GETTING STARTED

A City’s guide to finding the hidden datasets inside departments and launching a performance management program.
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Performance Management Getting Started Guide

In an increasingly tech-savvy and connected world, government performance is closely watched. Performance management helps governments use technology and data to openly set goals, hold participants accountable, connect to stakeholders, track progress, and achieve results. By collecting and analyzing data and evidence, determining the desired outputs and outcomes, and linking data to overarching priorities, city leaders can use performance management to best administer policies and programs to the benefit of their community and residents.

Government performance management has gained popularity at the local level. Cities across the US are seeing real success with implementing performance management programs.

The Center for Government Excellence at Johns Hopkins University, a partner in the What Works Cities initiative, has created this getting started guide to assist cities in implementing performance management programs in their own communities. By learning from the experiences of other cities and following the steps described in this guide, cities will have a greater understanding of performance management and be well on their way to launching their own performance management program.
Establish the Fundamentals

The construction of a sustainable performance management and analytics culture begins with a solid foundation. A solid foundation will enable learning, innovation, and continuous improvement. What are the fundamentals?

- First, understand what performance management means to you and your organization.
- Second, get clear about the role of analytics in performance management.
- Third, articulate what your organization is aiming for.
- Fourth, set short, intermediate, and long term goals.
- Fifth, establish a diverse set of key measures to track your progress toward those goals.

A team with strong data management and analytics practices will help generate insights for decision makers. But those decision makers must routinely convene to decide which actions are worth taking. This guide will cover those topics in depth in the following chapters. First, the fundamentals.
An Introduction to Performance Management

Until recently, governments made decisions largely based on instinct, anecdotal evidence, and politics. They lacked the time and resources needed to fully review the outcomes of various programs. Thanks to improvements in technology, data collection, and the rise of performance management programs that emphasize the benefits of data-informed decision making, the public sector is shifting toward governing with data. Forward-thinking governments are optimizing the power of data to create greater efficiency and better results for residents.

Cities across the US are seeing real success with implementing performance management programs, and some of the results are highlighted throughout this guide.

New Orleans, LA

In 2011, Mayor Landrieu, with the support of the city council, created the Office of Performance and Accountability (OPA). OPA’s mission is to promote better city services by incorporating data and evidence in management, decision making, and accountability to improve residents’ lives. BlightStat, a program to reduce blight within New Orleans, achieved success by identifying data trends and making adjustments where necessary. In 2010, there were an estimated 43,755 blighted residences in the community. By prioritizing the code enforcement process in just three years with the knowledge gained through BlightStat, New Orleans has:

- Reduced inspection times from 160 days to 80 days
- Reduced blight by 10,000 units
- Collected $3.4 million in foreclosure liens
- Helped 440 low-income families receive financial assistance to bring their residences up to city housing code

Although there are a variety of performance management systems, including Lean and Six Sigma, “Stat” is one performance management tool that cities across the country have used to drive increases in performance. Each city customizes its Stat program to its needs, but Stat programs almost always include public political commitment to defined goals, continuous measurement and review of data, regular meetings with senior officials to take stock of progress, and ongoing action based on the data being tracked. These elements combine to create a system that encourages commitment, measurement, collaboration, action, and accountability.
Performance management helps government entities use technology and data to openly set goals, hold participants accountable, connect to stakeholders, track progress, and achieve results. By linking data to overarching priorities, collecting and analyzing data and evidence, and determining the desired outputs and outcomes, city leaders can use performance management to best administer policies and programs to the benefit of their community and residents.

Launching a Performance Management Program

When launching a performance management program, a city should consider a variety of key questions. Who should be involved? What goals are most appropriate to be the focus of the performance management system? Answering these questions will help a city to design an effective performance management program.

Fort Lauderdale, FL

By actively checking in with residents, Fort Lauderdale is able to better allocate resources and meet resident needs. After residents weighed in on capital spending priorities in its 2013 annual neighborhood survey, Fort Lauderdale developed a multiyear stormwater management plan. In 2013, 64 percent of respondents saw an increase in flooding and only 27 percent reported being satisfied with the city’s prevention of stormwater-related flooding. The 2014 survey revealed that 52 percent of respondents saw an increase in flooding and 31 percent of respondents were satisfied with stormwater-related flooding prevention.

Building organizational culture around the use of data will be important to ensure that employees across the organization at all levels understand and use performance management principles effectively. In order to adopt these practices in depth, cities will often need assistance, coaching, and training on appropriate strategies to engage employees at all levels of government. GovEx infuses services throughout its engagements to help cities think through culture change when building performance management systems.

Following is an outline of the actions a city should take to implement a successful Stat performance management program:

1. Lay the foundation
   i. Identify citywide priorities
   ii. Gather a team and data
2. Define goals and measure progress
   i. Set short, intermediate, and long-term goals
ii. Align data to goals
3. Launch the system
   i. Prepare for the first stat meeting
   ii. Host a stat meeting

This guide breaks each step into actions, discusses key strategies to consider for implementation, and provides discussion questions to help cities determine next steps that are appropriate in their specific context.

Performance Management Principles

Find Advocates: It is very important for the principal to engage a wide variety of stakeholders in the process of articulating strategic goals. Be aware, some stakeholders are more challenging to motivate than others. The best way to build buy in for a new performance management program is to find advocates and champions, both inside and outside government, to help gather energy and resources around the strategic framework. This is done by including them in goal setting. Done in isolation, this work will inevitably fail to gain traction.

Durham, NC: Each year, Durham hosts workshops to solicit resident input on their strategic goals. Ensuring that stakeholders both inside and outside government are invested in strategic goals allows for easier measurement and management work.

Be Realistic: The principal must give perspective from the frontlines. If the strategic framework, goals, strategies, or data are disconnected from the realities of the day-to-day process, the framework will be ineffective. Establishing a feedback loop from the frontline service delivery levels helps give perspective. This is critical and should be done immediately.

New York, NY: CompStat was designed to insert data into policing, but also to get feedback on data accuracy and usefulness from frontline officers. Combining data and on-the-ground perspective increased CompStat’s usefulness and longevity.

Engage the Frontlines: The fastest and most effective way to reform is to identify internal champions for change. Very often in government, there is an incredible amount of positive energy and innovation that happens on the frontlines. There is also typically a mirrored level of energy and innovation at the top level of departments. In middle lies a level of career managers who have seen many leaders come and go. Because of their long-term commitment to working in city government, these managers are the most important element of lasting change, and for any progress to take hold, the principal and department leads must make decisions that are credible and get traction with these mid-level managers. A top-down, forced approach will rarely work when creating a performance management program.
Louisville, KY: Departments in Louisville engage in their own department stat meetings in between LouieStat meetings. These meetings help the department prepare for LouieStat meetings and also help staff at all levels engage with data and decision-making within the department.

**Choose Crosscutting Initiatives:** In this new economy, all governments will be forced to work with fewer resources and be creative. The government’s implementation of performance management can assist in facilitating this transformation, starting with the identification of crosscutting, multi-stakeholder goals. Often, departments duplicate efforts around similar subjects. If not coordinated, there can be duplication in how these programs are administered and funded. When a government brings departments together there are some natural ways programs and initiatives can be consolidated. Avoid creating a framework that will maintain the status quo and reflect government’s historic deference to silos and data hoarding. Governments will see faster results and higher returns if all parties are working together and sharing resources.

New Orleans, LA: With more than 40,000 blighted properties in 2010, New Orleans needed to make reducing blight a crosscutting priority. To do that, the city set up BlightStat, coordinating the efforts of five departments to use data and combine their efforts and programs to eliminate blight.

**Stay Connected and Open:** All participants, inside and out of a government’s performance management team, must be confident that this is an ongoing process throughout which they will have an opportunity to contribute feedback. By allowing the public to participate in the process, the process itself is inherently improved. The principal should make strategic requests of stakeholders to engage the right thought leaders, and this engagement should play out in an open environment.

Kansas City, MO: All KCStat meetings are live tweeted by city communications staff who engage in a dialogue with stakeholders. By engaging the public in the stat process in real-time during meetings, Kansas City helps to ensure that its stat process continues to address city needs.
Lay the Foundation

Identify Citywide Priorities

While the city uncovers its data assets, the principal should begin to think about the city’s priorities, which are desired outcomes for the entire city. These priorities may be informed by a formal citywide comprehensive plan or strategic framework, business plan, sustainability plan, campaign priorities, items mentioned in a state of the city address, or by stated strategic goals. The city should consider all potential forums in which strategic priorities may have been stated, and all potential subject matter areas. These areas are generally consistent across governments, and may fall into the following categories.

- Public safety
- Public health
- Education
- Sustainability and the environment
- Jobs and the economy
- Government operations and management

### Evidence of Citywide Priorities

**Bridgeport, CT:** The City of Bridgeport created a Master Plan of Conservation & Development ("Master Plan") to determine its course for revitalization. The Master Plan acknowledged that "the time is right for a renaissance in Bridgeport," and the city is poised to become a regional destination. Bridgeport is also part of a Regional Comprehensive Plan, which provides context for local and regional decision making. Bridgeport has created a Neighborhood Revitalization Zone Strategic Plan of Action as well as a Parks Master Plan. Although Bridgeport has not created a comprehensive strategic plan, it is safe to say that revitalization and planning are priorities for the City.

**Seattle, WA:** In 2012, Seattle’s energy utility, Seattle City Light, completed a strategic planning process to develop a roadmap to meet customers needs and enhance community engagement and environmental leadership. Since 1994, Seattle has used its comprehensive plan to guide city growth, and a Transportation Strategic Plan to guide the work of Seattle’s Department of Transportation. These documents are a great starting point for developing goals related to growth and sustainability.

**Syracuse, NY:** An update to its Comprehensive Plan 2025, the City of Syracuse’s Comprehensive Plan 2040 is made up of several components: Land Use and Development Plan, Sustainability Plan, Historic Preservation Plan, Syracuse Bicycle Plan, Public Art Plan, Pedestrian Infrastructure Plan, and Parks and Open Space. The plan also takes into account the city's TNT (Tomorrow's Neighborhood Today) Plans, Capital Improvement Program, Neighborhood and Business Development, and Transportation. With its Comprehensive Plan, Syracuse has clearly established its priorities and provided guidance for implementation by City departments.
Identify Priorities
Define Goals

Set Short, Intermediate, and Long-Term Goals

Once the foundation is established, department leaders and other high-level actors must establish goals and define measurements of success for everyone involved.

Useful goals have the following elements:

- **Well Defined**: A city must address the strategies the department lead will employ to use resources most effectively and articulate how the department will improve services.

- **Measurable**: A city must be able to measure results to show it has achieved its goals. A measurable goal includes targets, metrics, and timelines, which improves accountability internally and externally.

- **Citywide**: Goals that are citywide rather than focused on individual departments help a city avoid siloing and achieve results that improve the lives of residents. The principal and department leads should develop short, intermediate, and long term goals that the performance management effort can achieve. These will be informed by the strategic priorities, as discussed above.

Setting a "bold goal" can help to quickly articulate the city's desired result with more specificity than the overarching priority, without going into details of underlying metrics and strategies. A city's goals may cascade--a long-term goal may be supported by intermediate and short-term goals or outcomes--but the goal at the top is considered the bold goal. For example, if your long term goal is to reduce infant mortality by 10% within five years and your short term goal is to increase the number of parents who receive safe sleep training in hospitals by 15% within the next year, the long-term goal would also be the bold goal, the one to use in talking points and speeches.
### Short Term Goals: The short term set of goals should be achievable within one to two years.

- Increase the number of parents who receive safe sleep training in hospitals by 15% within the next year
- Increase the number of inmates who return to the community with an ID card by 30% within two years
- Reduce pending placement population in juvenile detention by 30% within two years
- Increase the number of farms using cover crops by 30% in the next 12 months
- Increase the number of children visited by social workers by 15% in the next year

### Intermediate Goals: These goals usually fit into a political term, achievable in two to four years. The intermediate goals are broader and contemplate more collaboration across city departments.

- Reduce unemployment by 25% by the next election
- Reduce domestic violence crimes by 20% in the next three years
- Increase the number of citizens who have health insurance by 10% within four years

### Long Term Goals: These goals are more ambitious and would take four to 20 years to achieve. These goals are most effective if they create a forcing mechanism for cross-department or multi-department collaboration. Setting goals that span Mayoral administrations demonstrates an unselfish commitment.

- Reduce infant mortality by 10% within five years.
- Reduce violent crime by 20% within the next 10 years.
- Decrease the infant mortality rate by 10% within the next 12 years.
- Improve eighth grade reading and math test scores by 20% in the next 15 years.
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 20% by 2030.

### Questions for Discussion: Getting the Right Goals

Has the city established overarching priorities through a strategic planning process, business plan, long-term goal statement, or some other way? List the priorities and any supporting documentation. Think about planning processes, legislation, initiatives, and speeches.
Has the city established long term, short term, or interim goals that are associated with your priorities?

If so, are there metrics and timelines associated with the goals? Can any of these be considered a bold goal? Have you identified a Key Performance Indicator (KPI)?

If not, brainstorm about what a bold goal might look like for each priority, including timeline, metrics, and KPI.

Which departments are responsible for the strategies to meet these goals? Do these departments have their own work plans to achieve the goals?

If there are not yet citywide goals, have any departments established their own missions or goals? Could these be linked to the Citywide priorities?

Is the data associated with your priorities and goals easily available for the city to tap into? Is there county, state, or federal data that would be applicable to the goals you want to achieve? If you need to gather datasets, which departments would you prioritize? Who would do this work?

Are there any upcoming opportunities to communicate the data and goals? Can the data you collect be linked to public demand? How closely does your data align to the strategic goals the city wants to achieve?
Measuring Progress

If someone asked you to drive from Kansas City to San Francisco in a car with no speedometer, no fuel gauge, no tachometer, no odometer, no oil pressure gauge, and no thermostat - you’d likely say no. These gauges are so fundamental to our understanding of how the car is performing, many of us cannot imagine driving without them. If we did, it would likely be a frustrating trip full of guesswork and worry - and all these gauges matter. Plenty of gas in the tank is useless if the engine is overheating. Good oil pressure is just as important as good gas mileage. Arriving safely and arriving without blowing a transmission are both important to your health and to your wallet.

In previous chapters, we talked about identifying priorities and setting goals in your organization (e.g., getting to San Francisco). Knowing the destination is critical. But the focus of this chapter is measuring progress along the way using a diverse suite of performance measures as gauges.

What Is a Performance Measure?

It’s the speedometer, the fuel gauge, the tachometer, the thermostat . . . Performance measures are what you look at to gauge how your program and/or organization are performing. They are descriptive, not diagnostic. They tell you how things are going (e.g., you’re out of gas). They don’t explain why (e.g., you missed the exit and didn’t fill up in time).

Types of Performance Measures

At GovEx, we encourage governments to use a diverse set of performance measures, sometimes referred to as a Family of Measures, because you’d never drive a car with an odometer but nothing else.

Why does GovEx encourage a diverse suite of measures?

Because outcomes matter (but so does the taxpayer), and GovEx does not believe in false choices. Many governments measure lots of outputs, not outcomes, so it is no surprise that performance management leaders are pushing their organizations to adopt an outcomes focus. While this is appropriate, measuring outcomes, inputs, and outputs are all important. Outcomes tell you whether the service achieved its ultimate purpose (e.g., did we get to San Francisco?). But the best way to get to San Francisco is to buy a private jet and fly there, an untenable plan when the taxpayer is footing the bill. Governments should look at ALL the gauges to understand performance toward strategic objectives. Getting there timely, safely, and cheaply are all considerations government managers must balance.
One of the best resources for understanding performance measurement, particularly in a strategic management context, is Fairfax County’s Advanced Performance Management Manual:

The Family of Measures includes the following types of indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Value of resources used to produce an output.</td>
<td>• Dollars budgeted/spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff hours used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Quantity or number of units produced. Outputs are activity-oriented, measurable, and usually under managerial control.</td>
<td>Output:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eligibility interviews conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Library books checked out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Children immunized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prisoners boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Purchase orders issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Inputs used per unit of output (or outputs per input).</td>
<td>• Cost per appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Plans reviewed per reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td>Degree to which customers are satisfied with a program, or how accurately or timely a service is provided.</td>
<td>• Percent of respondents satisfied with service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Error rate per data entry operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Frequency of repeat repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Average days to address a facility work order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Qualitative consequences associated with a program/service, i.e., the ultimate benefit to the customer. External forces can sometimes limit managerial control. Outcome focuses on the ultimate “why” of providing a service.</td>
<td>• Reduction in fire deaths/injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Percent of job trainees who hold a job for more than six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Percent of juveniles not reconvicted within 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adoption/redemption rate of impounded animals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Makes a Good Performance Measure?

The typical performance measurement guidance usually says performance measures should be S.M.A.R.T., a commonly used mnemonic acronym in performance management. It provides criteria for drafting strong goal statements. The concept originated in 1954 when Peter Drucker published a book about management by objectives. The idea is to ensure each goal statement fits all of the criteria in the acronym. The letters S and M usually mean specific and measurable, but the rest have numerous interpretations

- S = Specific, Strategic
- M = Measurable
- A = Achievable, Attainable, Action-Oriented, Agreed-upon, Aligned, Ambitious
- R = Relevant, Realistic, Resourced, Reasonable, Results-based
- T = Time-bound, Time-based, Time-limited, Timely, Time-sensitive
But the S.M.A.R.T. framework is not without controversy. Some take issue with the idea that strong performance measures must be “achievable.” Leaders, such as Steve Jobs and Jeff Bezos, have made careers out of setting very difficult goals for their organizations, so the idea that progress measures must be “achievable” is at odds with the notion that organizations must stretch themselves to reach previously unattainable levels of performance.

Additional characteristics of strong performance measures outside the S.M.A.R.T. framework are listed below.

- **Easy to understand:** measures should be intuitive and easily digested by residents and employees without much explanation, because if they can’t understand it, then how will you ever be able to explain the results?
- **Incentivize the right behavior:** performance management is littered with examples of performance measures incentivizing the wrong behaviors, like the scandal at the Veteran’s Health Administration in 2014 when veterans were kept waiting on unofficial lists to keep wait times appearing favorable. When deciding on the right measure, make sure hitting those targets doesn’t incentivize wrong-headed behavior at odds with your city’s overarching goals to serve residents well.
- **Visible/transparent to those involved:** How you are measuring performance should be plainly visible to everyone involved and be held accountable to those measures. Such transparency helps everyone keep their eyes on the ball and understand their contribution to the overarching performance of the organization.
- **Less is more:** Measuring everything at a department level is no better than measuring nothing, because no one can pay attention to every aspect of an operation. Stay focused, narrow the list of what you are focusing on improving, and you’ll get further faster.

**Common Mistakes**

- **Too many measures:** Organizations that measure everything, end up understanding nothing because insights get diluted in the noise
- **Unaligned to strategic priorities:** Organizations that cannot link performance gauges to the final destination are far less likely to arrive at their destination on time, intact, and on budget
- **Nothing under the hood:** Many organizations write down measures without an underlying data collection, calculation, and reporting methodology. These are vital if the measures are ever going to be real.
- **Unrealistic:** Sometimes the most well-intentioned measures are simply outside the reality of data collection. This is very common with outcome measures, which sound great in theory, but are much harder to capture in practice.
Building Strong Performance Measures

In previous chapters, we described what a performance measure is, described different types of performance measures, explained the characteristics of a good measure, and listed some common mistakes. But how do you come up with a strong performance measure in the first place? The goal of this chapter is to explain the various routes your organization can take to construct meaningful measures that matter.

There are basically three ways to build a strong performance measure and all of them are valid approaches:

- **Copy it**: Use a measure you like from a peer organization
- **Construct it**: Build it from the ground up like a construction project
- **Back into it**: Reverse engineer it through logic modeling

**Copy It**

Performance measurement is not new and it is not rocket science. Chances are that someone has already asked and answered the question: How do we want to measure progress on _? So the first place to start is by scanning the known environment of your peer organizations and governments.

A good place to start is the International City & County Managers Association (ICMA) Insights Program. The ICMA maintains a “core set of well-defined and comparable input, output, and outcome measures on a dynamic software platform that allows communities to easily collect, clean, report, benchmark, and analyze their data.” To truly benefit from their database, you have to be a paying customer, but the ICMA makes the basic measures they are tracking publicly available, so take a look and see if any of the existing measures resonate with your performance team and program experts.
The Community Indicators Consortium (CIC) seeks to bridge the gap between community indicators and performance measurement, providing ways for community groups and governments to coordinate efforts and jointly enhance knowledge about the use of indicators to leverage positive change. The CIC provides two resources which may be helpful as you look for the right measures:

- The **Indicator Projects Database** is a searchable selection of indicator projects managed at the community level. The CIC does not endorse any projects and the information is generated by the projects themselves. The CIC keeps the list current by regularly asking projects to update its page.
- The **Indicator Resources Database** is a wide range of knowledge resources designed to advance the work of CIC members and others in the field. It includes publications, presentations, reports generated by indicators projects, websites, webinar archives, conference presentations, and many other items relevant to the field.

Perhaps the best way to find performance measures worth “stealing” is to simply peruse the performance management websites of other cities. Here are a few examples:

- **Anchorage, AK**: publishes Performance Value Results which show key performance measures and how the municipality is performing against them.
- **Boston, MA**: lets users interact with its performance measures on its Boston About Results page.
Charlotte, NC: publishes an annual report based on its balanced scorecard approach to performance management, which shows its measures in strategic groupings.

Chattanooga, TN: has a performance dashboard called ChattaData, which groups performance measures into strategic categories.

Washington, DC: publishes all of its performance measures as open data.

El Paso, TX: publishes annual reports on its progress against its strategic plan for all eight goals.

Kansas City, MO: has a performance dashboard called KCStat, which groups performance measures into strategic categories.

Louisville, KY: by clicking on any agency name on its LouieStat site, you can see the performance measures for each agency.

San Francisco, CA: has Performance Scorecards, which group measures into key priority categories.

Scottsdale, AZ: publishes quarterly performance reports, which show measures and how they are trending against targets.

To make life even easier, GovEx compiled a Catalogue of Performance Indicators and Metrics with more than 2,000 examples from cities across the country.

**Construct It**

Building a performance measure from scratch requires an appreciation for the fact that we don’t just measure for sake of measuring. Performance measures exist in context and are meant to speak to the overarching achievement of a goal. Therefore, building them from scratch requires accounting for the entire context in which performance is being measured.

One of the best resources for constructing performance measurement in context is published by Department of Management and Budget in Fairfax County, VA. The County’s Basic Manual for Performance Measurement is one of the most comprehensive, timeless, and easy-to-use resources out there. For example, the guide includes sample worksheets and examples to help construct a healthy suite of performance indicators or metrics.
For more advanced organizations, Fairfax also publishes a Guide to Data Collection (written before open data was a thing, but still very relevant content), a Surveying for Customer Satisfaction Manual, and an advanced guide called Managing for Results.

In Oregon, the City of Portland publishes a Performance Management Manual, which includes guidelines for city employees on how to select or create performance measures. Multnomah County publishes a Performance Management Manual, which includes logic modeling (see next section).

Other notable resources for constructing performance measures from scratch include:

- A professor at the University of Wisconsin published a performance measurement guide for local Wisconsin government's in 2009.
• The State of Texas has a Guide to Performance Measure Management, published in 2012.

Back Into It

Across almost all of the resources mentioned above, you will see mention of the phrase “logic modeling.” Logic modeling can be a very useful tool for finding the right performance measures and there is a wealth of published guidance on how to construct and execute a logic model.

A logic model usually begins with a stated desired outcome and then works backward by making a graphical depiction of the resources, activities, and outputs needed to achieve that outcome. By beginning with the end in mind, organizations can ask themselves a series of questions like until they’ve linked resources to desired activities and outcomes:

• What outcome are we trying to influence?
• What do we actually do or produce that influences that outcome?
• What would we measure to know whether our work was influencing that outcome?

The most comprehensive tool for understanding logic modeling was written in 2004 by the Kellogg Foundation. It is called a Logic Model Development Guide. GovEx has published a highly simplified version of it on our Performance Alignment Guide. It is everything listed on the right side of the guide. In short, you do the following during the process of logic modeling:

• Define what resources/inputs you can leverage
• Make a list of all the activities/programs that consume resources
• Link those activities/programs to their outputs
• Define the link between outputs and the behavior you are trying to influence
• Articulate what a positive result/outcome looks like
Measure the Measurers

In August 2011, a government Stat Director was called into a meeting with a heavyweight senior leader in the organization, who had no problem bluntly speaking his mind. “I want to Stat the Stat program,” the senior leader said with unmistakable seriousness. “It’s a waste of my time, my staff’s time, and I’m not clear what we are getting out of it.” His request, while difficult to swallow for the Stat Director, was completely appropriate. Within three months, the Stat program held its first Stat … about itself – and every session thereafter ended with a one-question survey for all participants: was this worth your time? The answer: usually it was, but sometimes it wasn’t.

Performance analytics and management are not easy. They require participation from large sections of organizations. They involve cumbersome reporting processes. They make people uneasy and risk eroding trust. They use math and statistics, which most people try and avoid. They’re stressful. They’re seen as ancillary to the core services governments provide. And they take time - our most valuable and scarcest commodity.

If government employees are expected to participate in performance analytics and management, then those responsible must continuously communicate why it is still worth their time. It’s not easy, but there are a few simple places to start.

The Center for Government Excellence at Johns Hopkins University developed this guide to help the governments figure out how to measure the measurers. It includes tips and advice for establishing metrics that raise a mirror to performance practices and reflect back the value added or lost along the way.

1. Measure the Fundamentals
2. Get in the Weeds
3. Get out of the Weeds
4. Make It Worth Their Time
5. Track the Actions
6. Track the Traffic
7. Mind the GAAP

Measure the Fundamentals

Government’s exist to protect the governed and set the conditions for citizens to thrive. Therefore, no matter what your particular government cares about or points its resources toward, there are a few fundamental measures that should always be trending in a favorable direction.
- **Are more people choosing to live in your jurisdiction?** Governments are inherently place-based, so a key performance objective is to make your particular place as desirable and inhabitable as possible to current and potential residents. If net population is on the rise, then your jurisdictions is doing something right.

- **Do more people want to work for your government than want to leave it?** A little attrition is normal, but attrition that outpaces applications is a sign your government is not performing at peak potential.

- **Is the economy in your jurisdiction providing adequate opportunities to those who need them?** Is employment increasing? Is income increasing? Are incomes keeping pace with prices? Is a rising economic tide raising all ships, or is the income gap widening? The answers to these questions are critical to understanding whether your jurisdiction is making economic progress and highlight how performance analytics and management might be able to help.

- **Are people in your jurisdiction living healthy, “normal” lives?** The average life expectancy in the United States is 78 years and the leading cause of death is “diseases of the heart.” Is that true for your jurisdiction? Are your residents better or worse off than national norms? Is violent crime higher or lower than it used to be? If your jurisdiction deviates from national norms in concerning ways, then performance analytics and management have more to contribute.

- **Are children learning?** A society is only as good as its next generation, so jurisdictions should always monitor whether those coming into this world are prepared to inherit it. Education data is widely available, and even if your government doesn’t control education – it impacts (or is impacted by) education.

These are a few examples of measures that can be used to measure the measurers. If performance analytics and management are doing their jobs, then they should ultimately be impacting metrics like these. If these metrics aren’t moving, then there is more to contribute.

## Get in the Weeds

One thing every performance management program usually has is performance measures or metrics. And performance teams should constantly understand the status of those metrics. When the measurers are asked whether their “measurement” matters – they should be able to cite concrete examples of successes and challenges based on the measures being tracked.

Measurers should know the answers to these questions or at least have them at their fingertips. After all, the measurers ask others to report these statistics – so it’s only fair to read them and understand how performance is trending.

In Louisville, KY, the Office of Performance Improvement (OPI), established in January 2012, is helping the Mayor answer three fundamental questions: what are the key services metro government performs; how well are they performing, and how can they perform better? The identification, tracking and analysis of the most important metrics for each department, called Key Performance Indicators or KPIs for short, helps Louisville Metro Government Spot areas of weakness, where we are not delivering the best services or results possible; Make data-driven decisions regarding where and how to best allocate resources, and evaluate the true impact and effectiveness of the work being done across Metro Government. One way OPI holds itself accountable is to publish those KPIs right on its website, making it clear how each department is performing on the things that matter most. Viewers can simply glance and see whether performance is meeting, approaching or falling short of its goal.
Get out of the Weeds

Understanding performance at the micro level is important, but understanding it at the macro level is equally critical. There is likely a short list of outcomes your government’s leaders are trying to influence while they are in office, so knowing about performance against those outcomes is critical when the measurers get measured.

For many local jurisdictions, safer streets and communities are top priorities, so being able to cite progress against high-level metrics related to public safety is how the measurers know whether they are having an impact on the bottom line. After all, if a year of COMPStat sessions result in higher crime rates, then it is legitimate to question COMPStat’s focus and contribution. Perhaps the measurers are focusing the organization on the wrong things.
One tactic used by many governments is to use composite measures, multiple measures rolled up into one. An example is “the percent of key performance indicators on track or within the acceptable range of their target.” For example, the Office of the City Administrator in Washington, DC tracks the percent of Fiscal Year agency Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) either fully or partially achieved. Composite measures are not without controversy. They often mask underlying dynamics, hide important problem, and park key progress in the shadows – but they have their place in measuring the measurers.

Make It Worth Their Time

There is one commodity performance measurers demand even more than data, and that's time. Collecting data takes time. Explaining it takes time. Analysis takes time. Socializing questions and findings takes time. Meetings take time. Presentations take time. Reporting takes time. Even taking action takes time. Because so much of the performance process demands so much of people’s time – asking whether the “juice was worth the squeeze” can be a very simple but important question.

One approach is to simply ask, in an anonymous electronic survey (not a show of hands): **Was this worth your time**? It does not have to be more complicated than that. The anonymity ensures people feel safe being candid. The brevity increases the chances they
will actually answer the question. If you want more info, offer them a chance to submit comments explaining why it was or wasn’t worth their time. The insights might surprise you.

Once they respond, be transparent about the answers you get. If people see the measurers listening and adapting their practices and processes based on direct feedback, they are more likely to be honest and provide more feedback in the future. The example below is the opening slide for every FEMASStat session at the Federal Emergency Management Agency. It demonstrates the Enterprise Analytics Division is serious about its own performance and course correcting where appropriate.

**FEMASStat Performance Measures**

**Measure the Measurers**

**Track the Actions**

Strong performance analytics and management programs result in concrete actions based on useful intelligence. People should leave every data-infused meeting with a clearer list of strategies, tactics, and actions they want to take to move the needle. It isn’t necessary to track every action anyone agrees to, but the big ones deserve special attention.

Stat programs are an excellent place to track actions. Measurers usually leave those meetings with a list of actions agreed to by senior executives. They are usually assigned deadlines and departmental owners. With those three data points alone, the measurers can build ongoing reports about the status of those assigned actions over time.
It is not necessary to micromanage the actions in order to track them. The measurers simply need to check in with the action owners on a periodic basis to find out which of the following status categories are most applicable:

- **Incomplete** – Not Yet Due
- **Incomplete** – Overdue
- **Completed** – On Time
- **Completed** – After Deadline
- **Under Review** (the process during which the measurers determine whether the action is truly complete based on the deliverables submitted)
- **Overtaken by Events** (OBE) (something happened that makes this action irrelevant)
- **Merged** (with another action)
- **On Hold** (for some reason, it does not make sense to move forward with this action at this time, perhaps it is dependent on something else happening first)

These categories are not perfect. (No categories are). But they provide a consistent way of viewing the status of action items over time. Building a spreadsheet or database that tracks these actions can enable an analysis capable of answering questions like:

- Is there unnecessary or unexplainable asymmetry in who actions are getting assigned to?
- Is there one action owner holding up a large portion of progress on actions?
- Are the deadlines we are assigning reasonable?
- Are we reviewing the deliverables quickly enough?

**Track the Traffic**
One measure of the measurers success is whether they are attracting attention to performance and analysis inside and outside the organization. To that end, web traffic for all performance-related pages should be regularly monitored for trends in page views, unique visitors, time on page, bounce rates, and other meaningful measures of interest.

Understanding the traffic patterns helps measurers understand what content of greatest interest to stakeholders and what potentially useful content is getting buried and going unseen.

One of the most underutilized features of Google Analytics is the Users Flow diagram, which is a visual representation of the paths users take through an organization’s web site. The diagram starts by showing users’ arrival from the source, then follows them as they navigate through the various pages and eventually exit the website. The report lets you compare traffic volumes from different sources, examine traffic patterns, and troubleshoot paths that aren’t yielding strong engagement where you want it most.

![Users Flow Diagram](image)

**Mind the GAAP**
Bad performance often lands itself on the pages of an internal audit or in a qualified opinion on an auditor’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). For the federal government, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) routinely publish findings and recommendations for performance improvement. Offices of Inspectors General (OIG) across the country are busy issuing similar findings about governments could be managing resources more efficiently, effectively, and fairly.

To measure whether the measurers are having an impact on overall performance of the organization, audit findings can be an incredible resource. Is the government seeing fewer audit findings than before? Are qualified financial opinions becoming less frequent? Are there important changes in the types of findings auditors are citing in their reports? Though they are usually lagging indicators, they are nonetheless useful in understanding whether the measurement is starting to matter.
Lay the Foundation

Gather a Team and Data

It is good to gather key players and engage them right at the start. A city needs certain people to lead with a bird's-eye view of the entire initiative, while others will focus on the day-to-day details of the data. Think of this as an opportunity to share with staff the reason for the shift to performance management, and some examples of how performance management has worked for other cities.

The following list provides a description of each key player:

- **Principal**: The mayor, city manager, or any other (typically elected or appointed) leader who has the desire to manage a government or a branch of a government utilizing an evidence based approach.

- **Department Lead**: The department head or division administrator who owns the data that is being utilized to measure progress. This person is ultimately accountable to the principal for making progress on shared goals or a strategic plan. There may be multiple department leads.

- **Stat Lead**: An appointed member of the principal's team that is responsible for overseeing the departments through the performance management process. This person must have credibility with department leaders and direct access to the principal and his or her senior team. This position is akin to a city's chief operating officer or a mayor's deputy chief of staff - someone with the gravitas to make things happen.

- **Stat Analyst**: The person responsible for collecting and managing the data used in the performance management program, and preparing analyses and reports of department data. See Appendix D for a sample Stat analyst job description.
Hiring a Stat Analyst

The Stat analyst plays a crucial role in the success of the program. After a few years in this role, the Stat analyst may transition to a position within a department, deepening the performance management culture and skills within the city. At a minimum, he or she needs to possess the following skills: **Intellectual curiosity**: He or she must want to discover lessons from the data. **Interpersonal skills**: He or she will need to gain the respect of everyone involved in the performance management program, including department heads and frontline workers. **Communication skills**: Not only will the Stat analyst mine data, he or she will need to communicate what is found in a clear, concise, and compelling way. **Confidence**: Look for someone who is willing to take risks and accept that he or she may make mistakes. **Basic technical abilities**: To create reports and visualizations, he or she must be proficient in data analysis techniques. **Team attitude**: He or she must understand the relationship his or her work has to the work of other analysts on staff.

**Budget Analyst**: Every government has a budget office staffed with analysts who know where the proverbial "bodies are buried" from a financial standpoint, and they should always be included in the Stat process from the very beginning. Unfortunately, budget analysts are often siloed from other analytical staff and it requires a conscious effort to leverage them as a critical asset. Getting budget analysts involved in the Stat process is easy. It is as simple as inviting them to meetings as you prepare for a Stat session and giving them a seat at the table during the session. Here are five simple ways to leverage a budget analysts in the Stat process:
Leveraging Budget Analysts

- **Leverage their portfolios.** Budget offices usually divide the work into "portfolios" and assign different departments and programs to different analysts (e.g. human services portfolio, public safety portfolio, public works, etc). As your government prepares for a Stat session on policing, bring the public safety budget analyst into the team at the beginning of the process. Their insights on how the police department is leveraging funds will be invaluable as the organization has discussions about shifting resources to do more effective policing.

- **Leverage their knowledge.** Budget analysts know where the money is loaded, which programs have been cut from year to year, and which programs are requesting more funding. They can provide invaluable evidence, including documentation, of historical funding shifts and spending patterns.

- **Leverage their understanding of performance.** If the organization is doing performance-based budgeting, then budget analysts know how funds are allocated based on programmatic results that contribute to organizational goals - a major focus of Stat programs.

- **Leverage their established relationships.** Budgets are built by people and budget analysts often know people at every level of the organization - useful resources for a Stat program trying to understand how services are delivered and learn more about a program's performance and contributions.

- **Leverage their analysis.** Budget analysts routinely conduct cost benefit analysis, analyze returns on investment, scrutinize spending patterns, and conduct analysis of funding alternatives. They are often adept with Excel and are one of a handful of people who can extract information out of source financial systems. These are invaluable to any Stat program strapped for talent and searching for insights.

**Department Contact:** A person on a department leader’s team, ranging from a database manager to chief of staff, who has the best information related to the metadata, the current use of the data, and the general value and quality of the data. This person may already exist if the department has a chief data officer or a director of research. The department contact is responsible for shepherding the data including curating the data and ensuring that it is clean and in compliance with the metadata. This person will be the main point of contact for the Stat team and will play a critical role in making sure the performance management program is a success.

**Data Experts:** Other key participants in this preliminary conversation are geographic information system (GIS) professionals, database administrators, department staff with “analyst” or “research” in their title, and internal auditors. These are the people in a city department who manage data or otherwise know where data lives. These individuals...
are likely not currently working together on a consistent, coordinated, or regular basis. Many cities are not tapping into their analytical capability, and the exercise of identifying data experts can be a first step to deepening a city’s bench.

- **Public**: For successful performance management programs, the public is an important end user. Public use of Stat generally occurs in three broad forms:
  1. A user seeking services or general information
  2. Press or non-profit organizations seeking details or context for government data to support the writing of an article or grant application
  3. A developer who wants to understand the capacity of the data

**Conducting a Data Inventory**

Once the team has been identified, the Stat analyst will lead the effort to collect and track data. The first step is to create a data inventory, which is crucial to support goal setting. If a city has an existing set of priorities or a strategic framework, use it to guide the data collection process by prioritizing the datasets that are related to the priorities, and the departments that may own the data.

The Stat analyst should set up a meeting with the department lead and his or her leadership team, as well as the data experts mentioned above. Prior to this first meeting, a city should ask the invitees to come to the table with any data they own or know that the department is collecting. The following types of questions can help with data collection and discovery before the meeting. For a more thorough discussion of uncovering datasets, see our Dataset Prioritization Guidelines.

1. Do you provide information for reports on federal, state, or nonprofit grants?
2. Do you manage a database?
3. Do you compile reports for a legislative body (city council or cabinet meeting)?
4. Does your department have a strategic plan or any other key performance objectives?
5. Is your organization under any oversight from state or federal agencies, external auditors, or investigators? Is there a corrective action plan?
6. Do you already have a performance-based budgeting or evaluation program?
7. What data is often requested by the public through FOIA requests, 311 or some other method?
8. Does the data align with an agency or citywide initiative?

GovEx recommends that cities begin their data inventory with the datasets that are more critical to decision making (311, call center data), or datasets that are relevant to a particular initiative (BlightStat, CompStat, BayStat). In addition to streamlining the workload, this approach can allow the city to work out any pain points that might crop up. Common pain
points include defining terms like dataset, data, and information; communicating the importance of identifying data ownership; and prioritizing this work in the face of other pressing responsibilities.

Las Vegas, NV

Traffic safety is a priority for the Las Vegas community. In 2014, the city reduced the number of automobile accidents at targeted intersections by 23 percent when it re-engineered the 50 intersections with the most crashes in a specific year. Additionally, Las Vegas reduced traffic delays by at least 25 percent at 25 of the 50 Most Congested Intersections. The city achieved these results by using data and evidence to drive decision making.
Define Goals and Measure Progress

Align Data to Goals

Once the principal and the department leads have settled on the strategic framework and have set goals, it is time to align data with the city’s goals. Throughout the data uploading process when historical data is transferred to performance management software or a dashboard, the performance management team will have the ability to map the data to the goals the data supports, and the departments that are responsible for the activities that will advance those goals. The first data uploaded to the performance management dashboard will likely be what was gathered at the inception of this process. It should be data that already exists and is reasonably well organized.

Selecting First Datasets

Once a city has identified its goals and the corresponding metrics, the city must next prioritize its datasets for release.

A city will upload a broad variety of data that aligns to the outcome measures and goals. When possible, the first datasets should be organized by data type, typically in the following categories:

- *Operational data*, which is typically collected across multiple organizations, such as financial or human resources data.
- *Subject matter data*, which tells leadership about the performance of various programs, such as average length of stay in juvenile detention or third grade reading test scores.
- *Validating (external) data*, which are common datasets that are universally understood as standard. Examples include the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) published by the FBI, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Unemployment Rate, and the Big Three credit agencies’ bond ratings. The closer the data aligns to validated data, the more credible the goals become.

Operational Data for Measuring Outcomes

There will always be some standard operational data that will be collected consistently across a city government. This operational data will most likely come from a centralized personnel system or financial management system.
These are high value datasets because they are usually collected across departments and are typically standardized, which makes them ideal for pointing out cross-departmental trends. Because they will be used frequently and relied upon when conducting analyses, these datasets should be prioritized when beginning to embark on performance management work. The following are examples of data to include:

- Dollars spent on overtime
- Overtime hours paid
- Hours not worked
- Sick leave
- Open and filled positions

Please see our [Data Set Starter Kit](https://www.gitbook.com/book/centerforgov/open-data-getting-started/details) for additional data sets to consider.

**Subject Matter Data for Measuring Outcomes**

Cities that are successful in achieving results for their residents use subject matter data to measure outcomes. Subject matter data gives city leadership an indication of how multiple departments are working together to produce outcomes. Some subject matter metrics for public safety goals are found in:

- Offender case management systems
- Localized crime data
- Court processing data
- Warrants

**Validating Data for Measuring Outcomes**

Validating data is data that is recognized as the standard, or that is endorsed publicly as the key metric for specific measures. The following are common examples of validating data:

- **Unemployment Rate**: In this changing economy, most governments are focused on employment and use the unemployment rate as a bellwether for economic recovery. This information is provided in a dataset from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and is universally used as benchmark employment data.

- **Crime Rate**: The FBI's Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) are used domestically as the standard for measuring crime from the national level to the local level.

- **Educational Test Scores**: Scores from standardized tests are frequently used to measure average student achievement and readiness. These can be local or national tests and provide prevailing data for a particular jurisdiction’s education systems.
Louisville, KY

In 2012, Louisville, Kentucky, created an Office of Performance Improvement to engage residents in strategic planning, develop and implement an open data portal, and administer LouieStat. LouieStat requires each department to identify data sources and track metrics in order to reach goals determined by the department, city management, and residents. The outcomes have been impressive. By using LouieStat to inform decision making, Louisville seen the following results:

- Removed more than two hundred days from key administrative processes
- Reduced unscheduled overtime and worker’s compensation expenditures by more than $2 million
- Aligned the budgeting process with city and departmental strategic objectives.

Mapping Data to Outcomes

Once the data is identified and uploaded, it is time to map the data to outcomes. This requires creating a consistent taxonomy across all measured units or departments of the organization. A taxonomy organizes the process of measuring results in the following way:

1. Priority
2. Goal or Outcome
3. Key Performance Indicator
4. Metrics

Here is an example of an applied taxonomy:

1. Public Safety
2. Reduce Violent Crime by 20% by 2015
3. UCR (FBI) Violent Crime Data
4. Number of Open Warrants, Number of Inmates, Crimes Committed, Domestic Violence Crimes, Visits of Probation Officers for Serious Offenders, Technical Violation of Parole or Probation, etc.
Conduct Relevant Analysis

So far this guide has focused on performance management or results-focused management which is only one half of the equation, because there needs to be an analytical engine under the hood of every organization. Analytics is not new. People have been trying to understand our world since we first woke up in it. This diagram was published by statistician Florence Nightingale who pioneered use of the polar area diagram to explain causes of death in the British army during the Crimean War. The diagram showed that epidemic disease, which was responsible for more British deaths than battlefield wounds, could be controlled by a variety of factors including nutrition, ventilation, and shelter.

At GovEx, we encourage governments to build a performance and analytics practice to turn information into insight. Performance analytics is what’s under the hood and encompasses a broader suite of competencies necessary in 21st century governments. Along the way, analytics helps answer some core questions faced by government leaders:

- **What happened?** Descriptive analytics helps us understand what happened. We can’t just use dashboards, metrics, and KPIs to answer these questions. We have to have more real-time analytics.
- **Why did it happen?** We usually wait for Stat meetings to ask and answer these questions but governments need more opportunities for self-service analytics so every employee can answer questions like this at his or her desk.
• **What will happen?** Governments sometimes think benchmarking against other jurisdictions will answer this question, but it helps to maximize what you know about yourself first. Knowing what will happen often starts with analyzing your own performance trends.

• **How do we make it happen?** Very few government organizations are taking advantage of more robust data and the latest technology to optimize their performance with predictive analytics.

### Understanding analytics through a traffic jam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
<th>Traffic Jam Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What happened?</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>A driver knows there is a traffic jam because he is stuck in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did it happen?</td>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>A traffic reporter in a helicopter tells listeners the traffic is due to an overturned truck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will happen?</td>
<td>Predictive</td>
<td>Google Traffic uses color to show users there is bad traffic ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we make it happen?</td>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>Waze optimizes your route to minimize traffic and drive time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analytics in Practice

**New York City, NY** established the Mayor’s Office of Data Analytics (MODA) to leverage data science practices across city operations:

- Used open data to identify, with 95% accuracy, restaurants that were illegally dumping cooking oil into sewers doubled the city’s hit rate in finding stores selling bootleg cigarettes
- Sped the removal of trees destroyed by Hurricane Sandy
- Helped steer housing inspectors to lawbreaking buildings where catastrophic fires were most likely to occur

**Washington, DC** began a significant investment in data-driven decision making in 2007:

- Used better data on HIV transmissions to implement behavior interventions that have reduced transmissions year over year
- Improved data collection on students with disabilities to reduce segregation in DC public schools
- Launched Track DC and Grade DC to engage residents in performance and accountability discussions
- Infused high-quality analytics into CapStat, SchoolStat, and EdStat
Chicago, IL established a Chief Data Officer in the Department of Innovation & Technology to manage data science projects for the city.

- Used open data to identify restaurants likely to experience critical violations to more effectively deploy inspectors. Violations were found, on average, 7 and a half days earlier. That is, an additional 37 establishments would have been cited for violations in the first month, as opposed to being discovered later, potentially after patrons became ill.
What Is Performance Analytics?

Most people in government have at least heard the term "performance management" but are less familiar with "performance analytics." So what's the difference? In theory, nothing. In an ideal world, performance management encompasses high quality analytics. Under some performance frameworks, every organization must have a management system that ensures continuous improvement, demonstrates efficient and effective operations, and engages stakeholders. Analytics should be a key ingredient to all of that work, but it rarely is. Instead, the average person in many governments thinks "performance management" is having a Stat program, a list of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and a pretty dashboard. For too many jurisdictions, "performance management" has become synonymous with paperwork and quarterly reports to the city manager's office. The Center for Government Excellence (GovEx) is encouraging governments to be explicit about the importance of going beyond the meetings, the metrics, and the reporting - because there are more insights underneath which help public servants redesign services for better outcomes.

So what is "performance analytics"? As you can see in the diagram below, it is the intersection of results based performance management (as the average person tends to think of it) and high quality analytics. It is the practice of constantly studying how you can do better and inserting those insights into your operational decision making processes, not just the strategic ones. Why does GovEx feel so strongly about this distinction between "performance management" and "performance analytics"? Because we have seen analytics make game-changing contributions to the way governments deliver; and we know it is the engine under the hood of a sound performance management program. For many governments, performance management is one way to open the door, get people talking about the importance of data, and asking smart questions. Performance analytics provides answers.
On the management side, organizations still need the key ingredients for success:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ingredients for Performance Management</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Champion</td>
<td>Governor, Mayor, City Manager, Department Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Vision &amp; Purpose</td>
<td>Cohesive strategic plan &amp; concrete goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Accountability</td>
<td>Clear owners, measures, performance plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Orientation</td>
<td>Peer Benchmarking, Best Practices,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of Inquiry</td>
<td>Managers asking &quot;why&quot; and analysts empowered to answer them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging Forums</td>
<td>Stat meetings, budget meetings, Data visualizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Transparency</td>
<td>open data and open meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the analysis side, organizations need to deepen the bench of analytical skills in government across multiple dimensions, which means attracting 21st century talent and using modern tools and techniques. Data is everywhere, and accessing it is cheaper and easier than ever. But analyzing it requires these competencies to turn insight into foresight:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ingredients for Analytics</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technological Dexterity</td>
<td>Computer Science skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving Orientation</td>
<td>Demonstrated ability to apply complex skills to common problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Dexterity</td>
<td>Competency in descriptive, diagnostic, predictive and prescriptive analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Curiosity</td>
<td>Demonstrated habit of asking &quot;why?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Demonstrated habit of asking &quot;why not?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communications</td>
<td>The ability to translate information into digestible insights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Player</td>
<td>Bias toward &quot;we&quot; instead of &quot;me&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Convene with Purpose

When governments have the fundamentals, they are clear about what they want to achieve, how they will achieve it, and how they will know when it is achieved. When they have strong teams and strong analysis feeding decision makers, governments can add evidence to the suite of ingredients that factor into sound decision making. But increasing the effectiveness of governments based on evidence requires sound management, which inherently requires routinely convening the managers.

Convening with purpose is NOT having meetings for meetings sake. High-performing governments convene decision makers around a very clear purpose: crime reduction, snow removal, emergency management, school openings, etc. They bring the entire team together to have an honest and collaborative conversation about shared objectives and obstacles. At the end of those discussions, actions get assigned and tracked.

Stat programs are one examples of purposeful convenings, but they aren't the only type. In this section, we will use the Stat model to explain the virtue of convening with purpose, so you can shape a model that fits your organization's culture and decision making process.
Is Stat Right for You?

Stat programs have made a tremendous impact on the services delivered by governments across the country, so it's no wonder many executives want to implement them. Fortunately, the model is well documented and books like The PerformanceStat Potential can help guide interested governments through the lessons learned from Stat programs since the 1990s.

Unfortunately, Stat programs are not copy and paste initiatives. They must be adapted to fit each organization they serve and certain conditions must be true in order for them to drive progress without wasting the valuable time of participants. Therefore, the Center for Government Excellence developed this guide to help interested governments figure out if they are ready for Stat program implementation.

If the answer to any of these questions is "no," then you are not ready for a Stat program.

- **Do you have a senior executive to champion this work?** Without a champion at the senior executive level, (i.e., Mayor, city manager or any other elected or appointed leader) Stat programs are unlikely to be more than collaborative conversations among colleagues. A senior executive can move resources, give direction, and be the ultimate arbiter of tough issues where disagreement exists within the organization. If such an individual exists in your government organization, great. Move on to the next question. Without him or her, a Stat program is a non-starter.

- **Does that champion have the influence to garner participation from the entire management team?** The executive champion or principal cannot be a champion in name only. They must have the ability to marshall resources, influence other leaders in the organization, and ensure others actively participate in the Stat program. If they have such influence, great. Move on to the next question. Without it, a Stat program is unlikely to be a valuable use of time.

- **Does the champion and management team have clear strategic goals for the organization?** If your executive champion and senior management team have no collective strategic vision or goals for the organization, then your Stat program will be a solution constantly chasing a problem. Effective Stat programs almost always begin with a clear purpose and vision for what they are seeking to accomplish. Without that clarity of purpose, a Stat program is likely to be unfocused and poorly executed. Instead of starting a Stat program, consider launching a strategic visioning process with stakeholders.
If the answer to all of the questions above is "yes" then consider these questions next. Depending on the answers, a Stat program might be an appropriate next step for your government.

- Is there data available for analysis?
  - Yes: Continue to the next question
  - No, but we are willing to experience growing pains: Continue to the next question
  - No, and that's not going to happen: Stop. Your organization is not ready for a Stat program. Data (and the analysis of it) is a critical ingredient to the success of Stat programs, so if there is no viable path for leveraging data, then your organization should focus on data inventory and management before launching a Stat program.

- Are there analysts positioned high enough in the organization to analyze everyone's data?
  - Yes: Continue to the next question
  - No, but we are willing to create a team: Continue to the next question, because if you really create an analytics team and empower them, then a Stat program could be the right next step for you (even if a few remaining things are missing)
  - No, and that's not going to happen: Stop. Your organization is not ready for a Stat program. Data is useless without analysis, and analysis requires people. If you are not willing to establish analytical support for your Stat efforts and are not willing to empower them with the ability to look at data from across the organization, then you aren't truly committed yet.

- Do the managers and executive champion take action based on analysis?
  - Yes: Continue to the next question
  - No, but only because they lack the opportunity to do so Congratulations, Stat might be the perfect next step for your organization because it creates that opportunity to make decisions based on the latest information.
  - No, because they lack the willingness: Stop. Your organization's leadership is not ready for a Stat program. Perhaps they don't trust the data, maybe they are afraid of making the wrong decision. Whatever the reason, an unwillingness to take action based on data and evidence is a deal-breaker. Progress requires leaders to take risks.

- Do the managers and executive champion routinely follow-up to take stock of what's working?
  - Yes: Congratulations, you basically already have a Stat program. Don't fix what's
not broken.

- **No:** Congratulations, Stat might be the perfect next step for your organization because it requires routine follow-up and create opportunities to take stock of progress.
30 Reasons to Implement a Stat Program in Your City

As mayor, city manager, or an executive of the city administration, you have no ambiguities about the fact that your residents will demand services ranging from public transportation, sanitation, safer streets, playgrounds, housing, clean water, economic development, emergency services to public utilities and even zoos. Inevitably, not only do residents demand service delivery they also care about the quality and quantity of the service.

As a result, of budget constraints and limited resources which have always existed, there is the need for prudent management practices to ensure that the cities achieve more with what they have. Inarguably, every resident's request is important, but not all requests can be satisfied, so setting priorities and targets are necessary to improve service delivery for everyone. Hence, performance management has become important to hold managers accountable.

Cities across the country have embraced the concept of performance management otherwise referred to as PerformanceStat, a process of setting goals, identifying metrics, assessing performance, and evaluating employees’ performance and program outcomes to inform decision making. PerformanceStat is a continuous process where city government executives work with their staff to deliver results to city residents. Today, managers are focused on leveraging data, analysis, responsibility, discretion, and power to convene follow-ups to improve performance with the various Stat models.

Performance management presents tremendous value to the city administration and here are 30 reasons your city should consider establishing a Stat program:

1. Enhances the effectiveness of city governance and helps the city to accomplish its goals and objectives.
2. Provides opportunities for departments to communicate constraints to executives and negotiate solutions.
3. Promotes rapid deployment of resources and direct focus to areas that can ensure big wins for the city.
4. Promotes government accountability, transparency and responsiveness.
5. Offers opportunities for capacity development for senior management, managers and staff.
6. Provides avenues for residents to engage and learn of how their tax dollars are managed to deliver service.
7. Ensures the setting of performance standards and benchmarks for managers.
8. Encourages tactical problem solving, process improvement and proactive solutions to
maximizing residents experience.

9. Increase communication between agencies, departments and residents.

10. Provides executives with an effective tool to increase responsibility in senior management by setting performance targets and tracking progress against those targets.

11. Allows for the setting of clear expectations from senior managers, managers and senior staff.

12. Provides direction and pathways for managers to adapt to maximizing their performance and helping them to monitor the progress of their staff as well.

13. Provides opportunities for the removal of barriers to improving productivity.

14. Helps managers to become more aware of targets and expectations relating to the needs of the city.

15. Facilitates the process of identifying resources, training and logistics necessary for managers to achieve city objectives.

16. Allows for the measuring of progress helping managers to understand how they are doing and what they should be doing to improve outcomes for city residents.

17. Improves productivity, maximizes results and enhances efficient use of resources.

18. Promotes and facilitates communication between city executives, managers and staff.

19. Ensures that city staff understand the importance of their contribution to achieving city objectives.

20. Provides opportunities for recognizing and rewarding dedicated managers.

21. Enhances teamwork, and increase staff productivity while improving collective accountability and responsibility.

22. Identifies problems at their early stages and addresses them before they get out of control.

23. Promotes efficient use of time, money, and resources.

24. Allows for an opportunity to provide feedback to managers to better align their strength and competencies to improve work outcomes.

25. Helps to better communicate city strategic goals and priorities to managers and promote understanding of what needs to be done at specified periods.

26. Enables open conversation between executives, managers and staff about city priorities and promote harmony in a manner that contributes to achieving city objectives.

27. Enables city executive to increase quality of service and improved value to residents.

28. Helps city managers to better manage scarce resources and drive down cost of operations and management.

29. Fosters timely intervention into practices that ensuring that managers stay on track to achieving set targets and results.

30. Provides an opportunity for developing management strategies and tactics for achieving performance outcomes.
30 Reasons to Implement a Stat Program in Your City
Gotcha vs. No Surprises

Remember the story of those four people named Everybody, Somebody, Anybody, and Nobody? There was an important job to be done, but it did not get done because no one took responsibility and they all made assumptions about what the rest were doing. This happens in government all the time. It happens when management ignores questions like: Who is responsible for what? Who will follow up to make sure it got done? When can we expect to see results?

Governments across the country are answering these questions by embracing the concept of performance management - a process of setting goals, identifying metrics, assigning responsibilities, appraising performance, and evaluating program outcomes to inform decision making. Some of them even employ a “stat” program, where decision makers routinely meet to review analysis and co-problem solve. With growing issues of budget constraints and limited resources coupled with increasing service requests from residents, these PerformanceStat programs have become an important management instrument. But it comes with some baggage cities must learn to navigate.

There is overwhelming agreement that well-run stat programs can improve government performance, but the approach and form it takes can cause headaches when it is not matched with your organization’s current or desired culture. Scenes from the TV series The Wire, set in Baltimore, showed fictional administrators often terrified of the podium and being grilled on their data during performance management meetings, an approach commonly referred to as “gotcha.” While some executives favor the “gotcha” approach, others support the “no surprises” model of PerformanceStat. Here are some of the risks and benefits of each approach to consider as your government grapples with how to take responsibility for taking action and getting results.

Gotcha PerformanceStat

Gotcha by definition is an unpleasant surprise, usually a disconcerting challenge, attempting to expose something, such as underperformance or poor management. Gotcha implies someone is after you and you have to figure out how to avoid any negative implications. The purpose of gotcha-style stat is to encourage a high-level of preparation and a deep understanding of operations for both the meeting leadership and participants. Before the gotcha stat meeting, executives familiarize themselves with agency’s, department’s, or subunits operations and data including work records, reports, and input from others familiar with the work of the manager. In most cases, before the stat meeting, the stat analyst prepares notes and sample lines of questioning for the city’s leadership team that identify
issues and data of critical concern to be discussed at the meeting. Sometimes, this information gathering process happens unbeknown to the manager. Additionally, the analyst's notes are not distributed to the relevant agency, department, or subunit. With this approach, managers required to speak to the issues during the meeting are left to prepare on their own without seeing the questions that will be asked during the stat meeting. Some executives believe, since no one wants to get caught, this approach provides an incentive for managers to keep their house in order. Such managers make the following arguments for the benefits (and risks) of this style.

**Benefits of Gotcha**

1. Encourages managers to adequately prepare for the meeting. “The best preparation for tomorrow is to do today’s work superbly well” said Sir William Osler. Knowing that you will be publicly quizzed about tomorrow about programs you are responsible for today requires adequate and continuous preparation. You do not know the questions that will be asked but you are expected to intelligently respond to them. Not only does this require you to anticipate them, think smart, and consult with subordinates, but it also demands developing effective and convincing responses. Managers become aware that there is no room for complacency and adequate preparation is key to avoid potential embarrassment at the meeting.

2. Encourages managers of subunits to thoroughly analyze all their data. The chief executive’s leadership team probably already received analysis of the data relevant to a department and will require someone to speak to that information. The person on the "hot seat" can sufficiently address matters arising from the data only if he/she collects and analyzes his/her own data. Demonstrating a lack of knowledge about data from their own agency could expose managers to perceptions that they are not doing their job well which could be embarrassing. Before the meeting, managers examine and analyze their data, discover trends and new patterns, and identify areas where resources and attention may be necessary.

3. Easy to identify performing and non-performing agencies. Identifying non-performing managers can be tricky, especially when little or no independent checks are conducted to verify claims from departments. Managers are expected to meet the goals of their department within allowable timeframes, budget, and resources. During the PerformanceStat meeting the chief executive leadership team can easily identify or deduce performance surpluses or deficits from how managers respond to the analysis and data from their own departments. Since the analysis and questions are not distributed to managers before the meeting, it often becomes apparent for executives which agencies are meeting expectations, achieving targets, and delivering results. This becomes necessary for executives to carefully explain and follow up with subunit managers on how they could improve their work.
4. Reveals areas for improvement which otherwise might be difficult to uncover. Collecting and analyzing data pertaining to the relevant department appearing at the PerformanceStat meeting is an effective “X-ray” tool for executives to gain a comprehensive insight into the operations of the department. It is effective for assessing and understanding the status of the department's progress toward achieving their objectives while discovering areas for improvement.

5. Motivates improved supervision. At the meeting, executives expect the manager to respond to the data that will be presented as well as all matters arising from his or her agency. The manager is expected to take full responsibility for the successes and failures of the department. With this knowledge, managers are motivated to ensure that subordinates do what is expected of them in the interest of the department.

6. Promotes collective accountability. Agencies, departments, or subunits can only succeed if everyone does his or her work. A manager's job is to link consequences to collective results and help subordinates do their job well. Agencies succeed with collective accountability. Managers cannot succeed if subordinates focus only on personal goals rather than department success. But managers bear ultimate responsibility for their departments. Knowing this before performance meetings helps them broadly consult with any staff or others whose cooperation is necessary in order to meet the department's targets.

7. Enables managers to keep track and update their data. Keeping track and updating information is important to monitor progress toward city goals. This is necessary to assess whether the department's operations are yielding efficient outcomes for residents, which programs are effective, or what changes need to be made. Data-driven decisions should be based on accurate information and the executive team knows that. Hence managers endeavor to keep track and update their data preparing for the performance meeting.

8. Broadens the scope of issues to be discussed during the stat meeting which otherwise would have been overlooked. Sticking to predefined scope of issues tends to constrain matters that could be important for discussions during the meeting. Instead, a wide array of issues that concern the participating department are discussed. This is necessary to thoroughly address performance challenges that may have been overlooked by limiting discussions to predetermined issues only.

9. Motivates managers to regularly scrutinize their approach in identifying creative solutions to persistent problems. Managers utilize time and resources to deal with problems that their agencies confront. In most cases during the performance meeting, the chief executive’s leadership team will stop at nothing to determine whether managers are making judicious use of the limited resources or wasting resources on the same problems. Managers aware of this line of questioning would also invest in evaluating their approach to identify and innovative ways of solving problems that otherwise may have recurred.
10. Motivates managers to focus more on the results and less on the process. One of the key ways to evaluate success as the head of the department is to consider the outcomes and results of the department's work. During the meeting, the executive team wants to find out how managers are achieving results. In order to appear at the meeting and feel confident, it becomes necessary to discover the right metrics that focus on expected results.

**Risks of Gotcha**

1. **Unnecessarily surprises managers and leads to confrontation.** The purpose of PerformanceStat is to motivate managers and their teams to get better at achieving results. When managers are confronted with data and analysis that has the potential to cast doubt on their work performance, they may tend to debate executives rather than discuss the issues. Managers sometimes become more defensive rather than cooperative, which is not the goal.

2. **Unnecessarily raises managers' anxiety.** Fear of the unknown confronts everyone to some degree or another. Not knowing what to expect, especially when quizzed publicly, can bring troubling and unpleasant emotions before and during the meeting. This makes managers unnecessarily anxious which can affect their entire experience during the meeting and after.

3. **Creates a culture of fear and low morale.** Persistently surprising managers (and subordinates) with analysis that that exposes performance deficits creates a culture of uncertainty and fear.

4. **Discourages innovation and risk-taking.** When managers are confronted and realize the potential of being seen as under-performing or exposed to public ridicule, there is the tendency to confine themselves to specified and narrow goals within their control. Fear of such consequences can stifle creative thinking and risk-taking to address problems they confront in their departments. Creativity thrives in an environment where subunit directors have the freedom to devote time and effort to ideas and projects that may yield short-term results, but will have long-term impacts.

5. **Prone to inaccurate conclusions.** When managers are confronted with data that they have no knowledge of and are asked to speak to them, “I don’t know” becomes their best answer. This may be the case when they have no idea what data may appear at the meeting. At the end of stat meeting, people may draw their own conclusions about the performance of participating departments.

6. **Feedback for performance improvement is delayed.** Timely feedback is important to prevent situations from getting out of control. When managers are informed ahead of time issues that would be discussed at the performance meeting they are can take steps to
correct any performance deficits. Surprising managers at meeting with issues that they know little about delays feedback to improve performance.

7. **Focuses on what managers are not doing right.** Everyone likes to be recognized for their achievements, managers are no different. The surprises approach focuses on performance issues that managers may often not be proud of and ignore important areas of progress, leaving them feel unfairly judged. This may be counter-productive to get things done in a more timely and constructive manner.

**No Surprises PerformanceStat**

This approach emphasizes full disclosure to managers all matters and potential issues that would be addressed during the meeting. Before the meeting, managers are provided with the questions and issues that they may be required to speak to. The goal of this approach is “no surprises.” Each manager arrives at the meeting knowing what data and issues he or she is going to be presenting on and discussing.

**Benefits of No Surprises**

1. **It removes uncertainties reducing manager’s anxieties.** This approach removes elements of uncertainties and surprises and helps to alleviate stress that usually characterizes the gotcha performance approach. Everyone feels anxious about the unknown. Sometimes our ability to know what is likely to happen can provide a lot of comfort, enhancing our ability to perform at optimum levels.

2. **Allows managers to adequately prepare for performance meeting.** Meetings are most productive when participants attend prepared. Stat meetings are organized not only for accountability but to ensure that things are getting done effectively. When managers who are key participants to these meetings are allowed time to prepare, they are better positioned to engage in deliberations that yield productive outcomes.

3. **Promotes collaboration and cooperation between managers and senior executives.** Managers and executives must work together to get things done for the city. Building trust is critical to accomplish city goals. Letting managers understand ahead of time what they can expect at the performance meeting engenders confidence around the stat process. It allows them to seek clarification about issues, require more information and work collaboratively with executives to achieve city objectives.

4. **Allows managers to address potential performance deficits before the meeting.** One of the purpose for stat meeting is to provide the managers opportunity to get feedback on their progress towards city goals. A successful performance meeting aims at addressing
performance deficits. Allowing managers to address issues ahead of time produce fruitful meeting results.

5. Removes manager’s fear of humiliation building trust and confidence in the process. Continuous communication between executives and managers about the process is necessary to achieve performance expectations. Being open about what managers can expect before the meeting builds their confidence in the process thus removing any semblance of fear and perceptions of victimization from senior executives. Acts of surprises from senior executives may be counter-productive.

6. Managers become aware of the resources and operational capacity needed to address problems. Clearly defining the issues ahead of time provides managers the opportunity to identify resources needed to achieve city objectives. The questions may serve as a prompt to allow managers take stock of the capacities available to deliver on specific tasks.

7. Promotes a culture of trust, candor and openness. Cities are filled with senior managers determined to serve residents well. But they may face challenges that require them to be open and frank with executives to enable them function effectively. A culture of trust and openness enhances their ability to be creative and take risk.

Risks of No Surprises

1. It’s usually time consuming. In most cases, a lot of time is invested in writing responses to the issues that would be raised during the performance meeting. Depending on the number of questions, it can take several hours to provide effective answers to questions. Sometimes the managers may request their staff to respond to the questions, but it require them allocate adequate time to familiarize themselves with what the staff provides. Since they are responsible for issues raised they may also have to do a lot of double-checking of records to ensure accurate information is provided to executives.

2. Duplicative and waste of resources. Ultimately, the objective of the no surprises approach is a mutual agreement about the performance outcomes. The meeting is merely a reinforcement of answers to questions that have already been addressed. In the end the meeting only becomes repetition of discussions between the manager and executives, but this time before a wider audience. This risks a show-and-tell type Stat meeting, which should be carefully avoided.

3. Prone to cover-up of critical details from the executive team. It is expected that issues discussed at the performance meeting will come as no surprise to managers, therefore issues that could reveal critical details with the potential for exposing weaknesses in performance may not be discussed or are carefully avoided by skillful managers.
4. **The scope of issues that agencies are supposed to respond to is often narrowed.** Sometimes executives may not be thoroughly abreast of key issues that are crucial to address performance deficits. Managers might decide to provide answers to issues only raised by executives in the pre-meeting memos. This limits number of issues that they can be discussed during the performance meeting.

5. **Overemphasizes recent work and accomplishments.** Follow ups to previous discussions are necessary to address performance gaps comprehensively. But managers often get uncomfortable with having to answer repeated questions hence they tend to focus on recent accomplishments.

6. **Results in praise singing rather than objective feedback to managers.** Feedback are necessary for managers to deliver results to their residents. However, the no surprises approach is usually prone to highlighting achievements as managers often present issues that they know are deserving of praise from executives. This does not encourage objective feedback necessary for managers to improve performance.

**Making the Choice between the different approaches**

Effective PerformanceStat meetings achieve a variety of purposes. They provide operational updates, reveal deficiencies, highlight areas for improvements, and create accountability. These goals must drive the meeting. The focus should be on what the city needs to do to achieve its goals of providing quality service to its residents. And must identify the relevant data, analysis, and performance deficits that departments need to address. It is all about exploring alternatives for eliminating or mitigating the deficiencies that exist, learning from what has worked, considering strategies for future improvement, and recognizing managers and departments that are making progress. What is important is that the meeting is conducted to keep every manager focused on creating meaningful and realistic results. There is no one size fits all approach to carrying out a PerformanceStat meeting - it should be adapted to ensure that everyone is committed to achieving the city’s performance targets. The benefit for these stat meetings is that managers have an opportunity be accountable for their data. In the end, the choice of the approach must depend primarily on solving specific problems, identifying causes of those problems, exploring alternative solutions, determining capacities and resources that exist to address the issues, and assigning responsibilities.
Prepare for the First Stat Meeting

Once the city has decided to take a more evidence-based approach to management, architected the framework, and identified the initial datasets, the city is well on its way to implementing a performance management program.

The next step is to begin to analyze the data and prepare for the first Stat meeting. At these meetings, department leads, the principal, and a panel of stakeholders will participate in a collaborative discussion of the data. This discussion is framed by analytics prepared by the Stat analyst and the discussion is led either by the principal or the Stat lead.

The Role of the Stat Analyst

The Stat analyst always has important work to do before every Stat meeting. He or she provides the materials that guide the focus of the meeting. The Stat analyst needs to pay attention to areas addressed in the strategic framework keeping the legislative cycle, current events, and pressing administrative issues in mind. Another important function the Stat analyst performs is to create charts, graphs, maps, and other visualizations which improves understanding of the data.

In addition, the analyst works with the Stat lead to determine the priority areas for Stat meetings. Before the first Stat meeting, the analyst collects input from the department, after which time he or she reviews the indicator data relating to an issue or department and crafts a Stat memo.

Meeting Prep Tips for Stat Analysts

If the Stat analyst wants to prepare for the meeting efficiently, he or she needs to have two important pieces in place:

- Know the performance management team, especially the department contact, at each contributing department. The analyst should already have established working relationships with every department involved during the data collection phase.
- Understand the department well. The stat analyst should have a working knowledge of an department’s: Strengths and weaknesses Current priorities (policy and legislative) Current budget

The Stat Meeting Memo
The Stat analyst drafts a memo for every Stat meeting, based upon that hierarchy of priorities. Here are guidelines for drafting a Stat meeting memo (see Appendix B for a sample memo).

**Memo Intro:** The beginning of the memo should include a list of the topics that will be covered in the meeting. This introduction sets out the organization, agenda, and flow of the meeting.

**Topics to be Covered:** Each portion of the memo should have a title, a data visualization, and an estimate of how much time will be dedicated to the subject. The first topic in the memo should be a review of the Key Performance Indicator data that has been mapped and identified as informative of progress for the city's goals. This is important because it reinforces the importance of the department's work to the overall strategic framework and citywide goals.

**Review of Data:** In general, the Stat memo and analyses should be organized in the following way:

- Review of any outstanding follow-up issues prompted by the prior Stat meetings
- Review of goals and related data
- Review of the operational data
- Review of the subject matter data
- Review of any overlapping operational or subject matter data

**Essentials for Each Topic:** Each discussion topic in the Stat memo should include the following elements:

**Introductory Narrative:** Introduces a particular topic and describes the data that was used in the analysis.

**Data Visualization:** A map, chart, graph, table, photograph, or any other visualization.

**Data Source:** The performance management team is never the source of the data; the department contact should provide the appropriate data source. This may be discussed during the data alignment phase.

**Leading Questions:** The Stat analyst should construct recommended questions for the Stat panel to ask the department leader(s). These questions should help to further explain the data, should be based in analysis, and be well researched by the Stat analyst.

**Distribution of the Stat Memo**

Determining who gets the memo before the initial Stat meeting depends on the goals of the program. Choosing not to share the memo with the department requires department heads to have a deep awareness of their data, their connection to the strategic or goal framework,
and be prepared to discuss how the department is performing. In some cases, not seeing the memo before the meeting can encourage departments to develop their own internal "Stats," in which they review the data internally, a sign that performance management is taking hold within the department. This practice can also discourage departments from preparing presentations to address topics that are brought up in the memo. At the beginning of the meeting, the department has an opportunity to open the discussion with an update or some news, but presentations are discouraged and the memo serves as the agenda for the discussion.
Determine the Structure of Performance Management Meetings

Performance management meetings are implemented uniquely from city to city, depending on the desired frequency, focus, and leadership of the meeting. The questions below are meant to guide cities in thinking through what their meeting structure might look like.

Performance management meetings are critical to setting the tone around the importance of a city's performance targets, to keep the citywide goals top of mind, and to keep momentum going as those at the table work to identify trends and solve problems. When setting up performance meetings, ensure that the meeting schedule is frequent enough to move the needle on the targets; regularly recurring; public, even if the meetings are not open to the public; and that the meeting is led by the city’s chief executive and/or designees.

Below are some questions to help determine the structure of performance management meetings:

Will your Chief Executive (Mayor or City Manager) lead each meeting?

If not, who will be their designee?

- Even if the Chief Executive will not be present at each meeting, leaving a place at the table or even a name plate for them can send the message that the meetings are a priority. In Louisville, Mayor Greg Fischer attends each LouieStat meeting.

- Ensure that the same person runs each meeting, to bake continuity into the discussion of performance.

- A designee must have the authority to ask departments to follow up on action items that are raised during the meeting, and to hold them accountable for those action items in subsequent meetings. Remember that the person who runs the meeting will set the tone. Will the meetings be contentious and focused on putting departments in the hot seat, or collaborative and dedicated to finding concerted solutions?

A Note About "Contentious" Meetings

Performance management meetings, especially Stat meetings, have a reputation for being "contentious" and are often described as "gotcha" sessions. While that style can be effective, it is not the only tone worth striving for. A better framing is "problem focused." Performance management meetings should always be problem focused. Problems are inherently difficult, and solving them can be a tense process. Therefore, constructive tension during collaborative problem solving is nothing to be afraid of.
Will the meetings focus on a subject matter area, internal departmental operations, or both?

- ChattaData meetings are focused on the City's performance priorities.
- New Orleans has several monthly stat meetings, each focused on a particular subject area, including blight, quality of life, and customer service.
- Seattle's SeaStat is aimed at analyzing crime data and community incident reports to identify crime hotspots.
- In Maryland's StateStat, each State department had a Stat meeting once a month. Follow up items from the previous month were discussed, as well as new topics and trends. These meetings were complemented by quarterly "subject-matter Stats," in which all agencies that have ownership of certain topics were present.

How will you bring departments to the table and cultivate buy-in for the process?

- Sharing information on results that other cities have seen from focusing on performance metrics can help make the case for internal buy-in. Let department heads know that the performance meetings are an opportunity to elevate issues, propose solutions, and request resources.
- Cross-departmental participation also drives more creative solutions. So in addition to your program experts, aim for representation from the following divisions:
  - Finance/Budget
  - Procurement
  - Information Technology
  - Communications
  - Legal
  - Human Resources
  - Equal Rights
  - Policy

How frequently will the meetings occur?

- Frequency is important to keep the momentum going. Holding meetings at regular, publicly posted intervals helps build trust with residents by building in accountability.
Consider placing holds on the calendars of all senior executives one year in advance, along with back-up holds in case the original meetings get bumped.

- Kansas City releases its KCStat schedule for the upcoming year at the end of the previous year.

**Will meetings be public?**

- Most performance meetings are not open to the public. Even if your meeting is closed, consider keeping it transparent by publishing the meeting schedule, releasing notes and slides with sensitive information redacted after the meeting, and even televising or live-tweeting the meeting.
Questions for Discussion: Preparing for Launch

How will the city prepare for each meeting? Will a new process be created or does an existing process have room to include Stat preparation? Who will be needed to prep for each meeting? Are there current staff members that can dedicate their time to this work?

Who will be invited to each meeting? Will the actors be consistent or will they vary? Are employees expected to attend and/or participate in the meetings?

How will the city encourage departments and senior staff members to use the information from the meetings in day to day work? How are employees expected to access and use the information?
Launch the System

Host a Stat Meeting

Now that the city has its Stat memo drafted, it is time to assemble the Stat panel and have the first Stat meeting.

Timing of the Meeting:

These meetings should occur at least once a month per department and include all internal stakeholders. This means that those involved in the overall performance management program will likely attend multiple Stat meetings per week, so that every department or issue receives a monthly review.

Different jurisdictions have different timing practices. Maryland’s StateStat program typically has between six to eight topics detailed in a single meeting memo. The amount of time spent on each ranges from 5 to 30 minutes. Regular meetings are always 90 minutes long. Having a finite time allotted for the meeting allows for predictable and easy scheduling.

The LouieStat team meets with each department every six to eight weeks to discuss goals and progress, with departments holding their own Stat meetings in the interim to prepare for the full LouieStat meeting.

New Orleans BlightStat meetings were originally held twice a month due to the intensive need to reduce blight, with meetings then monthly after a year of the program.

Who to Invite to a Stat Session

- **Principal**: The principal should always attend the first session to set the tone. It signals to the department that the performance management program is how it would be held accountable to its progress, and it is how the department will be managed. But more importantly, the principal’s attendance is confirmation that the process itself -the participants, the data, the dialogue- is important.

- **Chief of Staff**: The chief of staff or the operational supervisor of the department should always attend. It is important that the department leader sees his or her supervisor at the table. This will also help to confirm the importance of the process in the overall governance methodology of the administration.
• **Department Budget Analyst:** In many cities, there are independent budget departments responsible for assembling and administering the city’s budget, and there is typically a budget analyst assigned to each department. That analyst should always be present at his or her assigned department session, allowing for continuity between the performance management process and the budget process. The budget analysts can also provide background on how decisions around budget were made, what priorities were protected through the budget process in the past, and how decisions around the current budget are shaping up. They add enormous value and should be encouraged to participate in the performance management process.

• **Legal Counsel:** Always have legal counsel at the table; the principal’s own legal counsel is best. Avoid having the department’s attorney on the panel. The purpose of independent counsel on the Stat panel is to expedite conversations where legal barriers are present or perceived to be present.

• **Department Head:** The department head and key personnel should always be at the table. The Stat team should rely on the department head to invite the correct people from their organizations. Having other staff at the meetings helps with the flow of the conversation. Many cities have at least ten department leaders at Stat meetings with some departments bringing significantly more participants.

• **Additional Participants:** It is also important to invite frontline staff to observe some meetings. This helps illustrate the value of data collected and helps the Stat panel stay connected to the barriers to progress that exist on the frontline. Any other management stakeholder should participate. The department’s data officer or data organizer should be present at all meetings.

**Guidelines for the Meeting**

Keep in mind that these are not typically public meetings, particularly in the beginning. The session should be no more than 90 minutes and follow the same format every time. Being respectful of everyone’s time is very important. The session should be driven by the data. The department leader should always have an opportunity to start the meeting with good news, then get into areas of concern, and outputs of internal data analysis.
The Role of the Analyst at the Stat Meeting

The analyst should be the formal recorder of what occurs in the meeting. He or she should be prepared to contextualize any questions concerning the data, as well as drive the data visualizations and have access to the data for in-meeting analytics.

After the meeting, the analyst should prepare a follow-up memo from the Stat session and distribute it in the days following the session (see Appendix B). This document will be used as the basis for the next session and should include clear time frames for a reasonable response.

Incorporating the Dashboard

If a performance management dashboard has been built for the principal to review how the departments are performing, it should always be the landscape for the beginning of the Stat meeting. All the data visualizations and the data should be available in the room for on-the-fly analytics and discussion. Choose a Meeting Leader

The meeting should have a leader. When the principal is in the room, he or she should always lead the meeting. There should be a director or owner of the process that can lead the meeting in the absence of the principal. This person should have the authority to make decisions and the capacity to allocate resources or authorize the allocation of resources. This person should have direct access to the principal and this should be well known to the departments and department contacts.

Following Up

Follow up is critical to any performance management program, and can be the difference between success and failure. During each meeting, identify issues that need further exploration or deeper analysis, and assign individuals the responsibility to follow up. The memo should make clear the relationship between the issues discussed at the previous meeting and the current meeting. Ideally, each meeting will build on problems, solutions, and commitments made, meeting after meeting. Please see Appendix C for a sample follow up memo and links to real-world examples. Here are some best practices on crafting follow-ups:

- **Plan Ahead.** Walk into every Stat meeting with an idea of what actions are likely to emerge from the discussion. If you don't know, you probably haven't done enough prep work. Laying the groundwork for important actions is part of the Stat programs key responsibilities.
- **Record them Live.** During the Stat meeting, capture everything a senior executive asks for clarity or deliver on, no matter how big or small. Write it all down.
- **Read them Aloud.** At the end of the meeting, read the list of all the action items you've
captured for the entire audience to hear. Make time for this part of the meeting, otherwise it will be rushed and you will miss the most important opportunity to turn insights into action.

- **Get clear on priorities, owners and timelines.** Some things matter more than others, so make the senior executives in the room prioritize the action items before adjourning the meeting, especially if there are a lot of them. But mix it up. Don't make every action item impossible to execute. Some of them should be easily doable to give the programs a sense of fairness and accomplishment.

- **Don't leave the room without commitments.** People need to look each other in the eyes and make commitments to getting these action items done on the agreed upon timeframe. If you sense trepidation or reluctance, it is a sign people are not bought in, and the senior executive should make it clear these actions are real.

- **Be specific about deliverables.** Every action item should state very clearly what delivery looks like. Is it a memo? A report? A verbal briefing? An analysis? Launching a new program? A budget request? A deployment of resources? Don't leave any room for ambiguity about what is expected to be delivered.

- **Turn it around quickly.** As soon as humanly possible, get this list of prioritized action items into formal memo for the senior executive to sign and issue to subordinates, especially those on the hook for delivering. The longer you wait, the less likely people will remember the discussion and hold themselves accountable for taking action.
Stat Seating Chart (example)

Stat sessions can be configured a number of ways, but they are a few key ingredients every Stat program should include:

- **Senior Executive Champion:** For citywide Stat initiatives, the Mayor or City Administrator should always be at the head of the table, making it clear they intend to use the Stat process to make more informed choices about service delivery. For department Stat programs, the Department head should sit in the head position for the same purpose. This could be the Police Chief (like CompStat) or the Director of Human Capital, depending on the focus of the meeting.

- **Diverse representation from the organization’s senior leaders:** For citywide Stat initiatives, the people seated around the table should be department heads, representing as many departments as possible, from public safety to procurement. The same goes for department Stat - the more perspectives around the table the better the outcome.

- **Hot Seat:** Every Stat session focuses on one topic or one program, so the person with the most responsibility over that topic or program should be sitting in the “hot seat.” In this seat, the senior executive expects thorough answers to all questions and no finger pointing. It’s called the hot seat because all fingers point inward, which can be uncomfortable, but often yields important insights.

- **Hot Seat Support Staff:** The person in the “hot seat” cannot possibly know everything, so Stat sessions should include space for his/her team to attend. If the component director needs to defer to a subject matter expert, those in the room can chime in. Without support staff present, Stat session action items are too often “get backs” on questions that could not be answered in the room.

- **Projection Screen for Data Visualization/Analysis:** Without data, a Stat meeting is just another meeting - so having a place for data analysis to be visualized is critical for decision makers to have confidence that they have the best information available. A large projection screen or multiple televisions around the room are a great way to ensure everyone in the room can see the analysis being discussed.

- **A place for the analysts:** Those who know the data well should have a place in the room, in case there are questions those at the table cannot answer. This includes anyone on the Stat program’s team, members of the performance team and/or members of the open data team. It is also important for those individuals to hear the context of the discussion and the resulting action items, because they will be responsible for recording those actions and tracking progress.

- **General seating area for spectators:** Stat sessions can be closed to the public, but they should rarely be closed to employees of the organization. Therefore ensure there is
a seating area for employees who simply want to listen to the conversation.
Turning Insight into Action

Introduction

A perennial problem (or opportunity) in medicine is that human beings don’t always turn insight into action when it goes against our short-term interests. Research has proven that high calories, sugar, alcohol, and saturated fats are bad for long-term health, yet very few people make choices to eat and drink healthier. Obviously many people in the US don’t have the resources to make healthier choices a reality. But even the average person with adequate resources usually eats poorly, skips routine checkups, avoids getting tested, and pays for gym memberships they seldom use. Kaiser Permanente, the largest managed care organization in the US, recently took a small action to combat this tendency and drive more people to action: They changed the way patients see their medical information.

Since Kaiser is an integrated managed care organization, it has an integrated electronic medical record, so any Kaiser customer can always see their full history of test results online. Until 2016, a typical customer getting a routine physical would see her past blood tests presented this way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lipid Panel</td>
<td>3/04/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemoglobin A1C</td>
<td>3/03/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipid Panel</td>
<td>8/25/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipid Panel</td>
<td>2/28/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBC (Complete Blood Count)</td>
<td>2/28/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipid Panel</td>
<td>11/7/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A patient could click on each test (each row) and see the results presented this way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIPID</th>
<th>PANEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordered By</td>
<td>Dr. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Results</td>
<td>2/28/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol</td>
<td>165 MG/DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL</td>
<td>59 MG/DL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since most patients aren’t also doctors, these numbers don’t mean much to most people. So the average person would close his browser and go on about his day, making very few changes to his diet based on the information. But in 2016, Kaiser made a switch. Now, when a patient clicks on a test result, this is what he can see on his mobile app:
Take Action

Test Result Details

**CHOLESTEROL**

**Result**: 191

Standard range: <= 199

---

**Results Over Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Result (mg/dL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/04/2016</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/2016</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/2013</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/07/2011</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See All Results
Instead of looking at numbers, the patient is looking at his life. As time has passed, he sees evidence that his cholesterol is climbing. It’s approaching the upper limit of what Kaiser considers a “standard range.” This information is much harder to ignore and Kaiser is betting it drives more patients to turn insights about their cholesterol levels into action at the grocery store and dinner table.

**What does cholesterol have to do with government inaction?**

Kaiser’s example is a microcosm of the challenges faced by governments everywhere: how to use information in a way that helps people make smarter choices that are in their best interest and in the best interest of society. Many governments are struggling to turn insights about their performance into smart and effective delivery changes. There are a host of reasons why and most aren’t as simple as changing an online chart for residents or employees (although some are).

In this guide, the Center for Government Excellence (GovEx) will explore the common causes for government inaction and suggest strategies to either overcome them, work around them, or simply understand them.
Understanding Inaction

It’s easy to think of “inaction” as simply the lack of action, but it isn’t that simple. Inaction is an action. It’s a conscious choice to maintain the status quo. There are many reasons organizations choose not to act on opportunities or insights about their own performance. The diagram below is called a fishbone, or cause and effect diagram. It’s a useful diagnostic tool for figuring out the root causes for a specific problem. In this case, despite evidence that government isn’t performing at its highest potential, there is continued inaction. The key is figuring out why.

The Inaction Fishbone

Conducting a fishbone exercise in your organization is very simple:

- Gather a diverse group of individuals with intimate knowledge of your government and agree on a problem statement (the effect).
- Write the problem/effect down on the far right side of a whiteboard or flip chart for everyone to see and draw an arrow pointing to it.
- As a group, brainstorm all the possible major causes of the problem/effect. Typical results include big categories, such as people, technology, process, methods, environment, culture, leadership, etc.
- Write the causes as branches flowing into the main arrow.
- For each major branch, ask the group “why is this happening?” Write down each answer as a branch flowing into the main cause category. If the answers aren’t the root cause of the problem, keep asking why again and again until you’ve found the root cause. For example:
  - **Problem/Effect:** Customer Satisfaction is Low
  - **One Potential Cause:** Shipping
  - **Why customers unhappy with shipping?** Because products are being shipped to the wrong addresses.
  - **Why are products being shipped to the wrong address?** The database for customer orders is incompatible with our shipping database.
  - **Why are the two systems incompatible?** Because no one has built an address translation layer between the two systems yet. Once we build that, the issue would be fixed.
  - **Why has no one built a translation layer?** No one was asked to.
In this fictitious example, an organization continues to deal with low customer satisfaction because no one was held accountable for fixing it, not an uncommon phenomenon in government organizations. In fact, social psychologists have found people are often encouraged to avoid taking action when responsibility is diffused across multiple parts of a large organization and it doesn't get much larger than government.

If your government is experiencing the problem of inaction, GovEx recommends conducting a brainstorming exercise, like the fishbone, to identify root causes and make a plan to address them. To guide practitioners through some common causes for inaction, GovEx created an inaction fishbone based on the experiences of governments across the country. We will deal with each “cause” as a group and offer prescriptions for overcoming them.

Causes of Inaction

![Fishbone Diagram]

*Politics has been inadvertently excluded from this chapter, but could easily be added as a cause for inaction.*
People: It's not them . . . it's you.

Civil servants don't get enough respect. They will never make a million dollars and very few people will ever know the great work they do, but their mistakes get plastered all over local news. If you are a government manager getting disappointed in the lack of action coming from employees, it's important to keep one thing in mind: It's not them . . . it's you.

Why do people in government not take proactive action to improve performance?

They don't feel empowered. Many government employees feel powerless to change something about the way programs are run.

- Why? Because decisions are always escalated higher and higher up the management chain. The phrase “that’s above my pay grade” is commonly heard among employees who don’t feel empowered.
  - What can you do about it? Establish clear escalation criteria as you push decision-making authority in the organization to the levels most appropriate to resolve the problems confronted by employees. Only bigger and more visible issues, where there is genuine disagreement, should rise to senior management.
- Why? Because they’re being micromanaged. Micromanagement is extremely toxic, and only appropriate in very specific circumstances. It occurs most frequently when managers want to feel more in control but don’t trust employees to handle the project or situation effectively. Unfortunately, that exercise of control often doesn’t coincide with clear guidance from managers, so employees are left feeling powerless and destined to disappoint a boss who expects them to read her mind.
  - What can you do about it? First, understand why micromanagement is occurring. Then set clear priorities and expectations and communicate them to employees in writing. Don’t just say them. Employees can’t read minds, so make it very clear how you expect the program to be delivered. Finally, slowly pull back from the behaviors that undermine employee empowerment without becoming disengaged.

They’re intimidated. Employees are sometimes afraid taking action will have negative consequences for them personally and professionally.

- Why? Many government performance management programs are modeled after New York’s CompSTAT and anyone who has seen The Wire believes that process doesn’t end well for employees in the hot seat. The fear of performance management being
used as a tool to separate “contenders” from the “pretenders” as Harvard’s Bob Behn calls them, is a lasting legacy of many Stat programs and it’s not a sustainable feature worth replicating.

- **What can you do about it?** Strike a balance. Research suggests people are motivated by positive feedback more than negative (often labeled “constructive”), and the balance should tip considerably toward the positive. Managers should make it clear that taking risks based on sound information and reasoned judgment is okay, and innovative employees will be rewarded, not punished, because the organization prioritizes continuous learning over continuous punishing.

The City of Alexandria, Virginia frames their AlexStat program as a “continuous improvement” process and describes it as “a collaborative analysis and discussion that helps you and the City Manager’s Office.”

**They aren’t prepared.** Inaction often occurs because employees don’t have the knowledge or training necessary to execute their work effectively.

- **Why?** If people weren’t included in the process that leading up to a decision, then they aren’t likely to support it with their time and energy.

  - **What can you do about it?** Research supports the inclusion of employees in management decisions that affect them - and if they’re going to carry out actions to change programs, then their inclusion and participation is vital. When people understand the reasons for change, they’re more likely to support it. This is one of the underlying fundamentals of change management theory.

Chattanooga’s Budgeting for Outcomes initiative includes stakeholders at every step of the way. The City provides several training opportunities to help budget offer writers understand the process, and even includes staff to be part of the Results Team, which ranks the offers. These rankings are critical in determining recommendations for funding. Involving staff in the budget process helps to mitigate perceptions that these decisions are made behind closed doors, while giving employees more ownership.

- **Why?** If people have no education or training about the problem being solved or the action being taken, then they aren’t likely to know HOW to help.

  - **What can you do about it?** If employees have no existing knowledge base of the problem being solved or the action(s) being taken, then managers have to educate and train them. Training an existing employee is cheaper than hiring a new one and training has never been cheaper to provide, so there is no excuse for leaving employees unprepared to take action on important issues.
Denver's Peak Academy is one of the most transformational programs operating in city government and their goal is to train and coach employees at all levels to improve the way government works. They train city employees relentlessly in continuous improvement, identifying waste, and eliminating it.
Leadership & Management - Start Making Sense

Leaders and managers must create the conditions for employees to feel empowered and prepared to take action, but they often give employees whiplash instead. Muddled vision, competing priorities, scattered game plans, and limited accountability are all contributing to a culture of inaction. So if you are a government leader who wants to see more action from the team, then it’s time to start making sense.

Why Are Leaders and Managers Setting Conditions for Inaction?

There is no clear vision. Leading an organization without a clear vision of the destination is like getting the whole family in the car for a road trip to . . . anywhere. It sounds fun at first, but problems soon ensue.

- Why? Visionless governments are often the byproduct of continuous leadership transitions. Political cycles exacerbate this problem by periodically sweeping out one person’s vision in exchange for another. Since continuous change is the only constant, new leaders should take quick steps to describe the destination.

  - What can you do about it? The US Army thinks a lot about leadership transitions and publishes a time-based guide for new leaders. The advice is applicable to many organizations. Spend the first 30 days listening more than talking, but establish a clear vision before the 60-day mark. Any longer without a clear vision, and leaders risk disrupting team cohesion. Once a clear vision exists, leaders and managers should share it with a broad audience to get support and continuously use it like a compass to guide the work.

In Jackson, Mississippi, Mayor Tony Yarber repeatedly highlights the importance of data and evidence in his vision for the city, making it clear the city makes “judgments based on the science and not art . . . on an assessment of the facts and not on our feelings. It means that at all levels; we will make decisions to fund things that are relative to our city’s sustainability and its ability to function properly.”

There is no focused plan. A leader can have a very clear vision but no clue how to get there, and that difference is frustrating to employees who have to make choices at every turn. Having a clear plan can help everyone be clear what to do first, second, and third. A focused plan also helps clarify what not to do.
• **Why?** Some leadership and management teams can’t make up their minds about which courses of actions to take. They change direction often and it’s hard for employees to keep track of how the organization is progressing and how they should contribute.

  - **What can you do about it?** Make a plan, write it down, communicate it, and stick to it. Setting out a clear vision isn’t enough. Leaders and managers must articulate how the organization is going to get there, assigning actions, timelines, and measures of progress.

Fort Lauderdale, FL, and Raleigh, NC, both have strong examples of vision documents and strategic plans, which make it clear what the city intends to achieve, and when.

**There is no accountability.** If leaders and managers don’t hold each other accountable for taking action, inaction will continue throughout the organization.

• **Why?** Tough conversations are uncomfortable and most people avoid them. Too often, leaders and managers avoid them by not assigning specific owners and not enforcing consequences for inaction or underperformance. They assume the problem will resolve itself if they simply express disappointment during a staff meeting.

  - **What can you do about it?** Take the emotion out of it. If leaders and managers have written down a vision, a plan, owners, and metrics for progress, then it’s a simple conversation about what has and hasn’t been accomplished. Questions from leadership should be respectful but persistent, so everyone knows accountability isn’t about embarrassing each other, it’s about making progress together.
Resources - Say “Yes” to Less.

Government employees are asked to take action without adequate technology and funding to support them. They’re called to “do more with less,” a mathematically flawed formula for success.

Why Are Resources Constraining Action?

The technology sucks. “Legacy systems” are the anchor around the neck of innovative and motivated employees.

- Why? IT systems are frequently controlled by a third-party vendor, cost too much to change, and don’t meet the program’s analytical needs. They aren’t agile enough to change with changing requirements, and users can’t conduct data exploration because the information is trapped behind an impenetrable firewall only the IT department can navigate.

  - What can you do about it? Set an expectation for agile development between programs and the IT department, and stop saying “yes” to large IT projects promising end-to-end solutions for your problems. Those solutions rarely work, and they always come in late and overbudget. Say yes to smaller incremental improvements that make employees feel like their needs are being heard and responded to.

There’s no money. Leaders and managers want employees to take action to improve services, but that expectation is rarely matched with any funding.

- Why? Leaders and managers say yes to everything and never take anything off the plate of overstretched employees and overextended resources.

  - What can you do about it? Start by stopping a few practices or activities that aren’t working, making it clear you are willing to divert resources away from bad practice toward proven or emerging practices. Then say “yes” to less. Resist the urge to greenlight every good idea that comes across the conference table. No one has enough bandwidth or funding to try everything, and if they do, it will be shoddy work.
Laws & Policy - Your Maze Needs a Map.

Taking action to improve performance in government is more complicated than other sectors, because the path is lined with legal and policy boundaries which are often hard to reconcile.

Why Are Laws and Policies Causing Inaction?

There is a legitimate question of legality. Government managers often wish employees were taking more steps to share information between departments. But many employees have legitimate questions about whether sharing information with colleagues is legal.

- Why? US law contains certain privacy protections for citizens and the mistreatment of sensitive information by government employees is punishable by law. The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA), and the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) are all complicated laws which make it clear sharing health, financial, and education information is quick route to putting yourself at risk, so information sometimes stays siloed.
  - What can you do about it? Make it crystal clear to employees which behaviors are allowed, which are risky, and which are prohibited. Don’t leave room for doubt or speculation. Use examples and train employees repeatedly on best practices that keep them operating in bounds.

The federal government requires annual employee training on ethics and information security requirements. The Department of Homeland Security even publishes a handbook for safeguarding sensitive and personally identifiable information.

The law or policy constrains creativity and innovation. Government employees don’t often feel free to improvise, because some laws and policies are written in a way that confuse them and constrain their choices. Also, if it takes a lawyer to understand the policy, there’s a problem.

- Why? Federal grants often come with strings attached. For more than a decade, cities and school districts who accepted certain federal public health grants had to teach abstinence-only education, a curriculum roundly proven ineffective at reducing STI transmission and unwanted pregnancy. In other cases, city-drafted policies focus on ensuring the taxpayer dollar isn’t wasted, meanwhile considerations about customer service and the user experience go unmentioned.
  - What can you do about it? Define who you exist for and make sure every law,
regulation, and policy has that end user in mind. If the policy makes it clear government services are about getting to yes for the people who qualify, instead of just getting to no for the people who don’t, then employees will exercise more autonomy in taking creative and innovative action to achieve the end goal. Bad policies are often a major contributor to inefficient and bureaucratic processes. If a manager wants more output and better outcomes, rethink the policy.

Between November 2012 and March 2013, New York City restored heat, power, and hot water in more than 11,700 homes representing more than 20,000 residential units affected by Hurricane Sandy through an innovative program called Rapid Repairs - a first-of-its-kind pilot program to provide free, government assistance to those without heat, power, and hot water. Until then, no other city had responded to a natural disaster by offering emergency repairs to allow homeowners to shelter in their own homes.
Process - It’s Not a Relay, It’s a Medley.

Governments are a patchwork of people and programs delivering disconnected services to overlapping populations. Taking advantage of the competencies of each employee and program is difficult to construct if leaders and managers think about services as a relay race of handoffs. In a relay, every runner runs equal distance and has roughly equivalent ability. Government isn’t a relay, it’s a medley. Different agencies have differing skills and abilities, and partnerships should be constructed with those varying competencies in mind.

Why Is Process Leading to Inaction?

Employees don’t have control over the entire process. One of the most common barriers to ownership occurs when trying to hold someone accountable for something he doesn’t control.

- **Why?** Lack of control usually stems from multiple players being involved in the process. Maybe the program is heavily regulated by state and federal governments because it’s a grant program. For many health and human service programs, there is often court involvement from previous civil rights violations and consent decrees.
  - **What can you do about it?** Own what you own. Even if a local program only owns one tenth of a larger process, they should completely own that one tenth, knowing everything about it and optimizing it every way imaginable.

The District of Columbia Public Schools successfully navigated its way out of one consent decree by aggressively speeding up services to children with disabilities - something entirely within its control.

Employees can’t see the entire process. Some of the biggest problems in government occur when employees in one program have no visibility into the operations and progress of other programs directly related to their own.

- **Why?** Information systems are often different between programs and many governments lack interoperable communications between them. Lines of sight are limited because employees feel very removed from the final outcome and don’t have the time or opportunity to communicate with their counterparts.
  - **What can you do about it?** Take a page out of Amazon’s playbook. They track their customers’ every move and customers can track an Amazon package on its journey from shopping cart to front door. Thinking about the end-to-end customer experience can help siloed employees see the big picture and find creative ways to
improve it.
Insights - Nothing for Them, Without Them

There is a saying among disability rights advocates: “nothing for us, without us.” The sentiment helps government leaders be more inclusive as they design policies that attempt to shepherd in a more inclusive and accessible world. The same sentiment is true for analysts who shouldn’t forget to include subject-matter experts on the front lines when they conduct analysis and communicate insights designed to help those same employees work smarter.

Why Are Insights Causing Inaction?

The analysis is irrelevant to the actual work. Just because an insight seems interesting to an analyst, doesn’t mean it’s relevant to the real work of those on the front lines of city services. Esoteric insights are unlikely to yield action and are more likely to alienate the analysts from the civil servants who understand the programs.

- **Why?** If analysts don’t include subject-matter experts and frontline civil servants in their work before it begins, then the insights they produce are likely to be tangential to anything useful or worth acting on.

  - **What can you do about it?** Analysts should take a note from a journalism playbook and embed themselves in the services they’re trying to improve and among the civil servants they’re trying to help improve them. According to Mike Flowers, former head of the NYC Mayor’s Office of Data Analytics, having empathy for those on the frontlines can help accurately determine the city’s capacity to develop solutions that actually work.

The insights are confusing. If it takes an analyst to understand the analysis, there’s a problem.

- **Why?** Analysts often try to pack too many facts and figures onto one chart or slide in an attempt to present the information accurately and demonstrate their own competence. Convoluted charts, unintuitive data visualizations, and technical language can create barriers to understanding the analysis and putting insights into action.

  - **What can you do about it?** Don’t dumb it down, just simplify it. Convey one, and only one, key message at a time. Don’t use a million footnotes or small font. Decimal places usually don’t matter to the average viewer, so round your numbers. Use colors consistently, and ask a layperson to look at it before you present it to anyone. For more help on effectively conveying insights, check out the GovEx guide to data visualizations.
The insights are wrong. If the analysis is built on flawed methodology or shoddy logic, no one is going to trust the information enough to act on it.

• Why? Analysts work under pressure, because programs don’t have time to experience paralysis by analysis. Often, when analytics take shortcuts or simply don’t have the adequate quantitative chops, mistakes get made and bias gets introduced into the analytical model. Once an analyst produces fundamentally flawed work, leaders and managers are less likely to trust future work.

  ▪ What can you do about it? Aside from making sure every analyst is continuously trained and retrained, managers should install an internal integrity process, where every analysis gets scrutinized by capable peers. This approach often reveals new opportunities or gaps in logic that will help elevate the final product.
Cities all over the US are actively using data and evidence in decision making, investing in what works, and improving the lives of their residents.

While implementing an effective performance management program takes a concerted effort from cities -- gathering the right team and data, setting up effective strategic frameworks, clearly defining city goals, aligning data to those goals, and finally preparing and hosting Stat meetings -- the results can be astounding.

Looking for further information how to get started with performance management? Please let us know.
Glossary

**Benchmark**: A standard or point of reference against which data may be compared or assessed. May be used in data analytics or in absence of city data.

**Goal/Outcome**: A measurable achievement that will lead to results in the identified performance priority categories within a specified timeline. Goals are more specific than priorities, and there may be multiple goals for each priority. A city may have short term, long term, and intermediate goals. Goals will be a blend of operational (process based) and programmatic (how well the processes are followed).

**Key Performance Indicator (KPI)**: A prevailing metric that the city identifies as the primary way to measure progress toward the goal. A goal may have one KPI, but multiple additional metrics.

**Metadata**: A set of data which describes or gives information on other data.

**Metric/Indicator**: A standard used to develop and measure goals, and track progress and ultimately success toward the goal. A city may identify a metric by inventorying data that it already collects, or using validating data. Output metrics measure a quantity, volume, or production value of data, while outcome metrics measure progress toward a desired result.

**Performance Priority**: Category of subject matter on which the city wishes to achieve results. Categories may include public safety, public health, education, sustainability and the environment, jobs and the economy, and government operations and management.

**Result**: The ultimate desired endgame, which is achieved by strategies and measured by metrics.

**Strategic Framework**: An overarching set of performance priorities for which the city wishes to achieve results.

**Strategy**: An action or set of actions that departments may take, individually or in concert with one another and/or the Mayor’s office and/or external stakeholders, to achieve the goal and ultimately the end result.

**Target**: A desired change in the metrics that will advance the goal.
Communicating Progress

So your city has setup a performance management framework, what's next? Many cities joining the evidence-based government movement are beginning to recognize the importance of engaging their residents in exciting new conversations on how data and evidence can solve problems and improve their quality of life and sharing progress made during performance management processes. GovEx has compiled samples of dashboards, press releases, articles, infographics, blog entries, interviews, and social media communications that others have used to discuss Stat success stories. Our hope is that these examples will provide a knowledge base for cities as they seek to share their own progress and innovation.

- Albuquerque, NM | Website and dashboard
- Chattanooga, TN | Sample tweets
- Kansas City, MO | Sample social media use
- King County, WA | Article
- Louisville, KY | Article
- New Orleans, LA | Press release
- Santa Monica, CA | Infographic

Albuquerque, NM | Progress Report, 2014

Website and dashboards

Source: ABQ Progress Report

Chattanooga, TN | ChattaData, 2014

Sample Tweets


Sample Social Media Use

King County, WA | Healthy Incentives, 2014
King County's Wellness Plan Beats the Odds

SEATTLE – When King County, Washington, launched its employee wellness program seven years ago, its motive was clear. “We were being eaten alive by runaway medical costs,” says the county’s top executive Dow Constantine.

By all accounts, the previous administration was desperate to bring down double-digit health care cost growth that threatened to destroy the entire budget.

That partially explains why King County, which spends nearly $200 million per year to insure 14,000 workers and their families, who mostly live and work here in the county seat, was willing to risk millions more on a wellness program that would prove to break the traditional mold.

It may also explain why labor unions took the unusual step of joining management in a plan that would ultimately shift more health care costs to workers.

But it doesn’t explain why this employee wellness program, which received an innovation award this year from Harvard University, has far surpassed all others in employee participation, health improvement and health care savings.

The program’s unusually high financial incentives for participation and an extensive outreach program to promote it are credited in large part for the program’s success.

In its first five years (2007 to 2011), the county’s “Healthy Incentives” program invested $15 million and saved $46 million in health care spending with sustained participation by more than 90 percent of its employees. Two years ago, $61 million in surplus health care funds were returned to county coffers because cost growth was lower than actuaries had projected. Seattle, the state’s largest city, is the county seat.

Employee health improved dramatically, raising King County employees’ health status above the national average and keeping it there. Smoking rates dropped from 12 percent of employees to less than 5 percent, and more than 2,000 employees classified as overweight or obese at the start of the program lost at least 5 percent of their weight, more than halving their risk of diabetes.

With an average age of 48.5 years and practically no turnover, the county’s worker population is getting healthier even as it’s growing older.

Outsized Performance
These results, documented in a 2012 internal report by former staff economist John Scoggins, are remarkable when compared to the generally lackluster performance of other wellness programs run by large U.S. organizations, including state and local governments. According to a 2013 report from the Rand Corporation, about half of all U.S. large employers offer some type of wellness program and the number is growing. But few end up saving any money and employee participation has been limited. Many fizzle out after a year or two.

On average, only 47 percent of employees participate nationwide, and only 2 percent of organizations that offer the plans report any reduction in health care costs, according to the study, which was funded by the U.S. Departments of Labor and Health and Human Services. Overall savings from wellness plans offered by the organizations Rand surveyed were too small to be statistically valid.

Still, evidence shows that workplace health programs have the potential to promote habit-forming healthy behavior, improve employees' health knowledge and help workers get necessary screenings, immunizations and follow-up care. The Affordable Care Act encourages employers to expand wellness programs by loosening federal regulations that limit the financial rewards employers can offer workers for reaching certain health goals such as quitting tobacco use.

King County’s intensive education and outreach effort cost the county nearly $7 million in the first two years. Since then, the effort has tapered, but six full-time employees still work to maintain the county’s high participation rate. “We want to make sure that no one is left out because of lack of knowledge,” said Brooke Bascom, who runs the program.

The biggest draw, Bascom said, has been the financial incentives King County offers its employees for participating. Other wellness programs offer much less substantial rewards, according to the Rand report. Among the 10 percent of employees who don’t participate in Healthy Incentives, most say it’s because they don’t want to share private information about themselves. A small number are given exceptions because of health conditions or family issues that prevent them from participating.

More Than a Wellness Plan

Healthy Incentives offers a model that state and local governments should replicate, said Stephen Goldsmith, director of the innovations award program at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government. Washington state is already emulating parts of King County’s wellness plan and Oregon is trying to start a similar program.

Here’s how the financial incentive part of the program works:
In the past, county employees didn’t pay a share of insurance premiums, but they did pay deductibles, co-insurance and co-pays. Healthy Incentives allowed workers to shave $200 off of their $500 deductible simply by filling out a health assessment form. They could get another $200 knocked off if they completed an “individual action plan,” such as attending six Weight Watchers meetings at work, completing five phone sessions with a tobacco cessation coach or learning how to better manage diabetes. Four years into the program, nonparticipants’ deductibles went up to $800.

In addition, employees who did not participate in the program had to pay a 10 percent higher co-insurance share of the cost of medical care after their deductibles were exhausted. When you put those two incentives together, the individual savings could come to more than $1,000 per year.

The program also encourages the use of less expensive generic drugs by increasing the co-pay for name-brand drugs from $15 to $30, while decreasing the co-pay for generic drugs from $10 to $7. These changes, put in place in 2010, resulted in $2.4 million savings to the county and a $1 million savings to employees by 2011.

**Higher Value Providers**

The wellness program began when former County Executive Ron Sims, credited with the big idea, donated $1.3 million in county dollars to help a fledgling health care organization, the Puget Sound Health Alliance, develop a medical claims database to help identify doctors and hospitals in the county that offered the highest quality services at the lowest prices. He also recruited large local employers including Alaska Airlines, Boeing and Starbucks to contribute money to the effort.

By analyzing claims data, the group found that one provider organization, Group Health Cooperative, was costing the county an average of $4,000 less per person per year while providing higher quality services than all other providers in the area. Group Health already served 20 percent of the county’s employees through its Seattle-based accountable care organization.

To encourage more employees to use Group Health, the county eliminated the deductible and added a graduated co-payment of $20 to $50 based on employees’ Healthy Incentives participation levels. Regence BlueShield patients remained subject to existing deductibles of up to $800. As a result, an additional 2,274 employees switched to Group Health, bringing its share of coverage to 30 percent. Between 2010 and 2011, the shift to Group Health reduced county expenditures by $6.5 million and saved employees $2.2 million.

“They needed a third party to do the research,” said Mary McWilliams who now runs the Alliance. “The unions would never have trusted the research if it had come from the county or the providers,” she said. The alliance since expanded to include the state of Washington.
Now called the Washington Health Alliance, the group plans to determine the highest-value services by physician groups and hospitals within the Regence network. Once those providers are identified, employees will once again be steered in their direction through reduced out-of-pocket expenses.

**Too Much Rigmarole**

Not everyone loved the program in the beginning. In its first two years, county employees objected to the time spent filling out forms and documenting their action plans. Some lodged formal complaints. Kathy Pompeo was one of them.

A supervisor in the Sheriff’s Office, Pompeo runs a 24-hour crew of data-entry workers who have little time to fill out online forms detailing their daily wellness activities. “My staff was very frustrated and very negative,” she said. They were spending more time reporting on their activities than working on their healthy behaviors. They participated, “kicking and screaming.”

Bascom said the county took complaints to heart and made the process easier. With such a diverse workforce — from bus drivers, road workers and custodians to law enforcement officers, doctors, attorneys and administrative workers — the county had to make accommodations so that everyone could participate. Bus drivers, for example, didn’t have access to computers, so the county developed a paper process.

Even the county executive complained that the process was cumbersome. “You’d get up in the morning and exercise and then have to sit down and log on to a computer. It didn’t make sense,” Constantine said. Now employees can text their activity to the program: “I’m walking my dog,” for example. And the county applies points toward their full participation status.

Has the county made it too easy to comply? Bascom doesn’t think so. Research shows that healthy habits can be formed in just four weeks. As for employees gaming the system by not really performing the activities they say they are, Bascom and others said they doubted much, if any, of that was going on.

“We’re a pretty ethical group,” Pompeo said, and there’s peer pressure to do the right thing. “It’s like having a running buddy or a diet buddy, only lots of them,” she said.

When Constantine took office in 2009, he was asked whether he wanted to continue the program. His response was immediate. “There was no question about continuing it,” he said. “Every employee was doing it, so it got internalized…. My question is why this hasn’t been done a thousand times before.”

Louisville, KY | Innovation Delivery Team, Mayor Fischer, 2012

Press Release

Louisville Innovative Delivery Team to Tackle Urban Problems

May 30, 2012

Louisville Mayor Greg Fischer has put together a special team that will take on five urban challenges.

The projects range from expanding recycling and reducing the number of low-severity 911 calls to implementing a more efficient rezoning process. Fischer announced a six-member “Innovation Delivery Team” will deal with the five goals, which will be funded by a $4.8 million grant from Bloomberg Philanthropies that the city received last year.

Fischer says the hope is to bring breakthrough ideas to Metro Government, such as new ways to reduce the number of vacant and abandoned properties.

“We’re soon going to take legal action to foreclose on 100 of the most market desirable properties. Once the city acquires these properties, they’re going to be converted to productive use by putting them into the hands of people who will improve and restore them,” he says. “So the goal with this project is to reduce the number of abandoned properties by 40 percent within three years and 67 percent in five years.”

About 100 U.S. cities applied for the philanthropic funding, and Louisville was among the five cities selected along with Chicago, Atlanta, New Orleans and Memphis. The Bloomberg grant is being doled out to the city over three years and Metro Government has to match the funding with $1.6 million.

Fischer had dedicated much of his 2012-13 budget plan to the Bloomberg programs, such as $90,000 to hire a nurse to reduce the number of non-emergency ambulance runs by 30 percent and $400,000 to increasing recycling by 25 percent over the next three years.

The five projects were identified and shaped over the last few weeks and started with city department directors, who proposed ideas for the team to focus on. The mayor was presented with more than 40 ideas, which were prioritized based on their effect on the community.

“There was a lot of competition for those,” says Fischer. “Imagine if you’re a chief or a director in the city and you have an opportunity for a group of experts to come and study what your challenge is, a challenge that you’ve identified and you’ve been trying to make progress on for the last several years and they’re going to help you take care of business.”
The Innovation Delivery Team projects are:

- **Make Louisville more “green” by increasing recycling and diverting solid waste from the city landfill** – Through expanded city recycling services, new ordinances and increased public awareness this project will target a long-term increase in both residential and commercial recycling while also reducing the amount of bulk waste going into the landfill. One of the first action steps will be to distribute larger, 95-gallon recycling carts on two selected routes in the Urban Services District. Selling material to recyclers is better financially than paying to dump it at the landfill, with the added benefit of a more sustainable future. Goal: increase recycling 25 percent within three years and divert 90 percent of solid waste from the landfill in 30 years.

- **Reducing the number of low severity medical 911 calls and related EMS runs** – Thousands of calls yearly to 911 and resulting EMS runs involve situations that are not medically severe. This has the potential to divert resources away from medical emergencies and is a costly burden to the city’s emergency response system. Louisville is already a leader in the nation by being the first U.S. city to adopt PSIAM – a system that triages low-severity 911 calls to more appropriate forms of care than emergency rooms. The project calls for expanding PSIAM triage capacity, providing an alternative phone number to 911 for low-severity patients, helping match recidivist low-severity 911 callers with more sustainable sources of patient care, and providing a means of alternate transport to decrease non-emergency ambulance usage. Goal: eliminate or redirect 30 percent of low-severity medical 911 calls within three years.

- **Reducing the number of vacant/abandoned properties** – The more than 1,200 vacant and abandoned properties in Louisville negatively impact property values and create public safety and health issues. To quickly impact the problem, legal action will be taken to foreclose on 100 of the most market-desirable properties, followed by 200 additional properties within the next two years. Once the city acquires the properties, they will be converted to productive use by putting the properties into the hands of persons who will improve and restore them, creating urban gardens or urban forests, etc. Other action steps will include helping connect at-risk property owners with existing resources. Goal: reduce the number of abandoned properties by 40 percent within three years, 67 percent in five years.

- **Increasing Metro Animal Services live release rate of healthy, adoptable animals** – The rising homeless pet population creates a huge challenge for Animal Services, which receives more than 12,000 animals yearly. Through greater use of technology and stronger partnerships with vets and advocacy and rescue groups, the number of pets coming into Animal Services will be reduced while pets being returned to owners and adopted by new owners will increase. Goal: increase the live placement rate to the national “best practices” standard of 90 percent within five years.

- **Implementing a friendlier, faster, more efficient rezoning process** – The current process takes too long and is not customer friendly, hampering new businesses from starting up.
and making it difficult for residents to fully participate in neighborhood and community development. Action steps will include creating a “fast track” system to speed simple rezoning cases, improving public notice of rezoning cases and increased use of technology – such as allowing citizens to submit and pay for zoning applications online. Goal: reduce the average time to complete rezoning while also raising customer satisfaction.

The team will be led by Director Margaret Handmaker.


New Orleans, LA | BlightStat, Mayor Landrieu, 2012

Press Release

City surpasses blight reduction milestone of 10,000 units by 2014

January 09, 2014

NEW ORLEANS, LA— Today, Mayor Mitch Landrieu announced that the City has exceeded its goal of reducing the blight count in New Orleans by 10,000 units by 2014. The milestone was confirmed through an independent study by University of New Orleans Professor Peter Yaukey, PhD.

Dr. Yaukey presented his findings at today’s BlightSTAT meeting, the City’s performance management tool for tracking the City’s progress towards reducing the blight count in New Orleans. Dr. Yaukey’s survey, the most recent authoritative estimate, found that the City has reduced blight in New Orleans by 30 percent between September 2010 and April 2013. The third party validation results are a culmination of Mayor Landrieu’s successful, aggressive, and comprehensive blight strategy launched in 2010.

“When I took office in 2010, New Orleans had the worst blight problem in America and no strategy to deal with it,” said Mayor Landrieu. “We got to work on this community-wide effort and we’re now fighting blight faster here than anywhere else in the country. Today’s announcement is the result of true collaboration between City government and residents with a common goal of improving the quality of life of our neighborhoods.” After extensive public input, research on best practices, and advice from national experts, Mayor Landrieu announced an aggressive blight reduction strategy in October 2010 with an ambitious goal of reducing the blight count in New Orleans by 10,000 units by 2014. The strategy prioritizes data-driven decision-making, innovative new enforcement policies, and opportunities for reinvestment to grow and strengthen neighborhoods.
Read 2014 report on the City’s Blight Reduction Strategy

Since the Blight Reduction Strategy launched:

- Over 54,000 Code Enforcement inspections have been performed;
- Over 500 first time homebuyers have been assisted in buying a home through the City’s successful Soft Second Mortgage Program.
- Over 4,000 properties have been demolished;
- $3.4 million has been collected through the City’s lien foreclosure process;
- Over 2,000 former Road Home properties were sold by the New Orleans Redevelopment Authority (NORA) and 75 percent of those new property owners met their compliance agreements by the one year deadline; and
- The City has secured over $30 million in federal funding to reinvest in blighted neighborhoods.

“Our strategy increased enforcement and helped us turn the corner on blight in New Orleans,” said Deputy Mayor and Chief Administrative Officer Andy Kopplin. “Once the City started taking enforcement more seriously, blighted property owners started taking their responsibility more seriously, and as a result many of those blighted property owners have come into compliance on their own. That has helped us to achieve our goal.”

In 2014, the City is doubling down on efforts to reduce blight across New Orleans and will ensure the tools are in place to keep up the momentum. The 2014 budget invests nearly $500,000 dollars for new inspectors and title research staff to help speed up the process.

**New process using data-driven decision-making**

In 2010, the City launched the BlightSTAT management program in order to coordinate data and information to measure blight and track the City’s progress toward meeting goals related to Mayor Landrieu’s Blight Reduction Strategy. BlightSTAT meetings are working meetings, open to the public, and are intended to provoke constructive dialogue on what’s working, what’s not, and what the various City departments and agencies need to do to improve. Citizens are invited to these public meetings to ask questions and to provide input on how the City’s blight reduction programs can be improved. The analysis for BlightSTAT meetings are held every second Thursday of the month at 8:00 a.m. in the 8th floor conference room at City Hall.

“At BlightSTAT, we’ve proved that if you can measure it, you can manage it. I want to thank Mayor Landrieu, the blight reduction team at City Hall, and the hundreds of citizen activists who have recognized the value of data to drive results and have helped make BlightSTAT a success,” said Oliver Wise, Director of the Office of Performance and Accountability. In order to improve efficiency, the City implemented a new information technology system called
LAMA that is used to track all code enforcement and permitting activities in City government. The new technology replaced an outdated and unreliable system and now provides real-time updates across City departments that utilize the data.

In 2012, the City partnered with Code for America to create a website called BlightStatus, an interactive online tool for residents to track the progress of blighted units within the Code Enforcement system in New Orleans. For the first time in the City of New Orleans' history, residents can now review up-to-date property information directly from City records without stepping foot inside City Hall. BlightStatus has improved the City’s work with neighborhood groups and individual residents in the fight on blight.

Restructuring and reorganizing

In order to streamline accountability and improve coordination, the City reorganized its blight fighting-departments in 2010. In the past, Housing Code Enforcement was responsible for inspecting blighted properties and Environmental Health was responsible for inspecting overgrown lots. To improve coordination and efficiency, the City merged those two departments, and since then, Code Enforcement has performed over 54,000 inspections.

The City also dramatically improved the capacity of its administrative hearings section so that more blight cases could be heard. In 2011, the average time between the initial property inspection and a hearing was 160 days. In 2013, that time was cut in half to 80 days.

In addition, the City now has dedicated staff for researching real estate ownership of blighted properties, preparing cases for legal actions as well as a legal team that files foreclosures on properties eligible for Sheriff’s sale. The 2014 budget invests nearly $500,000 dollars for new inspectors and title research staff to help speed up the process.

Better enforcement policies in place

In the past, the City’s code enforcement process was ineffective because owners of blighted properties faced no consequences for failing to pay their code liens and/or bringing their properties into compliance. As part of the new Blight Reduction Strategy, the City has strengthened the code enforcement process by utilizing the enforcement tools available in order to obtain compliance, including Sheriff’s sale or demolition. Since 2010, the City has filed writs of foreclosure on 1505 delinquent properties and demolished over 4,000 blighted units.

In 2013, the City Council passed new ordinances proposed by the Landrieu Administration that significantly strengthen the City’s enforcement capabilities on residential and commercial blight. Under the revisions, all properties must comply with minimum property standards, such as sanitary and maintained yards and structurally sound, secure buildings. Previously, this was only enforced on unoccupied properties. If a property is occupied,
additional standards will be required, such as, ensuring that properties supply sufficient ventilation, plumbing, and electricity. These new requirements protect basic quality of life needs for all residents.

Creating opportunities for redevelopment

In addition to stronger enforcement against blighted property owners, the City’s Blight Reduction Strategy works to provide opportunities for residents to do their part to clean up their neighborhoods and/or to return blighted properties back into commerce.

In 2012, the City re-launched the Soft Second First Time Homebuyer Assistance Program. Since then, it has provided purchase assistance and closings cost assistance to over 500 households throughout the city. The Affordable Homeownership Development Program component of the program has resulted in the transfer of 70 formerly blighted properties to be rehabilitated and to construct new homes for persons of low and moderate income. In total, the program will have stimulated the rehabilitation or new construction of homes on nearly 200 formerly blighted and vacant properties primarily located in place-based development areas.

NORA is in the final stages of the NSP2 program having provided financing to over 470 units of affordable housing across the city. In an effort to promote commercial redevelopment, NORA has invested more than $8.6 million and leveraged $74.6 million in the revitalization of about 300,000 square feet of commercial real estate on Oretha Castle Haley Boulevard, Broad Street and at the former Gentilly Woods mall. In addition, NORA has seen remarkable success with the Lot Next Door program. More than 811 Road Home properties were sold through the Lot Next Door Program (under both the 2008 ordinance and the 2013 revised City ordinance) since October 2010.

“Our partnership with the City is stronger than ever, and we will continue to work to provide opportunities for our citizens to redevelop and return vacant properties to commerce,” said Jeff Hebert, Executive Director of NORA.

As part of the City’s on-going effort to get the community involved in rebuilding their neighborhoods, the City organized five Fight the Blight Days and subsequently six NOLA FOR LIFE Days since 2010. The events leverage and foster community involvement while remediating blight issues and providing City resources to residents. The next NOLA FOR LIFE Day is scheduled for Saturday, January 11, 2013.

Strategy earns national recognition

In 2012, the Harvard University Kennedy School of Government Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation recognized the City’s Blight Reduction Strategy as a “Bright Idea in Government.” The Bright Ideas initiative is designed to promote creative government
initiatives and partnerships and create an online community where innovative ideas can be proposed, shared, and disseminated.

Additionally, the City’s Blight Reduction Strategy was awarded the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Secretary’s Award at the 2012 Council on Philanthropy Conference for its public-philanthropic partnership with the Greater New Orleans Foundation (GNOF), NORA and the Center for Community Progress (CCP). Through this partnership, New Orleans is developing a national model for addressing blight. Cities from across Louisiana and the country are working to replicate the success of New Orleans.

Hebert and Wise are 2012 recipients of the Innovation Award from the Bureau of Governmental Research. The Innovation Award recognizes employees who have used innovative solutions to solve pressing problems.

Source: "City Surpasses Blight Reduction Milestone of 10,000 Units by 2014."

**Santa Monica, CA | Wellbeing Project, 2014**

*Infographic*

“Let’s go beyond economic indicators and use the science of wellbeing. Let’s understand what we’re doing well – and where we as a community can take steps to improve.”
MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor  
Chiefs of Staff  
Budget Senior Staff  
IT Senior Staff Legal Senior Staff  

From: Performance Management Team  

Date: Date  

Subject: Department of __ [Performance Stat] briefing memorandum for reporting period __.  

Attached, for your consideration and review, please find a series of data observations and suggested lines of inquiry for the Department of __.

General Observations  
The following issues will be the focus of this executive briefing memo:

- Follow-up items (from previous meeting(s))  
- Standing Items (progress on goals that relate to city priorities)  
- New Items (timely and relevant items from the news, legislative session, or budget session)

Follow-Up Items:

(Suggested Discussion Length: XX Minutes)

- Recap of discussion of follow-up item, next steps discussed in previous meeting, and the responsible party’s responses to the follow-up memo.
  
  - Questions for the panel  
  - Questions for the panel

| GRAPHIC/ANALYTICS |

- Standing Item I:
• Review and discussion of topic, including importance of key indicator as it relates to strategic goal, or departmental outcomes. Provide context, including current events, administrative needs, legislative cycle. Dive into analysis of data, leading to questions.
  ○ Questions for the panel
  ○ Questions for the panel

|GRAPHIC/ANALYTICS|

• New Item I:

(Suggested Discussion Length: XX Minutes)

• Introduction and discussion of topic. Provide context, including current events, administrative needs, legislative cycle, and why this issue is being introduced. Dive into analysis of data, leading to questions for the panel.
  ○ Questions for the panel
  ○ Questions for the panel

|GRAPHIC/ANALYTICS|
MEMORANDUM (sample)

To: Department Lead

From: Performance Management Team

Date: Date

Subject: Department Meeting, DATE

As a result of our recent meeting, please provide brief written responses to the items below. Send all requested information via email by to: ANALYST EMAIL ADDRESSES

**Topic A**

1. Describe in detail the items that the department should follow-up on. Examples can include asking the department to review analysis and comment on opportunities and plans to make change; provide written responses to questions that could not be answered during the meeting; submit one-pagers that go into detail on specific topics; instructing departments to change the reporting frequency of a certain metric; etc.

**Topic B**

**Topic C**

**Topic D**

The Next Departmental Meeting will be DATE at TIME in LOCATION Follow-up materials will be due DAY, DATE.

MEMORANDUM (examples)

- Jackson, MS - JackStat
- Prince George’s County, MD - CountyStat
**Position:** Performance Management Analyst

**Organizational Appointment:** [ORGANIZATION]

**Number of Positions:** [#]

**Organization Introduction** [BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE ORGANIZATION.]

**General Position Description** [ORGANIZATION] is seeking a Performance Management Analyst.

Performance management helps government entities use technology and data to openly set goals, hold participants accountable, connect to stakeholders, track progress, and achieve results. By collecting and analyzing data and evidence, determining the desired outputs and outcomes, and linking data to overarching priorities, city leaders can use performance management to best administer policies and programs to the benefit of their community and residents. The Stat analyst plays a crucial role in the success of the program.

The analyst will support [DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, INDIVIDUALS] by performing a wide variety of analytical, assessment, and administrative duties. [BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF WHERE THE CITY IS IN ITS PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES.]

**Specific Activities**

- Provide support in the development of a [DEPARTMENT OR ORGANIZATION]-wide performance management system
- Research commonly-used performance measures and standards
- Develop and track performance metrics in line with [ORGANIZATION's] goals and priorities identifying trends and concerns for review
- Manage ongoing issues and serve as liaison for performance management initiatives
- Work with [DEPARTMENT] staff to document departmental processes and workflows
- Collaborate with [DEPARTMENT] staff to document data collection and reporting requirements
- Develop customer service surveys and performance measures
- Prepare clear, concise performance reports for [ORGANIZATION] audience
- Organize and convene performance management meetings
- Track and update performance management program
- Support [SUPERVISOR] in administration of a variety of projects

**Qualifications**

- Personal Skills
- Investigative ability and intellectual curiosity
- Strong interpersonal skills with the capacity to collaborate across [ORGANIZATION] with many different groups
- Ability to explain complex, technical subject matter to a non-technical audience
- A self-starter with flexibility to both work independently and as part of a team

**Technical/Knowledge Skills**

- Proficient in data analysis techniques with an understanding of basic statistical concepts
- Strong communication and written skills
- Fluency in Microsoft Office Suite (particularly Excel) required
- Familiarity with statistical software packages (e.g., R, STATA, SPSS) is a plus
- Knowledge of databases such as MySQL or PostGreSQL, and open source programming languages such Perl and PHP, is also a plus.

**Education**

- Possession of a Bachelor’s Degree in public policy, public administration, business, economics, finance, government or related field
  OR
- Any equivalent combination of education and experience determined to be acceptable by [ORGANIZATION].

[ORGANIZATION] does not discriminate in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy and gender identity), national origin, political affiliation, sexual orientation, marital status, disability, genetic information, age, membership in an employee organization, retaliation, parental status, military service, or other non-merit factor.