

LINKS TO OREGON BENCHMARKS

Agency Name: Public Employees Retirement System		Last Revised: 12/18/02	
Contact Person: David Bailey		Phone: 503-603-7702	
Alternate Contact: Matthew Rickard		Phone: 503-603-7576	

Related Oregon Benchmarks (OBMs) or High-Level Outcomes (HLOs):								
Secondary links to the following Oregon Benchmarks: 53 – Poverty Rate 54 – Health Insurance								
Mission Statement – Our Mission is to provide the highest quality services so each member has the opportunity for a successful retirement.								
Agency Goal	OBM# HLO#	Key Performance Measure	PM #	PM Since	New or Mod.?	2000 Value	2005 Target	Lead Division or Unit (Optional)
Goal 1 Provide high quality service to members.	53	Service Retirements Established per FTE.	459-01	1/1997	Mod	2.18	2.25	Retirement
Goal 1	53	Percentage of service retirements paid in 1-15 days.	459-02	1/1997	Mod	79%	80%	Retirement
Goal 1	53	Direct cost per retirement established.	459-03	1/1997	Mod	\$156	\$130	Retirement
Goal 1	53	Customer satisfaction rating with service retirement established.	459-04	1/1997	Mod	89%	90%	Retirement
Goal 2 Encourage participation in Deferred Comp among eligible members.	53	Percentage of increase in Deferred Comp participants annually.	459-05	7/1993	Mod	3%	5%	Deferred Compensation
Goal 3 Encourage maximum retirement savings by Def Comp participants.	53	Percentage of increase in total Deferred Comp dollars deferred annually.	459-06	7/1993	Mod	5.9%	7.5%	Deferred Compensation
Goal 4 Provide high quality service to Deferred Comp participants.	53	Cost per Deferred Comp participant for meetings and counseling.	459-07	7/1993	Mod	N/A	\$1.25	Deferred Compensation
Goal 4	53	Deferred Comp customer satisfaction rating.	459-08	7/1993	Mod	97%	98%	Deferred Compensation

PERFORMANCE MEASURE DATA SUMMARY

Agency Name: Public Employees Retirement System	
Contact Person: David Bailey	Phone: 503-603-7702
Alternate Contact: Matthew Rickard	Phone: 503-603-7576

Performance Measure Definition (numbered as shown below)	Data					Targets					
	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
<u>Agency # - 1</u> Service Retirements per FTE #459-01 – The average number of service retirements per month per agency FTE. This is an indicator of the overall output of the agency.	2.95	2.18	1.74	2.24	3.51	N/A	N/A	2.20	2.25	2.25	2.25
<u>Agency # - 2</u> Percentage of Retirements paid in 1-15 days #459-02 – The % of new service retirements paid out within 15 days of first payment due (statute requires within 62 days of first payment due). This measures customer service and agency compliance.	81%	79%	70%	47%	48%	N/A	N/A	80%	80%	80%	80%
<u>Agency # - 3</u> Direct Cost per Retirement Established #459-03 – The total direct cost (direct labor, computer time & postage) to establish retirements divided by the number of service retirements established.	\$155	\$156	\$86	\$47	\$61	N/A	N/A	\$130	\$130	\$130	\$130
<u>Agency # - 4</u> Customer Satisfaction Rating with Service Retirements Established #459-04 – Results of new retiree responses to Retirement Services survey. Total points awarded divided by total points possible.	88.75%	89%	89.75%	90%	85%	N/A	N/A	90%	90%	90%	90%
<u>Agency # - 5</u> Percentage of increase in Deferred Comp participants annually. #459-05 - Measures Def Comp participant growth. Number of new participants each year divided by total number of participants at beginning of year.	5%	3%	7%	6%	1%	N/A	N/A	5%	5%	5%	5%

Performance Measure Definition (numbered as shown below)	Data					Targets					
<u>Agency # - 6</u> Percentage of increase in total Deferred Comp dollars deferred annually. #459-06 - Measures effectiveness of Def Comp program to encourage participants to maximize their retirement savings.	9.5%	5.9%	6.2%	2.8%	3.9%	N/A	N/A	5%	6%	7%	7.5%
<u>Agency # - 7</u> Cost per Deferred Comp participant for meetings and counseling. #459-07 – Demonstrates efficient spending for Def Comp counseling and presentations. Total annual cost of counseling presentations & meetings divided by the total number of plan participants.	\$1.38	N/A	N/A	\$0.74 *	\$0.92	N/A	N/A	\$0.75	\$1.35	\$1.30	\$1.25
<u>Agency # - 8</u> Deferred Comp customer satisfaction rating. #459-08 – Demonstrates overall customer satisfaction with Def Comp program. Point system based on responses to enrollment and counseling meeting surveys.	100%	97%	99%	99%	99%	N/A	N/A	99%	99%	99%	98%
Agency # - 9											
Agency # - 10											

*The 2002 data for measure #459-07 represents a transition year for this service, and costs were significantly lower for several reasons (legislative and budgetary changes, as well as methodological changes). The costs should return to normal in the following years.

DATA SOURCES – PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM

- 459-01 Service retirements established per FTE: PERS Retirement Services Section statistical data
- 459-02 Percentage of service retirements paid in 1-15 days: PERS Retirement Services Section statistical data
- 459-03 Direct cost per retirement established: PERS Retirement Services Section statistical data
- 459-04 Customer satisfaction rating with service retirement established: New retiree surveys
- 459-05 Percentage of increase in Deferred Comp participants: Oregon Savings Growth Plan (Def Comp) statistical data
- 459-06 Percentage of increase in total Deferred Comp dollars deferred annually: OSGP statistical data
- 459-07 Cost per Deferred Comp participant for meetings and counseling: OSGP statistical data
- 459-08 Deferred Comp customer satisfaction rating: OSGP participant surveys

Performance Measures Review

FINAL

Agency: Public Employees Retirement System
Date: December 18, 2002
Lead Reviewer: Jeff Tryens
Approved: George Dunford

Mission: Provide the highest quality services so each member has the opportunity for a successful retirement.

Summary

The Performance Measure Review Committee finds that this agency's performance measures meet all five criteria in the guidelines. Eight performance measures are aligned with four goals and the mission statement. The agency also identifies secondary links to two Oregon Benchmarks – poverty and health insurance coverage. The measures lack any indicator relating to financial soundness of the system. PERS staff believes that the health of system is more an economic and legislative issue than an agency performance issue. Language meets standard concepts and definitions. Targets appear to be ambitious but realistic. A data sources sheet indicates that data will be verifiable.

Comments and recommendations specific to basic criteria

1. Gauge progress towards goals and pertinent benchmarks - Meets

The agency offers eight performance measures, aligned with four goals and their mission statement. The agency also identifies two Oregon Benchmarks – poverty and health care – for linkages. The agency acknowledges these links are secondary, not related to its core mission. Unlike in previous biennia, secondary links are no longer necessary to list. The agency does not offer a measure on the soundness of PERS. PERS staff claims that the health of system is more an economic and legislative issue than an agency performance issue. The agency did not add BM 35, public management quality, to its links, as was previously suggested.

2. A few key measures - Meets

The agency has eight measures that appear important as far as they go.

3. Conforms to standard concepts and definitions - Meets

The measures are primarily outputs, efficiency and customer satisfaction.. All measures are well stated except #5. In this instance, the agency is reporting a percentage increase in an activity without identifying the time period over which that change is occurring.

4. Targets - Meets

The agency offers targets for all of its measures. All targets appear moderately ambitious.

5. Accurate and reliable data –Meets

459-08 Data sources indicate the data will be verifiable.