

**TASK FORCE ON REINVENTING GOVERNMENT
HCR 76 HD1 SD1
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
MEETING NOTES**

I. INTRODUCTIONS

- A. Members Present:
Don Horner (FHB), John Monahan (Hawaii Visitors and Convention Bureau), Sen. Donna Mercado Kim, Randy Perreira (HGEA), Walter Ozawa (Judiciary), Laura Thielen (DLNR), Mark Fukunaga (Servco), Lynn McCrory (PAHIO Development)
- B. Members Excused:
Rep. Marcus Oshiro, Reginald Castanares (Plumbers and Fitters, Local 675)
- C. Meeting called to order at 10:18 a.m. by Chair Horner

II. GENERAL BUSINESS

- A. Approval of minutes – approved; no discussion
- B. At this point a discussion ensues as to the following questions:
 - 1. What to accomplish at today's meeting as it is the last scheduled meeting.
 - 2. When the final report will be finalized.
 - a. LRB staff will be out until Dec. 29, 2009, thereby delaying the date in which the final recommendations would have to be submitted to them. In addition, Chair Horner would like ample time to discuss and be comfortable with the ideas
 - 3. In what format should ideas and recommendations be presented? How much background information and materials are needed when presenting ideas?
- C. Members request to schedule one additional meeting to present and discuss all subcommittee ideas. Most members expressed a desire to spend more time with their agencies. And, as LRB staff is out until Dec. 29, 2009, it seems as though the report may not have to be finalized until January.
 - 1. **Task force agrees to submit all ideas to members by Dec. 24, 2009.** Don and Tony may meet soon thereafter to format the ideas and get them out to everyone.

2. **The next meeting will be scheduled for Monday, Jan. 4., 2010, 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Rm. 211**

D. Presentation of subcommittee recommendations:

1. DHRD Subcommittee:

Ideas included in a handout and presented by John Monahan.

- a. *Develop and implement an enterprise information management system*

- 1) Discussion: Any IT system should be statewide. Perhaps this idea could be grouped into one big one since it appears to span all areas. It also doesn't seem clear who is responsible for IT within government, as currently we have no one CIO for the State. Issues also exist around hardware, applications and software where if we could just consolidate the hardware and application software, we'd already be ahead. This could also include uniform accounting systems and public interface systems.
- 2) As a funding suggestion, Mr. Perreira suggests to treat IT investment as a CIP issue rather appropriating general funds to each department. The difficulty here is that the life of a bond is 20 years, where computers last about 3 years. Bond rating agencies would have to see it as capital also.
- 3) Director Thielen further suggests to use a system that's readily available or one that is "off the shelf", rather than commission a study. The group further discusses the importance of using existing software, where we could then customize internal processes Statewide to this system. The group also agrees that public interface is important, where the more the public can see and access, the less interaction to deal with.

- b. *Simplify the classification system*

- 1) Discussion: This recommendation came from DHRD who may be able to do this without legislation. Historically, DHRD has never updated this system so this is a monumental task where staffing would also be an issue. This issue will include looking at job descriptions within classifications where seeing as job classifications are rigid, job descriptions become even

more rigid. Often, benchmark classes are held within DHRD, but there's not a lot of flexibility when trying to use these to fit individual agency needs. The goal here may be to have a more flexible system, not necessarily to reclassify.

A) Director Thielen questioned how this is done in other states.

B) Chair Horner also questioned how this might negatively impact the employee. Mr. Perreira responded that from an employee perspective, their compensation is tied to what they're supposed to do on paper. On the other hand, from the employer's perspective, more titles have had to be added to fit their needs and those already existing have never been redone.

2) Perhaps the problem here is retention, since the current system may not be set up to compensate employees adequately. Perhaps a more flexible system could compensate for this.

c. *Develop a Statewide Employee Training and Development program*

1) Discussion: DHRD did not come up with this. Perhaps this and recommendation 2 (b.) should be embraced by the Task Force and taken back to DHRD.

2) It may be worthwhile to look at how other cities, counties, etc. manage their employees and their career development?

d. *Clear up redundancy between central agency and line departments*

1) Discussion: This is big, a classic challenge. Perhaps recommendation 2 (b.) should be figured out first to give a better idea of who's responsible for what. Additionally, this discussion (how personnel is handled, etc.) may need to take place more between DHRD and the other departments.

2) What should our personnel system entail for the future so that our employees can be compensated, developed and flexible enough to do different tasks?

3) What's the purpose of the role of DHRD? What are they supposed to be doing? Perhaps there are employees within DHRD that aren't needed, where their duties can be pushed down to the departments.

- e. *Enhance communication between the central agency and department personnel officers*
 - 1) Discussion: This recommendation may go back to the fourth (d.). One of the concerns expressed is that the central agencies' role isn't clearly defined resulting in a disjointedness between the central agency and the line departments. Where the central agency is concerned, because the lines are blurred, they believe they're only advisory. Staff (HR) also perceives that they're more advisory. This may be true, but then the line departments don't perceive they have the latitude to do what needs to be done.
 - 2) This may not need any legislation either. Chair Kim suggests that perhaps the legislature can urge the departments to do this through a resolution.

- f. *Miscellaneous Discussion*
 - 1) Perhaps recommendations 2 (b.) and 3 (c.) could be linked. The task force suggested looking at the classification system, where how flexible it is could be strongly linked to career development.
 - 2) Perhaps recommendation 2 (b.) would be key in defining an end goal.
 - 3) Mr. Monahan will ask Marie Laderta what the function of DHRD should be and how can the lines be cleaned to ensure the most effective operation of the department.

2. DOE Subcommittee:

Ideas included in a handout and presented by Chair Horner.

a. *Curriculum and Standards*

Discussion: There are 3 legs here: standards; a curriculum to meet those standards; and testing to monitor. The recommendation is to move to a statewide set of core standards in conjunction with the national standards and a standardized curriculum.

b. *Testing*

Discussion: Currently we spend \$40m/yr on testing and test 4-6 times annually which is so much that teachers feel there is no time to teach. Additionally, the test does not tie back to the standards or curriculum resulting in a great deal of disincentivization. We could possibly add back 4-6 classroom days and nationalize the tests to compare them to national standards.

c. *Data Information Systems*

Discussion: Currently there is no database or longitudinal tracking for students. With such a system, teachers would be able to see all details on students so as to better understand their needs. This may not be very expensive. We also have a very antiquated financial management system and could also upgrade interface systems.

d. *Organization (From the KPMG study)*

Discussion: There is a need to modify into two primary functions: academic achievement and administration. This would require a clear definition of personnel roles.

e. *Accountability*

- 1) Discussion: There is a need to hold the appropriate parties more accountable to their decisions and actions (including BOE, Governor, and Superintendent). The current structure appears to breed dysfunction.
- 2) This may require a constitutional amendment, which currently says nothing about accountability. The question remains: who is responsible for student achievement? A Constitutional amendment would have to define more clearly the responsibility of the elected board vis-a-vis the Governor and Superintendent.
 - A) There is a suggestion to give the BOE taxing authority and the ability to raise and manage their own money so as to hold them more accountable.
 - B) Another suggestion could be to appoint the board and the superintendent, thereby holding the Governor responsible.

- 3) The Task force agrees on the accountability issue and that crystal clear accountability is needed.

IV. NEXT MEETING

Monday, January 4, 2010, 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., Rm. 211

V. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:47 a.m.