

CITY BUDGET OFFICE

Ted Wheeler, Mayor
Amanda Fritz, Commissioner
Office of Nick Fish, Commissioner
Jo Ann Hardesty, Commissioner
Chloe Eudaly, Commissioner
Mary Hull Caballero, Auditor



Jessica Kinard, Director
(503) 823-6963
1120 SW Fifth Avenue #1010
Portland, Oregon 97204
www.portlandoregon.gov/cbo

CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON

Memorandum

To: Mayor Wheeler
Commissioner Fritz
Commissioner Hardesty
Commissioner Eudaly
Auditor Hull Caballero
City Bureau Directors
CC: Council Executives

From: Jessica Kinard, Budget Director

Date: 05/13/2020

Subject: Citywide Performance Reporting Guidance

As part of FY 2020-21 Budget Development, the City Budget Office (CBO) has conducted a complete review of the performance measures reported in the City's budget. This process builds on CBO's annual consideration of performance measures in an effort to promote the tracking and use of consistent and empowering performance data. The COVID-19 crisis has demonstrated with urgency that the City of Portland needs to be an organization that continually learns and improves using all the tools available to us.

In completing this performance measure review, CBO identified inconsistency in the City's performance measurement practices in issue areas which are important City priorities. While we are providing a review to each bureau's finance and performance staff that comments on that bureau's individual suite of measures, we are also providing Citywide guidance for performance reporting in the three areas of **equity, community engagement, and contract utilization**.

Understanding that everyone has urgent operational priorities right now, I would request that you – as time allows – use this information as follows: where possible, modify your bureau's existing measures so that they are more in alignment with this guidance; additionally, I ask that you take this guidance into account in the development of any new performance measures in FY 2020-21 and beyond.

Bureaus that incorporate the recommendations below into their own performance reporting will be better positioned to inform future operational and budgetary decision-making as we adapt to the crisis. Please review the below for guidance on the Citywide approach in these three areas.

Recommended Language and Approach for Equity Measures

Equity is a central priority across the City of Portland; appropriately, bureaus are increasingly adding performance measures that incorporate an equity lens to measuring and disaggregating outcomes. However, bureaus use a wide range of terminology in these measures. To encourage greater consistency in equity measures across the City, this section offers recommendations about language use in measures focused on equity. Equity language can evolve rapidly; these recommendations were created in collaboration with the Office of Equity and Human Rights (OEHR) to align with the bureau's recently-adopted Equity Stance and forthcoming strategic plan.

Language referring to groups at an aggregate level

Many bureaus currently have measures that refer broadly to “underrepresented groups,” “underserved areas” or “marginalized populations.” For measures that consider whether the demographic or geographic makeup of a program or service matches that of the City as a whole, “underrepresented communities” or “underserved communities” is the most appropriate phrasing. For example, “underrepresented” would be appropriate in the context of workforce demographics, leadership positions, and decision-making bodies such as boards, commissions, and advisory groups. “Underserved” is appropriate when referring to services delivered and resources allocated by the City or the Bureau. The use of “communities” rather than “groups” or “areas” captures the sense of vibrancy, connection, and resilience that communities nurture.

When used in a more general sense to refer to an aggregate of groups, we recommend the phrasing “historically and presently oppressed communities,” or simply “oppressed communities.” This may be most appropriate for measures of community engagement, where what is being measured is the City's efforts at engagement, rather than the representation of communities in certain spaces or services. This phrasing may also be useful in descriptive narrative that helps contextualize performance measures. Using this phrasing in these cases avoids positioning some communities below or at the margins of others.

Who do we mean by “historically and presently oppressed groups”?

In keeping with OEHR's intersectional approach to equity, which centers race, we recommend that bureaus always include the following groups when referring to oppressed communities in the aggregate:

- Black and Indigenous communities and people of color¹
- Communities whose primary language is not English (for example, immigrant and refugee communities)
- People with disabilities

When other groups are included in the focus of a measure along with the communities listed above, please note this in the measure metadata. Additional groups might include:

- Women and non-binary people
- Members of the LGBTQIA community

¹ Many existing measures use “people of color (POC)” to refer to non-white communities. New language is emerging around specifying Black and Indigenous communities within this grouping, resulting in phrasing of “Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC).” This recognizes that the particular histories and needs of Black and Indigenous communities often continue to be erased even when the focus is on people of color.

- Youth
- Individuals experiencing poverty

Disaggregation and specificity

Generally, we recommend using the most specific language that is accurate for what a data point is measuring. In cases where the focus of a program or service is one community among those discussed above, the title of the measure should refer to that community specifically. The language in the bullet points above is what we would recommend for referring to particular communities.

This preference for specificity extends to decisions about the right level at which to disaggregate measures. We recommend disaggregating data by demographic group where feasible, particularly where doing so provides significant additional insight into whether the City is succeeding in better serving Black and Indigenous communities and people of color, communities whose primary language is not English, and people with disabilities. For example, a number of bureaus currently have measures that group together women and people of color in outcomes around workforce diversity and equitable contracting, and City Council has recently asked for this data broken out so that we can understand the impacts of the City's efforts on these groups separately.

Despite Citywide interest in understanding progress on equity, CBO recognizes that the City's current performance reporting tool (BFM) is not ideal for reporting on disaggregated data at a granular level. While we expect that bureaus would use highly-disaggregated data to make internal assessments of performance, where reporting all of this data to CBO poses an undue reporting burden, we recommend reporting at the level of disaggregation that most clearly speaks to the goals of a given program or service.

In keeping with OEHR's intersectional equity stance, bureaus should center race in data disaggregation. This does not mean abandoning efforts to disaggregate data in other ways, but that race should always be a lens through which we assess our work. For example, if equity for people with disabilities is the primary focus of a program, the performance measures for that program should disaggregate results by disability status, and then by race within the initial groupings. This allows an intersectional look at how interpersonal and institutional racism may further compound other inequities.

Efforts across bureaus to deepen understanding of current impact and progress on equity will be paired with the introduction of a set of Citywide community equity measures in FY 2020-21. We can build on this equity tool with additional centrally available, disaggregated demographic data in the future. Improvements to Citywide data management and analytics capabilities will more fully enable the City to deliver on our goal of creating an equitable Portland community.

Reporting on Equity in Contracting

The City of Portland promotes the utilization of Disadvantaged, Minority-Owned, Women-Owned, Emerging Small Businesses, and Service-Disabled Veterans Business Enterprises (D/M/W/ESB/SDVBE) contractors and sub-contractors to promote inclusion and a sustained, vibrant local economy. The Procurement Division sets Citywide goals and tracks utilization of D/M/W/ESB/SDVBE firms by City bureaus. Reflecting the importance of contracting as a lever to advance equity in the community, several bureaus highlight these results as performance measures for their own programs.

The Procurement Division has been ramping up reporting on D/M/W/ESB/SDVBE utilization and plans to offer this information in a dashboard similar to the recently launched [Workforce Training & Hiring](#)

[Program](#) dashboard. With that dashboard, users may disaggregate results by bureau, project, and owner ethnicity on a monthly basis. Procurement expects to be able to provide bureau-by-bureau reporting on contract utilization with a similar approach by FY 2021-22.

In the meantime, there is an opportunity to increase alignment across bureaus on both language and methodology for performance measures on contract utilization. Bureaus should review the following to see if adjustments to language or methodology may be needed.

Updated language and designations

The City's performance reporting for contract utilization includes all of the designations currently recognized by the State of Oregon's Certification Office for Business Inclusion and Diversity (COBID), "D/M/W/ESB/SDVBE." To reduce potential for confusion with the current state of emergency, CBO recommends including the list of designations in the measure title rather than using the term "COBID."

While CBO *does* recommend that bureaus review the language used in procurement measures, methodology will generally *not* need to be changed to reflect the additional SDVBE designation. On a related note, bureaus do not need to retroactively update prior year actuals as the new designation reflects an evolving authorizing environment. CBO will work with the Procurement Division to note the change in the methodology from previous years in reporting for Citywide measures.

Reporting on a subset of designations

Bureaus reporting on a subset of these designations should ensure that this approach is clear in the measure title and metadata. For example:

- "Percentage of professional services contract dollars awarded to disadvantaged, minority-owned, and women-owned (D/M/W) firms"
- Metadata: This measure does not include ESB and SDVBE-designated firms; measure does not include construction contracts.

Additionally, bureaus may be interested in disaggregating beyond the existing designations to report on the ethnicity of the firm owner. To ensure consistency and correctness in reporting, CBO recommends that the forthcoming contracting utilization dashboard from Procurement, once available, be the definitive data source for providing information at lower levels of disaggregation.

Reporting on contracts vs. dollars awarded

Both approaches can provide valuable information. Measuring the "percentage of contracts" awarded communicates diverse access to opportunities, whereas "percentage of dollars" demonstrates whether these enterprises are increasingly able to secure larger projects. The most relevant measure may depend on the number of contracts typically awarded by the bureau and the degree to which they vary in size. When setting these measure targets, CBO recommends contacting Procurement or your CBO budget analyst to ensure that bureau targets are aligned with City goals.

Recommendations for Measuring Community Engagement

Meaningful, effective community engagement is another key to supporting the City of Portland's equity goals. Performance measures that track the scale of participation, who was involved, the effectiveness of engagement, and how information is shared will inform us about the state of community engagement across the City and highlight ways to improve and potentially coordinate on community engagement efforts.

Greater consistency in reporting on community engagement is needed. However, we know outreach

efforts will continue to evolve. There are many bureaus actively researching, creating, and implementing new methods to facilitate improved community engagement and data management—particularly in response to COVID-19. These efforts will continue to inform better practices for measuring community engagement. In the meantime, bureaus reporting on community engagement are advised to consider the following approaches.

Highlight the *type* of community engagement

Defining what is meant by community engagement is an important step to track and improve performance. Different types of events and efforts reflect different types of public participation. The International association for Public Participation has a [spectrum of public participation ranging from inform to empower](#). Different types and stages of programs and projects will require different public participation goals. Bureaus tracking the types of engagement efforts used will help show if a variety of methods are being put to use.

Identifying the engagement activity can be done in either the title or in the metadata of the performance measure. Are participants responding to a survey or attending a training? It may be possible to group some activities together in a measure (see the public participation spectrum for examples), but for activities that vary significantly, bureaus should consider splitting into multiple measures or selecting the most important activity to report on externally.

Report on “how many” and “who”

Reporting the number of people participating in engagement helps demonstrate the scale of impact for that event or activity. Additionally, because participation is generally voluntary, the number of people participating is also a proxy for effectiveness. If more Portlanders choose to spend their time participating, it indicates that they view the event as worthwhile. Fortunately, participation counts are already collected for most community engagement activities, so this information should be readily available for programs looking to track the effectiveness of their engagement activities.

Another key question for community engagement is, “who is participating?” Depending on the topic of the engagement, relevant demographic markers may include race/ethnicity, income, age, education, employment, gender, and household size. Data collection has typically been a big challenge in this area; demographic reporting for an intercept survey will naturally be more limited than reporting on who is participating on City advisory boards and committees. Please refer to the section on Recommended Language and Approach for Equity Measures for additional guidance on how to report on the demographics of people participating in community engagement activities. When collecting demographic information of people participating, a privacy review assessment could be helpful. This is a current focus of the Privacy Work Group coordinated by Smart City PDX, who can be contacted at smartcitypdx@portlandoregon.gov.

As a general rule, CBO recommends against tracking simply the *number* of events or trainings provided because of the lack of specificity. Events come in many shapes and sizes, so counting the number of events does little to communicate the scale or impact of the activity.

Report on resources allocated to community engagement

Understanding resources invested can be a proxy for the amount of engagement being done; identifying where additional resources are needed may help bureaus progress toward more meaningful engagement practices. This has not been a common practice for the City, but was a recommendation in CBO’s budget analysis of Council Offices’ FY 2020-21 budget submissions. Pending a common methodology, this measure could be introduced as a Citywide measure that more comparably tracks

engagement activities across bureaus in the future.

Resources allocated to engagement should include the costs of supporting, designing, and evaluating engagement by cost of labor hours, materials, translation services, meals, space and/or technical tools for virtual meetings, and payments to community-based organizations, partner hosts, and consultants. These could be collected at a program level and added up to the bureau level. Additionally, citizen advisory committees and community-based organizations are often fundamental to designing and carrying out engagement activities. City staff hours spent working with these groups to design engagement should also be tracked in the cost of labor hours.

After the event: engagement outcomes and sharing of results

Evaluating the impact of an engagement event helps answer the question, “Was anyone better off?” The Portland Bureau of Emergency Management’s *“Percentage of participants who rate PBEM classes and exercises as good or excellent”* is an example of this type of measure. Bureaus that conduct a post-engagement survey likely have a data point that could be used as a proxy for effectiveness. Bureaus that don’t do any post-event evaluation may consider incorporating this practice.

Another key outcome to consider is how public input was considered in decision-making. How did the engagement affect a government process, policy, or project? New protocols may be needed to assess the impacts of engagement, which could lead to the development of new performance measures.

Finally, insights gathered from community engagement are not often shared back to participants or outside of the project team. Sharing the information gathered can help improve trust with communities and inform the design of a future engagement activity. Beyond performance reporting, better data management will enable more sharing of the results and impacts of community engagement efforts.

Next Steps

In the face of the current crisis, we have come together more than ever to operate as one City. I hope that this guidance has been useful in considering how your bureau can align with a Citywide approach while demonstrating impact on advancing equity, contract utilization, and community engagement. If changes to current measures are needed, we encourage bureaus to make changes to FY 2020-21 performance measures until June 5th. Contact your bureau’s CBO analyst to make changes.

Given the urgent nature of the public health crisis, we recognize that some of the recommendations included here may need to be considered over a longer time frame. Please reach out to me or my staff with any questions, or to provide more detailed suggestions on specific performance measure additions for your bureau.