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The current Managing for Results movement in the American public sector is only the latest rendition of a number of government reform efforts that began in the late 1800’s. Each of these efforts represented an attempt to improve government efficiency and accountability. Parallel with these initiatives, several types of organizations have emerged to support these movements.

This paper focuses on the contributions made by these organizations, particularly the American Society for Public Administration’s (ASPA) Center for Accountability and Performance (CAP). Of particular concern are the roles that these organizations can play in furthering managing for results. To this end, this paper begins by presenting an overview of the various periods in the accountability movement and then describes the supporting organizations. After describing the contributions of these organizations, we then turn to the challenges facing those wishing to promote responsive government and consider recommendations that can help address those challenges.

THE MOVEMENT TOWARD MANAGING FOR RESULTS

In 1886 Woodrow Wilson advocated a civil service reform to help change the negative image that public administration had due to the corrupt behavior of public officials (Wilson, 1968). This effort may be viewed as the first of four periods, described by Bouckaert (1992), preceding the modern management for results movement.

Fighting patronage, Wilson saw a need to hold workers accountable for their actions. This, he believed, could only be accomplished through professionalism. Professionalism would lead to an honest and efficient government. The “progressive” movement that ensued viewed accountability as tantamount to government efficiency. Administration became viewed as a primarily technical question (Bouckaert, 1992) and the emphasis was on procedures and measurement techniques to identify and increase the productivity of workers. Efficiency, generally defined as the ability to produce more output with less input, or the comparison of inputs to outputs (managerial efficiency), became the basis of scientific management studies. The motive for this innovation was the search for better and more productive government.

The measurement of efficiency in this period, according to Miller (1991, p. 13), “stood as the ‘scientific’ check on processes used in government, by providing a performance standard.” Performance standards and techniques of work measurement were introduced in several government agencies, and several professional associations developed grading systems to assess administrative performance (Schick, 1988). In 1938, Ridley and Simon published the results of a study where they identified five kinds of measurement: 1) needs, 2) results, 3) costs, 4) effort, and 5) performance, but the latter three categories were aggregated into a measure of administrative efficiency (Schick, 1988).

This emphasis on efficiency, however, was controversial even during that era. In describing the productivity movement in the United States, Bouckaert (1992) explained that during the period between 1890 and 1940 the received definition of efficiency was opposed by some scholars because it neglected human cost, satisfaction, and benefits produced. For example, Dimock, an early scholar of public administration, challenged the importance attributed to efficiency, contending that it minimized the value of the larger purpose of governance (Caudle, 1987).

During what can be considered the second period, from the 1940s through the 1970s, the focus of government management reform was to control expenses through the budget process. Thus,
productivity--doing more with less--remained of interest (Bouckaert, 1992). It was during this period that the Department of Defense adopted the planning programming budgeting system (PPBS), which was expected to serve as a change agent that would reorient the budgeting process (Scheick, 1988). Like scientific management, PPBS sought to apply management principles based mostly on efficiency values. PPBS “led to the analysis of programs, the establishment of goals, and the rational pursuit of goal and program achievements” (Miller, 1991, p. 15). The orientation was clearly economic, and emphasized optimization, neglected process and procedure, and assumed a public employee counterpart to the Economic Man. This man --Budgeting Man--“whatever his station or role in the budget process, is assumed to be guided by an unwavering commitment to the rule of efficiency; in every instance he chooses that alternative that optimizes the allocation of public resources” (Schick, 1988, p. 59). Other administrative tools of this era, with an inherent emphasis on efficiency, included management by objective (MBO) and zero-based budgeting (ZBB).

Between 1970-1980 American public management saw a continuing emphasis on measuring efficiency and an evolving interest in effectiveness. Attention was paid to program productivity and responsiveness to client needs as well as policy guidance (Miller, 1991). Productivity was defined as efficiency and effectiveness, but there were discussions as to the operationalization of the terms and their relationship (Bouckaert, 1992). The focus on effectiveness was a result of the implementation of PPBS, ZBB, and MBO, which required civil servants to include goals and objectives in their activities.

However, during this period, there was less optimism on government’s ability to deliver public services efficiently. The increasing lack of trust in government’s abilities lead eventually to an emphasis on minimizing the role of government in delivering such services (de Lancer Julnes, 1999). Mark (1981) attributed the need to develop measures of productivity for public agencies to the growth of government and public concern over the rising cost of government. And, as a result of this continued cynicism about the money spent by public organizations on social services (Schein, 1996), public management in the United States entered the “government by the private sector” era in 1980 (Buckaert, 1992).

The focus of the fourth period, between 1980 and 1990, which was to cut government spending. Privatization was born under the assumption that the private sector could do a better job than the public sector at delivering services at a lower cost. This leads us to the current period, the 1990’s to the present, with Americans continuing to express their belief that a large portion of public funds are wasted (Fischer, 1994). This perception, coupled with an increased awareness of improved quality in the private sector has resulted in a number of initiatives to improve accountability in the management of federal programs (Office of Evaluation and Inspection, OEI, 1994). Included among these initiatives are the passages in 1990 of the Chief Financial Officers Act and in 1993 the Government Performance Results Act (GPRA).

In summary, accountability and performance measurement in the public sector throughout most of the 20th century has centered on financial accounting focusing on questions of how much money was spent and on what items (Callahan and Holzer, 1999; Fischer, 1994). Improved performance has mostly been defined in terms of efficiency. Today, however, accountability takes a broader meaning to include the results of actions. Performance has come to mean whether constituents are satisfied with the way tasks have been performed (Romzek and Dubnick, 1998). Thus, current performance monitoring efforts are called Managing for Results.
This latest management reform attempts to link measures to program mission, to set performance targets and to regularly reporting on the achievement of target levels of performance (Newcomer, 1997). Governments now attempt to show their constituents what they are getting for their tax dollars, how efficiently and effectively their tax dollars are spent, and how expenditures benefit their lives (Callahan and Holzer, 1999). We now turn to discuss how and what organizations have helped to promote these goals in the public sector.

TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS PROMOTING ACCOUNTABILITY

Although most reform efforts have been initiated by businessmen, scholars, citizens, and the federal government, a number of organizations have had an important impact on such efforts. This section presents an overview of four types of organizations involved in promoting and supporting better government. These include professional, private, government, and nonprofit, organizations.

One professional organization with a long history of support for the improvement of government’s performance is the International City-County Management Association (ICMA). In 1938, under the authorship of Simon and Ridley, ICMA published Measuring Municipal Activity. This publication suggested several types of information that local governments could use to monitor local services and to assess how well these services were being delivered (Fischer, 1994).

Later, in 1973, ICMA cosponsored and provided technical assistance to the National Science Foundation (NSF) on a survey that sought to assess the effectiveness of the delivery of public services. Two publications came out of this project (in 1974 and in 1977) that provided information on the criteria for selecting effectiveness measures, uses of the measures, and early findings of implementation. In addition, the 1977 publication reported on the percentages of cities that used different measures including measures of effectiveness, efficiency, workload, and goals and objectives (Fukuhara, 1977).

Contrary to some views, however, professional organizations do not tend to promulgate standards of performance as is often believed (Ammons, 1994). Their influence on managerial reform resides more in their endorsement of guidelines and standards and their advice given to agencies with a more direct role in developing standards. Professional organizations may also disseminate information and provide training, which can indirectly influence the setting of standards. One of such organizations is ASPA. Since its founding in 1939, ASPA has been committed to the professionalization of public service. Consistent with this mission, in 1996 ASPA founded CAP. The role of CAP in the management for result effort is discussed in the next section. Further information on the role of ASPA in the development of American public administration, is presented by Mary Hamilton in this panel.

Research on government by private, independent, organizations such as the Brookings Institution, whose predecessor was the privately sponsored Institute for Government Research (IGA), also had an important impact on supporting, if not defining the meaning of “better government” in the early part of the 20th century. For example, in regards with the controversy as to whether the focus of government should be efficiency, the IGA, in making its assessment of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, believed that outcomes and results in an agency would improve as a consequence of improved efficiency (Bouckaert, 1992). Today, the Brookings Institution continues to be a leader in providing information that seeks to improve the performance of public institutions and programs.
A number of government-sponsored initiatives and organizations have also focused on improving the performance of public agencies. In 1906, the quest for better government lead to the development in New York City of the Bureau of City Betterment, which later became the Bureau of Municipal Research. This initiative then became the model for many other cities across the country, Canada, and abroad (Gulick, 1928). The local level initiatives were also followed by similar programs at the national level whose main focus was administrative reform and the study of government and principles of administration. For example, in 1913 President Taft created the Taft Commission; the President’s Committee on Administrative Management (Brownlow Committee) was created under President Roosevelt in the 1930s.

Further, in 1949 the first Hoover Commission made recommendations on performance budgets and standards, and in 1955 the second Hoover Commission made recommendations on budgets, costs, and management reports (Bouckaert, 1992). The commissions worked to streamline the federal government because it had grown too large and too disorganized as a result of the Great Depression and World War II (Fisher, 1994).

In 1970, President Richard Nixon created the National Commission on Productivity (which later became the National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life in 1977 under president Jimmy Carter). The purpose of the commission was to improve productivity growth and increase economic effectiveness in the public and private sectors of the United States. When this Center was eliminated in 1978, its public sector focus was assumed by what is known today as the National Center for Public Productivity.

Another government-sponsored initiative is the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA). The Academy, founded in 1967, is an independent, nonpartisan organization chartered by Congress to assist federal, state, and local government in improving their effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability (NAPA, 2000). NAPA’s congressional charter was signed into law in 1984.

A more recent government-sponsored organization was the founding in 1993, under President Bill Clinton and the leadership of Vice-President Al Gore, of the National Performance Review, which became the National Partnership for Reinventing Government in 1998. This organization has developed steps to deal with areas in need of reform. One of the outcomes of these efforts Managing for Results, which the Results Act of 1993 (Government Performance and Results Act, GPRA) to develop a “high-performing, outcome-driven, fully accountable federal government” (National Partnership for Reinventing Government, 2000). One of the goals, as intended by Congress, is to improve the confidence of Americans in the capability of the Federal Government. All levels of government, however, have embraced managing for results.

Finally, nonprofit organizations have also had an important role in government reform in general, and the measure of performance in particular. One of the most notable institutions is the Urban Institute, whose contribution began shortly after its founding in 1968 with the development of methods for government and human services to measure the performance of their programs. The Institute continues to conduct research and disseminate this knowledge to help solve social problems and to improve government decisions and their implementation.

With this short overview, we now turn to discuss the role of ASPA’s Center for Accountability and Performance (CAP) in support of Managing for Results.
THE CENTER FOR ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE

In November 1996, the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) established the Center for Accountability and Performance (CAP). This decision was based on the 3-year effort of ASPA’s Task Force on Government Accomplishment and Accountability. The task force recommended that CAP be created as an ASPA standing committee or “Center” to address the extensive emphasis and requirement for all levels of government to move to performance-based, results-driven management.

Mission

The mission of CAP is to improve the practice of public service by helping ASPA members to acquire the knowledge, technical skills and resources necessary to successfully manage for results. CAP achieves its mission through education, training, advocacy, technical assistance, resource sharing, and research into best practices in performance management.

Organization

CAP is operated by two co-chairs who lead a nine-member CAP Board and fourteen CAP Fellows in strategic planning, specific projects and activities. The CAP Director manages the day-to-day operations of the Center and provides guidance and support to the co-chairs and supporting board members and fellows in achieving CAP goals.

Goals

CAP’s goals are to:

- Demonstrate the value of performance measurement and management to line managers, staff, elected officials and the public;
- Equip and motivate ASPA members to be learners of best practices and leaders of positive change;
- Identify successful practices in public sector performance management, both in the US and internationally; and
- Act as a central information source for strategic planning, performance measurement, and best practices research and techniques.

Cap Resources And Training Programs

In support of these goals, CAP provides numerous training and information resources variously geared to government practitioners, academics and students. Some of the many training materials and information resources available from CAP include:

- CAP’s popular workbook, *Performance Measurement: Concepts and Techniques*. Already in its third printing, this workbook is designed for use in workshops, as a self-study course, or as a handy reference tool.
- A growing body of case studies prepared by local, state and federal government practitioners describing their application of performance measurement and management, strategic planning and
managing for results. Abstracts of all case studies are available on this web site and may also be ordered on-line.

- The “CAP Corner,” a monthly feature published in ASPA’s PA Times and on this web site highlighting various on-going activities in performance measurement.

- A 3-part video series, Managing for Results: The Key to More Responsive Government, narrated by National Public Radio White House correspondent Mara Liasson. This video series provides insights from national leaders on implementing results-oriented government and features interviews with over 50 city and county practitioners. The video series also includes a 174-page resource manual with a facilitator’s guide.

- A multi-media CD-ROM training program, Applying Performance Measurement, co-sponsored with the ICMA (International City/County Management Association), the Urban Institute, and PTI (Public Technology Inc.)

- The “Brown Bag Lunch Series on Performance Measurement and Evaluation” co-sponsored with the US General Accounting Office and George Washington University (DC area only). This monthly series began in January 1999 and has included such useful, informative topics as “Measuring Performance in Cross-cutting Areas” and “Validity and Reliability of Performance Data.”

- Comprehensive web Links to PM-related web sites, including links to key Best Practices web sites.

- The new Performance Measurement Message Board in ASPA’s new On-Line Community, where members can discuss PM issues and share PM news, comments, questions, and advice with other members interested in PM and Managing for Results.

Although most of CAP’s training and information resources are available to non-members, CAP’s special emphasis is to help ASPA members acquire the knowledge and technical skills they need to better “manage for results.” To this end, the Center has a cadre of experienced, knowledgeable practitioners, academics, and consultants who, upon request and availability, can work with regional conference committees and individual ASPA chapters and sections to provide low-cost training workshops, host conference panels, or make special presentations to ASPA members. Furthermore, the Center for Accountability and Performance is continually expanding its services and product lines to help ASPA members stay informed. Ultimately, the goal is to be a one-stop shop for PM information and training resources.

CHALLENGES AHEAD

Whatever the successes of the long tradition of performance measurement, there are a number of interrelated challenges that organizations such as CAP continue to confront as they promote the goals of managing for results. These challenges can be broadly categorized as: 1) underutilization of performance measures by public organizations; 2) sustaining performance measurement systems; 3) involving citizens in the drive for performance improvement. The first is discussed from the perspective of current research and experiences of government organizations experimenting with performance measurement; the other two are also based on concerns that emerged during the 1998 Performance Measurement, Performance Improvement on-line conference sponsored by the National Center for Public Productivity. These issues, we believe will continue to have an important impact in current and future government reform efforts.
I. On the matter of Underutilization

In spite of the long history of efforts to measure performance to bring about government reform in the United States, not many state and local governments have developed performance measurement systems and even fewer implement or actually use these systems to improve decision-making, or report out to citizens, elected officials and the media. For example, Osborne and Plastrik (1998) don’t even discuss performance measurement as an approach to reform, indicating that although some public organizations have measured performance for years this has had almost no impact in their performance. Measuring does not necessarily force fundamental change in public organizations. This insight speaks to the fact that even when performance measures have been developed, they are not implemented thus hindering the success of the reform effort.

Further illustration of this issue is provided by the results of a survey of governmental institutions conducted by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) in 1996. The results indicated that even though a significant percent of the respondents stated that their organization had developed some form of performance measures, a small percentages actually used them for strategic planning, resource allocation, or program monitoring (GASB, 1997). Similarly, in the preface of his latest book Hatry (1999) noted that even organizations that had been routinely collecting data on service outcome, had not been using the data in a systematic way to evaluate services.

In seeking to understand this underutilization, Halacmi (1998) has argued that we have not learned the lessons from the past performance measurement efforts. He stated that organization structures need to be adjusted so that they are more conducive to performance measurement. Structure in organizations reflects more than just economy or efficiency.

Using the image of a Procrustean Bed, de Lancer Julnes (1999) argued that one of the reasons for the lack of success of previous reform efforts, and performance measurement in particular, is the lack of fit between organization needs and performance measurement solutions. One source of this lack of fit is the “persistent disregard of factors outside the rational/technocratic model of organizational change” (p. 46). As discussed in the first section of this paper, performance measurement as a vehicle to bring about government reform through accountability is deeply rooted in the tradition of scientific management and an emphasis on efficiency. Reliance on a technocratic view does not allowed researchers or those attempting to support management reform to develop strategies that deal with the nuances of organizational life (de Lancer Julnes and Holzer, forthcoming).

Even more important, however, is the need to recognize that there are stages of utilization--adoption and implementation- and also the need to consider contextual organizational factors that may affect the fit between the organization and performance measurement systems. Such reflection may force us to think about ways in which to support each of the two stages. For example, while not discounting the importance of technocratic factors such as resources (personnel, time, money, data, etc.), knowledge of how to conduct performance measures, and having a goal orientation which show a preponderance to affect adoption of performance measures, de Lancer Julnes and Holzer argue that organizational politics and organizational culture have an important impact on whether organizations fully embrace performance measurement. They indicate that efforts to promote performance measurement utilization, and implementation in particular, require the inclusion of interest groups such as management and non-management employees, citizens, elected officials, and unions. The reasons are
simple, even when the information can be used in a positive manner, individual managers and employees may feel threatened by the possibility that the information may open their program to criticism (Kingdon, 1995). The support and involvement of citizens and elected officials are needed because the organizations will need to devote resources to the performance measurement effort. Also, unless managers are allowed to use the information even if the results are against the political agenda, their reform effort may be frustrated. As pointed out by Wildavsky (1988), very often when programs serve a strong constituency, efforts to cut the program based on performance information may not only fail but the program may even see a budget increase.

A related point is the need for organizations to develop a performance improvement culture. When the organizational culture encourages and supports management and non-management employees to implement appropriate organizational innovation and change and when both view performance measurement as a vehicle for performance improvement, accountability efforts will be successful.

II. Sustaining Performance Measurement System

Experience suggests that success in performance measurement requires a long-term commitment to develop, use, and refine performance measures (Stahl, 1998; Merjanian, 1996; Tracy, 1996; Marshall, 1996). This long-term commitment needed to sustain it is believed to be among the chief obstacles to success in performance measurement (Stahl, 1998). Stability, however, could be a mixed blessing because it could stifle innovation and cause the organization to measure the same old things. Some have suggested (Halacmi, 1998, for example) that reorganization may help management for results succeed. Reorganization can be a driving force to compel organizations to develop new measurement systems and rethink their goals and strategies. However, that too can be very disruptive to measurement efforts because they are often designed to fit the needs of a particular organizational structure. Thus, the question is how to keep the right amount of stability that also allows for continuous improvement.

Similarly, Wholey (2000) has suggested that efforts to implement results-oriented management could be thwarted by an overly centralized or overly decentralized agency or program. While professional organizations may not be able to directly affect the structure of public organizations, they can provide training that helps to develop a performance improvement culture by integrating the concepts of management for results into the daily activities of the organization (de Lancer Julnes and Holzer, forthcoming; Wholey, 1999). Even though it may be necessary for organizations to reorganize, a performance improvement culture can help guide this change so to minimize disruption to the performance measurement effort.

The lessons learned about developing sustainable performance measurement systems have other implications as well. For example, some state and local government organizations that have experimented with performance measurement have concluded that performance measurement is political because of the resources, time, and commitment necessary to develop the system (Marshall, 1996; Tracy, 1996). This suggests that for management for results to be successful, organizations need to identify and involve their internal and external stakeholders (de Lancer Julnes and Holzer, forthcoming). Together with senior officials and key stakeholders, managers will need to develop agreed-on goals and arrive at a consensus as to the resources, activities, and processes required to meet these goals (Wholey, 1999).
III. Citizen-Driven Government Performance

Citizens can be considered a special group of organizations’ external stakeholders. Today there is a great deal of discussion as to the need to involve citizens in the performance improvement effort (Glaser, Aristigueta, and Payton, 2000; Epstein et al., 2000). Callahan and Holzer (1999, p. 51) have stated that in order to develop an objective approach to accountability that “is accepted as impartial, utilized as a means of adding value to public decisions, and applied to positively impact the day-to-day lives of citizens,” organizations have to involve citizens in the process of performance measurement. In particular, since the ultimate goal of a performance improvement effort is the improvement of quality of life of citizens, it is important to view the community as part of the elements necessary for performance improvement.

Furthermore, some argue that engaging citizens in performance improvement efforts, can help to (re)build public trust in government and lead to the long term sustainability of the performance measurement because citizens can create accountability among policy makers (Epstein, 1998; Weidner and Noss-Reavely, 1996). In addition, the experience of the Council on Human Investment in Iowa indicated that citizens’ participation is important as a change strategy (Weidner and Noss-Reavely, 1996). Citizens are viewed as “a vital force to shape the responsiveness and quality of government in their community” (Epsein, et al., 2000).

Consistent with existing research on participatory evaluation, discussions during the Performance Measurement on-line conference acknowledged the need to involve citizens but also recognized that there are many challenges involved in this task. First, any participatory approach requires an investment of time and money (Innocenti and Roberts, 1999). Second, because of the diversity of clients that public organizations serve, there is a need to identify the most effective approaches to engage each citizen group. Experience of program evaluators suggests that diversity in the background of participants can provide a more holistic view of the meaning and content of the issue (Mathie and Greene, 1997). Third, those wishing to involve citizens need to ensure democratic participation so that no one value system or interest dominates the effort. This is very important given that participatory approaches tend to give greatest voice to those with the most experience and political power (de Lancer Julnes, 1999).

Paradoxically, two other issues arise. The first issue is the question of how to involve citizens. The second is who to involve (Mathie and Greene, 1997). Related to the first, one strategy may be better for one group of citizens and not for another. One may suggest that to deal with this situation organizations should develop multiple approaches. While in theory this seems a sound strategy, due to lack of resources among other things, it may be difficult for public organizations to put it into practice. With regards to the second, not all citizens may need to be involved in the performance measurement process, and not all voices should carry the same weight. For example, we might not want to include the input of someone who has been convicted of molesting children in developing measures of performance for a community’s child abuse awareness program.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Managing for Results in the United States is part of a long lineage of government reform. The
account presented in this paper has shown how reform efforts began with an emphasis on accountability and efficiency and the use of performance measurement as the main tool to achieve these goals. During the 20th century the goals evolved to include effectiveness and, recently, outcomes or results.

This paper also discussed the ways in which different types of organizations, including professional organizations such as CAP, have had an impact on government reform. Some organizations, such as those sponsored by government, have done this by means of setting standards of performance. Others, such as professional, private, and nonprofit organizations, have influenced government reform through the dissemination of knowledge and by endorsing reform efforts.

These discussions provide a context for understanding the challenges ahead of Managing for Results. Specifically, the discussion identified three interrelated issues that included the need for strategies to promote utilization of performance measures, the need to develop strategies for sustaining performance measurement systems, and the need to involve citizens in the measurement effort. In order for the current management for results effort to be successful, public organizations need to develop strategies for overcoming those challenges. Professional organizations, like CAP, interested in supporting the Managing for Results movement can work with public organizations to help in developing such strategies. For example, we can suggest that professional organizations’ efforts be directed in the following ways:

- Provide assistance in identifying and developing the organization’s internal and external stakeholders. First, the support of these groups is essential for the adoption and implementation of performance measures. In particular, these groups are an important influence in creating the mechanisms necessary for carrying out the performance measures effort in support of managing for results. Second, engaging all appropriate stakeholders in the process will make measures useful and improve the chances of their utilization.

- Help public organizations develop strategies to promote and sustain appropriate citizen participation. At the same time, these strategies must support diversity and democratic participation.

- Devise strategies for developing a culture that supports performance improvement and results. It will take time for employees to overcome the fear, sometimes rational sometimes not, of performance measures. However, by having organizations develop goals that lead to performance improvement and clearly communicate those goals, as well as the strategies for achieving them, superior performance would come to be expected.

- Conduct targeted dissemination of knowledge about the value of performance measures and the necessary long-term commitment to public organization’s internal and external stakeholders. Stakeholders must be convinced that benefits will outweigh costs.

- Disseminate and continue the improvement of the knowledge on how to develop performance measurement systems. The knowledge needed includes defining the goals and strategies for achieving the goals, identifying appropriate performance indicators, and collecting the appropriate data for analysis.

- Provide training on how to effectively implement performance measures. This would include strategies for communicating performance information to all stakeholders, and information on how
to use the measures in strategic planning and in program management, monitoring, and evaluation.
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