

THRIVING -- NOT JUST SURVIVING: NEW REALITIES FOR TOMORROW'S PUBLIC SERVICE EXECUTIVE

Roger Kaufman, Geraldo Flowers, Ingrid Guerra, Neil Crispo

ABSTRACT

The United States has the economic engine that the rest of the world typically envies. In spite of criticism from both the political right and left, the public service system has played a major role in helping to bring our economy to success. The public management literature carries spirited debates on whether service is improving or otherwise. However, even with disagreement over service philosophy and huge economic and social diversity, the public sector provide unparalleled opportunities to many citizens. This work argues that while our current successes are enviable, simply continuing what we do now in the public sector, even while making organizations more efficient, will likely fail to meet the challenges of the future.

INTRODUCTION

The thesis of this article is that the public service systems and the performance indicators used to define success and influence decisions are neither responsive nor useful. Rather, the practices, performance indicators, and thinking that have brought apparent success will lead to failure in the future.¹ Most public service professional are likely to shrug off such observations, while continuing to derive inspiration and direction from methods employed by other public administrators. They are unlikely to realize that techniques such benchmarking, when improperly applied, can be destructive. In examining some popular approaches to public administration and organizational improvement it is possible to identify inherent flaws and how continued use of these practices will drag public service in the U. S. to the rear of the progression toward successful citizen service provision.

MANY TACTICS AND TOOLS USEFUL IN THE PAST ARE DEFECTIVE FOR MAKING FUTURE CONTRIBUTIONS

This section explores some popular and accepted public sector reform approaches and provides explanations of how they are flawed.

- *Benchmarking*:² The process of seeking to identify “best practices” that can be imported into one’s own organization. Popularized by Xerox, this approach has been applied worldwide.³ It is tempting to look at others who seem to be successful and think that what is then imported will increase success. But at what price and with what risks do we apply conventional benchmarking? The assumptions are almost breathtaking. One assumption is that the benchmarked public service organizational processes are matched and compatible with the objectives of your public service organization. Will the processes others use work for us? Process – means – are only rational when they lead to worthy ends. How about importing human resource development (HRD) and training

methods? Let us take a closer look at this type of activity because it is a factor in the assessment of competence of public servants. Copying training and HRD processes is not likely to be useful. Replicating “better” or “more efficient” ways to deliver learning/training/HRD opportunities assumes that (a) the parent organization is the correct unit of analysis for training, (b) public services are only the sum total of training and education activities, and individual task completion; (c) what you are benchmarking can be successfully replicated within your institutional context; (d) current public service delivery methods and means are what should be improved instead of revising and defining new ends and related means to provide valid and useful learning/HRD opportunities. In addition, if the public service institutions benchmarked are themselves continuously improving, then what you are “benchmarking” is outdated by the time you apply it.

- Benchmarking is useful only when it is not simply applied to process improvement. Process-focused benchmarking assumes that the existing processes, once made more efficient, will add value to public service. In fact, most public service purpose statements are loose, fuzzy, and do not speak to the success, survival, and quality of life of citizens.⁴ Why benchmark processes and methods that will not lead to demonstrably valuable results for all stakeholders, including measurable contributions to citizen/resident success?
- *Downsizing*: The approach of cutting lower priority services and thus adding to the available public service budget. Cut waste? Certainly. Cut the muscle and bone from an organization for a quick fix to a questionable budget? Not a good idea. The purpose for getting “lean and mean” might at first seem rational, but in practice it may not be related to adding value to the organization and external clients. Local, state, and national government have been plagued by “budget-cutting” of resources without first defining required results and then linking budgets to results and payoffs. Governments have been abused by politicians that rely on budget-driven strategies instead of strategy-driven budgets. Let us first consider value added to society and then align our results (ends) with that external focus. If we do, budgets will link to useful results and consequences and thus better assure success and organizational thriving. Doing this will in turn allow us to justify what we use, do, produce, and deliver to politicians and citizens alike.⁵
- *Reengineering*: The process of redesigning current processes by asking, “if this process didn’t exist, how would you invent it?” The reengineering process is useful but why can’t we change? Many organizations will not change even in the face of data supporting reform.⁶ And while thinking of useful reengineering, we usually don’t ask the really tough questions at high enough levels of our operations. For example, why not ask several other reengineering questions:
 - “If my public service unit didn’t exist, would I invent it exactly as it is now?”
 - “If my division didn’t exist, would I reinvent it exactly as it is now?”
 - If my service community didn’t exist, would I invent it to be exactly as it is now?

- Reengineering can be a useful process, but it is usually reduced to simple tinkering rather than dramatic and required change. It can and should be a more powerful tool for shifting organizations from a mode of merely surviving to thriving.
- *Quality management/continuous improvement*: Identifying how one is progressing towards improved quality – fitness for use as judged by the user⁷ – and continuously improving the processes to move ever-closer to defined results. What argument could anyone sensibly have against continuous improvement? This potentially useful approach has been used as an excuse to "micromanage" activities rather than learning from them how to best improve. Also, misapplication of this tool usually emphasizes process improvement without relating improvements to useful results.⁸ When used inappropriately, this approach fails for the wrong reasons. Quality management and continuous improvement, correctly applied, can and should be a very useful process.
- *Needs assessment*: The identification of the gaps between current results and desired or required results.⁹ However, the common use of the word "need" is as a verb – a gap in means or resources¹⁰ -- shifts the focus from ends to means. Most so-called needs assessments are *solutions assessments* and deliver a confusion of means with ends. Identifying needs as gaps in results allows one to consider all possible means (solutions) and then determine which is most appropriate. In turn, this will give us additional data to prioritize needs on the basis of the costs to meet them as compared to the costs to ignore them, allowing us to properly identify, select, and justify service needs.
- *Training, including in-service training*: The process that intends to help associates know what to do, how to do it, and when to do it. At which tasks do we want people to be competent? Do we take the time to assure that what each person does and produces adds value to the organization and all external clients? Not usually.¹¹ Failure to distinguish between "means" – resources, methods, activities – and "ends" – results and consequences – is almost a hallmark of current organizational practice.¹² Training is rushed into as the "solution-de-jour" without asking, "if training is the solution, what's the problem." By rushing into a training solution – ignoring other possibilities such as job redesign, personnel selection, job aids, rewards, automation – the results can be disappointing.
- A sign of the current choice of comfort over reality is the widespread use of "training needs assessment." While many organizations opt to start improvement initiative by identifying "training needs," experience shows that beginning at the individual performance improvement level will be wrong 80-90% of the time.¹³ Deming and Juran noted that most performance problems are not at the individual performance level, but are the result of system breakdowns. No matter how much you improve individual performance, if you do not deal directly with what is causing the problem in the first place at a higher organizational level, you will waste time and money.
- *Systems approach*: An approach intending to make certain that all of the parts of an organization interact successfully as they move toward a common objective. Should we avoid the "splintering" of our efforts? Absolutely.¹⁴ Does a focus on internal means and ends add value outside of our organization? Not

likely if we don't design it that way. The literature blurs the terms "system approach," "systems approach," "systematic (orderly) approach," and "systemic (affecting all parts of the system) approach" and thus leads us away from the fundamental issue - - the requirement to add value both within and outside the organization.¹⁵

- *Strategic planning*: A process that intends to define useful results, contributions and outcomes in terms of the value any organization should add for all stakeholders, including external clients, as well as the organization.¹⁶ This method tool has received harsh -- often deserved -- criticism.¹⁷ It seems only rational to identify where you want to go and justify why you want to get there¹⁸ so why do some people object?¹⁹ There are many examples of misapplication of this potentially excellent concept and tool.
- One reason for the criticisms is that most of what is termed "strategic" is not. While called "strategic planning" it is usually "tactical" instead (what are the best *ways and means* for achieving defined results) -- or even operational (how do we *keep activities on track* as we move forward). Instead of allowing for new objectives to be considered and adopted, what is inaccurately called "strategic planning" is, instead, used by public service administrators and their planning partners to reinforce the status quo and justify current directions, means, and resources.
- Another problem is that conventional strategic planning does not address social ends.²⁰ Public administrators are not usually strategic and typically fail to define what kinds of measurable contributions are made to society and external clients. Inappropriately, they limit the use of "strategic" to what is good for their own organization, and not what will also add value to all partners. Again, a good idea fails for the wrong reason. Computers, e-government, accountability, program budgeting, etc. will not deal with what services and resources should be provided, in what form, and why they should be done at all. No matter how much we tinker with the means of delivery, no matter how great the efficiency increases, it won't do much good if we are still delivering services that are not useful.²¹ We must link our means and results to societal ends and consequences. If we don't, how will we ever know if what we use, do, produce, and deliver is adding value to our societal partners?
- *Balanced Score Card*: The introduction of the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) in 1992 recognized that it was not appropriate to calibrate organizational success by financial indicators alone. The BSC provided a fast way to look at the larger picture and revealed how well an organization was achieving its mission. "The Balanced Scorecard puts strategy - not control - at the center" (Kaplan and Norton, 1992).
- Central to the BSC is the selection of short-term "performance drivers" -- the particular targets an organizations selects to get results for internal units -- that link with one another to achieve broader outcomes (Kaplan and Norton, 1996: 2). The BSC has become popular in both the public and private sectors. Although useful, we suggest it is incomplete. That which BSC conventionally terms "outcomes" are actually the outputs that an organization delivers to its shareholders and immediate clients, but rarely includes societal/community impact and contributions. While it is useful to keep track of progress toward

the mission of an organization, a task well done by a BSC, it is also vital that accountability be also linked to societal value added (mega results and consequences). The addition of external client and societal returns yields an expanded BSC that is called BSC+ to indicate the addition of societal returns (Forbes, 2000; Kaufman and Forbes, in preparation)

WHAT IS REQUIRED TO SHIFT FROM SURVIVING TO THRIVING?

The public service must overcome the tendency to repeat the concepts, tools, performance/results criteria, methods, and thinking that have delivered past success solely because they appear to have worked in the past. The methods and “vital signs” that have been useful in the past can be useful only if we shift our focus from organizational success as the primary purpose to adding value to all external clients and society. Only when we have established what results must be accomplished at the societal level will we be able to properly select and apply the tactics, methods, approaches, resources, and/or interventions to reach organizational success.

Adding value for all external clients is fundamental to future success.²² It provides the opportunity to foresee opportunities and prevent potential problems that often come about from shortsighted planning. Public service organizations are simply means to societal and external client ends. There are some different perspectives – paradigms,²³ or frames of reference – that will better assure thriving and not just surviving for the executive and public service administrators of the future.

FOCUSING ON SOLUTIONS AND NOT METHODS

How do public organizations move from surviving to thriving? The following criteria would appear essential to move forward.

- *Focus first and foremost on societal contribution.* Apply a mega focus and matching criteria – value added for external clients, including society – is the missing element in current strategic planning and thinking.²⁴ A societal primary focus should seem basic. After all, our organizations are nested in society and we are all external clients; responsive and responsible services and support will measurably add value to citizens and society. Everything we use, do, produce, deliver, and evaluate should measurably add value for all of our internal and external partners (including all stakeholders such as youth, adults, workers, parents, employers, politicians).²⁵ If we do not shift from placing the organization as the primary focus to first focusing on and emphasizing societal contributions, then other systems and countries that do will gain a quality of life beyond we now enjoy in the U.S.²⁶
- *Link everything your public service organization uses, does, produces and delivers to external client and societal value added.* Means lead to three levels of ends: societal (mega), organizational (macro) and building block internal results (micro). If you don't link ends and means then you cannot be certain that what you use, do, produce, and deliver will be successful and add value for all. We propose that a useful framework for doing this is the Organizational Elements Model -- OEM (see Table 1).

Table 1: Five Levels of Public Service Results (based on Kaufman, 1998, 2000)

The Organizational Element	The Level of Planning and Focus	Brief Description
Outcomes	Mega (Societal)	Results and their consequences for external clients and society
Outputs	Macro (Organizational)	The results any public service organization can or does deliver outside of itself regardless of the value added for external clients and society.
Products	Micro (Individual or Small Group)	The building block results that are produced within the public service organization
Processes	Process (Efficiency)	The ways, means, activities, procedures, methods used internally
Inputs	Input (Resources)	The human, physical, financial resources any public service organization can or does use

The levels of results -- outcomes, outputs, and products -- and the related three levels of planning -- mega, macro, and micro -- provide useful, integrated, and complete criteria for planning, management, implementation, evaluation and continuous improvement. These results-oriented criteria can serve vital signs for public services that are responsive, responsible, and complete.

The six critical success factors for strategic thinking and planning are shown below in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Critical Success Factors (Kaufman, 1998, 2000)

- CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR #1:**
USE NEW AND WIDER BOUNDARIES FOR THINKING, PLANNING, DOING, AND EVALUATING/CONTINUOUSLY IMPROVING: MOVE OUT OF TODAY'S COMFORT ZONES.
- CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR #2:**
DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN ENDS AND MEANS -- FOCUS ON "WHAT" (Mega/Outcomes, Macro/Outputs, Micro/Products) BEFORE "HOW".
- CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR #3:**
USE ALL THREE LEVELS OF PLANNING AND RESULTS (Mega/Outcomes, Macro/Outputs, and Micro/Products).
- CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR #4:**
PREPARE OBJECTIVES--INCLUDING IDEAL VISION AND MISSION OBJECTIVES--WHICH HAVE MEASURES OF HOW YOU WILL KNOW WHEN YOU HAVE ARRIVED (Mission statement plus success criteria).
- CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR #5:**
DEFINE "NEED" AS A GAP IN RESULTS (not as insufficient levels of resources, means, or methods).
- CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTOR #6:**
USE AN IDEAL VISION AS THE UNDERLYING BASIS FOR PLANNING (don't be limited to your organization).

© R. Kaufman, 10/98 critsuc3.ppt

AN APPROACH TO ASSURE SUCCESS

As noted in analyzing how to correct flawed application of useful tools, approaches, techniques, and methods discussed earlier, the Organizational Elements Model is intended to:

1. *Give a common focus for everything a public service organization uses, does, produces, and delivers. It places the external clients and societal value added in central and primary focus. There will be little confusion concerning what each person and part of the organization is to use, do, and deliver. Provide criteria for success and continuous improvement that employees will commit individually and collectively to contribute to a shared purpose.*
2. *Reduce the risk of splintering the resources and efforts of all organizational members. If one is not adding value to external clients and society, one should either be moved or eliminated. Instead of getting locked into the time and money-wasting initiatives such as in-service training, or improvement of individual tasks or departments there is assurance that everything used, done, produced, and delivered will add measurable value.*
3. *Provide the criteria for measuring positive results. The strategic thinking process will define, justify, and provide "vital signs" of what useful public service agencies must deliver. It defines the costs and consequences for what the organization uses, does, produces, and*

delivers. Proving value added is essential for future survival and thriving.

- 4. Make all decisions, regardless of the politics of the situation, on the basis of “will this measurably²⁷ add value to mega societal results, consequences, and payoffs?” If the answer is “no” then rethink the action, policy, or program.*

By using a mega-social focus, using the six critical success factors, and linking the five organizational elements, the criteria – vital signs – for public service planning, development, implementation, evaluation and continuous improvement become realistic and justifiable. An example of OEM application in Leon County, Florida is provided below.

CASE STUDY: USING THE OEM IN LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA

General Project Summary

In 1996 the City of Tallahassee and Leon County requested that the 21st Century Council make an independent assessment of the “needs and assets” of human services within Leon County. The information from this assessment was to be used by a Citizen Advisory Committee to make recommendations regarding future human services delivery in the county. The Center for Needs Assessment and Planning (CNAP)²⁸ at Florida State University was subcontracted to direct the development of the needs and assets assessment. Florida Tax Watch Research Institute was also subcontracted to act as an independent review body for the process.

The purpose of this assessment was to identify the gaps between the desired community vision of its people and services and the existing situation (McKnight, 1995). The results would be based on the community “pay-offs” of the programs, not the conventional mere measure of “need” which is usually based on the number of people desiring services in relation to those currently being served (FSU CNAP, 1997). This is an important departure from the conventional wisdom of viewing human services programs. The ability or inability to locate or obtain the required data for such an assessment was seen as an important contribution of the assessment as well.

CNAP had the coordinating role and along with a Technical Advisory Group (TAG), made up of community and industry leaders, identified the required data, developed and validated the data collection instrument, oversaw the collection of data, and reported the findings of the process to the Citizens Advisory Committee. The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) provided the required guidance in the areas of what data was to be collected and what safeguards should be installed to assure validity and confidentiality. Florida Tax Watch acted as an independent review/auditor of the process and methods used in data collection and analysis.

Assessment instruments consisted of surveys sent to the appropriate selected human services providers, along with a letter from the 21st Century Council outlining the reason for the survey. Workshops were scheduled for organizations to facilitate the

completion of the surveys. In-person interviews were also conducted where circumstances warranted that method. Moreover, three consecutive data collection procedures were attempted due to poor response. Data was also gathered from the files of the City of Tallahassee and United Way databases, as well as from telephone surveys. Combined, these efforts yielded information from only 20 of the 297 agencies targeted. The general reason cited for data collection difficulties was that the agency did not collect the type of information the survey was seeking. It had simply never been requested in the past. Some were candid enough, off the record, to note that: a) If they had the data they would attempt to withhold it because it would likely not show any positive societal impact, and b) If the funding agencies did not require it, they did not want to collect it. Because of resistance to, or inability to provide performance and “value added” data, it was recommended that each human services agency contribute a small part of their budget to a common data collection and evaluation function. This would not put heavy time and financial penalties on any one organization while still generating critical information for decision making.

THE USE OF THE OEM IN LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA

This needs and assets assessment project used the Organizational Elements Model (OEM), which was used as a results-based assessment tool. The real benefit of using the OEM in Leon County was that it provided a linkage between the resources available to agencies, the services that are provided by such agencies, the results that are enjoyed by both the individual in requiring and obtaining services, and the impact and value for the community as a whole. Other evaluation instruments only illustrate the difference between demand and availability of services. Only through the use of OEM can a complete and comprehensive evaluation be done of the human services that are currently being provided and those that will be required and useful in the future.

The methodology used in this assessment started with Leon County’s vision for itself and its citizens and looked at the gap between that end and the current situation within the county. This is a unique approach to human services program evaluation. It then formed a base of results information that was collected from human service providers and other means. To do this assessment it was important to identify categories of services to be used, identify the agencies that provide those services within Leon County, and to collect the relevant data from those agencies to use in the assessment using the appropriate assessment survey instrument. Fifty-seven categories of human services were initially identified. This was narrowed to those most closely linked to those services that contributed to the fulfillment of Leon County’s vision of itself. Thirty-eight categories were finally decided on. Using the Telephone Counseling and Referral Service (TCRS) 297 individual local agencies were identified as providing the appropriate human services.

A survey was sent to these agencies to collect the required data. This method provided little useful data in response, therefore, follow-up surveys, by telephone, and in person interviews were also conducted. Unfortunately, the results of these efforts still provided little relevant data. Human services data from the City of Tallahassee and the United Way were reviewed and portions of the data that were used in the assessment were compiled with some of this information. A database was then created using the available information from the surveys and it was determined that only human services

categories that had more than 30 agency programs that provided data could be used. This created a set of data that was approximately 1/6 or 17% of the total number of programs that responded to surveys.

RESULTS FROM THE STUDY

There were a number of findings that surfaced as a result of this assessment. The main purpose of this assessment was to generate data on human services programs within Leon County so that the Citizen's Committee could make better funding decisions--decisions that were more likely to measurably improve the survival, self-sufficiency, and quality of life for all residents. Several other elements also offered themselves as results of this work. There is an increased awareness of the importance of societal results and payoffs with regards to human services and that funding of such programs should be based on the value they add to the community. Most social service agencies either cannot or will not provide the aforementioned type of data. There is a widespread misunderstanding of the differences between a "needs assessment" and a "demand analyses". Other elements that came to light as a result of this assessment were:

- There are many people, programs, and organizations intending to do good things for misfortunate and unlucky people in Leon County.
- There is a general lack of communication between the various entities providing human services programs within the county.
- Many services contain a great deal of overlapping from agency to agency and some types of services for specific groups are readily available. Other services for particular groups of people are scarce or nonexistent.
- No formal or informal way to calibrate whether services were doing good, nothing, or perhaps, harm. Good intentions are not always the same as good results.

Based on the results of the work it did the assessment report provided the following recommendations to the Citizen's Committee and the 21st Century Council.

- Continue using current criteria for funding decisions concerning human services until appropriate data is collected and made available.
- Make the collection of outcome—Mega—level results data a precondition of agency funding.
- Provide technical assistance to agencies in the definition and collection of results data.
- Require that funding choices be made based on measurable objectives concerning who is being helped, how they are being helped, how this increases overall community betterment, and the impact of those results.
- Set up a shared data collection and reporting function for all human services organizations so that the "burden" of collecting impact data did not overwhelm individual budgets.

In summary, the results revealed there was a misunderstanding of the difference between "needs assessment" and "demand analysis". It showed that there was a large degree of

duplication of certain human services being provided in Leon County. It uncovered a lack of communication between human service providers and a lack of understanding of what the various programs were providing. The assessment defined where a multitude of services are available and where limited if any services can be obtained, depending on the need (gap in results) and makeup of those in requiring successful services. The assessment also highlighted the lack of available outcome data as it relates to the “pay-offs” of the various human services to the community. It emphasized the requirement for this type of information to be collected, analyzed, and used in future funding and evaluations of human services in the area.

WHAT WORKED IN LEON COUNTY?

The use of the OEM in Leon County was helpful for several reasons. It proved to be a useful instrument for highlighting and clarifying the confusion between “needs,” “wants,” and “demand” in the arena of human services. It served to provide an informative body of research into the available data in the field and illustrated the gaps in data currently available and collected. This assessment project showed how better funding and program choices could be made with the right type of data and using the right analytical tools. The report was informative and about shortcomings and provided honest, realistic conclusions.

The needs and assets assessment report revealed a general misunderstanding between the concept of a “needs assessment” and that of a “demand analyses”. A needs assessment measures the gap between current conditions and those of the desired results and/or consequences of a program. In the case of this report, the current human services provided and their community payoff were measured against Leon County’s vision for itself. Demand analysis merely shows how many individuals or groups within a community may want or could use a particular human service. It does nothing to address the effect of receiving that service.

The report showed the lack of available relevant data in the human services field to do realistic needs assessment within the community. It uncovered inability and/or unwillingness to capture and share data relating to actual impact on the community at all levels. The report pointed out that without this data there is no way to do an actual needs assessment; only demand can continue to be measured. Through explanation and education, the report showed how important it is for decision makers to formulate their funding choices in the area of human services based on the outcome or payoff to the community.

The strongest element of the analysis was the up-front way in which it addressed the difficulties that were encountered in the collection of appropriate data and how this affected the outcome of the project. Whether it was dealing with non-responsive agencies, incomplete survey results, or unavailable data the report openly showed how these elements affected the process of assessing human services conditions in Leon County. The clear documentation and analysis of the system and problems created an informative learning tool that served as a device for creating change and a model for other communities.

CONCLUSIONS: CHALLENGES FACED IN IMPLEMENTING OEM

One clear problem impeding the use of OEM in Leon County, Florida in terms of fulfilling what it set out to do was the inability to collect and put together the relevant data to properly assess the actual contributions made by the human services agencies. Without the proper input required by the OEM, the model appeared to be short in providing the requested product at the end of the assessment. The problem was not with the OEM but with a lack of useful data. Data availability would seem to be a continuing problem because data collection on performance often is not mandated. Regardless of usefulness, managers often will not collect useful data if it is not required.

The findings note that the participants - supervisors, managers, directors -- were suspicious that there was a lack of available relevant return from OEM to clients and society. The assessment project ran its course and supported the hypothesis that funders, managers and supervisors generally do not want to collect performance data.

Because of the resistance to and inability to provide performance and value added data, it was recommended to the County that each human services agency contribute a small part of their budget to a common data collection and evaluation function. This would not put heavy time and financial penalties on any one organization while still generating critical information for decision making. In this way, what was confirmed about the absence of important data to determine the value and worth of public sector intended assistance might be made available. The study confirmed that there was a lack, either intended or otherwise, of useful decision making data for continuous improvement on what the agencies did and delivered to help those they intended to serve.

The OEM approach is not conventional wisdom in public service. Adopting this approach -- and it only takes a decision to do so²⁹ -- requires managers to do more than benchmark conventional practices. Serving external clients well should be both practical and ethical. Doing so should allow organizations the opportunity to thrive, not just to survive. Our future depends on provision of appropriate learning opportunities that will instill the skills, knowledge, attitudes and abilities for all citizens to be more productive and better neighbors in a very complex world. Public service resources, methods, and activities should assist in enhancing citizen capabilities.

Roger Kaufman is Professor and Director, Office for Needs Assessment & Planning, Florida State University and Research Professor of Engineering Management, Old Dominion University.

Geraldo Flowers is Vice President of Finance and Administration at the University of Belize.

Ingrid Guerra is Assistant Professor at the University of Michigan - Dearborn and Adjunct Professor at Boise State University.

Neil Crispo is Courtesy Professor and Intern Coordinator at the Askew School of Public Administration and Policy, Florida State University.

Notes

-
- ¹ Marshall and Tucker, 1992; Peters, 1997; Kaufman, 1992, 1998, 2000.
- ² Kaufman and Swart, 1995.
- ³ Some wags have dubbed it industrial tourism (noticing that few Alaskan public service systems are benchmarked in January).
- ⁴ Kaufman, 1995: Aug. 31; Kaufman, 2000:Jan.
- ⁵ This process is known as costs-consequences analysis.
- ⁶ Joel Barker's insights on paradigms and Daryl Conner's writings about change are useful resources for this issue.
- ⁷ We would include society as a "user" to judge the quality and usefulness (Kaufman, Herman, and Watters, 1996).
- ⁸ It is interesting to note how many organizations worldwide have interpreted "quality management" as continuous process improvement." Comfortable only, for it assumes that process improvement will add value to all internal and external clients. It thus is usually a triumph of means over ends.
- ⁹ Kaufman, 1972, 1992, 1998, 2000; Watkins, Leigh, and Kaufman R., 1998:Sept.; Kaufman, and Watkins, R.: 1996: Spring.
- ¹⁰ Inappropriate use of "need" includes "I need more money," "I need more resources," or "I need training." The use of "need" as a verb leads one to means and solutions before the problems – gaps in results – are selected and justified.
- ¹¹ Recently, Kaufman ran a workshop for two major international organizations on strategic planning and thinking. Some of the participants only wanted to limit what they did to individual training tasks. Stating "it is academic to worry about how the subsystems add up to an overall system. .we just want the training tools." They didn't see the relationships among "training," "performance," "value added" and external contributions. Several of the participants later communicated that while they resisted that recent events for one of the organizations – a major world-attention-getting disaster came from the failure to link all activities and tasks to safety and well-being for all external clients.
- ¹² The International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI) has taken the professional position to guide decision makers to shift from "training to performance" and the much larger American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) has joined this orientation.
- ¹³ Triner, Greenberry, and Watkins, 1996:Nov.-Dec.
- ¹⁴ Senge and earlier, such writers as von Bertalanffy, Benathy, and Kaufman (see References) all have written extensively about "system thinking and planning" as a way to better assure that the parts contribute to a useful whole.
- ¹⁵ Kaufman and Watkins, 2000:April.
- ¹⁶ For governmental organizations these would include the extent to which citizens are or become self-sufficient, self-reliant and enjoy a positive quality of life.

¹⁷ For example, see Mintzberg, 1994.

¹⁸ Kaufman, 1972, 1992, 1998, 2000.

¹⁹ Some “Constructivists” building on perhaps failed philosophy (Gruender, 1996).

²⁰ Kaufman, 1998, 2000.

²¹ One analogy might be “no matter how well you practice techniques of archery, none of it will be useful if you have the wrong target.”

²² Drucker, 1992, 1993; Forbes, 1998; Kaufman, 1992, 1997, 1998, 2000; Popcorn, 1990.

²³ Joel Barker’s work is important in understanding this now oft-maligned important concept. It is based on the work of Nobel Prize winner Thomas Kuhn,

²⁴ Kaufman, 1972, 1992, 1998, 2000.

²⁵ Think of an analogy for the requirement for product and output usefulness of airplanes that crash, boats that sink, foods that cause illness, medicines that make people ill. If you don’t measurably add value for all partners, what is the purpose?

²⁶ Consider all the organizations that are now attempting to serve the conventional public school populations.

²⁷ For those still clinging to the unsupportable contention that there are some things that are not measurable, note that even that position requires a measurement: which of two piles “measurable” and “not measurable” will this item be sorted. If you can name it, you are measuring it. (Kaufman, 1972, 1988, 2000; Kaufman, Herman, and Watters, 1996, Stevens, 1951).

²⁸ Now the Office for Needs Assessment and Planning.

²⁹ Harold Greenwald’s landmark work (Greenwald and Rich, 1984) on direct decision therapy provides both the rational as well as clinical bases for making good decisions.

REFERENCES

Barker, J. A. 1992. *Future Edge: Discovering the New Paradigms of Success*. New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc.

Center For Needs Assessment and Planning. 1997. 21st Century Council, Human Services Interactive. Tallahassee, FL

Conner, D. R. 1998. *Building Nimble Organizations*. NY, John Wiley and Sons.

Drucker, P. F. 1992. *The New Society of Organizations*. *Harvard Business Review*: 29/3: 95-104.

Forbes, R. 1998. *Two Bottom Lines: Let’s Start To Measure*. *Quality Magazine*. 7/4: 17-21.

Greenwald, H., and Rich, E. 1984. *The Happy Person: A Seven Step Plan*. New York: Avon Books.

Gruender, D. 1996. Constructivism And Learning: A Philosophical Appraisal. *Educational Technology*. 36/3: 21-29.

Kaufman, R. 1992. Comfort And Change: Natural Enemies. *Educational Technology*.

Kaufman, R. 1995. If Distance Learning is the Solution, What's the Problem? Beyond DDSS. *DEOSNEWS* (An Electronic Publication of The American Center for the Study of Distance Education/The American Journal of Distance Learning of The Pennsylvania State University).

Kaufman, R. and Swart, W. 1995. Beyond Conventional Benchmarking: Integrating Ideal Visions, Strategic Planning, Reengineering, and Quality Management. *Educational Technology*: 11-14.

Kaufman, R. and Watkins, R. 1996. Costs-Consequences Analysis. *HRD Quarterly*. 7: 87-100.

Kaufman, R. and Watkins, R. 2000. Getting Serious about Results. *Performance Improvement*.

Kaufman, R. 1992. *Strategic Planning Plus: An Organizational Guide*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kaufman, R. 1998. *Strategic Thinking: A Guide to Identifying and Solving Problems*. Revised. Arlington, VA. and Washington, D.C. Jointly Published by the American Society for Training and Development and The International Society for Performance Improvement.

Kaufman, R. 2000. *Mega Planning: Practical Tools for Organizational Success*. Thousand Oaks, CA., Sage Publishing.

Kuhn, T. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Marshall, R. and Tucker, M. 1992. *Thinking for a Living: Education and the Wealth of Nations*. New York: Basic Books.

Mintzberg, H. 1994. *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*. New York: The Free Press.

Peters, T. 1997. *The Circle of Innovation: You Can't Shrink Your Way to Greatness*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Popcorn, F. 1991. *The Popcorn Report*. New York: Doubleday.

Senge, P. M. 1990. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday-Currency.

Stevens, S. S. 1951. Mathematics, Measurement, and Psychophysics. In Stevens, S. S. Handbook of Experimental Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Triner, D. Greenberry, A., and Watkins, R. 1996. Training Needs Assessment: A Contradiction in Terms? Educational Technology. XXXVI/6: 51-55.

Watkins, R., Leigh, D. and Kaufman, R. 1998. . Needs Assessment: A Digest, Review, and Comparison of Needs Assessment Literature. Performance Improvement. 37/ 7: 40-53.

Xerox Corporation. 1989. Leadership through Quality Processes and Tools Review: Quality You Can Copy. Multinational Customer and Service Education, Rochester, NY.

About IPMR	
IPMR	<p>The International Public Management Review (IPMR) is the electronic journal of the International Public Management Network (IPMN). All work published in IPMR is double blind reviewed according to standard academic journal procedures.</p> <p>The purpose of the International Public Management Review is to publish manuscripts reporting original, creative research in the field of public management. Theoretical, empirical and applied work including case studies of individual nations and governments, and comparative studies are given equal weight for publication consideration.</p>
IPMN	<p>The mission of the International Public Management Network is to provide a forum for sharing ideas, concepts and results of research and practice in the field of public management, and to stimulate critical thinking about alternative approaches to problem solving and decision making in the public sector.</p> <p>IPMN includes over 600 members representing sixty different countries and has a goal of expanding membership to include representatives from as many nations as possible. IPMN is a voluntary non-profit network and membership is free.</p>
Websites	<p>IPMR: http://www.ipmr.net/ (download of articles is free of charge)</p> <p>IPMN: http://www.inpuma.net/</p>