

**NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
ROBERT F. WAGNER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE**

**P11.2170 - PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND MANAGEMENT
FOR PUBLIC, NONPROFIT, AND HEALTH CARE ORGANIZATIONS
Spring, 2009**

Instructor: Roger Kropf, Ph.D.
212-998-7458 (office)
212-995-4162 (fax)
roger.kropf@nyu.edu
www.nyu.edu/classes/kropf

Day, Time and Location: Thursdays, 6:45-8:25 p.m., 19 W. 4th St., Rm 102
Prerequisite: P11.1020, Managing Public Service Organizations

COURSE DESCRIPTION

All public and not-for-profit organizations must assemble and report information on their performance. The need for performance measures goes beyond legal and regulatory requirements. To provide services effectively and efficiently, managers need information to make decisions. What performance measures are needed, how they should be created and what forms of communication are most effective are questions currently being widely debated.

The major purpose of this course is to provide students with an understanding of how managers make decisions through the use of quantitative measures of performance. The importance of performance measures and how they are used in areas such as human resources and strategic management is examined. The principal measures used by public, not-for-profit and healthcare organizations are presented. The selection of measures to meet needs such as meeting stakeholder expectations and requirements is described.

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

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.

OBJECTIVES

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

1. Describe how performance measurement is related to performance management, and state 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, outputs, results and outcomes and the purposes of each type of measure. Explain how the performance measurement process used by managers differs from program evaluation done by external evaluators.
3. Define performance measures in the areas of service quality; client satisfaction; staff productivity, turnover and morale; process; outcomes; and financial performance.
4. Select performance measures based on stakeholder expectations, organization strategy, usefulness in taking actions, measurability, data availability, and cost of collection.
5. Create or select an information system that will capture the needed data. This would include hardware and software options and emerging technologies like RFID tags and wireless devices.
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 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 MATERIALS

1. Poister, T. (2003). *Measuring Performance in Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Available at the Professional Bookstore on LaGuardia Place. A copy is on reserve at Bobst Library.
2. Penna, R., & Phillips, W. (2004). *Outcome Frameworks: An Overview for Practitioners*. Rensselaerville, New York: Rensselaerville Institute. Available at the Professional Bookstore on LaGuardia Place. Two copies are also on reserve at Bobst Library.

3. Packet of readings available at the Unique Copy Center on Greene St. Articles are included only if full-text is not available on the Internet. Two copies of all readings are also on reserve at Bobst Library. (Readings are marked “Course Pack” in the syllabus.)

INTERNET RESOURCES

1. 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/>

2. 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/>

3. 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>

4. “Outcome Management for Nonprofit Organizations” is a series of free guidebooks prepared by the Urban Institute in Washington, D.C. <http://www.urban.org/center/cnp/Projects/outcomeindicators.cfm>

5. 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>

6. 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/>

7. 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/>

8. 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/>

9. New York City Performance Management Reports http://www.nyc.gov/html/ops/html/performance_management/performance_management.shtml

10. United Nations Joint Inspection Unit, Overview of a series of reports on managing for results

in the UN System

http://www.unjuu.org/data/reports/2004/en2004_5.pdf See also

http://www.unjuu.org/data/reports/2004/en2004_8.pdf and a GAO critique at

<http://www.gao.gov/htext/d05392t.html>

11. Balanced Scorecard Institute <http://www.balancedscorecard.org/>

12. The Center for What Works <http://www.whatworks.org>

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

All assignments will be graded as Pass or Fail and returned with comments. Grades will be assigned based on the number of assignments completed

Grade	No. of Assignments
A	5
B+	4
B	3
C	2
F	1 or 0

The assignments and due dates are:

Assignment	Date Distributed	Date Returned
Oral presentation (5 min.)	Assigned weekly	One week later
Case analysis	February 26	March 12
In-class exam on the readings	April 30	April 30
Final project (counts as 2 assignments for grading)	February 12	May 7

CASE ANALYSIS

The case analysis will test your knowledge of the readings by asking you to apply what you have learned to carry out a series of tasks. Students will be given a case study and will prepare a

written case analysis. The case analysis will be in two parts. Part one will be a 5-page report to the senior manager of the organization under discussion. Part two will be a one-page memo to the instructor explaining how the concepts and knowledge in the course have been applied, and will include appropriate footnotes.

FINAL PROJECT

The final project will be to recommend to the executive director 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 may work individually or in teams of up to 3 people. Papers will be 10-15 pages excluding charts, tables and appendices.

Further instructions on what should be included in the project will be provided by the instructor on February 12. Students should submit a one-page proposal describing the project and the organization by **March 5**. Papers are due on **May 7**. Late papers will not be accepted without prior approval by the instructor.

INCOMPLETES

See the Wagner School's policy on Incomplete Grades at:
<http://wagner.nyu.edu/current/policies/incompletes.php>

COURSE OUTLINE & READING ASSIGNMENTS

January 22 History and Purpose of Performance Measurement; Relation to Other Management Tasks; Problems and Limitations

1. Poister, T. (2003). *Measuring Performance in Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Chapter 1.
2. Behn, R. (2003, September/October). Why Measure Performance? Different Purposes Require Different Measures. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5). (Available on Blackboard)
3. Laura Silverstein & Erin J. Maher, "Evaluation Blues: How accountability requirements hurt small, innovative programs the most" Stanford Social Innovation Review (Winter 2008). Full-text available at: http://www.ssireview.org/images/articles/2008WI_frontlines_silverstein_maher.pdf

Optional Reading:

Morley, E., & Lampkin, L. (2004). *Using Outcome Information: Making Data*

Pay Off. Urban Institute. Full-text available at:
http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311040_OutcomeInformation.pdf

January 29 Selecting A Performance Measurement Methodology

1. Poister, Chapter 3.
2. Penna, R., & Phillips, W. (2004). *Outcome Frameworks: An Overview for Practitioners*. Rensselaerville, New York: Rensselaerville Institute.

February 5 Design and Implementation of Performance Measurement Systems; Clarifying Objectives and Identifying Outcomes; Types of Measures and Indicators; Sources of Performance Data

1. Poister, Chapter 2,4,5
2. Robert Behn, "What All Mayors Would Like to Know About Baltimore's CitiStat Performance Strategy," IBM Center for the Business of Government, 2007. Full-text available at:
<http://www.businessofgovernment.org/pdfs/BehnReportCiti.pdf>

Optional Reading:

Lampkin, L., & Hatry, H. (2003). *Key Steps in Outcome Management*. Urban Institute. Full-text available at:
http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310776_KeySteps.pdf

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, p. 69-159
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.

February 12 Analyzing Performance Data; Trends and Comparisons; Validity and Reliability; Measurement Problems

1. Poister, Chapter 5,6
2. Hatry, H., Cowan, J., & Hendricks, M. (2004). *Analyzing Outcome Information: Getting the Most from Data*. Urban Institute. Full-text available at:
http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/310973_OutcomeInformation.pdf
3. 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://www.rockinst.org/nys_government/program_management.aspx

Instructions For Final Project Distributed.

February 19: External Benchmarking

1. Poister, Chapter 13.
2. Morley, E., Bryant, S., & Hatry, H. (2001). *Comparative Performance Measurement*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press. Chapters 3,6
- 3.. 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.org/articles/entry/the_ratings_game/

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

1. The American Institute of Philanthropy (AIP) produces a *Charity Rating Guide and Watchdog Report*.
<http://www.charitywatch.org/>
2. Charity Navigator evaluates “the financial health of America's largest charities”.
<http://www.charitynavigator.org/>
3. 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/>

February 26 Reporting Performance Measures; Needs of Stakeholders; Balanced Scorecards; “Dashboards”

1. Poister, Chapter 7.
2. Epstein, P., Fountain, J., Campbell, W., Patton, T., & Keaton, K. (2005, July). *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
3. Briggs, B. (2005, April). Dashboards Merge Health Data. *Health Data Management*, pp. 58,60. Full-text available at: <http://www.healthdatamanagement.com/issues/20050401/10743-1.html>

4. Kaplan, R., & Campbell, D. (2001). *Boston Lyric Opera* (Case Study No. 9-101-111). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press. (Course Pack)

“The Boston Lyric Opera was the fastest growing opera company in North America during the 1990s. Having successfully completed a move to a larger facility in 1999, the board and general director recognize the need to develop a formal strategic planning and governance process to guide the company into the future. Board members, senior managers, and artistic leaders use the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) as the focus of a multi-month strategic planning process that develops a strategy map and objectives in the four BSC perspectives for three core strategic themes.”

Case Analysis Distributed.

March 5 Selecting Information Systems for Performance Measurement; Interfacing Existing Databases; Selecting Software

1. Poister, Chapter 8.

Review the products below and think about the following questions:

1. What do you think are the strengths of the product?
2. What is the advantage of this product over Excel or other off-the-shelf PC/Mac software?
3. Would it be useful for both small and larger non-profit organizations?
4. What could be added? Why?

A. [Salesforce.com](http://www.salesforce.com)

1. Public sector Uses. VIEW DEMO for Salesforce for Human Services
<http://www.salesforce.com/industries/public-sector/>

2. Uses by non-profits. Read the Center for Employment Opportunities and the Utah Department of Community and Culture Snapshots.
<http://www.salesforce.com/customers/education-non-profit/>

3. Read about the donation for non-profits program.
<http://www.salesforce.com/foundation/>

B. [Performanceoft Suite](http://www.performancesoft.com)

<http://www.performancesoft.com>

1. View Performancesoft Views Product Demo (you may be asked to register for

free)

<http://www.actuate.com/democenter/corp-ft.swf>

2. Government uses. (Skim a few that interest you, but they aren't very helpful.)

<http://www.actuate.com/solutions/for-your-industry/government/index.asp>

C. SAS

<http://www.sas.com/solutions/pm/index.html>

1. Uses by Government (scroll down this page)

<http://www.sas.com/success/indexByIndustry.html#1100>

Read SAS® Helps National Treasury of South Africa Meet Hiring Goals

<http://www.sas.com/success/ntsa.html>

and Oslo Prison Uses SAS® to Support a Balanced Scorecard and Improve Results

<http://www.sas.com/success/osloprison.html#>

D. IBM COGNOS 8

1. Demo

<http://www.cognos.com/products/cognos8businessintelligence/scorecarding.html>

Be sure to click on “Cognos Scorecarding and the Balanced Scorecard Online Demo”

You'll need to register and may get a marketing call/email after. Just say you're a student and this was an assignment.

2. Download Government Customer Story Bundle and read the MassHousing and City of Albuquerque stories.

http://www.cognos.com/pdfs/success_stories/ss_bundle_customer_success_in_government.pdf

Submit One-Page Proposal For Final Project

March 12 Performance Measurement and Strategic Management

1. Poister, Chapter 9.

2. 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>

3. CASE: Grossman, A., & Curran, D. (2004). The Harlem Children's Zone: Driving Performance with Measurement and Evaluation. Harvard Business School, pp. 1-29.

Case Analysis Returned by 6:45 p.m.

March 19 No Class - Spring Break

March 26 Performance Measurement and Human Resources; Enhancing Staff Performance

1. Poister, Chapter 9.
2. 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. (Course Pack)

“When Anthony Williams is elected mayor of Washington, DC in November 1998, he inherits a city that had been close to insolvency. Williams had won a convincing victory at the polls in part by emphasizing the need for improved service and accountability. He faces two challenges: both to improve the quality of city services and to devise a way to ensure voters are aware of the extent of the improvement. With both in mind, Williams and his top aides develop a new system to guide city government. The comprehensive performance measurement system requires all city departments to set measurable "scorecard" goals for improving the services they deliver-and to report regularly on their progress in meeting them. This case describes the design and implementation of the DC performance measurement system. The case is designed, specifically, to help students understand the difference between outputs and outcomes.”

April 2 Performance Measurement and Quality Improvement; Improving Client and Customer Satisfaction

1. Poister, Chapter 12.
2. 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.

The data reported in this article is available at:

<http://www.hospitalcompare.hhs.gov/>

Optional:

Colorado Hospital Report Card

<http://www.cohospitalquality.org/index.php>

April 9 **Performance Measurement and Financial Management; Variance Analysis
Performance Budgeting**

1. Poister, Chapter 10.
2. Finkler, S. (2005). *Financial Management for Public, Health, and Not-For-Profit Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall. "Chapter 7: Accountability and Control."
3. 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://www.rockinst.org/publications/subpage.aspx?id=9518&ekmense1=12_submenu_0_link_14

Optional Reading:

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

April 16 **Performance Measurement and Operations Management; Improving
Productivity**

1. Poister, Chapter 11.
2. 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. Full-text available at:
http://www.rockinst.org/nys_government/program_management.aspx

April 23 **Performance-Based Contracting**

1. Smith, D., & Grinker, W. (2004). *The Promise and Pitfalls of Performance-Based Contracting*. New York: Seedco. Full-text at:
http://www.seedco.org/documents/publications/promise_and_pitfalls.pdf
2. 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. (Course Pack)

"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.”

April 30 Implementing Effective Measurement Systems; Leadership and Stakeholder Involvement; Dealing With Internal Resistance; Goal Displacement and Gaming

1. Poister, Chapter 14.
2. 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://www.rockinst.org/nys_government/program_management.aspx
3. Dobel, J. P. (2004). *Express Transmit Maintenance Division* (Case study from The Electronic Hallway). Seattle, WA: Evans School of Public Affairs, U. of Washington. (On Blackboard)

“Drivers and mechanics alleged that Express supervisors had doctored maintenance records to conceal decisions allowing unsafe and environment-damaging buses on the streets of Progress County. Further, transit workers alleged that Express management pressured them to falsify inspection reports, and they accused Express of suppressing dissent through harassment and intimidation.”

In-class Exam on the Readings

May 7 No Class - Final Project Papers Due

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).
- 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.nca.org/uploads/documents/live//Rating the Raters 5-9-05.pdf](http://www.nca.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*.
- 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: "CompStatting " 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>