

LEGISLATIVE INFLUENCES ON PERFORMANCE-BASED BUDGETING REFORM

Introduction

This report examines the issue of legislative involvement in performance-based budgeting reforms – specifically, whether and how legislative bodies should be engaged in implementation of the reform. Traditionally, budgeting and management reforms have focused on the executive branch and administrative agencies. However, a review of the history of budget reforms suggests that such an approach may be problematic. When legislatures are not engaged in the reform, they may fail to use the information generated or worse, may actively resist implementation. The analysis presented in this paper assesses current state-level implementation of performance-based management and budgeting reforms and how legislative involvement affects implementation. The analysis also assesses whether increasing legislative professionalism might improve the level of implementation.

Key Findings

- **Legislative oversight but not legislative professionalism play an important role in the implementation of performance-based management and budgeting reforms.**

Drawing on a national survey of agency staff and budget officers in the states, the analysis presented in this

report shows that the identification of legislative oversight of a performance management reform is one of the most consistent predictors of effective implementation across the government, including in agency management decisions, in budgetary processes, as well as in legislative policy-making. Although not a focus of this report, gubernatorial leadership also is an important variable, suggesting that elected official leadership in both branches is important if agencies are going to take the reform seriously.

A further question in the literature on legislatures is whether professional legislatures – full-time, highly resourced legislative bodies – provide more effective policymaking and oversight. Although legislative professionalism may be important for improving other legislative activities, this research finds little evidence that professionalism or higher levels of staff resources are the key to improving implementation of performance-based management and budgeting reforms. In fact, term limits appear to have a positive influence on implementation of the reform, and other measures of legislative professionalism have a statistically significant negative influence on implementation.

The positive effect of legislative oversight and the negative effect of professionalism suggests that the

quality of legislator and staff engagement rather than quantity may be a deciding factor. A further examination of states where legislative bodies play a significant role in oversight shows that high levels of legislative responsibility are not necessarily coupled with high levels of professionalism. States such as Virginia, Texas, New Mexico, and South Carolina, all have citizen legislatures or “moderately” professional legislatures, but at the same time have legislatures with substantial responsibility for budgeting, policymaking, and oversight.

- **Legislators are more likely to trust performance information from their own staff or other legislatively-affiliated organizations, rather than agencies, executive staff, or interest groups.**

In a second section, this report describes the results of a 2005 survey of members of the Georgia House and Senate Appropriations Committees. The results of this survey indicate that legislators would welcome access to more results and performance-based information. However, an important criterion may be the *source* of this information. Although survey respondents came from both parties, legislators tended to be generally distrustful of agency self-reporting and even executive staff analyses of agency performance. Instead, legislators favored analyses from legislatively affiliated sources such as legislative staff and the Department of Audits.

A final section of the report simply describes what “legislative oversight” might look like by examining how the legislatures in Florida, Texas, and New Mexico are involved in the state’s performance-based budgeting and management reform. A key feature in each of these states is an investment in legislative capacity to effectively evaluate performance information.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Carolyn Bourdeaux is an Assistant Professor who works in the areas of public finance and governance at the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies at Georgia State University. Her recent research has focused on performance-based management and budgeting. Her previous research has included a report on tax allocation districts in Georgia and the implications of using special district governments to develop infrastructure intensive services.

ABOUT FRC

The Fiscal Research Center provides nonpartisan research, technical assistance, and education in the evaluation and design of state and local fiscal and economic policy, including both tax and expenditure issues. The Center’s mission is to promote development of sound public policy and public understanding of issues of concern to state and local governments.

The Fiscal Research Center (FRC) was established in 1995 in order to provide a stronger research foundation for setting fiscal policy for state and local governments and for better-informed decision making. The FRC, one of several prominent policy research centers and academic departments housed in the School of Policy Studies, has a full-time staff and affiliated faculty from throughout Georgia State University and elsewhere who lead the research efforts in many organized projects.

The FRC maintains a position of neutrality on public policy issues in order to safeguard the academic freedom of authors. Thus, interpretations or conclusions in FRC publications should be understood to be solely those of the author. For more information on the Fiscal Research Center, call 404-651-2782.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Legislative Influences on Performance-Based Budgeting Reform. Using data from several surveys of the states as well as a survey of Georgia state legislators, this report examines the role of legislators in the implementation of performance-based management and budgeting reforms. (May 2006)

A Georgia Fiscal History of the Past Forty Years. This report describes spending and revenue trends through four decades and relates the trends to the agendas of the state’s governors. It concludes with a list of challenges for this decade and beyond. (April 2006).

Gasoline Taxes in Georgia This report describes and compares Georgia’s fuel tax with other states and evaluates it as a long-term dedicated revenue source for highway funding in the state. (April 2006).

A Historical Shift Share Analysis for Georgia. This report analyzes the trends in Georgia’s industrial composition and employment over the period 1970-2000 using shift share analysis. (March 2006)

The Demographics of Georgia III: Lesbian and Gay Couples. Using 2000 Census data, this report compares the residential patterns, household incomes, house values, property taxes, and parenting patterns of Georgia’s same-sex and different-sex couples. (March 2006).

For a free copy of any of the publications listed, call the Fiscal Research Center at 404/651-4342, or fax us at 404/651-2737. All reports are available on our webpage at: [//frc.aysps.gsu.edu/frc/index.html](http://frc.aysps.gsu.edu/frc/index.html).

Document Metadata

This document was retrieved from IssueLab - a service of the Foundation Center, <http://www.issuelab.org>

Date information used to create this page was last modified: 2014-02-15

Date document archived: 2010-05-20

Date this page generated to accompany file download: 2014-04-15

IssueLab Permalink: http://www.issuelab.org/resource/legislative_influences_on_performance_based_budgeting_reform_brief

Legislative Influences on Performance-Based Budgeting Reform - Brief

Publisher(s): Fiscal Research Center of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies

Author(s): Carolyn Bourdeaux

Date Published: 2006-05-01

Rights: Copyright 2006 Fiscal Research Center of the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies

Subject(s): Community and Economic Development; Government Reform