DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 389 HE 013 905

AUTHOR	Peterson, Marvin W.
TITLE	Innovation, Outcomes, and the State Budgeting Process (Conference Summary of State-Level Concerns for Performance Measures, Assessments, and Budgeting for Postsecondary Education).
INSTITUTION	Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Inservice Education Program.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
SPONS AGENCY	Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
REPORT NO	IEP-068
PUB DATE	Mar 76
NOTE	13p.: Paper presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education (San Diego, CA, March 1976).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; *Budgeting; *Educational Assessment; Educational Finance; Evaluation Criteria; *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; Outcomes of Education; Program Evaluation; *State Government
IDENTIFIERS	*Seminars for State Leaders Postsec Ed (ECS SHEEO)

ABSTRACT

State-level concerns for postsecondary education are discussed as part of an inservice education conference. Attention is directed to the purposes of a performance approach, distinctions between performance measures and other kinds of measures used for assessment in higher education, concerns about reaching consensus on performance criteria within a state versus the capacity for greater control being exercised, establishing the capacity to measure performance outcomes, the use of performance criterion in an evaluation process, and relating the performance measures to the budgeting function. There appears to be no strong agreement among conference participants on why performance measures are necessary or desirable and no clear evidence as to their consequences. There seems to be a consensus that questions of effectiveness and performance would inevitably have to be faced regardless of their intended purpose. In establishing the capacity to measure performance outcomes, a number of issues are highlighted: the content of each particular performance criterion needs to be carefully delineated; an issue of debate is whether performance measures should be specified for programs or for institutions; and a major difficulty in using performance indicators is the evaluation of other changes occurring in higher education that could affect the outcome indicators. (SW)

ED202389

Inservice Education Program (IEP)

Paper Presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education

INNOVATION, OUTCOMES, AND THE STATE BUDGETING PROCESS
(CONFERENCE SUMMARY OF STATE-LEVEL CONCERNS FOR
PERFORMANCE MEASURES, ASSESSMENTS, AND
BUDGETING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION)

MARVIN W. PETERSON

Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Michigan

San Diego, California
March 1976

IEP Paper No. 068

HE013905

Education Commission of the States

Inservice Education Program (IEP)
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

SHEEO

The IEP Program has been supported primarily by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation with additional funds from the Education Commission of the States, the Frost Foundation and the State Higher Education Executive Officers

INTRODUCTION

My original thought in summarizing this conference was to use what we had learned about performance evaluation and budgeting to assess this conference and the organizers' preparation for it. It was at that point that I recognized that there were two basic approaches which we had discussed. First is the "Complex-Rational" approach in which one begins by outlining the context of the conference, stating the purposes, forming performance criteria, reviewing how the program was carried out, designing a measurement system for data collection and analysis, and the developing of a mechanism for transmitting that information into future conference planning. After giving that some thought, I concluded it was potentially too controversial; I did not want to take the risk of threatening anyone before my expenses were paid. The second approach is the "simplest possible measure approach". In this approach one accepts the one measurable criteria that we all agree on and then utilizes it. The measure that I would suggest is the efficacy of each participants argument to his or her supervisor in order to convince them that in the Hotel del Coronado in San Diege by the Sea they A) worked, B) accomplished something worthwhile, and C) should still be reimbursed for that effort. I strongly suggest that Ken Fischer, obtain a transcript of the argument used by each participant, it may tell us a great deal about whether performance measures work and about how people are going to use performance evaluation to their own benefit. Besides, if it works, it might make a great argument for continued funding for this effort.

THE CONFERENCE: A CONTEXT

This particular conference, as most of you know, was an outgrowth of or follow-up to a PECA conference in San Francisco in July, 1975 on "State Funding of Postsecondary Education: Incentives for Improvement". That conference featured some very blunt discussions of the conditions that were leading to a litany of things like: A) stagnation of institutions of postsecondary education, B) excessive restraints on change, C) increased competitiveness for scarce resources, D) education as a sinking priority and E) the "Brown-Dukaki ethos" (in which the essential character of government services are reevaluated.

That conference identified as priorities for state-level action: 1. The focus on a performance orientation; 2. The establishment of steps to preserve adaptability; 3. The development of cooperative means to improve utilization of resources; and 4. An emphasis on mechanisms for enhancing trust and rationality in relationships between states and institutions. The conference had concluded that a performance approach was worth serious consideration and, more specifically, that its connection to budgeting should be evaluated. This became the planning focus for this conference on "Innovation, Outcomes and the State Budgeting Process". The program, however, has emphasized the latter two points--outcomes and budget (See Appendix A--Final Program).

The basic assumption underlying this conference, in my mind, is represented by one of Piet Hein's Grooks. For those of you that have not seen his work, Hein is a Danish scientist, philosc,.ner, and intermittent poet who occasionally publishes collections of his Grooks. A Grook is a cartoon caricature accompanied by a brief poem representing an eternal truth. The one that particularly comes to mind is the picture of a man on a tread mill, running and obviously very fatigued, with the caption: "He who tries to keep abreast is forever second best." In the context of this particular conference the planners were aware that institutional representatives, state legislators, executive budget officers, and state higher education agency staff all feel under substantial pressure regarding their interests in higher education and are trying desperately to keep abreast if not to do even better. Unfortunately but accurately the secondary assumption appears to be that we may be often running in very different directions and therefore an "exploratory" dialogue about where we are heading with regard to performance measures and/or budgeting would be appropriate. (See Appendix B--Final list of participants and Appendix C --Ken Fischer's Summary of Attendees).

The participants reasons for attending the conference were well summarized in the pre-conference interviews and by NEXUS staff and indicated a number of personal agendas which supported the planners assumptions. The first major concern was with the process by which states develop and implement outcome and performance measures whether for assessment or budgetary purposes. Your second major concern was to ask questions of each other. There was a great deal of interest in what's happening elsewhere? Why and how performance measures are used? What actually is the state of the art in this area?

A. What kinds of performance indicators or outcome measures are being used?

B. What difficulties have different constituents encountered in obtaining useful information? What is useful to the different constituencies?

C. How much information and in what form should it be provided to various groups? and,

D. How does one take into account outcomes that are not apparent or easily measurable?

The conference format, which emphasized autobiographical data from participants, allowed for considerable discussion, and provided for the presentation of examples of state-level activities underway, gave ample opportunity for addressing some of these concerns. The major statements by John Folger, Sid Micek and Howard Klebanoff addressed the pressures for, the initial NCHEMS studies of, and the the legislative perspective on outcomes of a performance orientation. Fred Pinkam's interview with Howard Bowen, James Furman, and Eileen Anderson allowed institutional, state agency and state executive officers to identify their perspectives. Needless to say the legislative representatives in the audience were also well represented in the discussion. John Folger's paper started us with a series, Possible Implications and Questions, which the small groups addressed. The basis for more detailed discussions in small groups were well established (See Small group summaries attached).

DOGMAS, DELUSIONS AND DILEMMAS

The flow of the conference has led us to a conclusion in which there are extremes: From some dogmatic support for to some delusion with a performance or outcomes orientation. But inevitably the conference ends where it began: with issues sharpened into dilemmas, dilemmas for which each participant is now hopefully better prepared, but which will, no doubt, be resolved in the context of each state's unique style, governance arrangement, pattern of institution, and current set of problems. There are seven broad areas that hightlight some of these dilemmas, each of which is discussed briefly.

A. The Problem Addressed: The Purposes of a Performance Approach.

In John Folger's initial paper and in many of the discussions that followed, it became apparent that there were a number of pressures or conditions to explain why people are looking at a performance approach both for assessment and potentially budgeting. In the larger society, Folger noted the declining confidence and esteem that people hold for higher education, the size of the higher education budget which has grown substantially to become a major proportion of most state's expenditures, and pressures of recession and inflation which are causing problems in resource allocation for state's government as well as institutions of higher education. In state government he noted the extended concern for accountability reflected by the extensive growth of auditing staffs in the state executive offices and more recently in the legislative staff area. This was combined with a concern reported by several of our participants on the need for state level budgetary reform which indicated some greater affinity to make changes in that area. Within institutions of higher education this summer's PECA conference noted that nontraditional and innovative programs have felt stifled by the input or effort oriented budget approaches currently in vogue. Similarly, institutions faced with resources reductions have been forced to considered reallocation and must consider discontinuance of ineffective as well as ineffecient programs. Finally institutions are being subjected to increasing student consumer concerns, reinforced by student-based aid, in which students demand more information about the nature of the programs and institutions that they are entering. The pressures at these three levels all have supported to some extent a concern for a performance-oriented approach. This unfortunately has occurred when there is a growing rift reported between legislators and higher educational officials as each becomes more cynical toward the other in a time of decline. The inevitable consensus of the conference participants seemed to be that questions of effectiveness and performance would inevitably have to be faced regardless of their intended purpose or one's position on their desirability.

The conference discussions themselves reflected considerable ambiguity and uncertainty regarding the consequences of the performance approach. There was support for the position this orientation might improve the performance of higher education if it were taken seriously and critically and if measures were applied with a substantial amount of diversity in different kinds of institutions, programs, and state situations. However, it could also be stifling if applied in more uniform ways. The same arguments, of course, apply to the consequences for diversity and innovativeness. There was some suggestion that, at least the attempt to provide performance indicators, might improve the legitimacy of higher education. It was also noted that the emphasis from state legislators and state agencies, perhaps, a reflection of their concern to retain legitimacy with their constitutencies by enabling them to point out what institutons were doing with the money they were appropriating or allocating. There was fear that the outcome oriented performance approaches might be too simplistic. However, the legislators pointed out the counter emphasis on the complexity of information derived to represent true performance led to their being inundated with data. There were also concerns, that outcome data might lead to further centralization by allowing higher education or state government agencies to dictate outcomes through the budget. But ways in which it might lead to greater institutional autonomy by leaving management to the institutions were also suggested.

The most crucial concerns about the purposes of a performance approach were: first, that performance or outcome questions inevitably and inextricably were value laden. Since different constituents not only would stress different performance criteria but may even interpret the same one differently, value conflicts would result. In this view the approach needed serious consideration rather than cursory review or perfunctory acceptance. Second, there was a substantial concern that the performance approach be viewed as means rather than ends. This, in part, reflected the uncertainty about their consequences but may also have reflected an attempt to downplay or to avoid becoming overly confident about the gains that proponents claim for the untilization of this kind of an approach. Opinions of participants themselves seemed to range from the optimistic extreme that this approach would allow higher education to get more state funds and perhaps even improve their autonomy to a pessimistic position that, regardless of the budgetary process and performance criteria, higher education in today's context would receive less funding and probably inevitably lose autonomy. The middle ground position suggested that it was an approach which might protect quality in a time of retrenchment, might allow for a larger range of educational needs (Diversity and Innovative), and might provide a mechanism for reducing some of the conflicts among participants in higher education policy making that we currently face.

In the discussions of the purposes and consequences of a performance approach, conclusions were hard to reach. However, there was substantial agreement that they would be helpful in identifying problem areas, that the development of them might be useful as a basis for dialogue among various constituencies, that there was a need for higher education to continue to try to make a better case for its share of state funds and that any performance approach should involve changes made with deliberate caution.

B. The Semantics Syndrome.

Perhaps one of the reasons for the general caution in discussing a performance approach to assessment and budgeting in higher education is partially a semantics issue. Legislators to some extent see it as another fancy term developed by institutions to disguise the fact that nothing has changed while institutions see this as just another "faddish" approach being instigated by the state. Regardless of one's perspective, it is also easy to see the term "outcomes" as just another example of "systems gobbledy-gook". Therefore, it is helpful to make some distinctions about what we really mean.

First, it is helpful to distinguish performance measures from other kinds of measures used for assessment in higher education. "Performance measures" generally refer to the outcomes of higher educational institutions or the impacts they have on the students, the state, or the larger social institutions which they serve. Measures of performance can be quantitative or qualitiative. They may be oriented toward goal achievement or, as some suggested, they need to incorporate an examination of the unintended as well as intended effects or actions. Performance assessment differs to some extent from "management studies" which focus more on issues of productivity and efficiency. These in turn are differentiated from "operational reviews" that are more concerned with accuracy of data and responsible stewardship with funds and other resources. There is obviously a substantial overlap among these broad categories but clearly performance indicators are concerned with the effectiveness of our institutions and programs.

On the second dimension, it is helpful to recognize that assessment occurs in a variety of forms. There are audits, normally regular assessments of quantifiable indicators in some standardized procedure (in the past these have normally been associated with operational or fiduciary audits or management efficiency or productivity audits). There are program reviews in which there is a far more intensive and comprehensive review or programs or institutions focusing primarily on examining their real value or effectiveness. Audits and reviews are typically done by groups external to the institutions although not always. Finally, there are self studies or assessments done by the institutions for some form of external recognition or for its own self improvement. These different kinds of assessments or evaluations may include performance dimensions or judgements about it.

The performance assessment approach is further complicated by the fact that they are often done by a number of different institutions or agencies. For instance, in the context of this conference, examples of audits or reviews were reported: a) from the executive branch of government usually by the budget or finance office; b) from the legislature where in the more complex states there may be legislative fiscal, audit, and program evaluation staffs each serving the legislature; c) from the state higher educational governance system where governing borads conduct reviews to fulfill their managerial responsibilities for spending and allocating money while the coordinating board may be more interested in policy reviews to justifying requests to the legislature or for planning. Naturally, many assessments occur within institutions themselves either by institutional and analytic studies offices or other units and external review by accrediting agencies are also part of the picture.

This discussion of the definition of performance, the forms of assessment or evaluation and agencies involved is necessary to distinguish some of the vagueness in the terms and process that we use in talking about performance assessment, but it also highlights the potential complexity; there is a necessity in adopting a performance approach to obtain some agreement on what the terms mean, what agencies and groups are involved in each state. This is perhaps better accomplished with clear examples of the questions that are being asked about performance, the precise identification of indicators used, the clear understanding of the level of institutional program being assessed, and the roles and functions of the parties who are involved in that process rather than general categories or abstract definitions.

C. The Guidance System: Concern for Consensus or Control Capacity?

In his book, The Active Society, Amitai Etzoni distinguishes processes which social systems use to reach a consensus or make decisions from its capacity to control the social system (That is to collect and analyze data and to implement decisions). In his argument, an active society is one that has a high capacity on both. In the context of this conference the greatest emphasis seemed to be given to the process of reaching consensus on performance criteria. Perhaps this was due to concerns about credibility, about legislative-higher education disagreements, and about the general uncertainty regarding consequences and motives of other interested parties. In discussions about the consensus capacity within our states, great emphasis was placed on the communication gap between institutions and legislatures and some of the negative stereotypes that each had of the other were aired. The major concern was that educators and legislators find means of working together more effectively. It was pointed out that the anti-legislative, anti-government bureaucracy attitude in the country may be as strong as the anti-higher educational feeling. Therefore the two groups share a common problem--explaing what their efforts accomplish -- which might be the basis for their dialogue. However, mechanisms for generating dialogue were less clear and probably will vary by state. It was recognized that there is a need to involve state executive agency staff members as well and that there were often limitations due to the fact that legislative decision power was often situated outside of education committees or staff groups and that the real criterion for policy decisions were often much more pragmatic and political concerns regarding constituency interests.

On the control side of our higher education state guidance system the growth of information systems and analytic staff in institutions of higher education is known. It was noted that this was now being accentuated by growth of such staff members in legislative and executive branches. There is the potential in many states that these groups may all be working in the same area. Because of different concerns and purposes of legislatures, executive, higher education agency and institutional and staff members, there also is the possibility that it may become a duplicative or conflict situation: distrust in one anothers data and analyses or competetion by these staff to gain greater favor with their supervisors. The latter issue clearly raises the question of cost of all of our control system apparatus for higher education. What is its real cost? What is it adding to our bureaucratic procedures and how might it be simplified if states move to performance approaches? What kinds of things might be replaced? There were no answers but it clearly is an area that needs to be explored.

There was a general feeling on the part of conference participants that, at least for the moment, they are less concerned about the details of the control mechanisms than they were about the need to develop consensus if a performance approach were to work.

D. Creating Consensus Around Performance Criteria.

The need for dialogue in establishing performance criteria was previously identified. The problem of creating consensus performance criteria is separable from the problem of involvement in the evaluation process. In the context of the discussion groups, there seemed to be two quite different approaches to the process of creating consensus on performance criteria for a state that was considering moves in that direction. The one extreme suggested starting with legislative and executive needs for decision making as "valid" information and as a basis for defining the scope and nature of data required for performance criteria. The other approach begins with the assumption that valid information begins with institutions' statements of mission, role, and scope which are prerequisites for institutions developing their own performance criterion measures which they then present to state government. Obviously these two approaches, no doubt, represent differences in styles of state coordination and governance, but they may also represent very different notions of performance indicators, the latter focusing on what institutions think they accomplish and the former focusing on the concerns of legislators and executive officials in their daily political lives. There is some evidence on the differing priorities one might find in these two various approaches reflected in Sid Micek's paper in which he identifies outcomes preferred by various constituencies and these deserve careful review.

Another interesting dichotomy of process was identified by the discussion groups. One suggested that the process of creating performance criteria would essentially be one of consensus flowing out of informal communication and discussions encouraged by Mr. Klebanoff. On the other hand, some groups talked of it in terms of institutions negotiating with the state, again this, no doubt, reflects the differences in state governance style, emphasis on collective bargaining, etc., but it does point out that the process by which performance criteria are to be decided is likely to vary by state.

More specifically in the discussions there was a varied picture of the appropriate role and function of the state legislature, state executive officers, higher education coordinating officials and institutions in determining performance criteria. However, there was general agreement that if institutions or the higher education agencies didn't do something it was likely to be mandated and/or initiated from the state level. Also there was general agreement that the process through which performance criteria were established should involve open discussion. The experience of the states involved in performance reviews gave us some limited information on the experience of establishing performance criteria, however, the performance reviews were often quite limited in scope and this process needs greater attention.

E. The Measurement Issues..

The measurement of performance indicators, as Sid Micek pointed out, are complicated by a number of issues such as: the lack of existing explicit measures for outcomes that are well accepted, the fact that techniques for analyzing and collecting outcome measures were not well understood, that the goals and objectives that indicators might be oriented toward were often not existent or unmeasurable, that there is substantial fear that they will be misused, and that their mode of presentation is often a major concern. Yet in the conference itself, it became apparent that program reviews in several states are beginning to use outcome or performance criteria in serious attempts to assess programs. NCHEMS, of course, has a major project focused on categorizing outcome criteria which was presented although an operational discussion of its usefulness was not included in the program. It was pointed out performance measures, whether those developed by NCHEMS, or others, should probably not be stipulated for all institutions or states without much more careful consideration of their appropriateness in the specific context.

In establishing the capacity to measure performance outcomes, a number of issues were highlighted:

1. The content of each particular performance criterion needs to be carefully spelled out. What in fact is being measured? Is it an immediate outcome or an impact on the larger society? Can it be measured now or only after passage of time? The NCHEMS outcomes it was felt, offered a useful initial categorization of a variety of different content areas of outcomes.

2. The level of measurement is an issue of considerable debate. Should performance measures be specified for programs or for institutions? Those most interested in resource allocation and concerned about the current budgetary constraints seemed to favor performance outcomes focused on program level assessments. Others who were more concerned about issues of institutional autonomy and about the more abstract and/or value laden nature of institutional outcomes which are very difficult to measure or to obtain agreement on seemed to prefer institutional level measures, if any. It is, however, reasonably clear in a survey done by Robert Barak last year that most of the existing attempts to develop performance measures by state higher education agencies focus on programs rather than total institutions and this may reflect the current direction.

3. Regardless of the content or level on which the performance criteria is measured, one major difficulty in using performance indicators is imputing causation from the higher education experience to changes in the outcome indicators. The complex problems of setting up comparative research programs to control all the variables that might influence the outcomes are extremely time consuming, complex, and potentially expensive. The more positive view was that a longitudinal review of the same performance measures, used consistently, might be some barometer of effectiveness or the impact of other changes that were occurring but that these had to be interpreted with caution.

4. In light of the difficulty of imputing causation to the performance measures the problem of deciding what standards to use for evaluation emerges. One approach is to relate performance measures to goals. But this may overlook many important unintended consequences of a particular program or institutional effort which might be far more important than goal achievement. Another criterion is comparison. But here the difficulties of finding similar institutional types or programs and the difficulties of insuring data consistency, collection and analysis procedures in larger scale institutional comparisons are extensive. This problem has already been identified as a major focus for NCHEMS' institutional exchange project which unfortunately does not currently focus on outcome measures.

5. A final measurement issue concerns the multiplicity of performance reviewers that may be interested in performance evaluation who may expect multiple criterion if there is limited agreement on which are most appropriate. Even further, the exaggerated fear of misuse of simplistic indicators may lead to an overemphasis on the development of multiple outcome measures. This not only increases the difficulty of performance assessment but leads to direct conflict with state-level decision makers' concerns that they not be inundated with too much data.

While there are other measurement issues connected with performance assessment, these represent some of the most crucial that were mentioned during the course of this conference.

F. The Evaluation or Assessment Process.

The use of performance criterion in an evaluation process, even when the criteria are carefully agreed upon, inevitably raises questions about what the particular performance criteria means. While the detailed question of roles and function of the various constituencies in evaluation was addressed in the groups, a number of alternatives were implied. These ranged from institutional based evaluation teams, to state higher education agency research staff, to state legislators and executive auditing staff, to outside accreditation teams, and to various combinations. These are partially related to the purpose of the evaluation--where it is to provide information for improvement or to make final judgments on contribution. This assessment or evaluation issue is further complicated by the question of who is the best source of data, should it be collected and provided the institutions themselves, by state agencies, or by some other group? To the extent that there is a substantial amount of distrust, these issues become more and more central to making an effective assessment process work. While many of these issues were identified, there was no real consensus around the role and function that the various groups should play in the data analysis and assessment process. Obviously institutions desire to claim as large a role as possible yet most of the efforts initiated today appeared to be from the state level.

G. The Linking Dilemmas: Relating Outcomes to Action

There was little experience reported by the participants in relating the performance measures to the budgeting function. It was suggested that budgets were influenced by very marginal judgments that might be made on the basis of information available to them through some program review or audit. For the most part there was a skeptical feeling that the form of budgeting really had very little effect on outcomes and that it was not likely to affect the number of dollars received in higher education. Therefore there was little support in the discussion groups for attempting to link performance measurement to budgeting. On the positive side there was an expression of feeling that performance parameters could be very usefully linked to the identification of problems, that both qualitative and quantitative performance measures might be very useful to encourage the generation of alternative means for achieving outcomes which then could be tried and evaluated.

Despite these ways in which outcome information might be linked to action, the general tendency was to support the development of performance indicators first as some states have been doing, and only consider moving into performance budgeting after there is substantial experience with the indicators themselves. There seemed to be some tendency to stress the development of quantitative performance indicators first and some impression that these might be the only ones that would have any potential use in the budgeting process, if at all. There was a stronger suggestion that performance measures should not or could not be related to budgeting because budget decisions have to be made annually while performance indicators change more slowly and because decisions in the budget are on the basis of inputs or efforts which are easily understood and that we are not likely to have strong sense of the linkage between outcomes and budget dollars for years to come.

Finally, if performance measures were applied to the budgetary process, the technical issue raised was the old NCHEMian dilemma: there was a concern that there should be a close fit between the budgetary reporting structure and an outcome which should reflect their cause and effect association. This was a greater concern of those who were most interested in program-oriented performance measures. The plausible linking structure becomes less clear as one favors institutional performance budgets except to provide institutional lump sum appropriations.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

In summary, there appeared to be no strong agreement on why performance measures were necessary or desirable and no clear evidence as to their consequences. There was general agreement that they may be inevitable, may have desirable consequences, and that there is a need to pursue their development. This seemed to be felt more strongly by state level officials. The conference identified numerous recent examples or experiences with the use of performance indicators for program audits or review but little in the area of performance budgeting. There was very strong feeling that the performance criteria and performanceevaluation processes need to be the focus of substantial dialogue among interested parties but that the format will vary from state to state. The participants reflected great interest and substantial caution or tentativeness. Whether the tentativeness expressed in this conference was a form of future shock, fear,or impressions of faddishness was still unclear. However, it did seem apparent that the participants were not ready for a "Grand Scheme", but would subscribe to recommendations such as the following:

1. If outcome or performance reviews are to have a positive effect and if thereis any potential in relating them to the budget process, there needs to be a new set of attitudes (or at least an image) on the part of institutional based innovators, budget officers, and state level officials. Innovators need to avoid the pitfall of having "answers in search of money". Budgeters have to focus on "outcomes and not inputs". Legislators need to convince others that they are willing to "provide incentives" to give the approach an opportunity to develop. All need to treat this development as a "new experience"; as a theory to be tested and not as a "New Dogma" which conflicts with the "truth or past experience".

2. Mechanisms for dialogue among various constituencies on a state by state basis may be a very useful step. Some suggestions included:

A. Informal institution/legislator/executive branch staff meetings to discuss issues and problems of higher education and particularly focused around performance measures.

B. The possible creation of an independent citizens council to collect and maintain information on the performance of higher education.

C. The development of some form of interstitial group uncommitted to any constituency who understand education, have evaluation experience, have some expertise in public policy assessment, and who understand the legislative process. Such a group or task force might guide the development of an effective performance system while allaying some of the fears of each constituency about the potential abuses by the others.

3. There is a need to review the experience with performance measures and performance review or auditing to date. There are some preliminary efforts underway which should be referenced in the near future. However, there is also a need to have some more extensive research on approaches being used and the effects of them.

4. There is a need to fund major development projects such as the performance budgeting FIPSE project in the state of Tennessee. A set of projects in different states designed to constrast the complexity of higher education structure in the state, the variation in forms of higher education coordination mechanisms, and differing types of performance criteria would provide a set of comparative projects that might give us more insight into the consequences not only of performance assessment but of the extent to which it could be tied to budgeting.

5. There was support for continued meetings or conferences to explain this topic. The suggestions ranged from meetings of the varied constituents in states with active programs in this area, to regional meetings of states not yet involved, to the creation of a broadly representative National Task Force to set forth some principles and guidelines.

This summmary started out with a <u>Grook</u> so let me end it with a limmerick which I will try my best to keep clean:

"There once was a conference at Coronado;
Where participants sought the new El Dorado;
Performance and budgeting were the game;
The rhetoric was both new and the same;
But spiced with candid and classy bravado."