



Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
**P11.2170 - PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND
MANAGEMENT FOR PUBLIC, NONPROFIT, AND HEALTH CARE
ORGANIZATIONS**

**Fall, 2010 Tuesdays, 4:55-
6:35pm, 712 Silver Center**

Professor Dennis C. Smith 295 Lafayette, Room 3073

212-998-7425; dennis.smith@nyu.edu

Office hours Mondays, 5-6, Tuesdays 330-430, and by appointment.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

For most of its history the field of public administration devoted little attention to the systematic measurement of performance defined in terms of outcomes (ie., services or products that make a difference in the lives of people or communities). Instead, outcomes were *assumed* to follow from proper organizational arrangements and adherence to “sound principles of management.” When the actual performance of organizations began to be studied empirically most of the “principles” were found, as Herbert Simon argued decades ago, to be “proverbs” rather than useful guides for achieving effectiveness and efficiency in practice.

In the past several decades the performance measurement and management movement has gained momentum --and critics.

We will argue that all public and not-for-profit organizations should assemble, report and use information about their performance to improve it. The need for performance measures goes beyond legal and regulatory requirements. To provide services effectively and efficiently, managers need the right information on time to make decisions. What performance measures are needed, when are they needed, by whom --inside and outside of the organization-- they are needed, and how managers can be held accountable for their use, are all questions being addressed by practitioners and scholars alike.

The major purpose of this course is to provide students with an understanding of

how managers make decisions through the use of, particularly but not exclusively, quantitative measures of performance. To the extent possible we will use the large pool of organizations in the New York region, public, nonprofit, health and international, that are striving to become more evidence based in their decision-making as a laboratory for our learning. The importance of performance measures and how they are used in areas such as strategic management, budgeting, and human resource management will be examined. The principal measures used by a wide variety public, not-for-profit and healthcare organizations are presented. The selection and timing of measures to meet diverse stakeholder expectations and requirements is described.

An information system is needed to collect and manipulate the data required to turn it into useful information. The information produced needs to be communicated effectively to managers and other stakeholders. Options such as “balanced scorecard” reports, flexible report writers and “dashboards” are described, and how managers select the most appropriate tools for their organizations is explored.

Performance measurement and management are related to but distinctly different from policy and program impact evaluation. While building on the same foundation of systematic thinking, of program logic analysis and the measurement of the variables in program models, they answer different questions for different audiences, and operate on a different timetable. Students of performance management need to understand these distinctions.

A special new theme in the literature is the need to include public integrity in performance management design and practice. This new theme will get special attention in this course.

People are a critical part of performance measurement. They affect the quality of the data collected and whether the measures have any effect on the decisions made. Examples will be provided of how organizations have increased cooperation and compliance, and improved the effectiveness of performance measurement through systems design and user involvement. The role of sharing performance information with the public as part of a strategy of achieving greater accountability will also be explored.

OBJECTIVES (the number of the objectives listed below most closely related to each class session is indicated in the weekly class descriptions.

At the end of this course, students should know, understand and be able to:

1. Describe how performance measurement is related to performance management, and to explain how performance measurement is used in human resources management, strategic management, financial management, operations management and quality management.

2. Describe the difference between measures of inputs, activities outputs, and outcomes and the purposes of each type of measure. Be able to explicate the logic model of an agency's mission, policies and programs. Explain how the performance measurement process used by managers differs from systematic program evaluation done by impact evaluators.
3. Define performance measures in the areas of service quality; client satisfaction; staff productivity, turnover and morale; process; outcomes, including integrity; and financial performance.
4. Select performance measures based on stakeholder expectations, organization strategy, usefulness in taking actions, measurability, data availability, and cost of collection.
6. Explain the options for benchmarking. This would include the selection of measures and the collection of data through secondary and primary sources.
7. Define how measures could be communicated effectively. This could include paper or digital reports, "balanced scorecards", "report cards" or "dashboards" for real-time information display. Understand the range of software available.
8. Describe how politics and other human factors affect performance measurement and what strategies have been used to improve cooperation and reduce resistance to data collection (improving the validity and accuracy of the data), as well as to help decision-makers use the measures.

REQUIRED COURSE MATERIAL

On occasion other materials will be distributed in class or posted on Blackboard with proper notice, but most of the assigned reading will come from the following:

David Ammons, Ed, *Leading Performance Management in Local Government*. ICMA Press, 2008.

Dall Forsythe, ed. *Quicker, Better, Cheaper: Managing Performance in American Government*, Rockefeller Institute, 2002, at <http://rockinst.org/publications/federalism/quickerbettercheapertoc.html>

Shelley Metzenbaum, *Performance Management Recommendations for the New Administration*, IBM Business of Government, <http://www.businessofgovernment.org/pdfs/MetzenbaumNewAdmin.pdf>

Poister, T. (2003). *Measuring Performance in Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Philip Joyce, *Linking Performance and Budgeting: Opportunities in the Federal Budget Process*, IBM Center of the Business of Government, 2003.
http://www.businessofgovernment.com/pdfs/Joyce_Report.pdf

New York City, Mayor's Office of Operations, Mayor's Management Report, at <http://www.nyc.gov/html/ops/html/mmr/mmr.shtml>

Dennis C. Smith, Beryl Radin, Point/Counter Point, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Summer, 2009.

Dennis C. Smith and Robert Purtell, *Managing Crime Counts*, Center on Crime and Criminal Justice, NYU School of Law, 2006. Available on Blackboard.

INTERNET RESOURCES

New York City agencies performance data, under Agencies, at NYC.gov

Robert Behn's "Public Management Report", a free monthly newsletter by the author of *Rethinking Democratic Accountability* (Brookings), who is a lecturer at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government.
<http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/TheBehnReport/>

Results and Performance Accountability, the Home Page of The Fiscal Policy Studies Institute. Includes papers on results-based decision making and budgeting, performance measurement, <http://www.resultsaccountability.com/> and <http://www.raguide.org/>

The Performance Management, Measurement and Information project (PMMI) in the United Kingdom seeks to provide assistance to local government councils.
<http://www.idea-knowledge.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=76209>

"Outcome Management for Nonprofit Organizations" is a series of free guidebooks prepared by the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C.
<http://www.urban.org/template.cfm?navmenuid=554&Template=/TaggedContent/NonprofitManagement.cfm>

Performance Management for Government is a website sponsored by the Government Accounting Standards Board. It offers free research report and case studies. <http://www.seagov.org/index.shtml>

The Citizens Budget Commission conducts and publishes research on the finances and performance of New York State and New York City.
<http://www.cbcny.org/>

The Straphangers Campaign is a program of the New York Public Interest

Research Group that collects and publishes rider evaluations of the New York City subways. <http://www.straphangers.org/>

The United Way’s Outcome Measurement Resource Network provides outcome measurement knowledge and resources. They have developed accountability measures and procedures for use in agencies providing health, youth and family services. <http://national.unitedway.org/outcomes/>

United Nations Joint Inspection Unit, Overview of a series of reports on managing for results in the UN System
http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2004/en2004_5.pdf See also,
http://www.unjiu.org/data/reports/2004/en2004_8.pdf and a GAO critique, at <http://www.gao.gov/htext/d05392t.html>

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

The assignments and due dates are:

Assignment			Percent of Grade
Class participation, including attendance		Every class	5
Program logic model and measurement		September 29	10
Book review		Scheduled in class	15
Take home exam on the readings		November 16	30
Final project (presentation)/ (written)		November 30, December 7/ December 17	10 30
Total			<hr/> 100

MODELS and MEASUREMENT

Students will select one major policy or program, 1) explicate its logic model and, 2) specify measures to be used to monitor and manage the policy’s or program’s performance, and 2) assess the strengths and weakness of the model and measures presented. (15%; Due: September 29)

EXAMINATION

There will be a take home examination over the lectures and readings that will require answering a subset of question drawn from a master list of questions presented to the class before the examination. (30%; Due November 16)

BOOK REVIEW

Class members will each select one book from a the list below, write a journal style book review, and participate in panel comprised of those who read each particular book, scheduled throughout the semester. The written review will be due the day of the panel. (15%)

Michael Barber, Instruction to Deliver

William Gormley and David Weimer, Organizational Report Cards

Beryl Radin, Challenging the Performance Movement

Evan Berman, Performance and Productivity in Public and Nonprofit Organizations

Patria Julnes and Marc Holtzer, Performance Meausurement

Stephen Goldsmith, The Power of Social Innovation: How Civic Entrepreneurs Ignite Community Networks for Good

Michael Lewis, Moneyball

Ian Ayres, Super Crunchers: Why Thinking-by-Numbers Is the New Way to Be Smart

FINAL PROJECT

The final project will analyze and make recommendations to officials of a public, non-profit or healthcare organization a performance measurement and management process. Revisions to an existing process can also be proposed. For complex organizations, the project can focus on a major component (e.g., a set of measures or a reporting mechanism). Students will work in teams of 2-4 people. Papers will be 10-15 pages, excluding charts, tables and appendices. The projects may be an exercise, or where possible a service to actual officials who have been consulted during the semester and sign on as clients to receive the teams report. (Total for class presentation and paper 40%; Due: December 18.)

Further instructions on what should be included in the project will be provided

by the instructor. Students should submit a one-page proposal describing the project and the organization and the team by Tuesday, October 26 .

Teams will make mini presentations scheduled throughout the last half of the course, with final written presentation in lieu of a final examination due on December 18.

INCOMPLETES

See the Wagner School "Policy on Incomplete Grades, Effective September 1995" for school policy.

COURSE OUTLINE & READING ASSIGNMENTS

Week 1: Introduction to performance measurement and management in City, State and Federal Government 1,2,8

Recommended: Dennis C. Smith, "Performance Management in New York City: The Mayor's Management Plan and Report System in the Koch Administration, a paper presented at the 15th Annual Research Conference of the Association of Public Policy and Management, Washington, D.C., October, 1993. (Available on Blackboard).

Week 2: From Performance Measurement to Performance Management: The great leap forward? 1,2

Assigned reading (AR) :Poister, T. (2003). *Measuring Performance in Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Chapter 1.

AR: Marisa Benson, What makes Washington State's GMAP program tick?

Prepared for the 28th annual research conference of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management Madison, Wisconsin, November 2-4, 2006. Available in Blackboard.

AR: Shelley Metzenbaum, *Performance Management Recommendations for the New Administration*, IBM Business of Government, <http://www.businessofgovernment.org/pdfs/MetzenbaumNewAdmin.pdf>, and Blackboard.

AR: Dennis C. Smith, Beryl Radin, Point/Counter Point, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Summer, 2009. On Blackboard.

Week 3 A theory based approach to performance management: Creating and using logic models 2,3

AR:McDavid and Hawthorn, Chapters 1-2. On Blackboard.
Weiss, Carol H. "Nothing as Practical as Good Theory: Exploring Theory-Based Evaluation for Comprehensive Community Initiatives for Children and Families," in Connell, P. James, Anne Kubisch, Lisbeth Schorr, and Carol Weiss, New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives: Concepts, Methods, and Contexts, The Aspen Institute, Washington DC, 1995.

Update on Hewlett Foundation's Approach to Philanthropy: The Importance of Strategy

<http://www.hewlett.org/NR/rdonlyres/C6EFD0A1-6716-4175-99B9-5FE0C38F87F1/0/PresidentStatement2003.pdf>

Week 4: Forum on CompStating New York City Government: A panel of public officials involved in performance management in NYC **2,3 4**

NB NYU Wagner recently convened for the first time a Working Group on Performance Measurement and Management, comprising government officials who are leading performance management efforts in their agencies, that will meet periodically at Wagner. This panel will draw from this Working Group a diverse of agency representatives.

AR: Selected MMR reports and agency websites based on panel composition

AR Poister, Chapters 11 and 12.

AR: Smith, D., & Bratton, W.. Performance Management in New York City: Compstat and the Revolution in Police Management, in Ammons, ed., ICMA also in In D Dall W. Forsythe (Ed.), *Quicker Better Cheaper? Managing Performance in American Government* (pp. 453-482). Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute Press. Full-text available at:

<http://rockinst.org/publications/federalism/QuickerBetterCheaperChapter16.pdf> and Blackboard

Week 5 Selecting A Performance Measurement Methodology : 4, 8

Design and AR: Implementation of Performance Measurement Systems; Clarifying Objectives and Identifying Outcomes; Types of Measures and Indicators; Sources of Performance Data
AR Poister, Chapter 2-5.

AR: Ammons, Basics of Performance Measurement, chapter 1.

AR: Hatry, Methods of Gathering Data, ICMA. ,23-5-0.

AR: CLARA HEMPHILL AND KIM NAUER, Managing by the Numbers: Empowerment and Accountability in New York City's Schools
CLARA HEMPHILL AND KIM NAUER
<http://www.newschool.edu/milano/nycaffairs/ManagingbytheNumbers.aspx>

Behh

Week 6: Selecting A Performance Measurement and Management Methodology (cont'd) 4,8

AR. Edwards and Thomas, Developing a Municipal Performance Measurement System. IMCA, Pp 51-66. Section II, ICMA, pp. 67-128.

AR Behn, The Core Drivers of CitiStat and The Varieties of CitiStat, in ICMA, pp 155-194.

AR

Recommended:

Fountain, J., Campbell, W., Patton, T., Epstein, P., & Cohn, M. (2003, October). *Reporting Performance Information: Suggested Criteria for Effective Communication*. Norwalk, CT: General Accounting Standards Board. Full-text available at:

http://www.seagov.org/sea_gasb_project/suggested_criteria_report.pdf

Describes a set of suggested criteria that state and local governments can use in preparing an effective report on performance information.

Week 7: Analyzing Performance Data; Trends and Comparisons; Validity and Reliability; Measurement problems 2, 3,4

Guest lecturer: Professor Carolyn Berry

AR:Poister, Chapter 5-6.

AR: Mc David and Hawthorne, Chapter 8.

Recommended: *Getting the Most from Data*. Urban Institute. Full-text available at:

http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310973_OutcomeInformation.pdf

Blalock, A., & Barnow, B. (2001). Is the New Obsession With Performance Management Masking the Truth About Social Programs? In D. W. Forsythe (Ed.), *Quicker Better Cheaper? Managing Performance in American Government* (pp.485-517). Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute Press.

Full-text available at:

<http://rockinst.org/publications/federalism/QuickerBetterCheaperChapter17.pdf> and Blackboard

Week 8: External Benchmarking 6

Book presentation: Instruction to Deliver
AR: Poister, Ch. 13.

AR: Morley, E., Bryant, S., & Hatry, H. (2001). *Comparative Performance Measurement*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press. Chapter 2,3,4,6
Blackboard

AR Saul, J. (2004). *Benchmarking for Nonprofits*. Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Publishing Center. Chapter 1,4,5 Blackboard.

Recommended:

Washington Monthly, Ranking Colleges and Universities,
http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/college_guide/toc_2010.php

Gift, R., & Mosel, D. (1994). *Benchmarking In Health Care: A Collaborative Approach*. Chicago, IL: American Hospital Publishing. Chapter 3,5,7.

Lowell, S., Trelstad, B., & Meehan, B. (2005, Summer). *The Ratings Game: Evaluating the three groups that rate the charities*. Full-text available at:
http://www.ssireview.com/pdf/2005SU_feature_lowell.pdf

The following organizations provide ratings of non-profit organizations that are available on the Internet:

The American Institute of Philanthropy (AIP) produces a *Charity Rating Guide and Watchdog Report*.
<http://www.charitywatch.org/>

Charity Navigator evaluates “the financial health of America's largest charities”.
<http://www.charitynavigator.org/>

The BBB Wise Giving Alliance “offers guidance to donors on making informed giving decisions through our charity evaluations, various "tips" publications, and

publishes the quarterly *Better Business Bureau Wise Giving Guide*.
<http://www.give.org/>

Week 9: Performance Measurement, Financial Management and Performance Budgeting 3, 8

Receive Midterm questions

Book Presentation: Money Ball

AR: Poister, Chapter 10.

AR: Philip Joyce, Linking Performance and Budgeting: Opportunities in the Federal Budget Process, IBM Center of the Business of Government, 2003.
http://www.businessofgovernment.com/pdfs/Joyce_Report.pdf

AR: Willoughby, K., & Melkers, J. (2001). Performance Budgeting in the States. In D.W. Forsythe (Ed.), *Quicker Better Cheaper? Managing Performance in American Government* (pp. 335-364). Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute Press. Full-text available at:
<http://rockinst.org/publications/federalism/QuickerBetterCheaperChapter13.pdf>
Blackboard.

Week 10 Reporting Performance Measures; Needs of Stakeholders; Balanced Scorecards; “Dashboards” 7, 8

Book presentation: Supercrunchers

AR: Poister, Chapter 7, 9

AR: Review the Mayor’s Management Report and compare one agency report with performance information presented on that agency’s website.

AR: Government Service Efforts and Accomplishments Performance Reports: A Guide to Understanding. Norwalk, CT: Government Accounting Standards Board. Full-text available at:
http://www.seagov.org/sea_gasb_project/sea_guide.pdf

Week 11 Performance-Based Contracting 1,2, 8

Mid-term take home due

No book presentation

AR: Smith, D., & Grinker, W. (2004). *The Promise and Pitfalls of Performance-Based Contracting*. New York: Seedco.

AR: Rosegrant, S. (1998). *Oklahoma's Milestones Reimbursement System: Paying for What You Get* (No. C114-98-1477.0). Boston, MA: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. "This human services contracting case describes an innovative system launched by the Oklahoma Department of Rehabilitative Services when faced with what it viewed as skyrocketing costs and ineffectual assistance for citizens with severe disabilities. Under fiscal pressure, the Department decided on a drastic change in its historic approach to contracting--which had reimbursed service providers for their billable hours. The new, "milestones" approach would reward vendors, instead, for specific results, on the road toward employment for the disabled. The case describes the virtues of the milestones system, as seen by the state; the fears of service providers and advocates that the new incentive system would cause a deterioration in the nature of assistance and therapy; and the early results of the program." Blackboard.

AR: Ammons and Rivenbark, Gainsharing in Local Government, in ICMA, pp. 129-142.

Smith and Purtell, Managing Crime Counts (available on Blackboard)

Forsythe, D. W. (2001), Pitfalls in Designing and Implementing Performance Management Systems. In D. W. Forsythe (Ed.), *Quicker Better Cheaper? Managing Performance in American Government* (pp. 519-551). Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute Press. Full-text available at:

<http://rockinst.org/publications/federalism/QuickerBetterCheaperChapter18.pdf>

Week 12 Information Management and Performance Management 1, 7
Guest lecturer: Patrick Yurgosky who manages the performance reporting system for the Center for Economic Opportunity

Book presentation: The Power of Social Innovation

AR Poister Chapter 8
Guest lecture

Week 13-14 Class presentation of remaining team project results 1-8

Week 15 Team project paper due.(Given the size of the class Final exam class may be needed for team presentations as well)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abravanel, M. (2003). *Surveying Clients About Outcomes*. Urban Institute. Available: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310840_surveying_clients.pdf (Accessed August 17, 2005).
- Barro, J., & Bozic, K. Z., Aaron. (2003). *Performance Pay for MGOA Physicians* (Case Study 9-904-028). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Barry, R., Murcko, A., & Brubaker, C. (2002). *The Six Sigma Book For Healthcare: Improving Outcomes By Reducing Errors*. Chicago, IL: Health Administration Press.
- Behn, R. (2003, September/October). Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5).
- Larisa Benson, What makes Washington State's GMAP program tick?
Prepared for the 28th annual research conference of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management Madison, Wisconsin, November 2-4, 2006. Available in Blackboard.
- Blalock, A., & Barnow, B. (2001). Is the New Obsession With Performance Management Masking the Truth About Social Programs? In D. W. Forsythe (Ed.), *Quicker Better Cheaper? Managing Performance in American Government* (pp. 485-517). Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute Press.
- Briggs, B. (2005, April). Dashboards Merge Health Data. *Health Data Management*, pp. 58,60.
- Cunningham, K., & Ricks, M. (2004, Summer). Why Measure. Nonprofits Use Metrics to Show that They Are Efficient. But What if Donors Don't Care? *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.
- Dobel, J. P. (2004). *Express Transmit Maintenance Division* (The Electronic Hallway). Seattle, WA: Evans School of Public Affairs, U. of Washington.
- Epstein, P., Fountain, J., Campbell, W., Patton, T., & Keaton, K. (2005, July). Government Service Efforts and Accomplishments Performance Reports: A Guide to Understanding. Government Accounting Standards Board. Available: http://www.seagov.org/sea_gasb_project/sea_guide.pdf (Accessed August 31, 2005).
- Finkler, S. (2005). *Financial Management for Public, Health, and Not-For-Profit Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Fitzpatrick, M. (2004). *Creating An Evidence-Based Practice Culture With Business Intelligence*. Cary, NC: SAS.
- Forsythe, D. W. (2001). Pitfalls in Designing and Implementing Performance Management Systems. In D. W. Forsythe (Ed.), *Quicker Better Cheaper? Managing Performance in American Government* (pp. 519-551). Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute Press.
- Forsythe, D. W. (2001). *Quicker Better Cheaper? Managing Performance in American Government*. Albany, N.Y.:

- Rockefeller Institute Press.
- Fountain, J., Campbell, W., Patton, T., Epstein, P., & Cohn, M. (2003, October). Reporting Performance Information: Suggested Criteria for Effective Communication. General Accounting Standards Board. Available: http://www.seagov.org/sea_gasb_project/suggested_criteria_report.pdf (Accessed August 31, 2005).
- Gift, R., & Mosel, D. (1994). *Benchmarking In Health Care: A Collaborative Approach*. Chicago, IL: American Hospital Publishing.
- Griffith, J., & White, K. (2005, May/June). The Revolution in Hospital Management. *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 50(3), 170-190.
- Grossman, A., & Curran, D. (2002). *EMCF: A New Approach at an Old Foundation* (No. 9-302-090). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Hatry, H. (1999). *Performance Measurement*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Hatry, H., Cowan, J., & Hendricks, M. (2004). Analyzing Outcome Information: Getting the Most from Data. Urban Institute. Available: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310973_OutcomeInformation.pdf (Accessed August 17, 2005).
- Hatry, H., Cowan, J., Weiner, K., & Lampkin, L. (2003). Developing Community-wide Outcome Indicators for Specific Services. Urban Institute. Available: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310813_OutcomeIndicators.pdf (Accessed August 17, 2005).
- Herzlinger, R., & Nitterhouse, D. (1994). *Financial Accounting and Managerial Control for Nonprofit Organizations*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western Publishing Co.
- Henchey, P. (2004, 9 December). Shared Metrics Inspire Collaborative Improvement Efforts At Maine Medical Center. *Healthcare Management Insight* [Online]. Available: <http://www.HealthcareManagementInsight.com>.
- Jha, A., Li, Z., Orav, E. J., & Epstein, A. (2005, 21 July). Care in U.S. Hospitals - The Hospital Quality Alliance Program. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 353, 265-274.
- Kaplan, R., & Campbell, D. (2001). *Boston Lyric Opera* (Case Study No. 9-101-111). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kaplan, R., & Norton, D. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating Strategy Into Action*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lampkin, L., & Hatry, H. (2003). Key Steps in Outcome Management. Urban Institute. Available: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310776_KeySteps.pdf (Accessed August 17, 2005).
- Letts, C., Ryan, W., & Grossman, A. (1999). *High Performance Nonprofit Organizations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Litman, S. (2003, Summer). The Peer Yardstick: Measuring Success in Franchise Nonprofit Organizations. *Stanford Social Innovation*

Review.

- Lowell, S., Trelstad, B., & Meehan, B. (2005, Summer). *The Ratings Game: Evaluating the three groups that rate the charities*. Retrieved September 13, 2005, from http://www.ssireview.com/pdf/2005SU_feature_lowell.pdf
- Masaoka, J. (2003, Spring). The Effectiveness Trap: Funders, government agencies, and donors get lost on the labyrinth. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.
- Morley, E., Bryant, S., & Hatry, H. (2001). *Comparative Performance Measurement*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Morley, E., & Lampkin, L. (2004). Using Outcome Information: Making Data Pay Off. Urban Institute. Available: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311040_OutcomeInformation.pdf (Accessed August 17, 2005).
- National Council of Nonprofit Organizations; National Human Services Assembly. (2005, May). *Rating the Raters: An Assessment of Organizations and Publications That Rate/Rank Charitable Nonprofit Organizations*. Retrieved 13 September 2005, from [http://www.ncna.org/uploads/documents/live//Rating the Raters 5-9-05.pdf](http://www.ncna.org/uploads/documents/live//Rating%20the%20Raters%205-9-05.pdf)
- Nayyar-Stone, R., & Hatry, H. (2003). Finding Out What Happens to Former Clients. Urban Institute. Available: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310815_former_clients.pdf (Accessed August 17, 2005).
- Niven, P. (2003). *Balanced Scorecard Step-By-Step for Government and Nonprofit Agencies*. New York: Wiley.
- Penna, R., & Phillips, W. (2004). *Outcome Frameworks: An Overview for Practitioners*. Rensselaerville, New York: Rensselaerville Institute.
- Poister, T. (2003). *Measuring Performance in Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rosegrant, S. (1998). *Oklahoma's Milestones Reimbursement System: Paying for What You Get* (No. C114-98-1477.0). Boston, MA: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- Saul, J. (2004). Benchmarking for Nonprofit Organizations. Available: <http://www.measuringimpact.com/images/Benchmarking21.pdf> (Accessed August 17, 2005).
- Saul, J. (2004). *Benchmarking for Nonprofits*. Saint Paul, MN: Wilder Publishing Center.
- Schade, S. (2005, 15 February). *Balanced Scorecard Initiative: Strategic Framework and Performance Improvement*. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Health Information and Management Systems Society (HIMSS). Dallas, TX.
- Schade, S., & Gustafson, M. (2003, September). The Evolution of Balanced Scorecard Reporting Systems. *Advance for Health Information Executives*.

Allen Schick, "Why Most Developing Countries Should Not Try New Zealand's Reforms" <http://wbro.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/13/1/123.pdf>

Scott, E. (2002). *Mayor Anthony Williams and Performance Management in Washington, D.C.* (No. C16-02-1647.0). Boston, MA: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Smith, D., & Bratton, W. (2001). Performance Management in New York City: Compstat and the Revolution in Police Management. In D. W. Forsythe (Ed.), *Quicker Better Cheaper? Managing Performance in American Government* (pp. 453-482). Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute Press.

Smith, D., & Grinker, W. (2004). *The Promise and Pitfalls of Performance-Based Contracting*. New York: Seedco.

Smith, D., & Grinker, W. (2005). *The Transformation of Social Services Management in New York City: "CompStating " Welfare*. New York: Seedco.

Willoughby, K., & Melkers, J. (2001). Performance Budgeting in the States. In D. W. Forsythe (Ed.), *Quicker Better Cheaper? Managing Performance in American Government* (pp. 335-364). Albany, N.Y.: Rockefeller Institute Press.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. (2004, January). *Logic Model Development Guide*. Retrieved 13 September 2005, from <http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/Tools/Evaluation/Pub3669.pdf>