

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA  
SESSION 2015

H

1

HOUSE BILL 805

Short Title: Measurability Assessments. (Public)

Sponsors: Representatives Blackwell and Avila (Primary Sponsors).

*For a complete list of Sponsors, refer to the North Carolina General Assembly Web Site.*

Referred to: Regulatory Reform.

April 15, 2015

1 A BILL TO BE ENTITLED  
2 AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR MEASURABILITY ASSESSMENTS OF STATE  
3 PROGRAMS.

4 The General Assembly of North Carolina enacts:

5 SECTION 1. The North Carolina General Statutes are amended by adding a new  
6 Chapter to read:

7 **"Chapter 143E.**

8 **"The North Carolina Measurability Assessment Act of 2015.**

9 **"§ 143E-1. Title.**

10 This Chapter shall be known and may be cited as the "North Carolina Measurability  
11 Assessment Act of 2015."

12 **"§ 143E-2. Request for measurability assessment.**

13 The General Assembly may require a measurability assessment of any proposed or existing  
14 State program to determine whether the program is or will be capable of reporting performance  
15 and return on investment.

16 **"§ 143E-3. Definition of measurability assessment.**

17 (a) A measurability assessment is an independent evaluation conducted on a new or  
18 existing State program.

19 (b) A measurability assessment must include or determine all of the following:

20 (1) Whether and to what degree the program is unique and does not duplicate or  
21 negate results of another public or private program or enterprise.

22 (2) The local, regional, or statewide problems or needs that the program is  
23 intended to address.

24 (3) Whether there is a program design portrayed by a logic model as defined by  
25 the Logic Model Development Guide by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation,  
26 including an evaluation of that logic model.

27 (4) Whether there is evidence that the program produces results attributable to  
28 the program to remedy the problem or need.

29 a. For a proposed program, whether the evidence stems from a  
30 formative evaluation of proposed activities through a field trial using  
31 a valid and reliable instrument or method to measure changes in a  
32 randomized control group that was not subjected to the proposed  
33 activities to changes in a randomized group that did receive the  
34 proposed activities.



\* H 8 0 5 - V - 1 \*

- 1                    b. For an existing program asserting existence of evidence, whether the  
2                    evidence stemmed from a post-program summative evaluation using  
3                    an experimental or quasi-experimental research design.  
4                    c. For both proposed and existing programs, if the evidence had been  
5                    subjected to alternative interpretations and peer review.  
6                    (5) The capacity of the administering entity to expand the program based upon  
7                    existing evidence or results.  
8                    (6) How the program proposes to engage in strategic planning.  
9                    (7) How the program proposes to measure performance, including measurement  
10                    of:  
11                    a. Total costs of program services with costs separately reported for  
12                    each activity associated with each service.  
13                    b. Outputs or counts of units of services and for individual activities  
14                    associated with each service.  
15                    c. Costs per unit of service and for individual activities associated with  
16                    each service.  
17                    d. Outcomes or results attributable to each program service including  
18                    results upon completion of program service; results still evident one,  
19                    two, and three years after completion; ultimate or permanent results;  
20                    and when and how permanent results will be determined by the  
21                    program.  
22                    e. Customer or client satisfaction with program services.  
23                    f. Statewide impacts of program outcomes as evidenced by census data  
24                    or other statewide data.  
25                    g. Performance compared to standards and what standards the program  
26                    intends to use.  
27                    (8) How the program will continuously improve quality of program services and  
28                    consistency with the strategic plan.  
29                    (9) Whether the administering entity has conducted an assessment to identify  
30                    financial and legal risks to the entity or the State and has plans for  
31                    minimizing risk exposure.  
32                    (10) Whether the program conducts five-year forecasts of annual recurring costs  
33                    and sources of funding for each year.  
34                    (11) Whether the program proposes to share costs with primary beneficiaries  
35                    through a fee-for-service, co-payment, or tuition basis and the extent to  
36                    which any expected cost-sharing is or will be means-tested and by what  
37                    method.  
38                    (12) How program staffing requirements are determined and an evaluation of  
39                    those requirements.  
40                    (13) Whether the program has or proposes to have a financial accounting system  
41                    capable of accounting for all assets, liabilities, receipts, and disbursements.  
42                    (14) Whether the program is or will be postaudited and if there are any potential  
43                    impediments to audits or evaluations by the State Auditor, agency internal  
44                    auditors, or the Program Evaluation Division of the General Assembly.  
45                    (c) The assessor must submit a written report containing the results of the measurability  
46                    assessment to the Office of State Budget and Management (OSBM) at a time and in a format  
47                    required by OSBM.

48 **"§ 143E-4. Administration of Measurability Assessment Process.**

- 49                    (a) OSBM must use a competitive process to prequalify independent measurability  
50                    assessors. The assessors will be independent contractors compensated through a uniform fee  
51                    system established by OSBM, and there will be no guarantee that any prequalified assessor will

1 receive assessment assignments. OSBM shall not assign an assessor to a measurability  
2 assessment if the assessor has been employed by or contracted with the entity within five years  
3 preceding the assessment.

4 (b) OSBM shall establish standards for assessor qualifications, independence, and for  
5 conducting and reporting measurability assessments. Individuals who do not meet the  
6 qualifications may not be used to conduct measurability assessments.

7 (c) Whenever a measurability assessment is required, OSBM shall select the assessor  
8 and require the agency or institution to reimburse OSBM for the assessor's costs and for a share  
9 of OSBM costs for administering the measurability assessment program."

10 **SECTION 2.** This act becomes effective October 1, 2015.