

HOW ARE WE DOING?

Enhancing Accountability Through The Mayor's Management Report



City of New York
Office of the Comptroller
Office of Policy Management
William C. Thompson, Jr., Comptroller

FEBRUARY 2002

William C. Thompson, Jr.
Comptroller

Greg Brooks
Deputy Comptroller
Policy, Audit, Contracts & Accountancy

Martha Kiamos
Special Assistant

Office of Policy Management

Jeanne Millman
Director

Donna Meeks
Senior Policy Advisor, Author

Serge Tran
Bethany Jankunis
Special Research Assistants

OPM Staff
Nancy Anderson, Ph.D.
Michael Beirne
Gail Benzman
Michelle Miao
Marilyn Mosley
Barry Skura, Ph.D.
Lincoln Stewart

Special thanks to Nadine Hoffman

Table of Contents

Preface by the Comptroller.....	1
Executive Summary.....	2
Introduction	
• The Mayor's Management Report 25 Years Later.....	6
• Changing Public Officials and the Timeliness of this Report.....	9
Findings & Recommendations	
• Section I: Overall Structure and Content of the MMR..... Findings 1-9	10
• Section II: Reporting by City Agencies..... Findings 10-16	19
Agency Index.....	42

Preface by the Comptroller

This year marks the 25th Anniversary of the *Mayor's Management Report* (MMR), making this an appropriate time to review the MMR's purpose, structure and content. The MMR is particularly important to maintaining and enhancing the City's accountability to its stakeholders. It is the only publication that sets forth goals, objectives and outcomes for services provided by each City agency. As such, it must be thorough and accessible, reliable and consistent. It must report not only what is good about City services, but also those things that must be improved.

A high-quality MMR is an important tool in assuring high-quality City services for the public. It is my hope that the Mayor and his staff will find this report a useful guide to overhauling the MMR.

It should be noted that the Comptroller's Office is not the only elected official to offer recommendations to improve the quality of the MMR. The City Council is charged in the City Charter with holding public hearings each spring (Section 12(6)(e)) on the Preliminary MMR and, under Council Rules (Section 7.30), hearings on the final MMR, the subject of this report. Many public officials, advocates and the general public have presented strong testimony at these hearings, and the accompanying analyses prepared by City Council staff have been excellent. Their observations, as well as our own, have contributed to the findings of this report.

William C. Thompson, Jr.
Comptroller

Executive Summary

The requirement for a *Mayor's Management Report* ("MMR") was added to the City Charter in 1977. This development coincided with an increased demand for governmental accountability that sought to develop performance outcome measures to complement traditional fiscal auditing of public programs and services. Over time, the concept came to incorporate performance outcome measures as a tool by government for overseeing programs and setting budgets. Commonly known as "Managing for Results," Congress made this approach to management the basis of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, which requires Federal agencies to develop annual performance plans and performance reports.

Managing for Results has influenced the MMR, which has gradually acquired performance outcome measures. But, as this report found, some City agencies still have few— or no— outcome measures in the MMR. Many indicators in the Fiscal Year 2001 (FY01) MMR, for example, are indicators of simple program inputs or outputs— dollars spent, numbers served— and do not provide a measure of the quality of a program, as outcome measures are intended to do. Only 20 percent overall of the indicators for City agencies in the FY 01 MMR Indicator volume are outcome measures. This report recommends a variety of specific outcome measures for City agencies that should be added to the MMR.

Another problem highlighted in this report stems from the decision made in 1995 to break the MMR into separate Indicator and Narrative volumes. As a result, many agency and program goals included in the MMR Narrative volume are without corresponding indicators in the Indicator volume, and indicators are presented in the Narrative volume which belong in the Indicator volume. These structural problems have made the MMR much less user-friendly, and should be corrected.

Last, five City agencies are currently not represented in the MMR Indicator volume, despite clear City Charter requirements for performance goals and performance measures for all City agencies. These include the Departments of City Planning, Cultural Affairs, Investigations, Records and Information Services and the Law Department. In addition, the work of many Mayoral Offices is not represented in the MMR Indicator volume, although City Boards and Commissions have been fairly well represented. This report urges the Mayor to make public in the MMR goals and outcome measures for the Mayoralty, such as the Office of Emergency Management, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Operations and Office of Contracts. These offices spend considerable City dollars to provide essential City services. The interests of "good government" argue in favor of greater reporting.

A high-quality *Mayor's Management Report* is an important tool in assuring high-quality City services for the public. This report is intended to provide the Mayor and his staff with a useful guide to improving the MMR.

The report's 16 findings and recommendations are presented below:

- 1. Finding:** Since 1994, the Narrative Volume of the MMR has grown to encompass a variety of goals, objectives and indicators not represented in the Indicator volume. At times claims in the Narrative are contradicted by data in the Indicator volume.
Recommendation: Integrate the Agency narrative descriptions of goals and objectives with the Agency indicators, as was the case prior to 1995. Information reported in the Narrative should correspond to information reported in the Indicator volume.
- 2. Finding:** The work of Mayoral Offices is infrequently reported in the MMR, despite the fact that many of these offices provide direct services to the public and many operate with sizeable budgets. Where mention of the work of the Mayoralty is made, it has occurred in the Narrative volume only, without corresponding Indicators in the Indicator volume. On the other hand, City Boards and Commissions have been fairly well represented in the MMR.
Recommendation: Report on the objectives and outcomes of additional selected Mayoral Offices in the MMR. Suggestions include major offices such as the Office of Emergency Management, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Operations and Office of Contracts. Others that provide direct services to the public, and therefore are strong candidates for public reporting, are the Action Center, Office of Immigrant Affairs and Language Services and the Office for People with Disabilities. Although many City boards are included in the MMR, there are still notable absences, such as the Board of Elections.
- 3. Finding:** Despite clear City Charter requirements for performance goals and performance measures for the past and current fiscal years for all City agencies, the FY01 MMR Indicator volume omits five City agencies altogether.
Recommendation: Meet Charter requirements by including goals and performance indicators for these agencies in the MMR.
- 4. Finding:** Columns in the Indicator volume report the prior fiscal year's performance, the current year's performance and goals, but the reader has no idea whether the goals for the indicator were met in the prior fiscal year.
Recommendation: Add a new column that includes the performance target for the prior fiscal year with that year's reported outcome.
- 5. Finding:** Separate Agency-wide Indicators, which are the only source of expenditure and employee data for many agencies, obscure relationships between program budgets and program outcomes.
Recommendation: Return Agency-wide Indicators, including data on contracted services, to the front of the indicator sections for each respective City agency.
- 6. Finding:** Major Mayoral Initiatives are reported inconsistently in the MMR Narrative and often lack corresponding indicators in the MMR Indicator volume.
Recommendation: Include indicators that clearly document the progress of Major Mayoral Initiatives over time.

- 7. Finding:** In general, footnotes in the Indicator volume do little or nothing to explain how the data making up the indicators were derived. This is a chronic deficiency, although the City Charter requires program performance goals for the current fiscal year and *a statement and explanation of performance measures* (Section 12(c)(1)) (emphasis added).

Recommendation: In the footnotes or in an Appendix, explain what each indicator means and how it was measured. Call special attention to changes in how specific indicators were measured. A contact person at each agency who can answer specific questions would also be a useful addition.
- 8. Finding:** The MMR has never included an Index. Locating programs and services, unless known to fall under the auspices of a particular agency, can be difficult. With so much data reported in the FY01 MMR Narrative volume, locating a particular program by skimming the text is unnecessarily time-consuming.

Recommendation: Include an Index.
- 9. Finding:** Although much progress has been made in recent years in posting the MMR and related tables on the City's website (www.nyc.gov), greater use of technology would enhance MMR user-friendliness.

Recommendation: Include cross-references to Agency websites and publications in the MMR that can provide the public with data in greater detail than is possible in the MMR. Create a link on the www.nyc.gov website that affords the public access to the MMR.
- 10. Finding:** Many City agencies continue to appear in the MMR without appropriate performance measures, particularly outcome measures, despite the importance of such measures to "managing for results," contemporary government management theory.

Recommendation: Develop appropriate performance measures, particularly outcome-oriented indicators, for all City agencies, using established performance standards (e.g., State and Federal standards) where applicable.
- 11. Finding:** The MMR Indicator volume contains few indicators that describe the cost per-person-served or per unit of service.

Recommendation: Use fiscal data more effectively by developing selected unit-cost and cost-effectiveness indicators.
- 12. Finding:** Although the City has made significant strides in creating performance-based contracts for contractors of City services, outcomes for these contracts are reported only in the aggregate for each agency and only in the Citywide Indicators section of the MMR Indicator volume.

Recommendation: Report outcomes for contracted services, together with other performance indicators, under the City agency responsible for monitoring the contracts in question. Provide more specific outcome measures as well as opportunities to compare the performances of individual contractors.

- 13. Finding:** Presenting Indicators based on averaged data can disguise variations occurring on a community basis, creating a misleading picture of City programs.
Recommendation: Include micro (community-based) as well as macro indicators to present a range of outcomes on a community basis for selected indicators. Consider using Federal Geographical Information Systems (GIS) maps to display variations across neighborhoods.
- 14. Finding:** Certain indicators in the MMR would be enhanced by a comparison with other U.S. cities, or with New York State as a whole.
Recommendation: Consider including cross-city (and/or New York State) comparisons to provide additional benchmarks for local performance outcomes.
- 15. Finding:** Over the past eight years, some indicators have been dropped that should be restored.
Recommendation: Include indicators important to assessing quality and effectiveness of City services that are not presently in the MMR.
- 16. Finding:** In recent years, a number of indicators have been added that improve the MMR.
Recommendation: These important agency indicators should be retained.

Introduction

The Mayor's Management Report, 25 Years Later

The requirement for a *Mayor's Management Report* ("MMR") was added to the City Charter in 1977. Since that time, it has served the general public as well as public officials as an important source of information regarding City services. The Charter mandates that the MMR provide the City Council, by January 30th (Preliminary MMR) and September 17th (Final MMR) of each year, information in six categories for each City agency. These six categories include program performance goals, an explanation of performance measures as well as a statement of actual performance for the entire fiscal year. The categories also include the status of internal controls as well as rulemaking and procurement actions undertaken by City agencies during the fiscal year.

Since 1995, the MMR has been published in three volumes: *Volume I, Agency Narratives*; *Volume II, Agency and Citywide Indicators*; and a *Summary* volume. In Fiscal Year 2001 (FY 01) a one-time supplement, entitled *Reengineering Municipal Services 1994-2001*, replaced the Summary volume. Prior to 1995, the MMR was published in a single volume, which incorporated both narrative descriptions and indicators of agency progress.

While the broad categories of information required by the MMR have remained unchanged over twenty-five years, the nature of the "performance measures" it publishes has changed considerably (see Table 1). Throughout the 1970s and into the 1980s, program and service evaluation concentrated on relatively simple measures of compliance. The evaluator determined whether or not the number of persons served or cases handled or requests processed met the performance expectations set for the respective service. These simple measures can be characterized as service "outputs," and while useful in gauging how much a service has accomplished in a given period, they do little to suggest how well the service was performed and, by extension, how well public dollars were spent. The first MMR, in 1977, coincided with this wave of governmental accountability that sought to develop performance measures to complement traditional fiscal auditing and, further, advocated public disclosure of performance outcomes.

By the 1990s, challenged by continued demands for public accountability, program evaluation came to mean something else. Increasing scarcity of public funds created an expectation of greater accountability for those funds. It is now no longer enough to know that a service was provided in the quantity and timely manner as intended. Public officials and the public need to know the goals and objectives for a service, how well the target of the service was served and, by extension, how well public dollars have been spent. This concept has come to be commonly known as "Managing for Results," and received a big boost in 1993 by passage of the Government Performance and Results Act by Congress. According to then President Clinton at the bill signing (August 3, 1993), "The law simply requires that we chart a course for every endeavor that we take the people's money for, see how well we are progressing, tell the public

how well we are doing, stop the things that don't work, and never stop improving the things that we think are worth investing in."¹

Table 1. MMR REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR EACH CITY AGENCY
<u>New York City Charter Section 12 (c):</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) program performance goals for the current fiscal year and a statement and explanation of performance measures; (2) a statement of actual performance for the entire previous fiscal year relative to program performance goals; (3) a statement of the status of the agency's internal control environment and systems, including a summary of any actions taken during the previous fiscal year, and any actions being taken during the current fiscal year to strengthen the agency's internal control environment and system; (4) a summary of rulemaking actions undertaken by the agency during the past fiscal year including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The number of rulemaking actions taken, (b) The number of such actions which were not noticed in the regulatory agenda prepared for such a fiscal year, including a summary of the reasons such rules were not included in such regulatory agenda, and (c) The number of such actions which were adopted under the emergency rulemaking procedures; (5) a summary of the procurement actions taken during the previous fiscal year, including (i) for each of the procurement methods specified in section three hundred twelve, the number and dollar value of the procurement contracts entered into during such fiscal year; and (ii) for all procurement contracts entered into pursuant to a procurement method other than that specified in paragraph one of subdivision a of section three hundred twelve, the number and dollar value of such procurement contracts by each of the reasons specified in paragraph one of subdivision b of section three hundred twelve; and (6) an appendix indicating the relationship between the program performance goals included in the management report pursuant to paragraph two of this subdivision and the corresponding expenditures made pursuant to the adopted budget for the previous fiscal year.

Managing for Results uses performance outcomes to assess the success of goals and objectives for service programs and as a factor in determining budgets for these programs. As described by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, performance outcomes under Managing for Results are naturally reliant upon service outputs and outcome measures. These measures are driven by the goals and objectives of the represented service. They are clearly defined and consistently applied, contain denominators as well as numerators, and respond to service changes over time. They also make frequent use of "benchmarks," numerical standards for measuring progress, either against the service itself or against other similar services or an accepted professional standard. The table below describes and contrasts forms of performance measurement as characterized by Managing for Results, intended for use by government services (see Table 2).

¹ See the following United States General Accounting Office, General Government Division publications: *The Results Act. An Evaluator's Guide to Assessing Agency Annual Performance Plans* (April 1998, GAO/GGD-10.1.20); *Managing for Results: Agencies' Annual Performance Plans Can Help Address Strategic Planning Challenges* (Jan. 30, 1998, GAO/GGD-98-44); and *Managing for Results: Analytic Challenges in Measuring Performance* (May 30, 1997, GAO/HEHS/GGD-97-138).

Table 2. MEASURES OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
(1) OUTPUT MEASURES
<p>(a) These indicators measure the physical quantity of a service provided. Measures may include the number of students promoted or graduated;</p> <p>(b) These indicators measure the physical quantity of a service provided that meets a test of quality. Measures may include the number of students graduated or promoted who have met a minimum pre-specified standard of achievement.</p>
(2) OUTCOME MEASURES
<p>(a) These indicators measure accomplishments or results that occur (at least partially) because of services provided. Results also include measures of public perceptions of outcomes. Measures may include the percentage of students achieving a specified skill level gain in reading.</p> <p>(b) Outcomes are particularly useful when presented as comparisons with results from previous years, entity-established targets or goals and objectives, generally accepted norms and standards, other parts of entity, or other comparable jurisdictions (both public and private). Measures may include 75 percent of the students achieving a skill-level gain in reading when the school district's objective is for at least 70 percent of the students to achieve a specified skill-level gain in reading or where 65 percent of the students statewide achieve a specified skill-level gain in reading.</p>
MEASURES THAT RELATE EFFORTS TO ACCOMPLISHMENTS
(1) EFFICIENCY MEASURES
that relate efforts to OUTPUTS of services
<p>These indicators measure the resources used or cost. . . per unit of output. They provide information about the production of an output at a given level of resource used and demonstrate an entity's relative efficiency when compared with previous results, internally established goals and objectives, generally accepted norms or standards or results achieved by similar jurisdictions. Measures may include the cost per full-time equivalent student of the cost per student promoted or graduated.</p>
(2) COST-OUTCOME MEASURES
that relate efforts to OUTCOMES or RESULTS of services
<p>These measures report the cost per unit of outcome or results. They relate costs and results so that management, elected officials, and the public can begin to assess the value of the services provided by an entity. Cost-outcome measures may include the cost per student who achieves a specified skill-level gain in reading.</p> <p>Source: Governmental Accounting Standards Board, <i>Service Efforts and Accomplishments Reporting, Preliminary Views of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board</i>. December 18, 1992, No. 093-A.</p>

While measures of service quality and efficiency have been added to the MMR over time, the MMR in many ways exists as a hybrid of the two contrasting approaches to program evaluation. Simple output indicators, some no longer relevant, exist side by side with relatively sophisticated outcome indicators. While output indicators are useful, they have their greatest utility in the MMR when they are reformulated to produce quality-driven outcome indicators (see illustration in Table 3).

Table 3. EXAMPLES OF OUTPUT INDICATORS EXPRESSED AS OUTCOME MEASURES

Agency	Current Output Measures	Suggested New Outcome Measures	Rationale to change current output measure for more meaningful outcome measure
HRA	Number of Persons/Cases Receiving Public Assistance	New persons/cases as a percentage of all persons/cases throughout the year who received public assistance.	The output measure is a monthly snapshot of the number of persons/cases receiving public assistance. The "HRA Facts" report tracks this output measure on a monthly basis and makes it available on its website. The suggested outcome measure would be more useful because it shows the rate of new persons/cases who need assistance.
FDNY (EMS)	Average Response Time to Life-Threatening Incidents	Rate of survival of patients when ambulance arrived at the hospital.	Average response time by itself is a less meaningful measure. The objective should be determining whether a patient survives when put in the care of EMS officials. Furthermore, EMS currently keeps this data.
DOH	Number of Medicaid Patients Enrolled in Medicaid Managed Care Plans	Average number of primary care visits, in-patient hospital cost or emergency room cost per Medicaid managed care enrollee as compared to average cost for Medicaid fee for service enrollee.	Enrollment is not an end in itself. The objective of enrolling Medicaid patients into managed care plans is to reduce Medicaid costs and improve access to primary care.

In addition to changing views regarding program evaluation, new technology has made data gathering and management possible to a degree not conceived of in 1977. Our capacity to use computers to store, change, update and manipulate data makes it possible to establish and maintain performance indicators over time without placing an undue burden on City agency staff. It also makes it possible to bring together fiscal data and program data in increasingly sophisticated ways, while the ease with which software can generate tables and charts makes the data increasingly accessible to the general public. Before the 1990s, the MMR was the only compendium of basic demographic data on all City services. Before desktop computers became commonplace, basic data on the numbers and characteristics of persons served by the City were much more difficult to cull. With data now readily available on websites and for download at the respective City agencies, however, the public is no longer dependent on the MMR as the sole source of basic information.

Changing Public Officials and the Timeliness of this Report

As term limits have simultaneously elected a new Mayor and a substantially changed City Council, they have provided an opportunity to take a longer view at the content and form of the MMR. The new Mayor will consider how the MMR can reflect his goals and priorities for his office. Similarly, the City Council will take a fresh look at the MMR as an adjunct to the budget process. This report is intended to provide both with points to consider in creating an MMR that meets the current needs of the City of New York.

Findings & Recommendations

Section I: Overall Structure and Content of the MMR

1. Finding: Since 1994, the Narrative Volume of the MMR has grown to encompass a variety of goals, objectives and indicators not represented in the Indicator volume. At times claims in the Narrative are contradicted by data in the Indicator volume.

Recommendation: Integrate the Agency narrative descriptions of goals and objectives with the Agency indicators, as was the case prior to 1995. Information reported in the Narrative should correspond to information reported in the Indicator volume.

Agencies become less accountable when information is presented in the Narrative volume, but not included in the Indicator volume. Information in the Indicator volume is more easily compared from year to year, and there is pressure to report data even when performance has decreased. In addition, when the reader reviews a standardized list of indicators, it is much more apparent when an agency has stopped reporting a particular indicator, or has added a new indicator. By contrast, information reported in the Narrative volume is less standardized from year to year, and much more difficult for the reader to compare from year to year.

Grouping the Agency goals and objectives statement and the Agency indicators is also consistent with the "Managing for Results" approach to service evaluation. Well-conceived indicators are the measure of the success of agency goals and objectives, and must be able to be readily compared to the agency goals. Separating the two defeats the purpose of developing and maintaining the indicators.

2. Finding: The work of Mayoral Offices is infrequently reported in the MMR, despite the fact that many of these offices provide direct services to the public and many operate with sizeable budgets. Where mention of the work of the Mayoralty is made, it has occurred in the Narrative volume only, without corresponding Indicators in the Indicator volume. On the other hand, City Boards and Commissions have been fairly well represented in the MMR.

Recommendation: Report on the objectives and outcomes of additional selected Mayoral Offices in the MMR. Suggestions include major offices such as the Office of Emergency Management, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Operations and Office of Contracts. Others that provide direct services to the public, and therefore are strong candidates for public reporting, are the Action Center, Office of Immigrant Affairs and Language Services and the Office for People with Disabilities. Although many City boards are included in the MMR, there are still notable absences, such as the Board of Elections.

The City Charter specifies that the Mayor report on "City agencies" in the MMR. Considering the Mayoralty itself as a City agency for this purpose is justified. First, the City Comptroller has long regarded the Mayoralty as a City agency, subject to its mandate to audit City agencies like any other. Second, as Table 4 illustrates, there are 46 offices or programs attributed to the Mayoralty that receive City funding and are listed in either the City *Green Book*, the City website www.nyc.gov, or both. The Mayoralty (excluding the Office of the Mayor) expended \$56,136,848 in FY01² and employed significant staff. The interests of "good government" argue in favor of greater reporting.

Finally, there is nothing in the City Charter that prohibits reporting on City activity over and above its strict requirements, and many mayors have done so. As documented in Table 4, the FY01 MMR includes reporting of the activities of Mayoral offices, boards, and affiliates including City University, the Civilian Complaint Review Board, the Economic Development Corporation and, most notably, the Board of Education. While activities of certain of the Mayor's Offices are mentioned in passing in the Narrative volume of the MMR— for those willing to search— none reports objectives and performance indicators in the Indicator volume.

Including the Offices of the Mayor in the MMR Indicator volume should be relatively easy. In the last few years, many offices and boards of the Mayoralty have developed excellent websites containing a wealth of information including, in some cases, outcome indicators.

² *Comptroller's Annual Financial Report*, p. 168.

Table 4. MAYORAL OFFICES, OTHER BOARDS & AUTHORITIES NOT INCLUDED IN FY 01 MAYOR'S MANAGEMENT REPORT INDICATOR VOLUME			
1	Action Center	19	NYC Tax Commission
2	Anti-Graffiti Task Force	20	NYC Transitional Finance Authority
3	Art Commission	21	NYC TSASC, Inc.
4	Biomedical Research and Development Task Force	22	Office for People with Disabilities
5	Board of Elections	23	Office of Contracts
6	Board of Standard & Appeals	24	Office of Emergency Management
7	Campaign Finance Board	25	Office of Grants Administration
8	Charter Revision Commission	26	Office of Immigrant Affairs & Language Services
9	Commission on the Status of Women	27	Office of Intergovernmental Affairs
10	Commission to Combat Family Violence	28	Office of Management & Budget
11	Community Assistance Unit	29	Office of Operations
12	Conflict of Interest Board	30	Office of Payroll Administration
13	Employees' Retirement System	31	Office of Veterans Affairs
14	Independent Budget Office	32	Rent Guidelines Board
15	Loft Board	33	United Nations, Consular Corps and Protocol
16	Municipal Water Finance Authority	34	Voluntary Action Center
17	NYC Empowerment Zone	35	Voter Assistance Commission
18	NYC Sports Commission	36	Year 2000 Project Office
MAYORAL OFFICES, OTHER BOARDS & AUTHORITIES INCLUDED IN THE FY 01 MAYOR'S MANAGEMENT REPORT INDICATOR VOLUME			
1	Board of Education	6	Health & Hospitals Corporation
2	Brooklyn Public Library	7	NYC Housing Authority
3	City University of New York	8	NYC Public Library
4	Civilian Complaint Review Board	9	Queens Borough Public Library
5	Economic Development Corporation	10	School Construction Authority

Source: List of mayoral offices, departments, and boards were compiled from <http://www.nyc.gov> and *The Green Book: 2000-2001*.

3. Finding: Despite clear City Charter requirements for performance goals and performance measures for the past and current fiscal years for all City agencies, the FY01 MMR Indicator volume omits five City agencies altogether.

Recommendation: Meet Charter requirements by including goals and performance indicators for these agencies in the MMR.

The five City agencies not represented in the Indicator volume of the FY01 MMR are as follows in Table 5:

Table 5. MAYORAL AGENCIES WITH NO INDICATORS*	
1	Department of City Planning
2	Department of Cultural Affairs
3	Department of Investigations
4	Department of Records and Information Services
5	Law Department

* Although discussed in separate sections within Volume I– Narrative, these agencies have no indicators (output/outcome/efficiency measures) in Volume II– Agency and Citywide Indicators.

4. Finding: Columns in the Indicator volume report the prior fiscal year's performance, the current year's performance and goals, but the reader has no idea whether the goals for the indicator were met in the prior fiscal year.

Recommendation: Add a new column that includes the performance target for the prior fiscal year with that year's reported outcome.

This recommendation responds to the difficulty in tracking agency objectives (e.g., Annual Plan and Fiscal 2002 Plan) in the current format of the MMR. The City Charter stipulates there be columns with last year's actual performance (e.g., Fiscal 2000 Actual), followed by columns with the objectives for the current year (FY01 Annual Plan), the actual performance for the current year (FY01 Annual Actual), and, finally, the next year's objectives (Fiscal 2002 Plan) (see Table 6). Current reporting follows the City Charter requirements. In effect, however, the MMR contains only one year's objectives and actual performance, making it difficult for the reader to evaluate the appropriateness of the objectives. An additional column disclosing the past year's "Annual Plan" would provide two years of goals and objectives, without having to resort to comparing two different MMRs, and would provide a better basis for determining the agency's success in meeting the objectives. It would also point out the appropriateness of the objectives which, in instances throughout the MMR, are raised or lowered without explanation or any apparent justification, such as in the case of HPD and occupancy rates included in Table 6.

Table 6. EXAMPLES OF THE NEED FOR PRIOR FISCAL YEAR'S PERFORMANCE GOAL IN ADDITION TO THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR'S IN THE MMR

Indicator	FY 00 Plan*	FY 00 Actual	FY 01 Plan	FY 01 Actual	FY 02 Plan
HRA: Timely implementation of fair hearing decisions for public assistance cases <i>(agency continually fails to meet goal)</i>	90%	70.5%	90%	74.6%	90%
DOH: DOH-treated TB patients completing treatment <i>(agency arbitrarily and continually sets goals that are lower than actual performance)</i>	80%	94.4%	80%	86.6%	80%
HPD: Occupancy Rate <i>(agency lowers goal to more closely reflect actual performance)</i>	72.8%	67.0%	71.2%	67.9%	69.4%

* This column is not currently included in the FY 01 Indicator volume. If it were included, the reader could determine whether an agency has met a stated objective over two consecutive years.

5. Finding: Separate Agency-wide Indicators, which are the only source of expenditure and employee data for many agencies, obscure relationships between program budgets and program outcomes.

Recommendation: Return Agency-wide Indicators, including data on contracted services, to the front of the indicator sections for each respective City agency.

Agency-wide indicators in the MMR Indicator volume include Expenditures (including State and Federal sources), Revenues, Total Employees, Paid Absence Rates (Sick Leave, Line of

Duty Injury), Overtime Earned, Agency Rulemaking Actions, Vehicle Fleets and Maintenance, Agency Procurement Actions (including City Contracts Awarded). These indicators generally represent service inputs and outputs. As such, they do not demonstrate how well a service was delivered, but they do reflect how efficiently it was delivered. Increases in an agency's employees, and especially in employee overtime, must be carefully weighed in light of agency results. In addition, relegating all data on contracted services to the back of the Indicator volume diminishes the opportunity to compare dollars spent and service outcomes between City-delivered and contracted services.

6. Finding: Major Mayoral Initiatives are reported inconsistently in the MMR Narrative and often lack corresponding indicators in the MMR Indicator volume.

Recommendation: Include indicators that clearly document the progress of Major Mayoral Initiatives over time.

From the standpoint of Mayoral accountability, a Mayor's special initiatives offer the criteria by which an administration asks that it be appraised. If these initiatives are reported inconsistently, or in narrative form only, the public has an unclear picture of what the initiatives have accomplished. Tracking outcomes of Mayoral initiatives is particularly important, because the dollars that go to support them generally represent dollars that otherwise would have gone to standard City services.

Several examples come to mind. The Mayor's HealthStat initiative, which began in June 2000, seeks to mobilize all "City agencies to identify and enroll uninsured New Yorkers." While the FY01 MMR Narrative describes the HealthStat initiative in some detail, critical outcome measures are missing. The public is left to question, what were each agency's goals for referral and enrollment during the reporting period, and were these goals met?

Another example on inconsistent reporting concerns the Mayor's New York/New York housing initiative for the mentally ill homeless, administered by the Department of Homeless Services. The number of housing units developed, a valid outcome measure, appears in the Narrative volume only and does not appear in the Indicator volume. The numbers of people on waiting lists for this housing, another important outcome measure, does not appear in the MMR at all.

A final example concerns the Administration for Children's Services' Neighborhood-based Services initiative. Although the initiative is a key program of the agency, there are no indicators in the MMR Indicator volume to document progress in carrying out its objectives, and only program goals are identified in the MMR Narrative volume. For instance, both the FY00 and FY01 MMR Narrative volumes set as a goal that the initiative implement neighborhood-based service contracts Citywide by the end of the respective fiscal year. Although the City failed to meet this goal for FY00, the FY01 MMR Narrative volume does not disclose this fact. Overall, the indicators that appear in the Narrative volume should be moved to the Indicator volume and updated each year so that progress in implementing Neighborhood-based Services can be tracked.

7. Finding: In general, footnotes in the Indicator volume do little or nothing to explain how the data making up the indicators were derived. This is a chronic deficiency, although the City Charter requires “program performance goals for the current fiscal year and *a statement and explanation of performance measures*” (Section 12(c)(1)) (emphasis added).

Recommendation: In the footnotes or in an Appendix, explain what each indicator means and how it was measured. Call special attention to changes in how specific indicators were measured. A contact person at each agency who can answer specific questions would also be a useful addition.

Occasionally, footnotes in the MMR are very helpful, but more often, they are misleading or conspicuously absent. It is often impossible to determine how the data making up an indicator were derived, and therefore what the indicator means. An explanation of year-to-year changes in the objectives for an indicator is also essential to understanding the meaning of the indicator. Lack of appropriate explanatory notes has the effect of undermining readers' confidence in the accuracy of the reported information. The following table selected from the FY01 MMR provides examples of the problem (see Table 7).

Table 7. EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS WITH UNHELPFUL EXPLANATORY FOOTNOTES

Agency	Indicator	Footnote Provided	Comment
HRA	Agency Reversals in Fair Hearings (increased)	"Although the agency presents well-documented cases at fair hearings, HRA attributes the increase to the State Administrative Law Judges deciding more issues in favor of the appellants."	The reason for the increase does no more than restate the indicator since "agency reversals" are always due to a judgment in favor of the appellant.
DEP	DEP-Initiated complaints received for Air and Noise (decreased)	"Total complaints received were below Plan due to a decrease in the number of DEP-initiated air and noise complaints."	The circular logic of this footnote fails to explain why the number of DEP-initiated complaints decreased.
DOT	Red flags routed (decreased)	"The number of flags routed on the City's bridges is based on the number of flagged conditions found. Flags are routed by City DOT inspectors and New York State DOT inspectors, both of whom must adhere to State standards"	This footnote neither defines the term "routed" nor provides a reason for the decrease in the number of "red flags routed."
BOE	Rate at which Gen. Ed. & Resource Room Pupils Met or Exceeded Standards in English and Math	"The Board supports academic progress through its math reforms, Academic Intervention Services, Saturday Classes and Summer School Programs. See Narrative."	The list of programs cited by the Board, while laudable, does not help explain why some grades experienced a decreasing number of students who met or exceeded standards in English and Math.
BOE	Number of Students Passing Regents Examination in Mathematics (decreased)	"The decrease in the number of students passing the Mathematics Regents examination reflects the decrease in the number of students who took the Regents."	Although this statement is correct on a simple numerical basis, a subsequent indicator reveals that a smaller percentage of students passed the Mathematics Regents.
DHS	Families at EAU over 24 hours (increased)	"More families applied for temporary housing at the EAU during Fiscal 2001 than during Fiscal 2000. As a result, the number of families per day for whom it took more than 24 hours to process an application [increased]."	An 187 percent increase in the number of families at the EAU over 24 hours is grossly disproportionate to a 10 percent increase in the number of families applying for temporary housing. Similar discrepancy also applies to the number of families that were placed in overnight accommodations and to the number of families at the EAU overnight.

8. Finding: The MMR has never included an Index. Locating programs and services, unless known to fall under the auspices of a particular agency, can be difficult. With so much data reported in the FY01 MMR Narrative volume, locating a particular program by skimming the text is unnecessarily time-consuming.

Recommendation: Include an Index.

Readily available computer software, which searches for specified key words in a text, makes the compiling of an Index a relatively simple exercise.

9. Finding: Although much progress has been made in recent years in posting the MMR and related tables on the City's website (www.nyc.gov), greater use of technology would enhance MMR user-friendliness.

Recommendation: Include cross-references to Agency websites and publications in the MMR that can provide the public with data in greater detail than is possible in the MMR. Create a link on the www.nyc.gov website that affords the public access to the MMR.

Table 8 lists City agencies and corresponding key publications that should be referenced in the MMR. Most of these City agencies participate in the Citywide Accountability Program (CAP), and may be accessed through the link for CAP on the City of New York website, www.nyc.gov. The CAP, modeled after the Police Department's COMPSTAT program, utilizes statistical information to evaluate City agency performance.

Three agencies that are not part of the CAP– the Board of Education (BOE), Administration for Children's Services (ACS), and Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC)– publish a variety of reports that may be accessed directly on the individual agencies' websites. For the BOE, this is www.nycenet.edu; for ACS, www.nyc.gov/html/acs/home.html; and for HHC, www.nyc.gov/html/hhc/home.html. In addition, HHC distributes quarterly and monthly performance reports at the public meetings of the HHC Board. Depending upon the information available directly to the public through websites and publications, it may be possible to omit some output indicators– not outcome indicators– from the MMR if the agency regularly reports those outputs.

Table 8. PUBLICATIONS WITH ADDITIONAL INDICATORS FOR REFERENCING IN THE MMR

<p><u>Administration for Children's Services</u> -Monthly Update -End of Year Report -Five-Year Report -Glossary of Indicators</p>	<p><u>Dept. of Health</u> -HealthTrac Fact Sheets -see also DOH publications lists</p>	<p><u>Dept. of Finance</u> Finance*Stat</p>
<p><u>Board of Education</u> -Annual School Report Cards -School-Based Budget Books -Flash Reports</p>	<p><u>Dept. of Housing Preservation and Development</u> Housing Operations Management System (HOMES)</p>	<p><u>Dept. of Youth & Community Development</u> Active Comprehensive Holistic Indicative Educational Validated Excellence (ACHIEVE Stat)</p>
<p><u>Dept. of Buildings</u> Building Understanding Integrity Leadership Dedication (BUILD)</p>	<p><u>Dept. of Juvenile Justice</u> Group -Oriented Analysis and Leadership Strategies (GOALS)</p>	<p><u>Fire Dept.</u> Management Appraisal Reviews and Comparisons (MARC)</p>
<p><u>Citywide Administrative Services</u> Agency Internal Management System (AIMS)</p>	<p><u>Dept. of Parks & Recreation</u> ParkStat Plus+</p>	<p><u>Human Resources Administration</u> -HRA Facts -Public Assistance Indicators -Glossary of Indicators</p>
<p><u>Dept. of Consumer Affairs</u> ConsumerStat</p>	<p><u>Dept. of Probation</u> Statistical Tracking, Analysis & Reporting System (STARS)</p>	<p><u>Police Dept</u> - Weekly citywide, borough and precinct crime statistics - Stop and Frisk Data from 1998-2000.</p>
<p><u>Dept. of Correction</u> Total Efficiency Accountability Management System (TEAMS)</p>	<p><u>Dept. of Transportation</u> Management Ownership Vision Empowerment (MOVE)</p>	<p><u>Taxi & Limousine Commission</u> Management Accountability and Productivity Program (MAPP)</p>
<p><u>Dept. of Environmental Protection</u> CAP indicators</p>	<p><u>Health and Hospitals Corp.</u> -HHC Trends -Strategic Plan Quarterly Progress -Monthly Financial/non-Financial Performance Indicator Report</p>	

Section II: Reporting by City Agencies

For this report, the Comptroller's Office undertook an extensive analysis of the MMR from FY93 to FY01, building a database of indicators in the MMR by agency, adding new and deleting old indicators as they changed from year to year. This database provided a wealth of information to analyze and summarize— more than 5,500 indicators of various types that appeared in the MMR during these nine years. Findings based on this analysis make up the balance of this report.

10. Finding: Many City agencies continue to appear in the MMR without appropriate performance measures, particularly outcome measures, despite the importance of such measures to "managing for results," contemporary government management theory.

Recommendation: Develop appropriate performance measures, particularly outcome-oriented indicators, for all City agencies, using established performance standards (e.g., State and Federal standards) where applicable.

Consistent with a survey performed by the Government Performance Project, sponsored by *Governance* magazine,³ many City agencies still lack appropriate indicators of program outcomes. In evaluating the FY99 MMR in 2000, the Government Performance Project found that outcome measures were in place for about one-third of City agencies. For those City agencies that provide direct services to the public, the Project reported two-thirds had some outcome measures in place.

Based on the FY01 MMR Indicator volume, the Comptroller's Office sought to update the findings of the Government Performance Project. A count of overall indicators by City agency and a count of outcome indicators revealed that currently, just 20 percent of 2,606 indicators in the MMR were "outcome" indicators.⁴ The proportion of outcome indicators also varied considerably from agency to agency, from a low of 0 percent for the Landmarks Preservation Commission and the Department of Homeless Services to a high of 63 percent in the Department of Parks and Recreation (see Table 9). "Outcome" indicators are those that employed a numerical measure judged to represent service quality or effectiveness – a definition consistent with that of the "Managing for Results" theory.

³ "Grading the Cities: A Management Report Card," *Governing*, February 2000.

⁴ This calculation includes only Agency Indicators and excludes Citywide Indicators and indicators in the Narrative volume.

Table 9. OUTCOME MEASURES AS A PERCENT OF AN AGENCY'S INDICATORS

City Agency	Total Indicators	% Outcome Measures
Police Department	163	18%
Fire Department	128	45%
Department of Correction	55	13%
Department of Probation	99	19%
Department of Juvenile Justice	35	17%
Civilian Complaint Review Board	47	32%
Department of Transportation	129	24%
Department of Environmental Protection	87	18%
Department of Housing Preservation and Development	100	6%
School Construction Authority	27	37%
NYC Housing Authority	52	23%
Department of Design and Construction	108	11%
Department of Sanitation	65	18%
Department of Parks and Recreation	73	63%
Landmarks Preservation Commission	22	0
Public Libraries	56	5%
Department of Business Services	39	5%
NYC Economic Development Corporation	16	31%
Department of Health	79	23%
Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	9	18%
Health and Hospitals Corporation	101	6%
Dept. of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Alcoholism Services	12	30%
Human Resources Administration	172	19%
Administration for Children's Services	80	14%
Department of Homeless Services	47	0
Department of Employment	45	47%
Department of Youth and Community Development	54	13%
Department for the Aging	18	24%
Board of Education	247	30%
City University of New York	56	21%
Department of Consumer Affairs	53	8%
Department of Buildings	113	12%
Taxi and Limousine Commission	47	9%
Department of Finance	63	19%
Department of Citywide Administrative Services	35	17%
Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications	43	16%
City Commission on Human Rights	31	3%
NYC Agency Average	70	20%

Source: Calculated by NYC Comptroller's Office based on the number of indicators categorized as "outcome measures" divided by the total number of agency indicators from FY 01 MMR Volume II.

Recommended New Outcome Measures

Our findings include a number of recommendations for selected additional performance measures. They appear below, listed by City Agency.

Department of Health (DOH)

1. The City should develop quantitative measures of the extent to which DOH is prepared to respond to future threats of bioterrorism. One set of measures would include the ability of DOH labs to perform tests in a timely manner for various emerging contagious diseases, such as anthrax, smallpox, and West Nile virus. Another set of measures would document DOH's ability to identify and track the spread of such diseases. These measures would include indicators related to doctor and hospital reporting of unusual outbreaks of illness; DOH's response to these reports; and the effectiveness of DOH's infrastructure for emergency response to infectious diseases.

2. The MMR should contain additional outcomes related to screening for major preventable illnesses. The MMR presents the number of reported cases of various illnesses (lead poisoning, sexually transmitted diseases, etc.), but it does not include data on the total numbers tested by DOH and non-DOH providers, and the goals for this testing. Similarly, the NYC Health Code requires new students to have a physical upon entering school. The MMR Indicator volume reports the absolute number of physical exams performed each year for new public school students. However, nowhere does the MMR report the number of exams performed as a percentage of all the new students required to have them, although the number of new entrants is readily available from the Board of Education (ATS "admission code 58").

3. DOH reporting in the MMR omits two important outcome indicators for women's health: the number of reported cases of chlamydia, the City's most common sexually transmitted disease, affecting primarily women; and the percent of women in the City receiving annual pap smears for early detection of cervical cancer.

4. The FY00 MMR Narrative volume introduced an important outcome measure of the public's health: the number of asthma hospitalizations. However, to contribute fully to the public's understanding of trends in public health over time, "asthma hospitalizations" would be more sensibly placed in the Indicator Volume with other Department of Health's indicators that are tracked year to year.

5. DOH is responsible for ensuring that houses and apartments comply with regulations requiring window guards to protect children from accidental falls. Good outcome measures include the number of falls by children that were preventable, and how many falls by children were fatal. These indicators appeared in the Narrative volume in FY98, FY99 and FY00, but were omitted from both volumes in the FY01 MMR. Had these indicators appeared in the Indicator volume, their omission would have been much less likely.

Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC)

1. The FY01 MMR Narrative volume lists 15 objectives for HHC, but only 9 of the 15 have corresponding quantitative indicators. Of these 9 indicators presented in the Narrative volume, only 4 also appear in the Indicator volume. All 15 objectives should be represented in the Indicator volume. For example, one of the objectives without a quantitative indicator is, “implement the Community Health Partnership Program.” According to HHC documents, a goal of the Community Health Partnership Program is to increase primary care capacity by collaborating with community-based providers. One indicator of such collaborations is the number of patients using HHC clinics and hospitals who have been referred by these community-based providers. The financial benefits to HHC of such collaborations could be measured by dividing the number of referrals into “insured” (Medicaid, Medicare, etc.) and “uninsured” patients.

2. The MMR should include an indicator documenting the number of enrollees in HHC's own Medicaid Managed Care plan, Metroplus, who voluntarily cancel their enrollments. This number should be reported as a percentage of the total number of Metroplus enrollees. Voluntary cancellations are an excellent gauge of patient satisfaction; they can also be viewed as an index of HHC's competitiveness among health care providers. To assure its future financial viability, HHC cannot afford to lose Medicaid patients.

3. Since one of HHC's primary goals is to serve those who are uninsured and unable to get medical care elsewhere, the MMR should report the numbers of uninsured patients treated at HHC facilities as well as those treated by other providers. HHC collects these data and has reported them to the HHC Board.

Emergency Medical Services (EMS)

1. EMS outcome indicators in the MMR focus almost exclusively on ambulance response time. Average response time in particular is misleading, as it disguises those ambulance runs that fail to meet medical standards. Response time can also be measured by the percentage of responses taking less time than a benchmark response time, a measure preferred by the Commission on the Accreditation of Ambulance Services, the American Heart Association, and other professional groups. The MMR does include this indicator but, unfortunately, uses a benchmark of six minutes, which is considered by many to be much too high for responses to life-threatening incidents like cardiac arrest, and therefore a poor measure of quality medical care. American Heart Association guidelines conclude, the "goal is to provide CPR and defibrillation [to someone in cardiac arrest] within four minutes of an EMS emergency call." We recommend that EMS adopt a response standard for life-threatening incidents of four minutes.

2. In addition to ambulance response time, it is important to include measures of the quality of medical attention received by patients using ambulances. One obvious indicator that should be added to the MMR is the percentage of patients surviving the ride to the hospital.

Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)

1. Progress in meeting Federal air quality standards, such as those governing fine particulates, ozone, and carbon monoxide, are not currently reported in the MMR and should be. Data are currently drawn from air quality monitors stationed around the City and reported by the State Department of Environmental Conservation. The City has yet to meet some of these standards, and even where it has, higher State or Federal standards, especially for fine particulate matter, may soon apply.

2. The MMR should report specific key Federal drinking water standards, such as total levels of coliform bacteria and disinfection logarithms, which are a statistical measure of the successful removal of certain pathogens from drinking water.

3. The FY01 MMR Narrative includes the goal "Develop and implement a water quality protection program to ensure the future quality of the City's water supply," without including corresponding indicators in the Indicator volume. Suggested indicators are the number of watershed sewage treatment plant upgrades completed and the number of cases per year of *cryptosporidiosis* and *giardiasis* infection.

4. Establish indicators in the Indicator volume that report on the City's success in meeting filtration avoidance program goals. The FY01 MMR contains significant narrative material on meeting these program goals, but without associated indicators in the Indicator volume, it is difficult to locate this information. For example, the MMR Indicator volume should include the total expenditures incurred under the Watershed Memorandum of Agreement.

5. Report on pending litigation against DEP for environmental violations associated with agency programs or facilities. Report on agency actions and budget allocations committed to compliance with court orders and completed litigation.

Department of Sanitation (DOS)

1. Report on the DOS "residue rates." These are the percentage of total materials set out for recycling collection that are later determined to be non-recyclable. Create separate indicators for paper, glass-metal-plastic, and bulk waste.

2. Develop an indicator that reports the cost-per-ton per contract for the current export and disposal of City waste. Provide year-by-year comparisons.

3. Report on specific steps accomplished to develop the City's long-term waste export plan, including an accounting for setbacks or delays.

Department of Transportation (DOT)

1. Include an indicator corresponding to the goal stated in the FY01 MMR Narrative: "Ensure that a minimum of 31.5 percent of bridges are rated either Good or Very Good condition." The MMR Indicator volume already indicates that "deck areas" are in "good repair," but this goal is only a part of a larger goal of keeping bridges in good repair. In addition, since the "deck area" goal is only 20 percent, it may be set too low. DOT actually met that goal two years in a row; good management suggests a progressive lifting of the bar.

2. Report on air quality at selected traffic congestion sites, using existing air quality monitors. Provide site-by-site performance indicators and whether they meet Federal Clean Air Act standards. Also measure the number of vehicles per hour at these sites, as well as the average speed of traffic at selected sites in each borough. These indicators would provide useful data to DOT to determine fulfillment of its mission to create efficient movement of vehicles around the City.

3. The FY01 MMR Narrative refers to a goal of increasing riders on City and privately owned ferries. Establish corresponding indicators in the Indicator volume that measure ferry ridership by route, and develop a target goal for increased ridership.⁵ These indicators will provide urban transportation planners and the public a better basis for making budget and transportation decisions.

Human Resources Administration (HRA)

1. Add separate indicators – input, output, outcome, and efficiency measures - for Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) cases that have been transferred over to Safety Net Assistance – Non Cash (SNA-NC) (New York State's income support program for public assistance recipients who have exceeded the 5-year time limit on TANF benefits, and those who have received SNA for 24 cumulative months).

2. For the TANF, SNA and SNA-NC programs, add indicators that include the average length of time in each program, as well as the reasons for leaving each program. For families whose reason for leaving is employment, include data on the source of the job– public or private sector– and the average monthly wages. In addition, report the percentage of families now employed that continue to receive Medicaid, Food Stamps, or publicly subsidized child care. It is important to track the families who do not receive TANF, SNA or SNA-NC but who do receive Medicaid, Food Stamps, or subsidized child care since tracking discloses the number of families/persons who qualify for these benefits because their wages are so low. Without these benefits, many more families would not be able to work and would be dependent on TANF, SNA or SNA-NC.

3. HRA should include complete indicators on the numbers of Work Experience Program (WEP) participants by City agency or nonprofit organization in which they are placed. This recommendation responds to concerns by advocates and labor unions that some agencies are too reliant on WEP participants for labor and that WEP assignments have replaced many positions at those agencies that had previously paid a living wage.

4. Although there is an indicator in the MMR that reports "HIV/AIDS Clients Moved into Housing," the MMR should also provide breakouts for the numbers of people who received temporary housing (SROs and hotels) versus those who received permanent housing – a change requested by the City Council.

⁵ Indicator numbers for only the Staten Island Ferry are in the FY01 MMR Indicator volume.

Department of Employment (DOE)

1. DOE has many indicators that are reported in the FY01 MMR Narrative that also belong in the Indicator volume. These include data on the number of students employed under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and Job Opportunities for Youth (JOY) programs, with separate reporting of those employed during the summer months.

2. Add indicators on the average monthly wage of jobs obtained and whether the jobs were in the public, private, or non-profit sectors.

Department of Finance (DOF)

1. Endorsing a suggestion by the City Council, add indicators that identify all tax abatement and tax relief programs administered by DOF by the type, targeted goal, number of users, and rate of use. Such programs, mentioned in the Narrative volume only, include the School Tax Relief program, Co-op/Condo Abatement Program, Commercial Expansion Program, and the Lower Manhattan Commercial Lease Abatement Program. In FY 01, the first two programs alone generated \$262 million dollars in tax savings for 819,000 homeowners, and the two latter programs, through various tax incentives, affected more than 1.4 million square feet of office space.

Department of Business Services/Economic Development Corporation (EDC)

1. From the FY93 MMR to the FY01 MMR, there has been a sharp decrease in the numbers of indicators for the EDC— from 108 to 16. While there was probably too much detail presented in FY93, the current FY01 MMR has overly reduced the level of detail, reporting only the total numbers of companies and jobs retained and recruited, and the total dollar value of these outcomes. Accountability demands further details, such as the number of jobs created or retained by program or employment sector, and the establishment of a relationship between EDC program goals and these outcomes. EDC reports its activities in much greater detail in its Local Law 69 Annual Report, which should be used as the basis for constructing revised goals and outcome indicators for inclusion in the MMR.

Department of Business Services (DBS)

1. A stated purpose of DBS is to conduct outreach to small businesses. The FY01 MMR records the total number of businesses reached, but does not define "reaching." The reader does not know that these contacts made are through cold calls, seminar attendance, etc. Without this information, it is impossible to determine which types of outreach activities are more successful.

2. Another objective of DBS, described in the FY01 MMR Narrative volume, is "evaluate BID effectiveness based in part on the Mayor's scorecard [which measures cleanliness], marketing and promotion efforts, and increases in new businesses or increases in retail sales as reported by individual businesses." However, this ambitious objective has no corresponding indicators in the MMR by which to determine its success.

Department of Homeless Services (DHS)

1. Although the FY01 MMR Indicator volume reports the average number of families, as well as single men and women, sheltered daily, the number of children affected is not reported, but should be.

2. While the numbers of shelter facilities and persons using these facilities are reported, it would be helpful to know the number of beds available by each type of temporary housing.

3. Add indicators regarding crime in the shelters, such as the number of violent incidents, thefts, etc., as well as variables pertaining to the Mayor's new initiative (January 2002) to decrease crime in the shelters (number/cost of police in shelters, etc.).

4. Add data regarding the fair hearing process for people denied housing, such as the number of hearings requested and the outcomes of fair hearings (i.e., client withdrawals, agency reversals, etc.).

5. Break down the number of people in temporary housing by type of housing (e.g., mental health facilities, substance abuse facility). In the FY01 MMR Narrative, the City referred to placements in these social service facilities as desirable outcomes and goals for DHS. As such, they should be separately listed.

6. Add the percentage of families completing the eligibility review process within 10 days of arrival at the Emergency Assistance Unit. This was reported in the FY01 MMR Narrative volume as an objective for the Department.

7. Add the number of individuals and/or families requesting Rental Assistance Program (RAP) and Family Rental Assistance Program (FRAP) vouchers along with the average waiting time for each. Also include the number of individuals and families receiving vouchers in the MMR Indicator volume, as it is in only the FY01 MMR Narrative.

Commission on Human Rights

1. Break down the number of cases closed by Commission attorneys to show the outcomes for substantive closures (benefit to complainant, no benefit to complainant, etc.). A study by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York (2001) showed that few cases are closed with a benefit to the complainant.

Department of Consumer Affairs

1. Add the average length of time required to resolve consumer complaints, as this is a key indicator of the Department's efficiency. Currently, the average processing time is listed only for parking lots, furniture stores, electronics stores, and home-improvement contractors. A more meaningful processing time indicator would include all categories of complaints, not just selected ones.

Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD)

1. Add to the MMR Indicator volume the number of youth placed in employment as well as the number of employers listing new job vacancies for youth through the Youth Empowerment Services (YES) Commission, a Mayoral initiative that identifies, develops, and funds job opportunities for youth aged 14 to 21.

2. The MMR provides the percentage of program participants achieving "positive outcomes." As observed by the City Council, "positive outcomes" should be defined for each program and report, and should include not only the number of persons achieving such outcomes, but more importantly, the percentage of participants who do so.

Administration for Children's Services (ACS)

1. In order to gauge the stability of foster care placements, add indicators documenting the percentage of foster children who have been in only one placement, the percentage who have been in two, and the percentage who have been in three or more placements.

2. Add to the MMR Indicator volume the number of cases per TASA caseworker, as the client-caseworker ratio is purportedly very high. TASA is the Federal Teen Age Services Act, which provides case management services for pregnant and parenting teenagers who are public assistance recipients.

Department for the Aging (DFTA)

1. Include the number of Home Care service requests, as the City Council has previously noted. DFTA's Home Care program serves the frail elderly who are not Medicaid eligible and who require non-medical in-home assistance. This vulnerable population has had to wait for DFTA services in the past. It would help in evaluating the extent of need citywide as well as need within each borough, if statistics were available on the number of Home Care service requests, the number of requests rejected, the average waiting time, and the average number on the waiting list each month.

Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services (DMHMRAS)

1. Since the Department of Health and the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services are being consolidated into the Department of Public Health, it is more important than ever to include comprehensive reporting on the programs of this agency. 1. The FY01 MMR Indicator volume includes only seven indicators on DMHMRAS, although the FY01 Narrative volume includes more than six pages of information, including statistics not included in the Indicator volume. Indicators appearing only in the Narrative volume include data on the number of programs and clients served in each of the Department's service areas: Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Alcoholism/Substance Abuse services.

2. The Narrative volume also includes measures on contractor performance, i.e., the percent of performance measures met by DMHMRAS-contracted agencies, and both output and outcome indicators for the Assisted Outpatient Treatment (Kendra's Law) program, the Community LINK forensic treatment programs and programs created through Reinvestment Funding. Including these output and outcome measures in the Indicator volume would permit assessment of the performance of the contractors. Currently, the number of agencies whose contracts were cancelled is the only contractor performance indicator reported in the MMR Indicator volume.

Department of Parks and Recreation

1. Improve the existing indicator in the Indicator volume, "Public Service Requests Received." A full 63 percent of requests are classified as "other"; more categories are needed to identify high-volume requests.

2. The addition in the FY00 Indicator volume of the outcome measure, “TreesRemoved within 30 Days,” expressed a reasonable goal for department efficiency of 90 percent. However, since the department has achieved 99 percent for two consecutive years, the target should be updated to set a more ambitious goal. Trees should be removed as quickly as possible to lower the risk of injury to the public or damage to property - the faster, the better in terms of the City’s interests.

3. The FY01 MMR Indicator volume reports the overall number of large and small playgrounds, parks, and sitting areas inspected, as well as the percentage of these inspections that were rated “acceptable.” Nowhere, however, is there an indication of the percentage of all playgrounds and parks that were, in fact, inspected. The raw number of inspections may (or may not) reflect coverage of just a fraction of park and playground acreage.

4. The MMR has never reported the condition of recreational facilities (i.e., Tennis Courts, Swimming Pools, Ball Fields, Ice Skating Rinks). The condition of these facilities should be reported for each type of facility, to identify areas needing additional attention.

Board of Education (BOE)

1. In general, the BOE section of the MMR would benefit by additional outcome measures of parent satisfaction. Results from the inaugural Parent Satisfaction Survey by the BOE are due to be reported in the FY02 Preliminary MMR, and are a welcome addition.

2. The FY01 MMR Narrative volume reports that the Office of Parent Advocacy at the Board maintains a log of parent complaints and their disposition. Indicators on the number, type, and resolution of parent complaints should be added to the MMR Indicator volume.

3. Goals for the BOE in the FY01 MMR Narrative include implementation of a “Building Capacity for Parent Involvement” protocol and a pledge to develop comprehensive District parent involvement programs in FY01. There are, as yet, no corresponding measures in the Indicator volume.

4. Indicators for BOE administration in the Indicator volume are simple, aggregate counts, and not as useful as they might otherwise be. For example, the Central Board headcount is reported only by its total. To be meaningful, the headcount should be broken out into administrative centers— Chancellor, Payroll and Personnel, Audit and Accounting, Instructional Support, etc.— and baseline ratios of central staff to students calculated. Meaningful objectives would follow. In fact, the BOE’s annual *School Based Budget* and *School Based Expense Reports*, begun in 1997, report per pupil costs for all central and local school administration, as well as direct instructional costs. These would arguably provide better outcome measures than those now used.

5. There are currently no indicators in the FY01 MMR Indicator volume associated with the City’s growing number of charter schools, although, as reported in the Narrative volume there are currently 17 charter schools in operation in New York City. These are publicly funded, privately managed schools for which the BOE Chancellor has oversight. By August 1st of each

year, each charter school is required to report, in writing, data on their student populations, academic outcomes including the results of standardized tests required of all publicly-funded schools, as well as an accounting of their revenues and expenditures. Indicators based on this data should be made available to the public in the MMR.

6. The FY01 MMR Narrative contains a number of worthy goals associated with teacher recruitment and retention; however, the Indicator volume has no corresponding indicators. The Indicator volume should include a cost-effectiveness indicator that expresses the amount of dollars spent for each teacher recruited. In addition, tracking the number of uncertified teachers in the City's SURR⁶ schools is important. Although the FY01 MMR Indicator volume does report the number of all teachers who are certified, the State Education Department has set as a specific goal for the Board of Education, the elimination of uncertified teachers in the SURR schools. Last, although New York City has among the highest teacher turnover rates in New York State— 19 percent annually— there are no associated indicators in the MMR.

7. Although there are a number of indicators related to the BOE revised Promotional Policy, such as the Percent of Students Promoted upon Completing Summer School, more data is needed. Data should include documentation of the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) program, which serves students who are retained in grade, having failed to meet requirements after attending Summer School. In addition, the outcomes of students retained must be carefully reported in the MMR Indicator volume— there were 24,370 students in grades 3 –8 alone, retained after Summer School 2001, as reported in the FY01 MMR Narrative volume. Presently, there is only a passing reference to these students in the Narrative volume, with the promise of more information to come.

8. Although new State standards requiring high school students to pass Regents exams as a condition of graduation have affected the Class of 2000 and the Class of 2001, data provided in the FY01 MMR make it all but impossible to understand the impact. For example, the MMR reports the number of students passing the Regents exams (English Language Arts and Mathematics) required for graduation, and the number of students meeting graduation requirements. These are entirely different numbers, because students take the tests when they are ready, sometimes as juniors, sometimes as seniors, and can take them multiple times if need be. To understand progress towards graduation, however, it is critical to have the data reported by graduating class. For example, the report should indicate how many students started as freshmen in the Class of 2000 and 2001, and what were their promotional outcomes. From the indicators alone, combined with an absence of explanatory footnotes, it is impossible to know. The new Regents graduation requirements are a significant challenge to the school system. The public must have clear indicators of student progress in meeting these requirements.

School Construction Authority (SCA)

1. There is commendable outcome information in the FY01 Indicator volume on the SCA, such as the percentage of projects completed on time or early; however, the section still suffers from a lack of indicators concerning the final cost of projects and whether or not projects came in on budget.

⁶ SURR schools, "School Under Registration Review," are singled out by the State Education Department for possible closure as a result of chronic poor performance.

2. In addition, while the number of student “spaces”– seats– created is documented, it would be helpful to know what percentage of the overall projected need these new seats constitute.

Housing Preservation & Development (HPD)

1. Although indicators for the Housing Litigation Bureau in the FY01 Indicator volume include Judgments & Settlements, there is no record of the number of cases taken up on appeal, of the dollar value of current uncollected fines, or of the number of liens against property filed for uncollected fines.

2. Both the HPD Emergency Repairs and the Lead Paint sections of the MMR Indicator volume fail to state HPD’s cost to abate lead paint, whether the landlord was billed, and what HPD has collected from the landlord for abatement. These indicators should be added.

New York Police Department (NYPD)

1. Several indicators related to NYPD objectives have been added to the FY01 MMR Indicator volume under the headings “Gun Strategy,” “Youth Strategy,” “Drug Strategy,” “Domestic Violence Strategy,” and “Quality of Life Strategy.” These indicators include, for example, under Gun Strategy, “Weapons Confiscated,” and under Domestic Violence Strategy, “Violations of Orders of Protection Arrests.” However, the majority of these new indicators are output indicators. They would be improved by the inclusion of outcome indicators, such as the percentage of firearm search warrants that result in the confiscation of weapons.

2. Transit Police. Prior to 1995, when the Transit Police was merged with the NYPD, Transit Police activity was not reported in the MMR. Since that time, the MMR Indicator volume has included indicators of major felony crimes occurring under Transit Police jurisdiction. Outcome indicators, such as the number of arrests, as well as borough-by-borough breakouts of crime and arrest statistics, should also be included.

3. Housing Police. The Housing Police Department’s closed circuit television program, reported only in the MMR Narrative volume, should be included in the Indicator volume, and should report the number of closed circuit televisions added each year.

Department of Correction

1. Add to the MMR Indicator volume, as a measure of prison safety, the number of inmate attacks on correction officers.

Department of Probation

1. Although the number of indicators in the MMR Indicator volume for substance abuse and treatment services has expanded, the indicators are mostly output indicators. Only two of the nine indicators, “Probationers Placed in Substance Abuse Treatment Services” and “Probationers Discharged Successfully from Substance Abuse Treatment Services,” are outcome indicators. To fully understand this last indicator, however, the term “discharged successfully” has to be defined.

2. There is currently no measure of recidivism rates; one should be added. Recidivism rates are the ultimate measure of the success of probation programs.

Department of Investigations (DOI)

1. There are currently no indicators in the Indicator volume of the MMR for the Department of Investigation. Information for the agency appears only in the Narrative volume. The last time indicators appeared in the MMR Indicator volume was September 1993, at which time there were 51 indicators, many of which should be restored. For example, in September 1993, the DOI reported “Number of Investigators,” “Number of Complaints Received,” “Average Time to Complete Investigations,” and “Corruption Risk Identified.”

11. Finding: The MMR Indicator volume contains few indicators that describe the cost per-person-served or per unit of service.

Recommendation: Use fiscal data more effectively by developing selected unit-cost and cost-effectiveness indicators.

The following are suggested unit-cost and cost-effectiveness indicators for selected City agencies.

Department of Health (DOH)

1. At one time, the DOH MMR reported various cost effectiveness measures that are not currently reported. These are important in determining appropriate staffing levels for the agency. For example, in FY93, the DOH MMR reported the number of restaurant and window guard inspections per person per day, but in FY01 it did not.

2. The FY01 MMR Indicator volume reports the number of Medicaid patients enrolled in managed care. However, the MMR should also include information on the effectiveness of the managed care program as a whole in helping the City control its Medicaid costs, without sacrificing the quality of patient care. This information should be reported in the DOH section, since the City and State Health Departments are responsible for overseeing the Medicaid managed care program as a whole.

Health and Hospital Corporation (HHC)

1. The MMR Indicator volume should report the number of medical malpractice claims filed, and the average cost of each claim resolved that year, either through a judgment or a settlement. This is particularly important since in FY01, HHC reached an agreement with the City whereby it now will assume financial responsibility for the cost of malpractice claims and settlements.

2. In light of HHC’s mission to provide care for the uninsured, the MMR should include indicators that detail how much it costs HHC to care for these patients, as well as how much the City, State and Federal governments reimburse for this care. HHC maintains these statistics, although they are not regularly reported in the MMR.

Human Resources Administration (HRA)

1. Include an indicator that measures the dollar cost per job placement for clients completing job training programs. This in turn would allow HRA managers to track the efficiency of its job training programs and to predict future costs of training.

Department of Business Services (DBS)

1. As requested by the City Council, DBS should add more cost-efficiency indicators for the Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), such as "cost of BID sanitation activity per block cleaned"; "the percentage of activities of each BID that were funded by self-generating marketing efforts"; "the amount and percentage of BID funding spent on management and administration"; and "the amount and percentage of funding spent on sanitation and security staff."

Board of Education (BOE)

1. The Board of Education has made great strides, beginning in FY96, in developing "transparent" budget and expense data that is reported on a per pupil basis, as well as by school and NYC Community School District. This data is published annually in the *School Based Budget Reports* and *School Based Expense Reports*, available from the Board of Education in paper versions as well as on their website, www.nycenet.edu. The unit-cost indicators contained therein report everything on a per pupil basis, from the cost of teachers and principals to textbooks and central administration. Selected unit-cost indicators from these volumes should be incorporated into the MMR Indicator volume, along with appropriate targets for improving instruction-related spending.

12. Finding: Although the City has made significant strides in creating performance-based contracts for contractors of City services, outcomes for these contracts are reported only in the aggregate for each agency and only in the Citywide Indicators section of the MMR Indicator volume.

Recommendation: Report outcomes for contracted services, together with other performance indicators, under the City agency responsible for monitoring the contracts in question. Provide more specific outcome measures as well as opportunities to compare the performances of individual contractors.

In FY00, the Comptroller's Office registered 6,849 procurement contracts awarded by City agencies for a projected dollar amount of approximately \$9.9 billion. The total included \$3.1 billion in new client-service contracts, almost double the \$1.7 billion in client-service contracts registered in FY99. Client-service contracts provide programs on behalf of New York City, including social services, health or medical services, housing and shelter assistance, and vocational, educational or recreational programs.⁷

Determining whether contractors, especially client-service contractors, provide City services effectively as well as efficiently, is critical to the City's quality of life and fiscal health. The following are suggested outcome indicators and general comments about reporting contract

⁷ Office of the Comptroller, City of New York, *Fiscal Year 2000 Report on New York City Contracts*.

performance, listed by City agency, including those agencies most greatly affected by contracting-out.

Department of Health (DOH)

1. Since July 1, 1998, the City and State Health Departments have both been responsible for monitoring the performance of managed care providers holding contracts to provide Medicaid-financed health services to eligible City residents, and enforcing contractor compliance with the terms and conditions of the contracts. The MMR, however, has no indicators measuring the quality of the care provided by these managed care providers. For example, an important indicator would be a measure of patient access to medical specialists under each of the respective care plans. Instead, the only Medicaid Managed Care indicator in the MMR Indicator volume is the number of Medicaid recipients who have been enrolled.

Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC)

1. HHC provides physician services by contracting with medical schools and with physician groups, both of which are known as “affiliates.” These affiliation contracts contain measures of each affiliate’s performance in providing physician services, as well as physician productivity. The MMR Narrative volume provides examples of selected indicators. However, the MMR Indicator volume should include a set of standard indicators that are reported each year, and that together document the degree to which each affiliate is meeting HHC’s performance and financial standards.

2. The MMR should include indicators documenting the productivity of HHC physicians. For example, the number of primary care and specialty clinic patients seen per primary and specialty care clinic doctor hour should be included. Physician productivity should be reported separately for doctors employed directly by HHC and for doctors employed by individual medical school affiliation contracts, in order to compare and contrast performance among them and set reasonable productivity goals.

Emergency Medical Services (EMS)

1. Ambulances that operate in the 911 System are routinely supposed to take their patients to the nearest appropriate hospital. The Comptroller's Office issued a study (*Where Do 911 System Ambulances Take Their Patients?*, June 2001) that found that they do not always do so. The MMR should report how often 911 System ambulances take patients to the nearest appropriate hospital, and provide separate statistics for City and voluntary hospital ambulances.

Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services (DMHMRAS)

1. Because DMHMRAS provides the majority of its services under contract with outside providers, comprehensive performance indicators on contractor performance are especially important. The MMR Narrative volume reports that the agency uses performance-based contracts but neither identifies the major performance indicators nor reports how well the contractors are complying with them. In addition, the MMR Indicator volume should report the percentage of performance measures met by agencies contracting under DMHMRAS programs: Alcoholism Treatment Clinics, Psychosocial Clubhouse Programs and Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) Teams, which provide intensive psychiatric services for hard-to-treat populations in their homes or communities.

Department of Parks and Recreation

1. To measure contractor and staff efficiency, include the cost-per-tree removed/pruned, cost-per-stump removed, cost-per-tree planted, and cost-per-recreation-center visit.

13. Finding: Presenting Indicators based on averaged data can disguise variations occurring on a community basis, creating a misleading picture of City programs.

Recommendation: Include micro (community-based) as well as macro indicators to present a range of outcomes on a community basis for selected indicators. Consider using Federal Geographical Information Systems (GIS) maps to display variations across neighborhoods.

Department of Health (DOH)

1. Although the MMR Indicator volume used to provide borough-level information for several of DOH's citywide disease indicators (new cases of lead poisoning, tuberculosis, sexually transmitted diseases, and AIDS) and for several of its service delivery indicators (new enrollments in maternity services, child health clinic visits, window guard inspections), it no longer does so. However, the disease-related statistics sometimes appear in charts included in the MMR Narrative. These should be relocated to the Indicator volume and borough-level information regarding disease and service delivery indicators should be included.

Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC)

1. In most cases, the MMR Indicator volume reports statistics for HHC as a whole and not for individual hospitals or regional networks. The aggregate statistics often obscure major differences in performance among HHC facilities. Key financial and performance statistics should be reported separately for each HHC regional network. Such statistics are already available in monthly reports that are submitted to committees of the HHC Board, but are not readily available to the public at large.

2. The MMR Indicator volume used to report the volume of some HHC services by borough (e.g., the number of participants in teen pregnancy programs and women receiving AIDS education), but it no longer does so. These borough-based indicators should be included.

Administration for Children's Services (ACS)

1. Placement in the child's home neighborhood is the goal of ACS's Neighborhood-based Services Initiative. The percentage of foster children placed in care in New York City, in the child's home borough, and in the child's community district should be added to the MMR Indicator volume. The borough and community District data, which was previously requested by the City Council, appears only in the FY01 MMR Supplement.

2. The number of child abuse and neglect cases by borough should be reported, so that the public will know where ACS conducts more effective prevention efforts.

Department of Sanitation (DOS)

1. Report recycling and solid waste collection figures on a borough-by-borough basis. Include reference to the DOS website for district-by-district data, which should also be represented on a graphic map.

New York Police Department

1. Restore the borough breakdowns of arrest data to the MMR Indicator volume.

2. School Safety Division. Although the number of school safety indicators has been expanded, reporting of incidents by borough has been dropped since the September 1994 MMR. Restore the numbers of reported incidents in the schools by borough and add outcome measures, such as the number of arrests. Most serious crime occurs at the high school level, and the high schools are organized by boroughs.

3. Housing Police. Housing Police indicators in the MMR have been greatly reduced over time. The number of total arrests and felony arrests should be restored to the Indicator volume. Borough-based breakdowns of data are important because crime rates are not uniform across the City.

4. Transit Police. The MMR indicator volume currently contains only aggregate output indicators of major felony crimes. Outcome measures, such as the number of arrests, should be added and presented by borough.

Fire Department

1. While several indicators have been added to the MMR Indicator volume, such as data categorizing fire unit runs and average response times for individual boroughs, more borough-based data would be useful in documenting trends and determining where additional resources are most needed. These include restoring borough breakdowns for “fires spreading to adjoining structures,” field inspections of commercial and residential buildings, and arson fires and arrests by marshals.

Department for the Aging (DFTA)

1. Current reporting is insufficient to determine whether DFTA is meeting the needs of the elderly. 1. Restore borough reporting of current contracts for senior services, including the percentage of seniors served in each borough (e.g., the number and percentage of seniors receiving home care, the number of senior centers and the percentage of seniors served). Reporting on senior centers should include the number and percent that are handicapped-accessible (as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act). Including utilization rates would make it clearer to the public where the needs for services are greatest, and why proposals are made to consolidate some senior centers while opening others.

2. Add indicators to report separately the number of Home Delivered Meals served. These statistics have never been reported in the MMR, although they have been reported in DFTA's Annual Plan Summary. Indicators for Home Delivered Meals should include meals delivered, clients served, and waiting lists for regular and special meals (e.g., Kosher). Reporting should be

by borough because of the variation in distribution of senior citizens and their economic status. Reporting by borough would permit better planning to address areas of greatest need.

New York Public Library

1. The New York Public Library system data should be broken down by the three boroughs it serves: Manhattan, Bronx, and Staten Island. The Queens Borough and Brooklyn Public Libraries are independent systems serving their respective boroughs, and are already reported separately in the MMR Indicator volume.

Commission on Human Rights

1. As suggested by the City Council, the MMR should separate bias complaints and founded bias complaints by borough to demonstrate which boroughs would benefit most from increased anti-bias outreach efforts.

14. Finding: Certain indicators in the MMR would be enhanced by a comparison with other U.S. cities, or with New York State as a whole.

Recommendation: Consider including cross-city (and/or New York State) comparisons to provide additional benchmarks for local performance outcomes.

The following provide examples listed by City agency.

Department of Health (DOH)

1. Doctors and hospitals throughout the country are required to report various contagious and other diseases to their local health departments, which in turn report data to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The CDC publishes a wealth of data on the occurrence of reported diseases in major U.S. cities. The MMR Indicator volume could use this information to compare New York City's progress in reducing the incidence of disease with the progress made by other cities.

2. The U.S. Conference of Local Health Officials collects information on characteristics of local health departments, as do various Federal agencies. The MMR could use this information to compare the New York City DOH with public health departments in other cities.

Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC)

1. The National Association of Public Hospitals publishes utilization and financial status information on public hospitals around the country. Including these data would provide appropriate comparison for determining the performance of HHC hospitals.

Board of Education (BOE)

1. The New York State Education Department collects significant performance-related data on all school districts in New York State. This information is published annually in a report to the Governor, State Legislature and the public, commonly referred to as the "Chapter 655 report," after its authorizing legislation. The goals for the Board of Education in the MMR Indicator volume are generally set just a bit higher than the level of achievement that was reached in the prior year. Data from the State Chapter 655 report, including average

achievement by New York State students as a whole and by students in the other four large cities in New York State (Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse and Yonkers), can be used as the basis for constructing challenging benchmarks for New York City student performance. Many other indicators, such as New York State average per pupil expenditures, average class size, and teacher credential and turnover rates, are also available for comparison.

15. Finding: Over the past eight years, some indicators have been dropped that should be restored.

Recommendation: Certain indicators important to assessing quality and effectiveness of City services are not presently in the MMR, and should be included

Department of Health (DOH)

1. The MMR used to contain effectiveness measures for the Health Department laboratories, e.g., how quickly the labs performed tests for particular diseases. With the exception of HIV testing, it no longer has such measures. Some of the old measures were dropped because DOH believed they were no longer appropriate, but more appropriate, substitute measures have not appeared. Such measures are important in gauging how well the Health Department is prepared to respond to future outbreaks of contagious disease.

2. In FY94, the MMR Indicator volume reported the number of health assessments it had completed in the fiscal year of families living in temporary housing. In November 1994, however, the Homeless Health Initiative was transferred to HHC, which operated it “as a contracted service for the Department of Homeless Services (DHS).” None of the three associated agencies— DOH, HHC, or DHS— now reports the number of health assessments delivered to families residing in temporary housing.

3. The MMR Indicator volume used to report the number of cases of lead poisoning per 1,000 children screened. Because of a growing difficulty in obtaining all test results, positive and negative, from non-DOH providers, this reporting was discontinued. However, as of April 2001, because of revisions to the New York City Health Code (Sections 11.06(a)(iii) and 11.06(a)(iv)), DOH now receives all the data from its own as well as from non-DOH providers that it needs to calculate the rate of positive cases per 1,000 children. DOH should therefore reintroduce to the MMR Indicator volume this significant measure of effectiveness of the City’s lead poisoning control efforts.

Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC)

1. The MMR no longer reports a key quality of care measure: the percentage of medical records that are incomplete. Poor record keeping not only affects the quality of care; it makes it much harder for the City and HHC to defend themselves in medical malpractice lawsuits. The Comptroller’s Office performed a review of medical malpractice claims that HHC lost and found that poor record keeping was a major factor in these losses. An indicator of the quality of HHC medical records should be restored to the MMR.

2. The City’s tax levy support for HHC accounts for a small portion of HHC’s total revenue. The MMR once reported HHC revenues in detail. Revenue sources include Medicaid, Medicare

and short-term borrowing as well as tax levy funds. The proportionate amounts of funds from each source are important in assessing HHC's financial health.

Chief Medical Examiner's Office

1. The MMR should report additional measures of effectiveness for the Chief Medical Examiner's Office. These should include the percentage of forensic and histology cases completed within 30 days, and the percentage completed within 90 days. In addition, the report should include the percentage of toxicology cases completed within five days and the percentage completed within ten days. Through FY93 the MMR reported similar measures, using fewer benchmarks, but ceased to do so after that year.

Administration for Children's Services (ACS)

1. Restore the Permanency Planning Goals indicators for children discharged from foster care (i.e., reunification, adoption, independent living). The degree to which children discharged from foster care meet the Permanency Planning Goals set for them by the agency is an important outcome measure.

Board of Education (BOE)

1. Restore to the MMR Indicator volume indicators of the number of inter-district and intra-district school transfers requested by parents and the numbers of requests granted or refused. These requests, commonly known as "variances," are an index of parent satisfaction with neighborhood schools. These data were introduced in the FY94 MMR Indicator volume, but were later deleted.

2. Restore indicators on the outcomes of the High School Admissions process. Last appearing in the FY93 MMR, these indicators include the numbers of applications received and the numbers of students receiving their first-choice high school. The data should include breakouts by Specialized, Zoned Academic/Comprehensive, Vocational-Technical, and Alternative high schools. These indicators are another measure of parent satisfaction, and of the effectiveness of the high school admissions process.

Department of Finance (DOF)

1. TMR indicator volume should restore an indicator that last appeared in FY99, "Assessment per Audit." A new indicator added in FY00, "Audit Revenue Collected," adds an output indicator, but it is not as strong as the efficiency measure it replaced.

Department of Business Services (DBS)

1. Restore the Minority/Women-Owned Business Enterprise indicators for "Citywide Contract Dollars Awarded for M/WBE/LBE." A FY00 MMR footnote reports that the indicator was dropped because the legislation implementing this program had lapsed. However, the FY01 MMR Indicator volume still lists indicators for this "lapsed" program. In addition, a May 2001 report by the Comptroller's Office and The New York Women's Agenda, *Women-Owned Businesses in New York City: Results of the First Survey of A Growing Economic Force*, documented the growing number of women-owned businesses and their considerable needs. DBS should continue to monitor and report outcomes for minority and women-owned businesses.

Department of City Planning (DCP).

1. Since 1994, the MMR has not had an indicator section in the Indicator volume for DCP; the section should be restored. Some items formerly in the Indicator volume now appear in the Narrative volume. These include data on the applications submitted and certified in the current year, as well as data on efforts to reduce an agency backlog of applications.
2. In addition, indicator data in the Narrative volume no longer provide specifics on agency programs, such as the Uniform Land-Use Review Procedure (ULURP), Non-ULURP applicants, New Leases for City Office Space and Waterfront Consistency Review. This information should be restored.
3. Total applications received in the current year for land use and environmental review and the percentage of applications certified in the current year are reported in the Narrative volume, but there is no information on the number of applications carried forward from previous years. If disclosed, this backlog would inflate the agency workload and reduce the actual completion rate. For example, more than half of the Uniform Land-Use Review Procedure (ULURP) applications in 1993 were carried over from the prior year. The MMR Indicator volume should also report the average length of time for certification.

Department of Buildings

1. In the FY94 MMR Indicator volume complaint data, that had previously been reported by specialty area— such as complaints regarding plumbing, elevators, boilers, and construction— was aggregated in a single indicator. This information should once again be reported separately, to better understand the type and the volume of complaints to the agency.

Commission on Human Rights

1. Restore an indicator of the number of investigations initiated by the Commission to study areas of suspected systemic discrimination (e.g., racial discrimination by landlords in a particular neighborhood). The FY01 MMR Indicator volume reports only the outcomes of individual cases of discrimination.

Department of Consumer Affairs

1. Restore indicators detailing the disposition of complaints closed by “other resolution.” The number of complaints declared invalid, as well as the number of complaints reported to small claims court, should once again be reported separately.

Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD)

1. The FY01 MMR Indicator volume discontinued providing separate indicators for the number of youth served by the Neighborhood Youth Alliance, YOUTHLINK and the Street Outreach Initiative Programs. These indicators should be restored to the MMR to better understand the individual impact of these programs.

Housing Preservation and Development (HPD)

1. Separate indicators for each housing program, e.g., Mitchell-Lama, 7A, the Participation Loan Program, etc. should be restored.

New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA)

1. As of the FY98 MMR Indicator volume, all specific reporting of Heat & Hot Water Complaints was discontinued. The complaint data are now reported, with electrical, gas, and flooding hazards under the heading, "Emergencies." As stated in the 1997 MMR Narrative volume, "Also, heat and hot water complaints were formerly tracked as a separate category; validated heat and hot water complaints will now be included in an emergency complaint category along with those regarding electrical, gas and flooding hazards." This indicator should be restored.

2. The FY93 MMR included a number of indicators on the service and maintenance of elevators in NYCHA properties that were removed in FY94. These included the "Total Number of Elevators Not Serviced by NYCHA," "Average Monthly Elevator Outages per Car," and "Average Monthly Preventive Maintenance Work– Hours per Elevator." Since these indicators are measures affecting the safety of residents and reflect the efficiency of NYCHA maintenance programs, they should be restored.

New York Police Department (NYPD)

1. Housing Police indicators in the MMR have been greatly reduced over time. The number of total arrests and felony arrests, important outcome indicators, should be restored to the MMR Indicator volume.

Department of Probation

1. Although the total number of indicators in the MMR Indicator volume has increased, most outcome indicators have been dropped since 1993. Those dropped include the number of field checks per officer per month; the number of violations filed with attorney representation; and the revocation and incarceration rate with attorney representation.

2. Restore output and outcome indicators for Adult Court Investigations. Indicators include investigation reports ordered (felony and misdemeanor); average investigations completed, per officer, per month; and the percentage of investigation reports on jail cases that are delivered on the scheduled date of sentencing.

3. Restore the pre-disposition supervision indicators for Family Court investigations.

Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)

1. The outcome indicator for "Average Caseload per Manager," a measure of the appropriateness of staffing levels, should be restored.

16. Finding: In recent years, a number of indicators have been added that improves the MMR.

Recommendation: These important agency indicators should be retained.

Department of Health (DOH)

Indicators reported for HIV testing are much improved since FY93, and now include data on how quickly the tests were performed. These data in turn indicate how quickly patients are able to learn whether or not they have the HIV virus.

Health and Hospitals Corporation (HHC)

Since FY93, the MMR Indicator volume has greatly improved the reporting of AIDS services provided by HHC facilities. These now include better-defined indicators for both in-patient and outpatient AIDS-related services.

Office of the Chief Medical Examiner

Outcome indicators for the Chief Medical Examiner's Office have been improved by including timeliness objectives for some activities. For example, while the FY94 MMR Indicator volume reports only the number of autopsy reports completed, the FY01 MMR also reports the percentage of autopsy reports completed within 90 days.

Human Resources Administration (HRA)

HRA reporting in the MMR Indicator volume has been improved since FY98 by the inclusion of indicators measuring the City's progress in meeting work activities set by Federal and State guidelines. The MMR indicates that, beginning in FY02, it will include performance measures, such as job placement rate, job retention rate, and credentials attainment rate.

Department of Finance (DOF)

In FY99, an indicator reporting the number of stolen vehicles recovered by borough was added to the MMR Indicator volume, which improved reporting by the agency.

New York Public Library (NYPL)

Indicators for the public libraries in the MMR Indicator volume increased from 39 indicators in FY96 to 57 in FY01. These indicators are also reported individually for the four library systems— the New York Branch, New York Research, Brooklyn and Queens Public Libraries— which has been very useful.

New York Police Department (NYPD)

The FY01 MMR Indicator volume has been improved by including more detailed outcome measures of "crime in progress" responses, rating them as "serious," "critical" and "non-critical."

Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)

Since FY93, several new indicators have been added that improve reporting of juvenile crime. These include the percentage of on-time court appearances and the percentage of juveniles who successfully complete their programs.

AGENCY INDEX

PUBLIC SAFETY

Police Department.	17,18,20,30,35,40,41
Fire Department.	9,18,20,35
Dept. of Correction	18,20,30
Dept. of Probation.	18,20,30,31,40
Dept. of Juvenile Justice.	18,20,41
Civilian Complaint Review Board.	11,12,20

INFRASTRUCTURE

Dept. of Transportation.	16,18,20,23
Dept. of Environmental Protection.	16,18,20,22,23
Dept. of Housing Preservation and Development.	14,18,20,30,40
School Construction Authority.	12,20,30
NYC Housing Authority.	12,20,40
Dept. of Design and Construction.	20

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Dept. of Sanitation.	20,23,35
Dept. of Parks and Recreation.	18,19,20,28,34
Landmarks Preservation Commission.	19,20
Public Libraries.	12,20,36,41

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Dept. of Business Services.	20,25,32,39
NYC Economic Development Corporation.	12,13,20,25
Dept. of Cultural Affairs.	2,13,20

HEALTH SERVICES

Dept. of Health.	10,14,18,20,21,31,33, 34,36,37,41
Emergency Medical Service.	10,20,22,33
Office of the Chief Medical Examiner.	20,38,41
Health and Hospitals Corporation.	12,17,18,20,22,31,33, 34,36,38,41
Dept. for Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Alcoholism Services.	20,27,33

AGENCY INDEX (con't)

HUMAN SERVICES AND EDUCATION

Human Resources Administration.	10,14,16,18,20,24,32,41
Administration for Children Services.	15,17,18,20,35,38
Dept. Homeless Services.	15,16,19,20,26
Dept. of Employment.	20,25
Dept. for Youth and Community Development.	18,20,26,40
Dept. for the Aging.	20,35
Board of Education.	12,13,16,17,18,20,21,28, 29,32,37,38
City University of New York.	12,13,20

REGULATORY SERVICES

Dept. of Consumer Affairs.	18,20,26,39
Dept. of Buildings.	18,20,39
Taxi and Limousine Commission.	18,20

CITYWIDE ADMINISTRATION

Law Department.	2,13,20
Dept. of Finance.	18,20,25,38,41
Dept. of Citywide Administrative Services.	18,20
Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings.	20
Dept. of City Planning.	2,13,20,39
Dept. of Records and Information Services.	2,13,20
Dept. of Information Technology and Telecommunications.	20
City Commission on Human Rights.	20,26,36,39
Dept. of Investigation.	2,13,20,31