

## MINUTES

Public Safety Coordinating Council  
**Research and Evaluation Committee**  
Board of County Commissioners Conference Room  
125 East 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene

October 24, 2002 1:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Anna Morrison, (until 2:30), Jan Gund, Ken Viegas, Ken Tollenaar, Members;  
Mark Stevens, (for Quinn Sidon), Staff

ABSENT: Susan Bouchet, Gerry Gaydos, Maureen Weathers, Linda Wagner, Dave Factor, Patti Chamberlain, Members

GUESTS: Denis Hijmans, Tanya Heaton

### **1. Call to Order/Introductions**

Ms. Morrison called the meeting to order.

### **2. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as submitted by general consensus.

### **3. Presentation on Lane County Strategic Plan**

Tanya Heaton distributed written information on the Lane County Strategic Plan and performance measures.

Ms. Heaton provided an overview of the plan. She went through a power point presentation that included information the strategic planning process, types of analysis in the plan, the process of performance measurements, and categories of the plan. She noted that the plan had begun implementation in August of 2001.

Ms. Heaton said performance measures were used as a management tool and not used as a budgeting tool for elected officials. She said it was directly stated in the plan that performance measures were to be done. She said there were pilot programs in youth services, and custodial operations. She said the major roll out of the plan would be in December, 2002. She said the goal was that performance measures would be important to department management and would show effectiveness of programs.

Mr. Tollenaar said the R&E committee had identified broad goals and outcomes. He said the committee needed to know that the goals it had identified were the same as the County's goals.

Ms. Heaton said the County was hoping to join an organization called ICMA so it could compare itself to other counties. She said the organization would be very clear on how to compare benchmarks with other counties.

Mr. Viegas reiterated the importance of the committee goals being consistent with County strategic goals.

Ms. Heaton stressed that performance measures had to go through a long process before they could be used as a management tool. She said the intent was to get managers to make decisions as to whether programs were making the best use of the funds available.

Ms. Gund stressed the importance of using objective measures when measuring quality of programs. She noted that interpretation of quality was different for each person.

Mr. Viegas stressed the importance of getting more measurements on outcomes. He noted that a program could be very efficient but be doing the wrong thing. He reiterated that outcomes were the data that mattered.

Ms. Gund reiterated the importance of obtaining true objectivity in the definition of goals when doing performance evaluations.

Ms. Heaton said that the data from the measures would be reviewed annually and quarterly.

Ms. Morrison stressed the importance of keeping committee goals tied to the strategic plan goals of the County.

Ms. Gund reiterated her concern that the measurements needed to be taken in an objective manner.

#### **4. Evaluation Checklist**

In response to a question from Mr. Hijmans regarding who would use the checklist, Ms. Morrison said the committee would use the checklist to evaluate programs that were presented to it. She raised concern that the evaluations were not getting effective data from programs and said the checklist would help the committee collect data that had some value.

Mr. Tollenaar raised concern over getting effective data on cost benefit analysis for programs. He said it was a very complicated piece of the checklist and raised concern that no one on the committee had the expertise to do a true analysis.

Ms. Morrison said a lot of the checklist process would be driven by staff members who had the expertise to do an effective analysis.

Mr. Tollenaar expressed a desire to see a list of programs from the county and the cities in the metropolitan area that showed which programs had been evaluated.

Ms. Gund expressed a desire to see the total budget from each program that was asking for funding. She stressed the importance of knowing the entire budget of a program when making funding allocation decisions.

There was general consensus to keep the cost benefit analysis portion of the checklist and to have information on the total budget of a program that was asking for funding.

Ms. Morrison said the checklist would be a good starting point and noted that the list could be changed as the committee learned more about evaluating programs.

## **5. Community Safety Benchmark Project Plan: Next Steps**

Ms. Morrison said there should be a subgroup working with Mr. Hijmans on the benchmarking project.

Ms. Morrison left the meeting at 2:30 p.m.

Mr. Hijmans said a draft product could be developed that could be shown to a number of people for refinement.

Mr. Hijmans said he had developed a method of modeling the project that met all of the needs of the committee. He said the four criteria developed by the committee were not broad enough to be effective. He said his plan was to use the Oregon Progress Board as a model.

Mr. Hijmans said he was not asking to use the Oregon Progress Board's figures but wanted to use them as a model for creating a County specific program.

In response to a question from Ms. Gund regarding how the data related to what the committee was trying to achieve, Mr. Hijmans said there was a direct correlation between child literacy and anti-social behavior and therefore increasing literacy rates would decrease anti-social behavior.

In response to a question from Mr. Stevens regarding whether benchmarks were originally intended to be a broad look at how well other departments were doing, Mr. Hijmans said he had stayed within the parameters of the PSCC.

Members broke into individual discussions. Mr. Viegas said that benchmarks did not seem to affect state legislative thinking or the thinking of the general public. He raised concern that the PSCC was meeting but was not actually communicating. He said he was not opposed to the concept of Mr. Hijmans's plan but did not know whether it would "just end up on a shelf."

Mr. Hijmans suggested that the committee keep on its path and he would come back in three months with a revised/refined draft of his plan.

Mr. Tollenaar suggested that Mr. Hijmans return to the December 5, meeting to engage in further discussion with the entire committee.

## **6. Other Business**

The meeting adjourned at 3p.m.

(Recorded by Joe Sams)

*LCOG: C:\DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS\CLAS086\LOCAL SETTINGS\TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES\OLKF8\REMINS\_20021024.DOC*

*Last Saved: November 25, 2002*