


Resolution No. 31425

Relating to the City of Seattle's budget planning, establishing general standards for the measurement of program performance and program evaluation, and reaffirming the Council's intent to apply these standards in its review of the 2014 Proposed Budget.

The City of Seattle – Legislative Department

Resolution sponsored by: 

Committee Action:

Date	Recommendation	Vote
1/16 1/16	ADOPT	TB NL MO 3-0-0

Related Legislation File: _____

Date Introduced and Referred: 1.14.13	To: (committee): Government Performance + Finance
Date Re-referred:	To: (committee):
Date Re-referred:	To: (committee):
Date of Final Action: 1/22/13	Date Presented to Mayor: _____
Date Signed by Mayor: _____	Date Returned to City Clerk: 1/22/13
Published by Title Only <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Date Returned Without Concurrence:
Published in Full Text _____	

This file is complete and ready for presentation to Full Council. _____

Full Council Action:

Date	Decision	Vote
1/22/13	Adopted	8-0 (excused: Bagshaw)

CITY OF SEATTLE
RESOLUTION 31425

1
2
3 A RESOLUTION relating to the City of Seattle's budget planning, establishing general
4 standards for the measurement of program performance and program evaluation, and
5 reaffirming the Council's intent to apply these standards in its review of the 2014
6 Proposed Budget.

7 WHEREAS, the citizens of Seattle rightly expect that their city government will implement
8 programs in the most effective and efficient manner possible, especially in the priority
9 areas of public safety, human services, economic opportunity, and environmental
10 stewardship; and

11 WHEREAS, achieving specific and desired outcomes begins by clearly defining what the City
12 intends to accomplish for its citizens and requires accurately assessing the effectiveness
13 of City action toward this end; and

14 WHEREAS, the City Council introduced on August 13, 2012 and adopted unanimously on
15 September 10, 2012 a substantially similar Resolution to foster performance and
16 evaluations as part of the 2013-14 city budget; and

17 WHEREAS, the Mayor wrote on September 20, 2012 that "Adoption of this resolution came
18 after preparation of the 2013-2014 Proposed Budget..." and, therefore, "...the specifics
19 of the resolution could not be incorporated into the 2013-2014 budget submittal"; and

20 WHEREAS, the Council was able to amend the Mayor's 2013-2014 budget to include
21 independent evaluations of certain new and expanded programs to ensure that the results
22 of those programs will be evaluated for the people of Seattle; and

23 WHEREAS, adopting this new Resolution at least eight months ahead of the Mayor's submittal
24 of the budget for 2014 will provide the Mayor and City Budget Office with ample time to
25 design and budget for thorough and independent evaluations of any new or expanded
26 programs;

27 NOW, THEREFORE,

28 **BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE THAT:**

Section 1. In its review of the 2014 Proposed Budget, the Council has the following
expectations and intends to consider four main questions when acting upon the proposed funding
of new programs or significant changes to existing programs (such as proposed increases in
funding):



1 **A. What is the long-term and measurable goal(s) of the program?** Council expects
2 that new or significantly changed programs will articulate clear, specific, and measurable goals.

3 **B. What is the gap between the status quo and the program goal(s)?** A clear,
4 specific, and quantifiable assessment of the status quo, such as a statistical baseline, will be
5 essential for tracking results and determining the feasibility of achieving the goal(s).

6 **C. How effective is the new program expected to be in making progress toward the**
7 **stated goal(s)?** Budget proposals for new or significantly changed programs, should include
8 forecasts of expected outcomes. These forecasts should be described in terms of clear, specific,
9 and quantifiable progress toward the program goals, and the specific time period over which this
10 progress will be made, including the short-term (within the next 12 months) and, where
11 appropriate, the medium-term. The forecasts of effectiveness should be supported by high
12 quality evidence (such as objective studies of program outcomes with clear, specific, and
13 quantifiable results and a control group) of how comparable programs have been implemented
14 elsewhere, or describe the specific basis for the forecasts presented.

15 **D. How will the success of the new or changed program be measured?** Successful
16 proposals will include a specific plan for clearly measuring and evaluating program outcomes.

17 1. For any new or expanded program attempting to replicate a model successfully
18 implemented and rigorously evaluated elsewhere, the Council will expect the Mayor's
19 2014 budget submittal to include written, independent evidence that the new or
20 expanded program is significantly similar to the model, is being implemented with
21 fidelity (in the same manner as the model program), and that a clear process and
22 timeline for tracking specific and quantifiable progress toward the program goal(s) has
23 been established.

24 2. For programs that adopt more innovative approaches where success has not been
25 previously demonstrated by high quality evidence (such as objective studies of
26 program outcomes with clear, specific, and quantifiable results and a control group),
27 the Council expects the Mayor's 2014 budget submittal to include the funding and
28



1 design for independent program evaluations that will be completed or will provide
2 interim results to the Council prior to the Mayor's submittal of the 2015 budget. The
3 independent evaluations shall include (i) a clear process and timeline for tracking
4 specific and measurable program outcomes and (ii) a methodology for comparing the
5 outcomes of those targeted by the program with a comparable group not affected by
6 program implementation.

7
8 Adopted by the City Council the 22nd day of January, 2013, and
9 signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this 22nd day
10 of January, 2013.

11 
12 President _____ of the City Council

13
14
15 Filed by me this 22nd day of January, 2013.

16 
17 _____
18 Monica Martinez Simmons, City Clerk

19 (Seal)
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



FISCAL NOTE FOR NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS

Department:	Contact Person/Phone:	CBO Analyst/Phone:
Legislative	Alex Pedersen / 684-5341	n.a.

Legislation Title:

A RESOLUTION relating to the City of Seattle's budget planning, establishing general standards for the measurement of program performance and program evaluation, and reaffirming the Council's intent to apply these standards in its review of the 2014 Proposed Budget.

Summary of the Legislation:

This resolution reaffirms the Council's intent to apply standards for performance measurement and evaluation to new and revised City programs in its review of the 2014 Proposed Budget as it did for the 2013 Budget. The resolution generally defines the standards, to include a definition of measurable goals, measurement of the status quo, a forecast of the effectiveness of the program in moving toward the goal, and measurement of program success.

Background:

Many governments, including the current federal administration, the State of Washington, and many cities, have found that their performance can be improved by clearly stating what they intend to accomplish in a given domain and then accurately assessing the effectiveness of governmental action toward this end.

Please check one of the following:

 x **This legislation does not have any financial implications.**

a) Does the legislation have indirect financial implications, or long-term implications?

Ideally the resolution will encourage more effective and efficient City programs.

b) What is the financial cost of not implementing the legislation?

None.

c) Does this legislation affect any departments besides the originating department?

The resolution will affect those departments whose programs the Council reviews in this fashion.



d) What are the possible alternatives to the legislation that could achieve the same or similar objectives?

None.

e) Is a public hearing required for this legislation?

No.

f) Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required for this legislation?

No.

g) Does this legislation affect a piece of property?

No.

FILED
CITY OF SEATTLE

2013 MAR 29 AM 10:17

CITY CLERK

STATE OF WASHINGTON – KING COUNTY

--SS.

293696
CITY OF SEATTLE, CLERKS OFFICE

No. 31425

Affidavit of Publication

The undersigned, on oath states that he is an authorized representative of The Daily Journal of Commerce, a daily newspaper, which newspaper is a legal newspaper of general circulation and it is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of publication hereinafter referred to, published in the English language continuously as a daily newspaper in Seattle, King County, Washington, and it is now and during all of said time was printed in an office maintained at the aforesaid place of publication of this newspaper. The Daily Journal of Commerce was on the 12th day of June, 1941, approved as a legal newspaper by the Superior Court of King County.

The notice in the exact form annexed, was published in regular issues of The Daily Journal of Commerce, which was regularly distributed to its subscribers during the below stated period. The annexed notice, a

CT: TITLE ONLY RESOLUTION

was published on

02/11/13

The amount of the fee charged for the foregoing publication is the sum of \$39.77 which amount has been paid in full.



Affidavit of Publication



Subscribed and sworn to before me on

02/11/2013


Notary public for the State of Washington,
residing in Seattle

State of Washington, King County

City of Seattle Title Only Resolution

The full text of the following legislation, passed by the City Council on January 22, 2013, and published below by title only, will be mailed upon request, or can be accessed at <http://clerk.seattle.gov>. For information on upcoming meetings of the Seattle City Council, please visit <http://www.seattle.gov/council/calendar>.

Contact: Office of the City Clerk at (206) 684-8344.

RESOLUTION NO. 31425

A RESOLUTION relating to the City of Seattle's budget planning, establishing general standards for the measurement of program performance and program evaluation, and reaffirming the Council's intent to apply these standards in its review of the 2014 Proposed Budget.

Date of publication in the Seattle Daily Journal of Commerce, February 11, 2013.
2/11(293696)