

Performance Measurement: Adding Value through Citizens

Rutgers University
Graduate Department of Public Administration

Prof. Kathe Callahan
Spring 2002
Thursdays 5:30- 8:10

Office: 724 Hill Hall
kathe@andromeda.rutgers.edu
Call or e-mail for appointment 973-353-5093 x. 31

Overview of the course:

Performance measurement is a concept that has taken on renewed importance in the field of public administration.

In part this renewed interest can be attributed to resolutions by various professional organizations urging governments to institute systems for goal-setting and performance measurement. The added emphasis can also be attributed to quality of life issues that are of growing concern to communities around the world. Movements toward greater environmental quality, sustainable development, and healthy communities are evidence of a push for an improved quality of life. Performance measurement is an important tool in identifying and measuring quality of life indicators; especially when citizens are involved in developing and reporting these measures.

This course explores the relationship between performance measurement and citizen participation. Students will come to see the value of involving citizens in the measurement of state and local government performance. They will also become familiar with the challenges associated with creating and sustaining meaningful citizen participation. Through theoretical and practical exercises students will systematically examine the important dimensions of performance measurement and citizen participation. How can we develop indicators of performance that are meaningful to citizens and public administrators? How do we effectively communicate these measures to the public so that citizens can hold government accountable for results? How can we develop appropriate participation techniques to foster and sustain citizen involvement? How do citizens know they are getting value for their tax dollar? This course is designed to provide students with the opportunity to wrestle with these questions by acquainting them with the basic themes, concepts and competencies of performance measurement and citizen participation.

Course objectives:

This course aims to:

- a. Increase knowledge about citizen participation and performance measurement.
- b. Create an opportunity for students to learn and demonstrate various performance measurement techniques.
- c. Create an opportunity for students to learn and demonstrate the various approaches to citizen participation in a democratic society.
- d. Develop an understanding of the role of the public administrator in facilitating or discouraging citizen participation.
- e. Develop a general understanding of the evolving role of the public administrator.

Learning outcomes or competencies:

Students must be able to:

- a. Identify, analyze and critique the key benefits and shortcomings of a current performance measurement system for a local government.
- b. Develop and explain at least three options that would enhance the existing performance measurement system critiqued for class.
- c. Understand and explain the problems associated with the provision of quality municipal services, fiscal stress and resistance to tax increases.
- d. Demonstrate knowledge of various performance measurement techniques including: input, output, outcome and efficiency indicators, citizen surveys, balanced scorecards, and benchmarking.
- e. Distinguish among the different models of citizenship including their assumptions for high performing governments.
- f. Understand systemic factors that influence public participation, e.g. the role of policy design.
- g. Understand the role and values of various participation techniques such as public hearings, advisory committees, citizen commissions and boards, grass roots organizing.

Detailed reading list, required and recommended:

Required Text:

John Clayton Thomas, Public Participation in Public Decisions, Jossey-Bass, 1995

Harry Hatry, Performance Measurement: Getting Results, Urban Institute Press, 1999.

Recommended Text:

Richard Kearney and Evan Berman, Public Sector Performance: Management, Motivation and Measurement, Westview, 1999.

Cheryl Simrell King and Camilla Stivers, Government is Us, Sage, 1998.

Required Articles:

Sherry Arnstein, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 1969, 8(3), p. 217-224.

Sherry Arnstein, "Maximum Feasible Manipulation," Public Administration Review, 1973, 10(33), p. 377-390.

Charles Bens, "Effective Citizen Participation: How to Make it Happen," National Civic Review, April 1994, 83:1.

Evan Berman, "Dealing with Cynical Citizens" in Public Administration Review, March/April 1997, p. 105-112.

Evan Berman and XiaoHu Wang, "Performance Measurement in U.S. Counties: Capacity for Reform," Public Administration Review, Sep/Oct 2000, 60(5), p. 409-420

Kathe Callahan, "Results-oriented government: Citizen Involvement in Performance Measurement" Paper presented at Winelands Conference, Stellenbosch, South Africa, September 12-15, 2001

Robert Denhardt and Janet Vinzant Denhardt, "The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering," in Public Administration Review, July/August 2000, p. 549-559.

Paul Epstein, Lyle Wray, Martha Marshall and Stuart Grifel, "Engaging Citizens in Achieving Results that Matter: A Model for Effective 21st Century Governance," A paper presented at the ASPA CAP Symposium on Results-oriented Government, February 2000.

Richard J. Fischer, "An Overview of Performance Measurement," Public Management, Sept. 1994.

Fountain, James, "Are State and Local Governments Using Performance Measures?" PA Times, 1997, 20 (1): 2, 8.

Harry Hatry, "Performance Measurement Principles and Techniques: An Overview for Local Government," in Richard Kearney and Evan Berman, Public Sector Performance: Management, Motivation and Measurement, Westview, 1999.

Cheryl Simrell King, et. Al., "The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration," in Public Administration Review, 58, 1998, p. 317-327

John Nalbandian, "Facilitating Community, Enabling Democracy: New Roles for Local Government Managers," in Public Administration Review, May/June 1999, p. 187-197.

Theodore Poister and Gregory Streib, "Performance Measurement in Municipal Government: Assessing the State of the Practice," in Public Administration Review, July/August 1999, p. 325-335.

Public Administration Review, special issue on citizenship and public administration, March 1984.

Robert Putnam, "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America," PS, 28 (1995), 664-683.

Robert Putnam, "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital," Journal of Democracy, 1995, 6:1, p. 65-78.

Gerald Smith and Carole Huntsman, "Reframing the Metaphor of the Citizen-Government Relationship," in Public Administration Review, 57, 1997, 309-318.

Edward C Weeks, "The Practice of Deliberative Democracy: Results from Four Large-Scale Trials" in Public Administration Review, July/August 2000, p. 360-372.

Lyle Wray and Jody Hauer, "Performance Measurement to Achieve Quality of Life, PM, 1997, 79(8).

Course Requirements:

Class participation: I expect students to come to class prepared and ready to participate in all class activities. This includes readings, class discussions, small group activities, debates, and reaction papers.

Reaction papers: Reacting to what other people write helps you think about what they have to say, as well hone your own skills at writing clearly and concisely. These are short, 2-3 pages, papers and each student is expected to submit three reaction papers over the course of the semester. I will develop a schedule that will evenly distribute the papers and have the schedule to you the second week of classes. I know that the class roster will

change and therefore I did not create a schedule as of yet. In the reaction papers I expect you to react -- tell me what you think about the readings and if possible apply the theory to present day situations. I do not want a summary of the assigned readings. Students submitting reaction papers will be responsible for leading part of the class discussion the evening their paper is due.

Critique and Recommendations of Existing Performance Measurement System: You may select any community you want –the one you work in or live in, or one discovered on the Internet (however, not Montclair, Dayton, Syracuse or Winston-Salem as we will discuss them as a class). Describe in detail their system of measuring performance. What type of data do they collect? Who collects it? How often? Are measures collected for every function? How are measures reported? Are they tied to the budget? To performance assessments? To a strategic plan? Are citizens involved in the process? How? When? After describing what they do, tell me what you think. Is this a good system? Why or Why not? What would you do differently? Discuss three specific recommendations you have for improvement.

Research Paper on Citizen Participation: An in depth analysis of citizen participation in public sector decision-making (not just performance measurement). Examine the changing role of citizens and public administrators over time. Discuss the reasons for these changes. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of involving citizens in the decision-making process. Conclude your paper with a discussion on what you perceive to be the appropriate role for citizens and public administrators. I expect this analysis to be grounded in the public administration literature. You need to conduct a thorough literature review and show your knowledge of the various public administration journals. 15 pages.

Original Performance Measurement System: The class will be divided into two citizen advisory committees. While both committees have received the charge from the mayors of their respective communities to develop a manageable/feasible performance measurement plan and present that plan to the town/city council for approval, there is a difference; one committee represents an urban community, the other suburban. My only restriction is that both communities be New Jersey communities. Your committee may select the community – based on personal contacts and access to needed information or based on the availability of web-based information. The plan you develop should reflect the priorities of the community you represent and acknowledge the demographic data of the community in terms of data collection, data reporting, and citizen involvement. The plan you develop should be feasible, meaning it could reasonably be implemented, yet detailed. Will you build on an exiting framework or start from scratch? Where do you begin and how do you begin? With who? Why? Anticipate how much time it will take to implement the plan. The resources needed. If you plan to engage citizens, how will you do that? The written plan should be presented to me as if I were the Mayor of your community. Included in your plan should be examples of data collection tools, surveys, sample reporting formats, etc.

Group Presentation: Each group will present their plan to the class as if they were presenting their plan to the Mayor and council. The students not presenting will act as the Mayor and council; asking questions, raising concerns – political and otherwise. Be prepared to think on your feet. Come prepared with handouts, PowerPoint presentation; whatever you think is needed and appropriate in gaining approval. The Mayor and council will vote to adopt, or shelve, the plan based on your report and presentation. The presentation should take one hour. Be creative.

Evaluation criteria, weight in final grade and due dates for work:

Elements of Grade	Weight	Due Date
Weekly Reaction Papers	15%	Weekly
Critique and Recommendations of Existing Performance Measurement System	20%	8 th week
Research Paper on Citizen Participation	25%	10 th week
Original Performance Measurement System	25%	12 th -14 th week
Group presentation	15%	12 th -14 th week

Week by week list of topics, readings, assignments:

Week 1: Introductions, course overview, expectations
1/24/02

Week 2: Adding value to performance measurement
1/31/02

Read: Lyle Wray and Jody Hauer, “Performance Measurement to Achieve Quality of Life,” PM, 1997, 79(8).

Paul Epstein, Lyle Wray, Martha Marshall and Stuart Grifel, “Engaging Citizens in Achieving Results that Matter: A Model for Effective 21st Century Governance,” A paper presented at the ASPA CAP Symposium on Results-oriented Government, February 2000.

Kathe Callahan, “Results-oriented government: Citizen Involvement in Performance Measurement” Paper presented at Winelands Conference, Stellenbosch, South Africa, September 12-15, 2001

Week 3: Performance Measurement Basics
2/7/02 Readings:

Theodore Poister and Gregory Streib, "Performance Measurement in Municipal Government: Assessing the State of the Practice," in Public Administration Review, July/August 1999, p. 325-335.

Harry Hatry, "Performance Measurement Principles and Techniques: An Overview for Local Government," in Richard Kearney and Evan Berman, Public Sector Performance: Management, Motivation and Measurement, Westview, 1999.

Richard J. Fischer, "An Overview of Performance Measurement," Public Management, Sept. 1994.

Fountain, James, "Are State and Local Governments Using Performance Measures?" PA Times, 1997, 20 (1): 2, 8

Weeks 4 & 5: Citizen Participation
2/14/02, 2/21/02 Readings:

Sherry Arnstein, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 1969, 8(3), p. 217-224.

Sherry Arnstein, "Maximum Feasible Manipulation," Public Administration Review, 1973, 10(33), p. 377-390.

Charles Bens, "Effective Citizen Participation: How to Make it Happen," National Civic Review, April 1994, 83:1.

Robert Putnam, "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America," PS, 28 (1995), 664- 683.

Cheryl Simrell King, et. Al., "The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration," in Public Administration Review, 58, 1998, p. 317-327.

Public Administration Review, special issue on citizenship and public administration, March 1984.

Week 6: Public Participation in Public Decisions – Thomas book
2/28/02

Weeks 7 & 8: Performance Measurement Process -- Hatry Book
3/7/02, 3/14/02 (No Reaction Papers)

Oregon Benchmarks, Minnesota Milestones, Portland Experience

Critique of and Recommendations for Existing Performance Measurement System Due

BREAK

Week 9: The New Public Administrator—From Expert to Facilitator
3/28/02 Readings:

Evan Berman, “Dealing with Cynical Citizens” in Public Administration Review,
March/April 1997, p. 105-112.

Weeks, Edward C. “The Practice of Deliberative Democracy: Results from Four Large-
Scale Trials” in Public Administration Review, July/August 2000, p. 360-372.

John Nalbandian, “Facilitating Community, Enabling Democracy: New Roles for Local
Government Managers,” in Public Administration Review, May/June 1999, p. 187-197.

Robert Denhardt and Janet Vinzant Denhardt, “The New Public Service: Serving
Rather than Steering,” in Public Administration Review, July/August 2000, p.
549-559.

Gerald Smith and Carole Huntsman, “Reframing the Metaphor of the Citizen-
Government Relationship,” in Public Administration Review, 57, 1997, 309-318.

Research Paper on Citizen Participation Due

Weeks 10 & 11: Bringing Citizens into the Equation
4/4/02; 4/11/02 Cases: Montclair, Dayton, Syracuse, Winston-Salem

Week 12: Communicating Results
4/18/02 Reports, Data, Technology, Media

Week 13 & 14: Student Presentations
4/25/02, 5/2/02 **Final Paper Due**