MULTNOMAH COUNTY

PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN FY06-07 SUBMITTED PROGRAM OFFERS

OCTOBER 2006

REPORT #007-06

PERFORMANCE MEASURES IN FY06-07 SUBMITTED PROGRAM OFFERS

The Priority-Based Budgeting (PBB) process relies heavily on the performance measures provided by each program offer in determining how a program makes its contribution in achieving the County's Priorities. Based recommendations from last year's budget process survey, a substantial effort has been made to improve the performance measurement data in FY06-07 program offer submission. The Budget Office published the Performance Measurement Manual as part of an overall initiative to increase the quality of the data. Additionally, performance data input templates were created, and numerous trainings were provided to help the process of integrating performance measures into the program offer. The following summary was based on the performance measurement data <u>submitted</u> with FY07 program offers at the end of February. Results do not reflect the final purchased program offers.

Performance Measurement Data

Number of program offers submitted with a performance measure. A total of 536 program offers were received for the FY06-07 budget preparation deadline (February 28th, 2006). Of all submitted offers, 94.6% (n=507) provided at least one performance measure (PM) with only 29 without PM. Among 507 programs that provided PM, 97.4% (n=494) included an outcome measure. Further examination found that most of the 29 offers that didn't have any performance measure were non-operational programs designated for special fund payment, fund reserves or cash transfers (see Appendix A for a list of offers without PM). Almost all operational, administrative, and support programs provided some performance measurement data as part of their program offer.

Number of program offers with a performance measure		
	Frequency	Percent
Have PM	507	94.6
No PM	29	5.4
Total	536	100

Total number of performance measures submitted. The 507 program offers which had PM attached totaled 1,557 performance measures—an average of 3.1 measures per offer. The following table shows a distribution of measurement type for all 1,557 measures received. As indicated by the data, the most common type of PM received was 'outcome' (45.5%), followed by 'output' (42.8%). The remaining 12% were a combination of quality, efficiency, and input related measures. Only 1% of total measures were classified as 'input'.

Type of performance measures submitted with offer		
	Frequency	Percent
Input	15	1.0
Output	667	42.8
Outcome	709	45.5
Efficiency	70	4.5
Quality	96	6.2
Total	1557	100.0

Average number of performance measures per program offer. All 507 program offers met the requirement set by the Performance Measurement Manual: providing at least one output and one outcome measure for each program offer. Many of them went beyond the minimal requirement and submitted more than two PM. Data in the following table shows that about 27% of programs submitted two or more output measures, and 36% had two or more outcome measures. The average number of output measures was 1.2 and the average number of outcome measures was 1.3. In addition, 87 program offers provided quality measures and the number of program offers that submitted efficient and input measures was 71 and 15 respectively.

Number of PM the Program offers had by type of measure					
# of measures	Output (%)	Outcome (%)	Quality (%)	Efficient (%)	Input (%)
1	389 (72.6%)	343 (64.0%)	78 (89.7%)	70 (98.6%)	15 (100%
2	112 (20.9%	158 (29.5%)	8 (10.3%)	1 (0.4%)	0
3	35 (6.5%)	35 (6.5%)	0	0	0
Total programs	536 (100%)	536 (100%)	87 (100%)	71 (100%)	15 (100%)

Performance Measurement Data by Department

Four departments, District Attorney, Department of School and Community Partnership (DSCP), Department of Community Justice (DCJ), and Multnomah County Sheriff Office (MCSO), provided performance measurement for every program offer they submitted. Non-departmental and Department of Community Services had a higher percent of program offers with missing PM due to a larger share of program offers related to fund payment or reserve where performance measures might not be meaningful.

Department	Performance measures		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
NOND	42 (72.4%)	16 (27.6%)	58
District Attorney	22 (100%)		22
DSCP	26 (100%)		26
DCHS	86 (97.7%)	2 (2.3%)	88
HD	69 (98.6%)	1 (1.4%)	70
DCJ	58 (100%)		58
MCSO	73 (100%)		73
County Management	76 (97.4%)	2 (2.6%)	78
Community Services	23 (79.3%)	6 (20.7%)	29
Library	32 (94.1%)	2 (5.9%)	34
Total	507 (94.6%)	29 (5.4%)	536

The distribution of measurement type varies by department. Among all the PM submitted, DCJ and DSCP had the highest percentage of outcome measures (59.0% and 58.5% respectively). Departments that had the highest percentage of output measures were MSCO and Non-departmental (49.8% and 48.6% respectively). HD and County Management ranked higher on the number of quality and efficiency measures submitted. More than half of the 15 input measurement were from the District Attorney Office.

Type of performance measure by department						
	Output (%)	Outcome (%)	Efficiency (%)	Quality (%)	Input (%)	Total
NOND	53 (48.6)	47 (43.1)	2 (1.8)	7 (6.4)		109
District Attorney	24 (42.9)	23 (41.1)	1 (1.8)		8 (14.3)	56
DSCP	35 (37.2)	55 (58.5)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.2)		94
DCHS	122 (46.4)	122 (46.4)	4 (1.5)	14 (5.3)	1 (0.4)	263
HD	84 (35.6)	80 (33.9)	32 (13.6)	40 (16.9)		236
DCJ	68 (41.0)	98 (59.0)				166
MCSO	108 (49.8)	107 (49.3)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)		217
County Management	98 (40.5)	104 (43.0)	14 (5.8)	22 (9.1)	4 (1.7)	242
Community Services	28 (37.3)	35 (46.7)	7 (9.3)	5 (6.7)		75
Library	47 (47.5)	38 (38.4)	8 (8.1)	4 (4.0)	2 (2.0)	99
Total	667 (42.8)	709 (45.5)	70	96	15	1557

It was found that the distributions between output and outcome measurement for most departments were very close. However, a larger discrepancy between the number of output and number of outcome measures existed for program offers submitted by DSCP, DCJ, and Community Services. These three departments had a much higher percentage of outcome measures than output measures. On the other hand, Library provided more output than outcome measures. These differences can be partly attributed to the nature of services provided by each department.

Performance Measurement Data by Priority Area

Over 95% of program offers in *Basic Needs, Public Safety*, and *Accountability* priority areas were completed with performance measures. The percent of PM submission for other priority areas were also high. An exception was the '*Thriving Economy*' priority, which missed PM for two-third of its program offers.

Priority	Performance measure		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
Basic Needs	110 (97.3%)	3 (2.7%)	113
Safety	177 (98.9%)	2 (1.1%)	179
Accountability	150 (95.5%)	7 (4.5%)	157
Thriving Economy	6 (33.3%)	12 (66.7%)	18
Education	33 (94.3%)	2 (5.7%	35
Vibrant Communities	31 (91.2%)	3 (8.8%)	34
Total	507 (94.6%)	29 (5.4%)	536

However, further investigation found that the 12 program offers missing PM (NO-PM) were all related to fund payment, pass-through or cash transfers. A list of NO-PM program offers from *Thriving Economy* priority is listed below.

No-PM program offers in Thriving Economy priority area	
	Program Name
1	County Road Fund Payment to City of Troutdale
2	County Road Fund Payment to City of Fairview
3	County Road Fund Payment to City of Gresham
4	County Road Fund Payment to City of Portland
5	Oregon Science & Technology Partnership Pass Through
6	East Metro Economic Alliance Pass Through
7	Business Income Tax Pass-Through
8	State Regional Investment Program
9	Convention Center Fund
10	Strategic Investment Program Contractual Obligations
11	Road Fund Transfer to Willamette River Bridge Fund
12	Road Fund Transfer to Bike & Pedestrian Fund

Of 339 performance measures associated with *Basic Needs* priority, 43.7% were output PM (n=148) and 45.4% were outcome PM (n=154). The distributions between output and outcome measures were quite even for *Basic Needs, Safety*, and *Accountability* priorities but less for *Education* and *Vibrant Communities* priorities. *Education* and *Vibrant Communities* had a much higher proportion of outcome measures than outputs. *Vibrant Economy* contributed a higher percent of efficiency measures and *Accountability* ranked the highest in percent of quality measures submitted among all priority areas.

Type of performance measure by priority area						
	Output (%)	Outcome (%)	Efficiency (%)	Quality (%)	Input (%)	Total
Basic Needs	148 (43.7)	154 (45.4)	11 (3.2)	25 (7.4)	1 (0.3)	339
Safety	229 (43.3)	243 (45.9)	23 (4.3)	26 (4.9)	8 (1.5)	529
Accountability	195 (43.3)	190 (42.3)	23 (5.1)	37 (8.2)	4 (0.9)	449
Thriving Economy	7 (41.2)	8 (47.1)	1 (5.9)	1 (5.9)		17
Education	49 (41.2)	64 (53.8)	2 (1.7)	4 (3.4)		119
Vibrant Communities	39 (37.5)	50 (48.1)	10 (9.6)	3 (2.9)	2 (1.9)	104
Total	667	709	70	96	15	1557

Performance Measurement Data by Program Type

Overall, 94.6% of program offers submitted performance measure. The percent of program offers with PM attached was particularly high for the Internal Service, Administration, and Support programs. All 13 of Internal Service program offers had at least one performance measure. The percent having performance measure was also high for the new programs, similar to existing program offers.

Program type	Performance Measure		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
Administration	36 (97.3%)	1 (2.7%)	37
Support	60 (98.4%)	1 (1.6%)	61
Existing Operating Program	316 (94.0%)	20 (6.0%)	336
New Program	75 (94.9%)	4 (5.1%)	79
Program Alternative/Reconstruction	6 (75%)	2 (25%)	8
Internal Service	13 (100%)		13
Revenue/Fund Level/Tech	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2
Total	507 (94.6%)	29 (5.4%)	536

There were some variations among program offers on distribution of PM type. Internal Service programs had the highest percent of efficiency (13.3%) and quality measures (11.1%) and the lowest percent of outcome measures (33.3%). The combination of outcome, efficiency, and quality measures totaled 58% of all performance measures provided by Internal Service. It was not surprising to see Support programs ranked the highest in percent of output measure (48.0%). In comparison, the percent of outcome measure was slightly higher for the new and alternative program offers (49.3% and 47.4% respectively).

Type of performance measure by program type						
	Output (%)	Outcome (%)	Efficiency (%)	Quality (%)	Input (%)	Total
Administration	43 (43.4%)	45 (45.5%)	3 (3.0%)	7 (7.1%)	1 (1.0%)	99
Support	86 (48.0%)	79 (44.1%)	5 (2.8%)	8 (4.5%)	1 (0.6%)	179
Existing Operating Program	411 (41.1%)	456 (45.6%)	51 (5.1%)	72 (7.2%)	10 (1.0%)	1000
New Program	99 (46.5%)	105 (49.3%)	4 (1.9%)	4 (1.9%)	1 (0.5%)	213
Program Alternative/Reconstruction	8 (40.0%)	9 (47.4%)	1 (5.3%)		1 (5.3%)	19
Internal Service	18 (40.0%)	15 (33.3%)	6 (13.3%)	5 (11.1%)	1 (2.2%)	45
Revenue/Fund Level/Tech	2 (100%)					2
Total	667 (42.8%	709 (45.5%)	70 (4.5%)	96 (6.2%)	15 (1.0%)	1557

Performance Measurement Data Submission

Except for new program offers, four data components were required for each performance measure submitted: previous year actual, current year purchased, current year estimate, and next year offer. Not all performance measures entered the data for those four data fields. Only 50% of PM completed all four data elements. Forty-seven percent of PM had partial data input and 2.5% had no data at all (only PM name and measurement type were submitted). A close look at those missing data measures suggests that some of them might have entered zero (0) as a meaningful number. Because the database designates zero as missing data, however, it is hard to distinguish a meaningful zero from a default zero-coded as missing data—without going through further investigation. Taking this into considerations, the actual missing data rate could be lower than 2.5%.

Number of measure submitted with complete data		
	Frequency	Percent
No data	39	2.5
Some data	736	47.3
Complete data	782	50.2
Total	1557	100.0

Data completion by program type. Existing operating program offers had the lowest percentage of missing data or partial data submissions. Sixty-one percent (61%) of existing operating program offers completed all of four required data components. On the other hand, it was not surprising to see that "new" program offers had the lowest percentage of data completion and the highest missing data or partial data submission since completed PM data submission was not required for the new offers (except for their target service level). Support programs did not do well in providing complete data. The percent of complete data submitted for support program offers was below the average.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Data submission by program type</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>No data (%)</th><th>Some (%)</th><th>Complete (%)</th><th>Total</th></tr>
<tr><td>Administration</td><td>2 (2.0%)</td><td>40 (40.4%)</td><td>57 (57.6%)</td><td>99</td></tr>
<tr><td>Support</td><td>6 (3.4%)</td><td>100 (55.9%)</td><td>73 (40.8%)</td><td>179</td></tr>
<tr><td>Existing Operating Program</td><td>15 (1.5%)</td><td>371 (37.1%)</td><td>614 (61.4%)</td><td>1000</td></tr>
<tr><td>New Program</td><td>14 (6.6%)</td><td>187 (87.7%)</td><td>12 (5.6%)</td><td>213</td></tr>
<tr><td>Alternative/Reconstruction</td><td></td><td>19 (100%)</td><td></td><td>19</td></tr>
<tr><td>Internal Service</td><td>2 (4.4%)</td><td>19 (42.2%)</td><td>24 (53.3%)</td><td>45</td></tr>
<tr><td>Revenue/Fund Level/Tech</td><td></td><td></td><td>2 (100%)</td><td>2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>39 (2.5%)</td><td>736 (47.3%)</td><td>782 (50.2%)</td><td>1557</td></tr>
</table>

Data completion by priority area. Although a lower percent of program offers submitted PM in comparing with other priorities, the *Thriving Economy* priority actually had the highest percentage of PM data completion for programs that provided performance measures. The percent of complete data was also high for *Basic Needs* and *Vibrant Communities* PM—well above the average of 50%. The data completion rate was low for *Safety* priority; only 38.8% of PM in *Safety* priority area input all data elements. Almost 60% of PM in *Safety* priority only submitted partial data.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Data submission by priority</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>No data (%)</th><th>Some (%)</th><th>Complete (%)</th><th>Total</th></tr>
<tr><td>Basic Needs</td><td>4 (1.2%)</td><td>122 (36.0%)</td><td>213 (62.8%)</td><td>339</td></tr>
<tr><td>Public Safety</td><td>8 (1.5%)</td><td>316 (59.7%)</td><td>205 (38.8%)</td><td>529</td></tr>
<tr><td>Accountability</td><td>24 (5.3%)</td><td>205 (45.7%)</td><td>220 (49.0%)</td><td>449</td></tr>
<tr><td>Thriving Economy</td><td>1 (5.9%)</td><td>2 (11.8%)</td><td>14 (82.4%)</td><td>17</td></tr>
<tr><td>Education</td><td></td><td>52 (43.7%)</td><td>67 (56.3%)</td><td>119</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vibrant Communities</td><td>2 (1.9%)</td><td>39 (37.5%)</td><td>63 (60.6%)</td><td>104</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>39 (2.5%)</td><td>736 (47.3%)</td><td>782 (50.2%)</td><td>1557</td></tr>
</table>

Data completion by type of measurement. Input, efficiency, and quality measures had a higher percentage of PM data completion. Only 42.3% of outcome measures had submitted all four data elements—the lowest in terms of percent of full data submission. However, the percent of No-data was also low for the outcome measures (2.5%), indicating that most of outcome PM had at least had some data input, if not all.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Data submission by PM type</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>No data (%)</th><th>Some (%)</th><th>Complete (%)</th><th>Total</th></tr>
<tr><td>Input</td><td></td><td>1 (6.7%)</td><td>14 (93.3%)</td><td>15</td></tr>
<tr><td>Output</td><td>15 (2.2%)</td><td>294 (44.1%)</td><td>358 (53.7%)</td><td>667</td></tr>
<tr><td>Outcome</td><td>18 (2.5%)</td><td>391 (55.1%)</td><td>300 (42.3%)</td><td>709</td></tr>
<tr><td>Efficiency</td><td>1 (1.4%)</td><td>17 (24.3%)</td><td>52 (74.3%)</td><td>70</td></tr>
<tr><td>Quality</td><td>5 (5.2%)</td><td>33 (34.4%)</td><td>58 (60.4%)</td><td>96</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>39 (2.5%)</td><td>736 (47.3%)</td><td>782 (50.2%)</td><td>1557</td></tr>
</table>

Data completion by required data element. Comparing PM data submission by measurement type, it was found the most likely omitted data element was 'Current Year Purchased', which was supposed to be provided with last year's purchased program offer. Since standardized PM data submission started this year, it was understandable this column had a large amount of missing data. Some program offers entered 'Current Year Purchased' numbers based on the '*Current Year Estimate*' if they didn't supply figures in last year's adopted budget.

One data element that should be reported by all program offers was the '*Next Year's Offer'*. But, as indicated by the following table, 3.2% of performance measures submitted did not offer specific data for '*Next Year's Offer'*. However, the true No-data rate could be lower since some programs used zero (0) as valid number (such as no error would occur). Further investigation is needed to determine why some measures didn't give a specific target for the '*Next Year Offer*'. As mentioned earlier, future improvement in PM data submission template could help tell apart a true zero from missing data coded as zero.

Data submission by data element				
	Previous Yr Actual (%)	Current Yr Purchased (%)	Current Yr Estimate (%)	Next Yr Offer (%)
Have data	985 (63.3%)	859 (55.2%)	1198 (76.9%)	1507 (96.8%)
No data	572 (36.7%)	698 (44.8%)	359 (23.1%)	50 (3.2%)
Total	1557	1557	1557	1557

Data completion by measurement type and data element. A closer look at what data element were more likely missing indicates that outcome measures for programs purchased in FY05-06 budget had the lowest data completion rate (48.8%), followed by the outcome measure for FY04-05 actual (54.7%). This finding suggests that gathering program outcome data was relatively challenging. Although the percent of outcome data targeted for next year's offer submitted was similar to the percent submitted by other types of measures for FY07 budget. It is uncertain that a similarly high percent of actual FY07 outcome data would be available in the future.

Percent of data submitted by PM type and data element				
	Previous Yr Actual (%)	Current Yr Purchased (%)	Current Yr Estimate (%)	Next Yr Offer (%)
Input	14 (93.3%)	14 (93.3%)	14 (93.3%)	15 (100%)
Output	459 (68.8%)	379 (56.8%)	533 (79.9%)	648 (97.2%)
Outcome	388 (54.7%)	346 (48.8%)	513 (72.3%)	684 (96.5%)
Efficiency	57 (81.4%)	56 (80.0%)	65 (92.9%)	69 (98.6%)
Quality	67 (69.8%)	64 (66.7%)	73 (76.0%)	91 (94.8%)
Total	985 (63.3%)	859 (55.2%)	1198 (76.9%)	1507 (96.8%)

Performance Measure Data Comparison

Change of PM data by fiscal year. In this section, three pairs of comparison were made for the four data components: a) FY07 offer vs. FY06 purchased; b) FY07 offer vs. FY06 estimate, and c) FY07 offer vs. FY05 actual. Comparison was not made if one data element was missing in a pair.

For 858 pairs that had both FY07 offer and FY06 purchased data, about 35% submitted the same number, 49% provided a higher FY07 number, and 16% lowered numbers than FY06 purchased. A similar pattern was found for the comparison made between FY07 offer and FY06 estimate, although the percent of PM that submitted a lower FY07 target number increased. The gap further increased when comparing FY07 offers with FY05 actual: only 15% of PM had same numbers for both FY07 target and FY05 actual. Eighty-five percent of PM submitted a FY07 offering number either higher than FY05 actual (53.1%) or lower than FY05 actual (31.8%).

Change of PM data by fiscal year				
	Same (%)	Higher (%)	Lower (%)	N
FY07 vs. FY06 purch.	299 (34.8%)	418 (48.7%)	141 (16.4%)	858
FY07 vs. FY06 est.	484 (40.8%)	459 (38.5%)	249 (20.9%)	1192
FY07 vs. FY05 actual	147 (15.0%)	519 (53.1%)	311 (31.8%)	977
Total	930 (30.7%)	1396 (46.1%)	701 (23.2%)	3027

Overall, when comparing the FY07 offers with the FY06 purchase, the FY06 estimate, or the FY05 actual, 30.7% provided with unchanged measurement data, 46.1% increased their figures for FY07 offering, and 23.3% lowered FY07 figures. It's not clear whether an increased number or a reduced number indicates improvement over the previous year. For some measures an increase in the number is positive, while in other measures an increase could be a negative direction. All submitted PM data need to be examined individually to determine if the changes were moving in a desired direction.

Change of PM data by measurement type. Comparing the FY07 offer and FY06 purchase showed a difference by the type of measure. Outcome measures were more likely to stay with same number as FY06 purchased (44.9%) than the output measures (26.4%). Although 40.3% of outcomes were aimed higher, a sizeable of 14.8% gave a lower number in FY07 offer than in FY06 purchased.

Change of PM data by measure type: FY07 offer vs. FY06 purchased				
	Same (%)	Higher (%)	Lower (%)	N
Input	3 (21.4%)	7 (50.0%)	4 (28.6%)	14
Output	100 (26.4%)	207 (54.6%)	72 (19.0%)	379
Outcome	155 (44.9%)	139 (40.3%)	51 (14.8%)	345
Efficiency	15 (26.8%)	31 (55.4%)	10 (17.9%)	56
Quality	26 (40.6%)	34 (53.1%)	4 (6.3%)	64
Total	299 (34.8%)	418 (48.7%)	141 (16.4%)	858

To find out why some program offers lowered their outcome measures, an individual review of all measures was performed. Around 8%-9% of outcome measurement data should be reversely coded: indicating that a smaller number is a better outcome. Based on this finding, it was estimated over 80% of the outcome measures that provided a lower numbers for FY07 offer than for FY06 purchased or estimate were actually promising a better outcome. Similar situation also occurred for some output or other types of measure in which lower numbers or smaller percentages are favorable. Further analysis is needed to determine which direction of change in measurement data suggests program improvement when making year-to-year comparisons.

Another discovery was that some measures were inappropriately labeled. For example, some output measures would be better named as input measures and some submitted outcomes were actually output measures. Inappropriate labeling or mis-categorizing of PM type could partly explain why so many output measures increased FY07 offering when service levels generally were not expected to change. Further analyses are needed.

The following table shows the results comparing FY07 offers with FY06 estimate. At first glance, it appeared unusual that more output measures submitted a larger figure for the FY07 offering than for current FY06 estimate (45%). On the other hand, only 29.7% of outcome measures aimed higher for FY07 offering than for FY06 estimate. It was also noted that a higher percent of outcome measures lowered their FY07 target numbers (23.4%) than did the output measures (18.1%). If program offers were to maintain current service levels, it would be expected to not change much in program output from FY06 to FY07. Again, further investigation is needed in order to tell in which direction the output or outcome measures are moving. Inappropriately labeling in some of submitted measures also added difficulties to the analysis of PM data by measurement type.

Change of PM data by measure type: FY07 offer vs. FY06 estimate			
	Same (%)	Higher (%)	Lower (%)	N
Input	3 (21.4%)	6 (42.9%)	5 (35.7%)	14
Output	196 (36.9%)	239 (45.0%)	96 (18.1%)	531
Outcome	239 (47.0%)	151 (29.7%)	119 (23.4%)	509
Efficiency	17 (26.2%)	32 (49.2%)	16 (24.6%)	65
Quality	29 (39.7%)	31 (42.5%)	13 (17.8%)	73
Total	484 (40.6%)	459 (38.5%)	249 (20.9%)	1192

Change of PM data by program type. The following table shows the results of comparison between FY07 offer and FY06 purchased for different type of programs. Overall, 34.8% PM input exactly same data for FY07 offer and FY06 purchased. Around two-thirds of PM changed their FY07 target by submitting either a higher (48.7%) or lower number (16.4%) compared with the FY06 purchased. Breaking this down by type of program, it was found that administrative/support programs were more likely to set a higher PM targets in FY07 (53.6%) than existing program offers (48.6%), although the difference was not substantial. New and 'other' (Alternatives, Internal Services, and Revenue) program offers tended to have a larger

percent of unchanged measurement data (50% and 43.3% respectively) than administrative/support and existing operating programs. The number of pairs available for comparison was small for the new and other program offers so caution should be excised before drawing any conclusions.

Change of PM data by program type: FY07 offer vs. FY06 purchased				
	Same (%)	Higher (%)	Lower (%)	N
Administration/support	39 (20.5%)	81 (53.6%)	31(20.5%)	151
Existing Operating Program	241 (36.2%)	323 (48.6%)	101 (15.2%)	665
New Program	6 (50.0%)	4 (33.3%)	2 (16.7%)	12
Other	13 (43.3%)	10 (33.3%)	7 (23.3%)	13
Total	299 (34.8%)	418 (48.7%)	141 (16.4%)	858

A similar pattern was found when comparing FY07 offers with FY06 estimates by program type. Among the 29 performance measures submitted by new programs, 35% (n=10) lowered their performance numbers for FY07 offers. About two-third of measures provided same or higher FY07 target than FY06 estimate. It is possible that, for some performance measures, a smaller number than the one submitted for previous year indicates a better performance. Again, to determine which number is better—next year's offer or current year's estimate—each measurement should be examined individually.

Change of PM data by program type: FY07 offer vs. FY06 estimate				
	Same (%)	Higher (%)	Lower (%)	N
Administration/support	77 (26.2%)	86 (38.9%)	58 (26.2%)	221
Existing Operating Program	380 (42.8%)	342 (38.5%)	166 (18.7%)	888
New Program	9 (31.0%)	10 (34.5%)	10 (34.5%)	29
Other	18 (33.3%)	21 (38.9%)	15 (27.8%)	54
Total	484 (40.6%)	459 (38.5%)	249 (20.9%)	1192

Summary

Some positive aspects:

→ Almost 95 % of FY07 program offers submitted at least two performance measures as part of their program offers. This was very encouraging since standardized PM data input started this year.

→ All program offers that provided performance measures met the minimal requirement—submitting at least one output measure and one outcome measure. Among them, 72% (n=366) program offers submitted more than two performance measures.

→ Four data components were collected for each performance measure: FY05 actual, FY06 purchased, FY06 estimate, and FY07 offer. Over 97% of performance measures received with FY07 program offers provided some data inputs. Among them, over 50% completed all data requirement.

→ Outcome measures in general were more likely to have missing or partial data submission. Existing operation and administrative programs had a higher percentage of data completion for the performance measures submitted than other types of programs.

→ Comparing performance measures between the FY07 offer and the FY06 purchased target indicates that only 35% of measurement data stayed same. About 65% submitted either a higher or lower target than previous year's purchased figures.

Some limitations in performance measurement data submitted in FY07 program offers:

1) Some performance measures were not appropriately labeled. It happened mostly with output measures that were submitted as outcome measures.

2) The number of unduplicated performance measures might be a lot less than the total number of measures received with program offers (n=1557). Due to scaled or similar program offers, many redundant performance measures were found.

3) Although many performance measures demonstrated a high quality, quite a few measures were found insignificant, which did not reflect the essence of the services provided and did not contribute to the marquee indicators.

4) Measures were submitted without data input. Although only new program offers were expected to not have all data components available, nearly 50% of performance measures didn't submit all four data elements requested, indicating a challenging task for collecting performance data, especially the past years' data.

5) Some improvements in performance data input template, such as missing data identification and allowing qualitative data entry, should be considered in the future to enhance the performance data collection and analysis.

Appendix A. Program offers that did not have performance measures (N=29)

Program code	Program name	Department
25066	Mental Health Organization Provider Tax	DCHS
25101	Mental Health Beginning Working Capital	DCHS
72017	Recreation Fund Payment to Metro	County Management
91021	County Road Fund Payment to City of Portland	Community Services
91022	County Road Fund Payment to City of Gresham	Community Services
91023	County Road Fund Payment to City of Fairview	Community Services
91024	County Road Fund Payment to City of Troutdale	Community Services
91025	Road Fund Transfer to Willamette River Bridge Fund	Community Services
91026	Road Fund Transfer to Bike & Pedestrian Fund	Community Services
10010	CCFC Administration	NOND
10016	Strategic Investment Program Contractual Obligations	NOND
10018	Courtroom Facilities Costs	NOND
10021	State Regional Investment Program	NOND
10025	County School Fund	NOND
72097	Public Safety Bond Fund - Completion of Bond Fund Program Projects	County Management
10026	Multnomah County Schools	NOND
10027	Business Income Tax Pass-Through	NOND
10028	Convention Center Fund	NOND
10033	Equipment Acquisition Fund	NOND
10037	Progress Board Parity	NOND
40012B	Clinical Infrastructure - Call Center	HD
10048	Oregon Science & Technology Partnership Pass Through	NOND
10049	East Metro Economic Alliance Pass Through	NOND
80024	Troutdale Neighborhood Library	Library
80025	New Columbia Neighborhood Library	Library
10052	Debt Reserve Cash Transfer	NOND
10053	Capital Improvement , Asset Preservation Loan	NOND
95001	General Fund Revenues	NOND
95000B	Contingency - ITAX Sunset	NOND

Appendix B. Performance measures that did not have any data input (N=39)

Program name	Performance measure
A&D Outstationed Staff: Alcohol and Drug Assessment, Referral, and Consultation Services	50% of clients following referral and treatment recommendation.(see below)
A&T Business Application Systems Upgrade	Applications and Hardware Installed; Users Trained and Utilizing the Application
A&T Business Application Systems Upgrade	% of Employees Trained
Auditor's Office	Reports issued/FTE (See Below)
BIT Stabilization Fund	No General Fund mid-year budget reductions due to downturn in BIT revenues
Bridge Engineering	Percent of cost growth
Central Human Resources Administration	Countywide employee turnover rate.
Central Human Resources Administration	Countywide employee absenteeism rate.
County Attorney's Office	Preserve & increase County resources by reducing loss from claims liability ($)
Customer Access & Account Management	Items checked out not returned or recovered by collection agency (decimal)
Customer Access & Account Management	Cost per item checked out (requires decimal--see below)
Department Human Resources Team	Absence Rate
Department Human Resources Team	Recruitment Services: Improve timeliness in service delivery
Department Human Resources Team	Employee Satisfaction – DCM-HR Team
Department Human Resources Team	Customer satisfaction with HR Team services
Emergency Management - Business Continuation Plan	Number of applications/systems included in a BCP
IT - Application Services	Total App Services resource hours for New Work, Enhancements & Repair Work.
IT - Application Services	Application Services resource hours by New Work, Enhancements & Repair Work.
IT-Application Services Enhanced	Total Application Services resource hours for all categories.
IT-Application Services Enhanced	Application Services resource hours by maintenance category.
MCSO Booking: Gresham Temp Holding	Major complaints from agencies served or inmates booked
MCSO Digital Booking Recording System	% of people receiving letters citing video review that still pursue their case
MCSO Domestic Violence/Elder Abuse Protection	Letters to petitioners notifying of inability to serve in 10 days
MCSO Population Management Unit	% of capacity exceeded
MCSO Population Management Unit: Furlough Supervision	% P57 allotment over capacity
MCSO Wapato Jail Offer B	Staff assaults
Mental Health Residential Services	# of Plans of Care and # of days from placement to complete Plan of Care (new)
Methamphetamine Treatment Expansion and Enhancement	Maintenance of successful treatment at 6 and 12 months. (3)
Parent Leadership/Community Organizing for Family Issues	Increased citizen engagement
Parent Leadership/Community Organizing for Family Issues	Improved conditions for children and families
Psychiatric Residential Treatment Services for Children	Total Percent Of Children Manually Restrained.
PERS Pension Bond Sinking Fund	Moody's Full Faith & Credit Aa2 rating
Retirement Programs	Amount of fines from non compliance
Strategic Investment Fund	Return on investment within three year
Strategic Investment Fund	Program or process costs reduced by at least $20,000 or 10% of the current cost.
Tax Revenue Anticipation Notes	MIG 1 Moody's rating
Theft Detection System	New items protected with security strips annually
Theft Detection System	Annual missing rate (volumes missing from shelf/total collection size)
Traumatic Brain Injury Client Systemic Coordination and Efficiency Program	unknown

Appendix C. Program offers that had all performance data input (N=153)

Program name	# of measurement
A&D Adult Residential	2
A&D Housing Services for Dependent Children	2
A&D Recovery Supports	3
A&D Residential Treatment - Women Designated	2
A&D Sobering	2
A&D Supportive Housing	2
A&D Youth Residential Treatment	2
A&T- Records Management	3
A&T-Property Assessment- Special Programs	4
A&T-Property Assessment - Central Appraisal Support	4
A&T-Property Assessment - Commercial	4
A&T-Property Assessment - Residential	4
Accounts Payable	4
Addiction Services-Adult Drug Court Program	2
ADS Long Term Care	3
Adult Domestic Violence/Deferred Sentencing	3
Adult Family Supervision Unit	4
Adult High Risk Drug Unit	3
Adult Outpatient Addiction Treatment	2
African American Youth A&D Treatment	3
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention	4
BCC District 1	2
BCC District 3	3
BCC District 4	2
Bienestar Ortiz Site	4
Books 2 U-Current Service Level	3
Breast and Cervical Health Program	2
Bridge Maintenance & Operations	3
Budget Office	4
Bus Pass Program	4
Capital Debt Retirement Fund	2
CCFC Community Engagement	3
Central Library-Base Level	4
Central Library Division Management	2
Centralized Crisis Line	2
Child Abuse Mental Health Services	4
Child and Family Mental Health Services Administration	3
Child Development Services	4
Citizen and Community Involvement and Governance	4
Citizen Involvement Committee	3
Clinical Infrastructure - Pharmacy	2
Communicable Disease Prevention Control	4
Community Engagement Program (CEP)	2
Corrections Health - Detention Center - 156 Beds 8th floor	4
Corrections Health - Detention Center - 46 Beds 4th floor	4

Corrections Health - Detention Center - 78 beds 5th floor A&B	4
Corrections Health - Detention Center - 78 beds 5th floor C&D	4
Corrections Health - Detention Center - 78 beds 6th floor C&D	4
Corrections Health - Detention Center - 78 beds 7th floor A&B	4
Corrections Health - Detention Center - 78 Beds 7th floor C&D	4
Corrections Health - Detention Center - 78 beds 8th floor A&B	4
Corrections Health - Detention Center - 78 Beds 8th floor C&D	4
Corrections Health - Detention Center - Reception	4
Corrections Health - Donald E. Long 40 Beds	4
Corrections Health - Donald E. Long 60 Beds	4
Corrections Health - Inverness - 114 beds 1&2	4
Corrections Health - Inverness - 114 beds 4 & 5	4
Corrections Health - Inverness - 116 beds dorm 6&7	4
Corrections Health - Inverness - 116 beds Dorm 8&9	4
Corrections Health - Inverness - 140 Beds Dorm 12 & 13	4
Corrections Health - Inverness - 160 Beds 10,11,18 & Med Clinic	4
Corrections Health - Inverness - 285 Beds	4
Corrections Health - Inverness - 54 beds Dorm 16&17	4
Corrections Health - Inverness - 57beds Dorm 3	4
County Operated Early Childhood Mental Health Services	4
County Operated School Based Mental Health Services	4
County Surveyor's Office	4
CS Directors Office	3
DCM Director's Office / Chief Financial Officer	2
DD ACCESS & PROTECTIVE SERVICES	4
DD ADMINISTRATION	4
DD BASIC NEEDS	3
DD SUPPORT -B	3
DD SUPPORT	3
Dental Services	3
Deputy Department Director	2
Distribution Services	4
District Attorney's Office- Investigations	2
Domestic Violence Trial Unit- Elder Abuse and Gun DV	2
Domestic Violence Victim Services and Coordination	4
DSCP Director's Office	3
Early Childhood and School Aged Outpatient Mental Health Services	4
Early Childhood Resources-Current Service Level	4
Energy Services	4
Facilities Administration & Business Services	4
Facilities Capital - Asset Preservation (AP Fund)	3
Facilities Capital - Operating Costs	3
Facilities Capital Improvement Program (CIP Fund)	3
Family Alcohol and Drug Free Housing Network (FAN)	4
Fleet Services	4
Gambling Addiction Treatment	3
General Ledger	4
Health Planning and Evaluation	4

HIV Care Services	4
Homeless Families	4
Homeless Youth System	3
Housing Programs	3
Immunization	2
Juvenile Early Intervention Unit (EIU)	3
Juvenile Formal Probation Services	2
Juvenile Gang Resource Intervention Team (GRIT)	2
Juvenile Justice Outreach-Current Service Level	3
Juvenile Secure Residential A&D Treatment (RAD)	3
Juvenile Sex Offender Probation Supervision	3
Juvenile Sex Offender Residential Treatment	3
Library Book Collection	3
Library Books-Requisition & Processing	2
Materiel Management	4
MCSO Enforcement Records	2
MCSO Fiscal/Payroll/Budget	4
MCSO Human Resources	3
MCSO LE: Concealed Handgun Permits	2
MCSO LE: River Patrol	4
MCSO Professional Standards	4
Medicaid/Medicare Eligibility	4
Medical, Mid-level and Nursing Directors	3
Mental Health and Addiction Services Division Administration	3
Mental Health and Addiction Services Quality Management	4
Mental Health Crisis Call Center	4
Mental Health Inpatient Services - Verity	4
Mental Health Outpatient Services for African American Women	2
Mental Health Outpatient Treatment Services - Verity	4
Mental Health Transitional Housing	3
Neighborhood DA	3
Neighborhood Libraries-Current Service Level	3
Neighborhood Libraries Division Management	3
Primary Care - East County Health Clinic	4
Primary Care - Mid-County Health Clinic	4
Primary Care - North Portland Health Clinic	4
Primary Care - Northeast Health Clinic	4
Public Health Emergency Preparedness	2
Regional Arts & Culture Council	4
Regional Libraries-Base Level	3
Road Engineering & Operations	4
Runaway Youth Services	3
School Based Health Centers - High Schools	4
School Based Health Centers - Middle Schools	4
Social and Support Svcs for Educational Success	4
STD, HIV and Hepatitis C Community Prevention Program	4
Strategic Investment Program Community Housing	3
Students Today Aren't Ready for Sex (STARS)	2

SUN Community Schools (41 sites)	4
SUN Community Schools (5 schools)	4
SUN Service System Support	4
Sustainability Team	3
Tax Supervising & Conservation Commission	2
The Women, Infants and Children's (WIC) Program	2
Touchstone 10 month and .5 FTE - Current Service Level	4
Transportation Planning	2
Treasury	4
Victims Assistance	3
Volunteer Services/Title Wave Book Store	2
Youth Alcohol and Drug Outpatient Services	2