the legislature.
2. Establish a baseline on each of those measures.
3. Make public quarterly data on each of the measures.

This simple system will let Vermonters, their elected officials, and those providing services know the extent to which outcomes are being maintained or improved even as less money is spent.

The October QPR provides baseline data on some of the measures, but too many of the legislatively established outcomes do not have an accountability mechanism in place.

A small amount of the investment funds was intended for this purpose.

The choice of certain measures should be reviewed. Measures chosen for each outcome should: (1) measure something that is known to be highly correlated with the outcomes; and (2) be practical to measure on at least a quarterly basis. The legislature should be prepared to make a small investment in correctly assessing measures.

The first two quarterly reports from the executive branch have been too long. The length and complexity of the reports cloud the data and weaken accountability. A best practice for such a quarterly report might be only one or two pages in length—just the numbers with, perhaps, the data from previous quarters so that the reader can spot trends.

5. GAC RECOMMENDATIONS/ IMPROVING PERFORMANCE MEASURES

(Continued)

The best measurement systems are built from a big-picture perspective where detail is added over time. Many states and cities have built their systems by collecting thousands of more detailed measures. Such approaches usually collapse under the weight of their complexity.

Finally, the data need to be credible to a skeptical public. For this reason, some states use third parties such as a university or nonprofit organization to collect and report on the data. Such an approach would provide the most cost-effective means for establishing measurable and credible accountability.

A small amount of the investment funds should be used to contract with an organization outside state government to collect and report on the measures. That organization should provide a web-based vehicle for reporting data in a simple and understandable way and should refresh the data at least quarterly.

Outcomes established by the legislature cover only a portion of the overall set of outcomes the state seeks to produce. Using the same infrastructure described above, the state could round out its performance measurement infrastructure by providing high-level data on all outcomes it seeks to produce. Other states have successfully built simple and effective measurement systems.

Measures associated specifically with the restructuring process should be a subset of the whole system.

By the end of FY11, Vermont's high-level measurement infrastructure should be completed. The outside organization recommended should be used to gather data and report to Vermonters on the status of various outcomes.

6. GAC SCHEDULE AND WORK PLAN IDEAS

Wednesday, January 12, 2011, 8:00 am, Room 10

The Government Accountability Committee is scheduled to meet to give final approval to the January Report to the General Assembly.

Thursday evening, January 13, 2011 from 5:00 pm to 7:30 pm, Room 11

A public hearing is scheduled to receive testimony: (1) from the commissioner and deputy commissioner of finance and management on the administration's January QPR; and (2) from the public on the GAC January Report to the General Assembly, on the "Challenges for Change" in general, and on specific constructive ideas for moving forward.

Wednesday, January 19, 2011, 8:00 am, Room 10

The GAC is tentatively scheduled to reconvene according to new appointments and to elect a new Chair and Vice Chair. For the 2011 Session, the Chair of the GAC will be from the House of Representatives.

Wednesday, January 26, 2011, 8:00 am, Room 10

Develop a work plan for the Session in collaboration with leadership and committees of jurisdiction.

Hold a Legislative Workshop (Date to be determined)

Last January, at the request of GAC, PSG conducted a joint legislative/executive workshop on budgeting for outcomes. Thirty to forty legislators and senior executives attended the workshop. In addition to being introduced at a high level to the principles and methods of outcome budgeting, participants explored some of the problems the current system creates among the players—citizens, elected officials who authorize raising and spending the money, state departments, school districts, and private agencies who receive state appropriations. The formal evaluation of the workshop showed that participant reaction was both positive and hopeful that outcome budgeting would be pursued.

Ideas to be included going forward

- Focus the GAC on the education and engagement of legislators, the administration, and the public in the effort to transform Vermont state government into an institution dedicated to learning how to become most effective in delivering better outcomes for Vermonters.
- Continue development of the performance measurement infrastructure created for the "Challenges" outcomes and extend the system to all of state government.

7. GLOSSARY

Baselines are the beginning of a performance measurement. Baselines are where you start to measure change.

“Challenges For Change” is a series of government restructuring actions as directed in Act 68 and Act 146 of 2010. The “Challenges” are an agreement between the Legislature and the Executive branch to improve services, reduce spending, and track progress through performance measures.

GAC is the Government Accountability Committee, with six senators and six representatives and a nonvoting liaison member appointed by the governor.

Investment The legislature recognized the need for investment to facilitate true redesign and innovation and appropriated \$12 million for investments in “Challenges for Change.” To date, approximately \$876,000 (\$660,000 in General Funds) have been utilized.

Outcome-based Budgeting is a powerful method of institutionalizing continuous innovation by changing the way budgets are done. In Outcome Budgeting, leaders start with the results that Vermonters value. The focus is on the real issue of achieving results for policy priorities at a price we are willing to pay.

Outcomes are the policy objectives for program design as determined by the Legislature in Act 68 of 2010. Dollars spent to deliver services should result in achieving the outcomes.

Performance Measures and the data they generate are tools we use to make better, more informed decisions. The GAC approved a set of performance measures at the meeting on September 13, 2010 (See Links, p 17, #3). A measure is a number, not a “yes” or “no.” A measure is objective, not a value statement. A measure is how you know whether you are making progress, not the goal itself.

There are many types of performance measures,

- 1) **Input** measures, or resources invested, used, or spent.
- 2) **Output** measures, for example, number of cases managed or number of clients served.
- 3) **Quality** measures, or how well a service was delivered, based on characteristics important to the consumer.
- 4) **Efficiency** measures focus on the unit cost, or level of productivity associated with an activity, for example, cost per applicant trained and placed in a job.
- 5) **Outcome** measures focus on how people are better off, and what the different impact on the beneficiaries has been.

Performance Measurement Infrastructure is a credible, predictable system of performance measurement data easily accessible to the public to demonstrate accountability.

QPR The administration is required to submit Quarterly Progress Reports to the GAC with performance measures data.

Redesign is a specific restructuring approach used to develop innovative services that produce better results even when less money is spent. Redesign starts with a blank “page,” the list of desired outcomes, and the total resources available. The process engages administrators, providers, customers, and consumers in discussing “Results Mapping” to understand all the factors involved in creating better outcomes.

8. LIST OF LINKS TO DOCUMENTS

Challenges for Change information available on the web at:

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/Challenges%20for%20Change.aspx>

1. Administration's July Quarterly Progress Report

http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/C4C_July2010_Quarterly.pdf

GAC July letter to Secretary Lunderville in response

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/July%202010%20Report%20Response%20Letter.pdf>

2. Administration's October Quarterly Progress Report

http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/10-1-10_C4C_Report_Final.pdf

GAC November Report to the General Assembly

http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/10-1-10_C4C_Report_Final.pdf

3. Measures, as approved by GAC in September

http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/Challenges_for_Change_measures_adopted_Sep_13.pdf

4. Missing Baseline Data from October Progress Report

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/Summary%20of%20Missing%20Baseline%20Data.pdf>

5. Committee Meeting Timelines

2008

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/2008%20JLGAC%20Meeting%20Timeline.pdf>

2009

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/2009%20JLGAC%20Meeting%20Timeline.pdf>

2010

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/2010%20GAC%20Meeting%20Timeline.pdf>

6. Minutes of JLGAC from January 2010 to July and GAC from July 2010 to December

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/2010%20GAC%20Summary%20of%20Minutes.pdf>

7. List of Documents Submitted to the Committee

2009 handouts:

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/2009%20GAC%20Handouts.pdf>

2010 handouts:

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/2010%20GAC%20Handouts.pdf>

8. PSG September Workshop Booklet

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/PSG%20Workshop%20materials%200910.pdf>

9. Administration Use of Investment Funds to Date, October 19, 2010

http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/Challenges_for_Change_Administration_investment_update.pdf

10. Administration Working Allocations to Date, October 19, 2010

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/JFO/c4c/C4C%20working%20document%20memo%2010%2019.pdf>

11. Agenda for GAC meetings

2008

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/2008%20JLGAC%20Agendas.pdf>

2009

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/2009%20JLGAC%20Agendas.pdf>

2010

<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/2010%20GAC%20&%20JLGAC%20Agendas.pdf>

12. Act 68

(<http://www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/c4c/act068.pdf>)

13. National Governors' Association Issues Brief on Redesign

<http://www.nga.org/Files/pdf/1010STATEGOVTREDESIGN.PDF>