

Ongoing Discussion “Thought Piece”

To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

Prepared and Presented by Henrik Minassians

henrik.minassians@csun.edu

August 2014

Ongoing Discussion Host: Bill Bellows

william.bellows@rocket.com

for

Aerojet Rocketdyne’s
InThinking Network

Abstract

Outcome-based management is not new in the public sector, having been developed by U.S. states and cities over the past three decades. Publicizing the outcome of governmental programs on specific priority indicators has the proven potential to enhance external accountability and improve the overall performance and quality of public agencies. Reporting performance measures has become the presentational strategy of pundits who believe that “what gets measured is what gets valued.” This study examines the following questions through a case analysis of multiple Los Angeles County departments: Do the performance measures used for management of public organizations reflect only external concerns or do they evaluate the internal concerns of the organization as well? Are external stakeholders dictating the performance indicators, thereby creating intergovernmental ties or is the design of performance measures an organic extension of organizational management efforts? What are some of the performance indicators linking intra-departmental activities? What strategic priorities do performance measures serve in the context of intra-governmental relations?

Introduction

Democratic governments are designed to implement the collective preferences of their citizens. Therefore, citizens expect to see that government officials utilize taxes effectively to achieve common public goals. In order to meet the expectations of their constituents and to justify both their purpose and their services, public agencies in the United States and other democratic countries are focusing on measuring government results through both strategic means and the design of performance measurement initiatives.

Utilizing performance measures to evaluate the results of government action has become ubiquitous in public, private, and nonprofit organizations. There is a wide range of possible reasons for the rise of the use of performance measures in the public sector, including limited fiscal resources, citizen demands and, ultimately, limitations that fragmented democratic systems create with the oversight of public bureaucracies. Thus, performance measures have been established as a formal process to determine whether public programs are actually successful in delivering specific value that can be both measured and, subsequently, presented cogently to constituents. Clear justification of programs, enabled by valid assessment through effective performance measurement, can become a public sector management tool that ensures continued funding of particular programs.

However, measuring performance of public goals can be highly complicated, considering that-- in the achievement of those goals-- governments are no longer directly involved in delivery of goods and services. Instead, public agencies rely heavily on other public agencies and/or private and nonprofit actors to achieve public goals. Moreover, measuring and reporting performance becomes complicated when numerous mandates are imposed by external stakeholders, in this case the federal and state governments. Accordingly, performance management is a phenomenon of intergovernmental ties. Local public agencies continuously work in a turbulent environment where state and federal governments shift their priorities, funding, and goals.

Publicizing the outcome of governmental programs on specific priority indicators has the proven potential to enhance external accountability and improve the overall performance of

public agencies. Reporting performance measures become the presentational strategy of pundits who believe that “what gets measured is what gets valued.” This study examines the following questions through a case analysis of Los Angeles County multiple departments: Do the performance measures used for management of public organizations reflect only external concerns or do they evaluate the internal concerns of the organization as well? Are external stakeholders dictating the performance indicators, thereby creating intergovernmental ties or is the design of performance measures an organic extension of organizational management efforts? What are some of the performance indicators linking intra-departmental activities? What strategic priorities do performance measures serve in the context of intra-governmental relations?

Creation of New Accountability Measures: A Shift from Regulation to Measuring for Results

Although the mid to late 1980s witnessed increased movement towards performance measures in the public sector where citizens demanded greater accountability and better management of taxpayers' dollars, the idea of measuring performance predates that period. For much of the 19th and 20th centuries, accountability and performance in the public sector focused on fiscal accountability by assessing how much money was spent (Julnes, 2006). Performance measurement has its roots in early accounting systems of the Medicis (Johnson, 1981). As industrialized organizations developed, so did their need for better measuring and accounting techniques. After World War II, the public sector adopted more complex public accounting strategies. Traditional models of public accounting have been characterized as being financially-based, internally-focused, and input-oriented rather than actually measuring outcomes. All of this changed in the United States with the oil shock of 1970 and conservative anti-government revolution in the early 1980s. With increasing frequency in the late 1980s and early 1990s, local governments--particularly those that relied on the state sales tax as the sole mechanism for raising public funds--developed interest in more balanced performance measurement to better manage public funds and focus more on results.

By the mid-1990's, we witnessed a shift in the accountability of public sector services away from merely accounting for expenditures – a bean-counting mentality -- to a serious attempt to measure results. Momentum for this shift in the United States came from the reinvention movement that refocused the attention from budgetary regulations to calibrating results. The idea was that organizations could improve performance through decentralization and providing specific directions in order to achieve specific, measurable goals. “Performance measures, which encompass a variety of employee, customer, and other perspectives, are critical to management of the state's activities” (Monahan, page 36). Consequently, performance-reporting measures were developed with the goal of utilizing publicity as its lever on performance. By the late 1990's, many local governments had already become involved at some level of measuring programmatic outcomes. Even though scholars of public management at that time (e.g. Bardach, 1998) argued that finding ways to measure results and pay attention to what the measures reveal -- thereby giving more power to local agencies and street-level employees and reliance on third-party providers -- should improve public management and organizational performance, we still saw that politics dominated decisions related to performance measures and assessment of organizational outcomes.

In any case, performance measurement as a practice was uncommon at the municipal level until 2000 to 2005. By 2005, reporting performance measures had become the

presentational strategy of pundits who believe that “what gets measured is what gets valued.” Reporting results on performance promises that publicizing the outcome of governmental programs on specific priority indicators has the proven potential to enhance external accountability and improve the overall performance of public agencies. Proponents argue that measuring results can create public value strictly because of its informational value; in other words, informational values could result in efficiency and a greater level of services.

However, accountability through performance measures is no longer dependent on internal factors such as how finances are managed. Rather accountability depends on what external partners request from public agencies (Melkers, 2005). These expectations could be in the formal form of reporting to external stakeholders, or it could be a perception of what the community of practitioners and stakeholders expect from a particular agency. Also, within the evolution of performance measurement is the role that citizens can play by viewing this information. “Citizens are viewed as important players in shaping the quality and responsiveness of government programs in their community” (Epstein et al., 2000).

Greene, on the other hand, expresses concerns with the advocates of performance measures by arguing that availability and meaning of performance measures information to different audiences could be misleading. Also, “a focus on outcomes provides communities (all levels) with the opportunity for collective, shared deliberation about what constitutes valued outcomes from a given endeavor” (pg. 162). Perrin (1998) supports this claim and suggests that the use of performance measures within a networked environment might appear as rational decision making when, in reality, many decisions based on performance measures support political goals. Consequently, many municipal governments either refuse to report on specific indicators by arguing that measures outcomes are not possible in their particular localities due to their unique circumstances or they rely on reporting only on indicators that are measurable and less controversial. The question is whether use of performance measures across multiple departments can enhance collaboration among the units, and, thereby, lead to better public management outcomes. Provan, Fish and Sydow (2007) suggest one key challenge in managing networks is substantial operating autonomy by the organizations. This is a crucial component of effective public management, and use of performance measures should be an extension of creating better collaboration between various public and non-public entities. O’Toole (1997) maintains that, in public administration, networks should be given serious attention mainly due to the challenges that current managers face when it comes to crafting decisions. Others such as Bardach (1998) suggest that interagency collaboration should be the main focus for building theory for leadership in collaborative settings.

Furthermore, some argue that the new multi-sector governance is crucial for creating public value (Frederickson, 1997). In such a “disarticulated state” or fragmented structure, the sole responsibilities of outcomes are no longer in the hands of a single agency and the existence of collaboration or shared decision-making has become the core element of public decisions. Therefore, problem solving is no longer singular to agencies, and it requires the creation of communities of problem solvers as well as better learning and change within public organizations. Considering that these are the fundamental changes that public organizations encounter, the use of performance measures and metrics has become even more important for public management. Carefully designed performance measures and, ultimately, reports could enhance the collaborative nature of organizations, thus leading to better management of services and creation of public value. However, use of performance measures as currently practiced should not focus solely on interdepartmental measures but it is important to build intra-

organizational indicators for the purpose of linking outcomes. Others such as Alter and Hage (1993) argue that, in an informational era, the main challenge remains how to manage complexity, scope, speed and adaptability in a network context. These challenges extend in managing these governance networks through use of performance metrics.

Agranoff (2001) argues that in a context of network governance, public managers encounter horizontal overcrowding where collaboration between and among various public entities remains paramount. One could argue that this overcrowding places greater importance on the design of interlinked performance measures and indicators. This study will examine some of these challenges.

Case Study: What Happened to Los Angeles County

This study examines different policy types, internal/external concerns, and inter-and-intra-organizational ties and their implementation by Los Angeles County in California, a large municipal government in the United States, and what the indicators represent in a collaborative network of actors.

Los Angeles County is the second largest municipal government in the United States with 10 million residents, almost 100,000 public sector employees, and an operating budget of \$26 billion. In 2006, the county shifted its governance structure from a Chief Administrative model to a Chief Executive model. Under the new CEO model, County departments are divided into five clusters, and each cluster has unique goals that tie its organizational structure to the strategic goals and plans of the County. The idea behind shifting the county governance structure is to increase collaboration between departments and design performance measures across each department that will result in better outcomes for the county and better connectivity with the strategic plan of the County. Reliance on different clusters and the design of department-level performance measures is a new attempt to create better intra-organizational metrics and measurement in ensuring accountability. This study examines the design of performance measures across the cluster of "Children and Families Well-being," which consists of three departments: Child Support Services in the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Public Social Services and the Sheriff's Department. This study will examine the linkages, if any, that exist across these departments and regions and analyze whether performance measures actually link intra-organizational functions or rely solely on single-department reporting. The study will also suggest new designs for how to improve these linkages and intra-organizational connections for assessing better outputs and outcomes for the overall county.

The continuous issues that the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) has encountered over the years concerning the protection of children within the Foster Care system and/or under direct supervision of families under the DCFS have served as the catalyst for this study. In 2013, the death of an eight-year-old boy, Gabriel Fernandez of Palmdale, as a result of torture by his mother and her boyfriend, triggered an extensive public and internal outcry as to why public agencies were unable to intervene earlier and why social workers had repeatedly dismissed reports that the boy had been beaten at home.

In response, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors appointed a Blue Ribbon Commission to conduct an internal study and outline challenges that the DCFS and other

departments face in providing child-protective services. These include an insufficient number of foster homes, a lack of public trust in social workers, as well as dismissive treatment by staff, social workers and other departments. The Commission suggested that the Board should mandate a strategic blending of funding streams and operations as well as the movement of resources across departments to address these issues. The County departments involved in child protection are the DCFS, Sheriff, Public Health, Mental Health, Health Services, Public Social Services, Housing, Probation, and Office of Education as well as various other agencies. The issue under consideration is how effective are performance measures utilized by various departments in addressing intra-departmental activities. Skelcher and Sullivan (2008) suggest that collaborative performance should take place in a number of policy and administrative domains and by interlinking various administrative units and domains of operations, better insights into the measurement of performance can be developed.

Methodology

Having acquired the most recent documents and information available on *Program Summary and Performance Measures* from Los Angeles County, this author was able to analyze the format and content to determine readability. Of special note were all comments on the intended audiences, purposes and priorities of the reports, and the type and quantity of the performance indicators. In all, there are 307 indicators used for measuring performance outcomes across the four departments examined for this study: Department of Public Social Services, Department of Mental Health, Department of Children and Families Services, and the Sheriff's Department. Each indicator was categorized by the types, values and collaborative nature of each indicator (see appendix A). By categorizing each indicator type, one could discern the public values projected by each, whether those values represent the internal concerns of the organization or address external concerns, and finally, what collaborative nature to these indicators. Upon completion of these steps, descriptive analysis was utilized in order to identify what percentage of indicators reflect the values, types and collaboration of performance reporting priorities. Chi square was utilized to identify the relationship between various departments and their indicators. Closer assessment of performance measures indicates that they reflect multi-organizational priorities and represent intergovernmental ties. But what is lacking are indicators crossing multiple organizations. Categorizing these indicators into different values, types, models of excellence and concerns remains a subjective call by the reader. Careful examination of each indicator and assigning specific categories are challenging tasks and could represent the weakest link in the methodology utilized for this study. Although assignment of different categories to each indicator is a subjective call, the value of assigning categories to each indicator sheds new light and understanding on how indicators are designed and more importantly, on how they can be utilized to enhance internal or external organizational management or reporting of results to external governmental and nongovernmental entities. If performance reports are carefully produced, they can be a powerful tool in informing community of stakeholders.

Performance Reporting Indicators: Tool in Evaluation of Networked Governance

Fundamentally, the use of performance measures is to assess outcomes of public programs within an integrated network of players. In the case of Los Angeles County and the participation of all departments in the design and dissemination of performance indicators, one might argue that accountability is being achieved. However, the real missing link in the performance chain is the lack of integrated indicators that would allow the measuring of overlapping functions, outputs, and, ultimately, the outcomes of multiple departments. Close analysis of the *Program Summary and Performance Measures* published by Los Angeles County reveals elements of accountability (at least to the County CEO and the Board of Supervisors) representing the extent of performance by each department. However, this report -- in common with too many others -- focuses on the size of the forest and the number of trees without taking the systemic nature of the forest itself into account.

What is missing, mainly, are the linkages between county departments as well as between community and external groups, and contractors and providers to the overall performance of a network of participants. The main reason for the death of Gabriel Fernandez is that the larger network of participants shifted the responsibility to other departments and agencies instead of working collaboratively. One suggestion is to have performance indicators that link the performance of community-based organizations (acting, at times, as contractors) to the performance of various county departments. This could be achieved by creating vertical and horizontal indicators that, when linked, would encourage more and better collaboration.

Further, policy makers and public managers at various levels should link the performance of each entity to a limited set of common measures. This recommendation would result in a pyramid of indicators. At the top would be the core common measures of performance on the most critical contributions to the Board and State policy makers, while allowing mid-to-higher level public managers to make needed changes within performance indicators at the departmental level. Such an approach would provide the missing link in the performance chain.

In addition, using performance measures through intergovernmental ties could lead to creating better public value, as defined by both the outcome/s of the program and also by its cost effectiveness and/or its financial value.

While measuring the social outcomes/value/effectiveness of social programs tends to be complex and burdensome, it is a valuable strategy for public officials. DPSS -- in its design and implementation of performance indicators, decided early on to use a more collaborative strategy within its bureaus in order to generate better trust and cooperation within the organization. Through the lessons learned in this process, this strategy could be expanded to other county departments.

Meanwhile, a well-developed plan of action is critical to the success of any program, and performance measures can bring some form of alignment and focus to actual activities (Cole and Parston, 2006; Monahan, 2001; Moore, 1997). Within the context of intergovernmental ties, performance measures and use of indicators remain critical in assessing and evaluating the outcome of public programs. This strategy has allowed the federal government to assert an influential role in measuring the outcomes of programs. The use of performance measures allows various external actors and stakeholders to link the policy continuum, from upstream policy

development at the federal and/or state level to the midstream of policy implementation and, specifically, to the downstream -- policy/decision-enforcement -- level.

However, the central premise of this study is that performance measures have certain normative assumptions embedded within them. Thus, if outcome measures are valued for the purpose of better organizational management or integration of outcomes used by various external partners, then performance indicators can and should represent these embedded values. If public value or performance management of various actors are desired outcomes, then performance indicators can be used to determine what issues we think about by focusing our attention on specific aspects of institutional performance (Anglin, 2004). Moreover, if indicators used for performance measures aim to assess collaborative characteristics of different organizations, one could argue that the public value generated by these organizations are collaborative. One of the main challenges in using performance measures to assess collaborative practices among different public-public and public-private partnerships are the elusiveness of mandates in a public setting. This is a result of the political environment of decision making relative to selecting indicators and the purposes for which they were selected. When the collaborative practices of different organizations are being managed, therefore, it is common for performance measures to be mandated by external legislative bodies.

Also, close examination of performance measures for these agencies suggest that measuring outcomes is more challenging when compared to public services with more quantifiable actions, e.g., the time it takes a fire department to respond to a hazardous situation. One of the challenges that agencies encounter when reporting performance information in order to broadly improve programmatic aspects is their seeming inability to connect the findings with broader strategic planning changes. More specifically, the use of performance measures to assess the outcome of organizational policies, procedures and practices is difficult to evaluate. The use of performance measures might assess organizational practices, but whether these practices can shape the behavior of the target population's behavior remains unclear.

One suggestion for building stronger linkages between various departments and the measurement of outputs and outcomes is the creation of a set of core indicators that can cross or combine multiple functions, processes and purposes. For example, one might ask what is missing from the performance chain between various departments in relation to the number of child-abuse cases investigated that lead to referrals to DCFS; or the number of abuse cases that lead to referral to the District Attorney's Office, and how many of these then lead to successful prosecution. For DCFS, indicators are successful placement of foster children, the length of time (measured in months and years) that foster children stay with those families. Access to mental health services has also been identified as a need by foster parents, especially for the adolescents in their care. One might also examine the level of support provided to foster parents by the child welfare agency and -- as part of that process -- identify some of the difficulties that the foster parents experience in communicating with the welfare agency.

Findings and Recommendations:

This study of reporting indicators suggests the following findings:

- Even though there has been a greater emphasis on reporting outputs and outcomes for program and organizational performance, the inputs far exceed any measures of outputs and outcomes.
- Methods of initiating performance measures and indicators could be a powerful tool in linking intra-organizational performance, thus strengthening intergovernmental ties. Also, a mixture of internal and external initiation approaches to performance measurement could lead to more successful and collaborative public management.
- Based on the study's findings, this elevated emphasis on efficiency rather than on other program and organizational values is expected, since public organizations are now under a greater mandate to deliver efficient programs.
- It is essential to create performance measures that link functions, activities and processes of multiple departments.
- Even though the county has clustered various departments based on their objectives and functions, the missing link is addressing functions and activities that cross multiple clusters and departments (E.g., Sheriff's Department vs. DCFS vs. District Attorney's Office vs. DMH, etc.)
- It is essential to create common core indicators that extend beyond departmental boundaries and, ultimately, link their activities, types and policy values to create true inter/intra-departmental effectiveness.
- Closing the accountability gap requires pushing reporting on some common indicators down to the departments and, if needed, even down to the regional offices.
- It is essential for various departments to work with the advocacy and community non-profit groups and establish measures to link external functions to the internal processes and the outputs and outcomes of these functions. For example, kinship groups such as "Grandparents as Parents" (GAP) and level of support and services that DCFS provides them should be linked into the performance measures indicators. This is the idea behind the creation of a pyramid of indicators that reflect internal, external, inter-and-intra-organizational functions.

These findings suggest that federal, state and Los Angeles County policymakers should create better linkages between performance indicators and organizational strategic goals and outcomes. The strategic use of indicators to achieve improved outcomes will require directly linking strategic indicators with specific goals. Measuring solely for the sake of measuring provides only a long list of indicators but fails to help public service organizations solve community and clientele needs, which should be their primary purpose.

From this study, one can draw three recommendations to improve delivery of public services in an urban setting and more accurately measure those services to translate the data in a meaningful way. These recommendations will also strengthen intergovernmental ties.

The first recommendation is for federal, state, and county planners to have coordinated, common reporting indicators with an emphasis on selected critical areas. Each agency should then be encouraged to develop specific indicators representing the unique needs of its own community. The ideal model for designing performance indicators to strengthen collaborative and intergovernmental ties is through the creation of indicator pyramids where some indicators report

outcomes to the federal government, some to the state, and some to the local Board of Supervisors and the community. Meanwhile the majority of the performance reporting is addressed to the internal management. This type of design strengthens the links and accountability in a multi-actor environment.

The second recommendation is for output indicators to be more closely integrated for strategic planning purposes. Outputs and outcomes should be appraised and judged on their capacity to implement organizational transformation.

Third and finally, measurement indicators must focus more on the value of services as they are perceived by both clientele and taxpayers.

Conclusion:

Focusing accountability on improvement begins at the institutional level by establishing clear goals, realistic objectives, and relevant indicators that reflect the county mission and state needs. Data generated by public agencies does not identify meanings and significance, but data translated into relevant information and, more specifically, utilized to generate additional knowledge can assist organizations to move from their current status quo into learning organizations. Decision makers may receive information, but organizational change through generations of knowledge gathering requires profound understanding and reflection. The overall process is moving away from simple data collection to gathering information and building knowledge for organizational improvement. This trend requires more intense involvement of local departments and districts in the design, implementation and interpretation of the process of performance measurement. One strategy for organizations to utilize to accomplish their desire goals is through close identification of the social benefits that each activity generates. Moreover, local districts and offices can become more accountable and eager to adapt as required by becoming more “goals-oriented” as organizations. This strategy can reconcile external accountability with improvement of internal activities. Activities undertaken by local organizational units, therefore, can become more direct and focused on achieving desired community goals.

References:

1. 2007. Performance Budgeting in OECD Countries. MA: OECD Publishing.
2. (03/12/2014, Anonymous Interview).
3. Agranoff, Robert. "Managing within the Matrix: Does Collaborative Federalism Exist?" *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, Vol. 31 (Summer): 31-56, 2001.
4. Alter, Catherine, and Hage, Jerald. 1993. *Organizations Working Together*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
5. Anglin, R. V. 2004. Building the Organizations That Build Communities. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Housing and Urban Development.
6. Astin, A. *Assessment for Excellence: The Philosophy and Practice of Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1991.
7. Bardach, E. 1998. Getting Agencies to Work Together. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
8. Bardach, Eugene. 1998. *Managerial Craftsmanship: Getting Agencies to Work Together*. Washington, DC: Brookings.
9. Burke, J.C. and Minassians, H. P. *Reporting High Education Results: Missing Links in the Performance Chain*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002
10. Burke, J.C. and Serban, A. *Performance Funding for Public Higher Education: Fad or Trend?* New Directions For Institutional Research, no. 97. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.
11. Carter, N., Klein, R., and Day, P. *How Organizations Measure Success: The use of Performance Indicators in Government*. London: Routledge, 1992.
12. Cave, M., Hanney, S., and Kogan, M. *The Use of Performance Indicators in Higher Education: A Critique and Analysis of Developing Practice*, 2nd ed. London: Kingsley, 1991.
13. Cole, M and Parston, G. 2006. Unlocking Public Value. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
14. Epstein, P., L. Wray, M. Marshall and S. Grifel (2000) "Engaging Citizens in Achieving Results That Matter: A Model for Effective 21st Century Governance", Paper presented at the Center for Accountability and Performance's Symposium on Leadership of Results-Oriented Management in Government, Washington, DC, 11 February.
15. Frederickson, H. George. 1997. *The Spirit of Public Administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
16. Gazley, Beth and Brudney, Jeffrey. "The Purpose (and Perils) of Government-Nonprofit Partnership", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 36 (3): 389-415, 2007.
17. Greene, J. "The Inequality of Performance Measurements," *Evaluation*, Vol. 5 (2): 160-72, 1999.
18. Hatry, H. 1999. Performance Measurement: Getting Results. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.
19. Johnson, H.T. "Towards an understanding of nineteenth century cost accounting", *The Accounting Review*, Vol. LVI, No. 3, Winter 1981.
20. Julnes, Patria De Lancer. "Performance Measurement: An Effective Tool for Government Accountability," *Evaluation*, Vol. 12 (2): 219-235, 2006.

21. Melkers, J. and Willoughby, K. "Models of Performance-Measurement Use in Local Government: Understanding Budgeting, Communication, and Lasting Effects." *Public Administration Review*. 65(2): 180-190, 2005.
22. Monahan, K. E. 2001. *Balanced Measures: For Strategic Planning*. VA: Management Concepts.
23. Moore, M.H. 1997. *Creating Public Value*. MA: Harvard University Press.
24. O'Leary, R. and Bingham, L.B. *The Collaborative Public Manager: Bew Ideas for the Twenty-first Century*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2009.
25. O'Toole, Laurence J. 1997. "Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research-Based Agendas in Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 57: 45-52.
26. Parmenter, D. 2007. *Key Performance Indicators*. NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
27. Perrin, B. "Effective Use and Misuse of Performance Measurement," *American Journal of Evaluation* 19 (3): 367-380, 1998.
28. Provan, K., Fish, A., Sydow, J. "Interorganizational Networks at the Network Level: A Review of the Empirical Literature on Whole Networks", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33, No 3, 479-516, June 2007.
29. Radin, B. A. 2002. *The Accountable Juggler*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
30. Radin, B.A. 2006. *Challenging the Performance Movement*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
31. Richardson, R.C. "Effectiveness in Undergraduate Education: An Analysis of State Quality Indicators." In S. S. Ruppert (ed.), *Charting Higher Education Accountability: A Sourcebook on State-Level Performance Indicators*. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1994.
32. Richardson, R. 1994. Effectiveness in Undergraduate Education: An Analysis of State Quality Indicators. In *Charting Higher Education Accountability: A Sourcebook on State-Level Performance Indicators*, edited by S. S. Ruppert. Denver: Education Commission of the States.
33. Skelcher, C. and Sullivan, H. "Theory-Driven Approaches to Analysing Collaborative Performance," *Public Management Review*, Vol. 10 Issue 6, pgs 751-771, 2008.

APPENDIX A

DPSS

<i>Indicators - Social Services IHSS</i>			
Customer service & satisfaction rating	OUT	QUL	Inter
Percentage determining eligibility in timely manner	P	EFF	Inter/Intra
IHSS reassessment, percent completed	P/OP	EFF	Inter/Intra
IHSS consumers qualify and receive care, percent completed	P/OP	EFF	Inter/Intra
Number of IHSS consumers served	OP	EFF	Inter/Intra
<i>Indicators - California Work Opportunities & Responsibility to Kids CalWORKS</i>			
Percent of households in LAC living below federal poverty level	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of aided Welfare-to-Work participants employed	OP	EFF/EQ	Inter/Intra
Percent of Welfare-to-Work participants placed in jobs	OP	EFF	Inter/Intra
Average hourly wage at job placement	I	EQ	Inter/Intra
Percent of aided Welfare-to-Work participants engaged in education and training	I/P	CHO	Inter/Intra
Percent of persons referred to clinical assessment*	I	CHO	Inter/Intra
Number of children receiving childcare	I	EQ	Inter/Intra
Percent of former CalWORKs households back on aid after 12 months	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of Cal-Learn participants who received a bonus for participating satisfactorily in school	I/OP	CHO	Inter/Intra
Percent of Cal-Learn participants who received bonuses for earning a high school diploma	I/OP	CHO	Inter/Intra
Cal-Learn Graduation Rate	OP	EFF	Inter/Intra
Number of CalWORKs cases	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
Number of CalWORKs applications taken	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of CalWORKs applicants for which eligibility is determined in 45 days	P	EQ	Inter/Intra
Percent completed, Of the CalWORKs redeterminations due	I/P	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of registered participants actively engaged in Welfare-to-Work activities	I/OP	CHO	Inter/Intra
Percent of mandatory participants registered in Welfare-to-Work	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
Number of Cal-Learn participants	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
<i>Indicators - Other Public Welfare Food Stamps</i>			
Number of households receiving Food Stamp benefits	I	CHO	Inter/Intra
Number of households receiving Food Stamp Only benefits	I	CHO	Inter/Intra
Percent of households receiving Food Stamps 12 months after CalWORKs is terminated	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of Food Stamp applications for which eligibility is determined within 30 days	I/P	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of accurate Food Stamp payments	I/P	QUL	Inter/Intra

Aerojet Rocketdyne's InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

Number of persons informed & educated on the availability of the Food Stamps program beyond DPSS locations**	I	EQ	Inter/Intra
Number of community and faith-based organizations that received Food Stamp program training	I	EQ	Inter/Intra
<i>Indicators - Other Public Welfare General Relief (GR)</i>			
Number of GROW participants placed in jobs	OP	EFF	Inter/Intra
Average wage at job placement	I	EQ	Inter
Number of GROW participants engaged in education and training	I	CHO	Inter/Intra
Number of GROW participants receiving specialized supportive services	I	EQ	Inter/Intra
Number of disabled participants who were approved for SSI	I	EQ	Inter/Intra
Number of GR applications received	I	EQ	Inter/Intra
Number of GR cases	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
Number of GROW participants	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of GR applications for which eligibility is determined within 30 days	P/OP	EFF	Inter/Intra
Number of individuals evaluated for mental health issues	I/P	EQ	Inter/Intra
Number of participants evaluated for eligibility to SSI by DPSS	I/P	EFF	Inter/Intra
Number of homeless applicants who were issued a voucher for emergency shelter	I/P	EFF	Inter/Intra
<i>Indicators - Other Public Welfare Medi-Cal</i>			
Number of children enrolled in Medi-Cal	I	EQ	Inter/Intra
Average time on Medi-Cal of currently eligible children	P	EFF	Inter/Intra
Number of adults enrolled in Medi-Cal	I	EQ	Inter/Intra
Average time on Medi-Cal of currently eligible adults	P	EFF	Inter/Intra
Number of persons enrolled in Medi-Cal through outreach	I	CHO/EQ	Inter/Intra
Percent of non-disability linked applicants for which eligibility is determined within 45 days	P	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of redeterminations completed	P/OP	EFF	Inter
Percent of redeterminations resulting in ongoing eligibility	P/OP	EFF	Inter
<i>Indicators - Other Public Welfare - Community Service Block Grant Program (CSBG)</i>			
Percent of participants who were unemployed and obtained a job	OP	CHO	Inter
Percent of participating children previously involved with the criminal justice system who have not re-entered the system within one year	OP	QUL	Inter/Intra
Number of senior citizens who are able to maintain an independent living situation as a result of having received services from community programs	OP	QUL	Inter/Intra
Number of persons enrolled in employment/supportive services	I	CHO/EQ	Inter/Intra
Number of persons enrolled in services that promote independent living	I	QUL	Inter

Aerojet Rocketdyne's InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

Number persons receiving emergency services	I	CHO/EQ	Inter/Intra
Number of participating children enrolled in "before" or "after" school programs	I	QUL	Inter/Intra
Number of participating children who participate in pre-school activities	I	CHO/EQ	Inter/Intra
Percent of participating households receiving temporary shelter	I	CHO/EQ	Inter/Intra
Percent of participating households receiving domestic violence services	I	CHO/EQ	Inter/Intra
<i>Indicators - Other Public Welfare - Los Angeles County Community-Based Organization (CBO) Safety First Project (CBO)</i>			
Average percent improvement in participant's pre-/post test score for teenage drinking and driving class	OP	QUL	Inter/Intra
Average percent improvement in participant's pre-/post test score for pedestrian traffic safety education class	OP	QUL	Inter/Intra
Average percent improvement in participant's pre-/post test score for safety belt and child passenger safety class	OP	QUL	Inter/Intra
Number of car seats distributed to low-income communities	I	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of teenage participants who successfully completed the teenage drinking and driving class	P/OP	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of participants who successfully completed pedestrian traffic safety education class based on pre-/post tests	P/OP	EFF	Inter/Intra
Percent of participants who successfully completed safety belt and child passenger safety class	P/OP	EFF	Inter/Intra

Sheriff

Performance Measures	Type	Policy Value	Collaborative
Court Services Budget Unit			
Trial Court funding contract	Input	Quality	Inter/Intra
LAPD release contract	input	Efficiency	Inter/Intra
Courthouse visitors	input	Efficiency	Inter/Intra
Annual inmate population (per day court appearance annually)	input	Efficiency	Inter/Intra
Courthouse incidents	input	Quality	inter
Arrests	input	Quality	inter
Weapons seized	input	Quality	inter
TRO's received for service	input	Quality	inter
Custody Budget Unit			
Inmate versus inmate assaults	input	Quality	Inter
Inmate versus staff assaults	Input	Quality	Inter
Major disturbances	Input	Quality	Inter
Minor disturbances	Input	Quality	Inter
Narcotics found (grams)	Input	Quality	Inter
Jailhouse alcohol found (ounces)	Input	Quality	Inter
Searches	Input	Efficiency	Inter

Aerojet Rocketdyne's InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

District Attorney case filings	Input	Quality	Inter/Intra
Food deliveries to Sheriff's stations per year	Input	Efficiency	Inter
Food delivery costs (stations)	Input	Efficiency	Inter
Hours needed for menu calculations (in hours)	process	Efficiency	Inter
Personnel hours for fiscal recordkeeping (in hours)	process	Efficiency	Inter
Inmate food complaints	Input	Quality	Inter
Number of inmates taking auto-meds	Input	Efficiency	Inter
Inmate deaths (natural causes)	Input	Efficiency	Inter
Inmates deaths (homicide)	Input	Efficiency	Inter/Intra
Inmate medical complaints per month	Input	Quality	Inter
Doctor/time spent per patient (in minutes)	process	Efficiency	Inter
Cost saved per year by reducing expired/unusable meds	output/outcome	Efficiency	Inter
Number of Electronic Monitoring program (EMP) participants violating the terms of program	Input/output	Efficiency	Inter
Total number of EMP participants	Input	Efficiency	Inter
Detective Budget Unit			
Active cases	input	Efficiency	inter
Completed cases: Solved	output	Efficiency	inter
Completed cases: District Attorney rejects	output	Quality	inter/intra
Arrests: Felony	input	Efficiency	inter
Arrests: Misdemeanor	input	Efficiency	inter
Complaints filed (by District Attorney): Felony	input	Efficiency	inter/intra
Complaints filed (by District Attorney): Misdemeanor	input	Efficiency	inter/intra
Complaints filed (by District Attorney): Victims	input	Efficiency	inter/intra
Warrants: Search warrants served	input	Efficiency	inter
Warrants: Parole/probation searches	input	Efficiency	inter/intra
Seizures: Weapons	input	Efficiency	inter
Seizures: Cash (total dollars)	input	Efficiency	inter
Seizures: Narcotics (total street value)	input	Efficiency	inter
Seizures: Vehicle (total number)	input	Efficiency	inter
Seizures: Assets (all other property-total cash value)	input	Efficiency	inter
General Support Budget Unit			
Leadership and training: Number of deputy Sheriff Trainees (DST) entering the Academy	process	Efficiency	Inter
Days lost to industrial injury/illness: Sworn Staff	process	Quality	Inter
days lost to industrial injury/illness: Professional Staff	process	Quality	Inter
Technical Services: Respond to crime scenes with 72 hours to process physical evidence & to assist detectives invest	process/output	Efficiency	Inter
Technical Services: Maintain American Society of Crime Lab Directors/Lab Accredited Board	process/output	Efficiency	Inter
Facilities planning: Capital projects	input	Efficiency	Inter
Facilities planning: Alterations and improvements	input	Efficiency	Inter
Facilities planning: Leases	input	Efficiency	Inter
Facilities planning: contracts	input	Efficiency	Inter
Facilities planning: Request for proposals	input	Efficiency	Inter
Facilities Services: Total Energy System-Kilowatt Hours (TES-KWH)	input	Efficiency	Inter
Facilities services: Toilets replaced at Men's Central jail	input	Efficiency	Inter

Aerojet Rocketdyne's InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

Facilities services: Service request tickets	input	Efficiency	Inter
Patrol Budget Unit : Field Operations			
Part I crime rate total: criminal homicide	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate total: forcible rape	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate total: robbery	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate total: Aggravated Assault	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate total: burglary	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate total: Larceny theft	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate total: Motor vehicle theft	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate total: Arson	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I clearance rate (average): criminal homicide	output	Efficiency	Inter
Part I clearance rate (average): forcible rape	output	Efficiency	Inter
Part I clearance rate (average): robbery	output	Efficiency	Inter
Part I clearance rate (average): aggravated assault	output	Efficiency	Inter
Part I clearance rate (average): burglary	output	Efficiency	Inter
Part I clearance rate (average): Larceny Theft	output	Efficiency	Inter
Part I clearance rate (average): Motor vehicle theft	output	Efficiency	Inter
Part I clearance rate (average): Arson	output	Efficiency	Inter
Patrol Budget Unit : Emergency Operations Bureau			
Arson cases Investigated	input	Efficiency	Inter
Accidental fires investigated	input	Efficiency	Inter
Responses to suspicious packages	input	Efficiency	Inter
Canine (k-9) responses	input	Efficiency	Inter
Patrol Budget Unit : Aero Bureau			
Total low light infrared searches	input	Efficiency	Inter
K-9 support searches	input	Efficiency	Inter
Responses to vehicular pursuits	process	Efficiency	Inter
Respond to foot pursuits	process	Efficiency	Inter
Response time to all calls - Average (in minutes)	process/output	Efficiency	Inter
Calls for airborne support handled	process	Efficiency	Inter
Patrol Budget Unit : Special Enforcement Bureau			
Emergency services detail (ESD) operations	input	Efficiency	Inter
Canine services detail (CSD) searches	input	Efficiency	Inter
Special enforcement detail (SED) activations	input	Efficiency	Inter
Administration Budget Unit: Fiscal Administration			
Percent of invoices processed within the billing period	process	Efficiency	Inter
Percent of property/evidence pick ups recorded and stored within five business days of pick up	process/output	Eff/Quality	Inter
Percent of property/evidence requests for retrieval completed within requested frame	process/output	Eff/Quality	Inter
Percent of requests for supplies filled within five business days of receipt	process/output	Eff/Quality	Inter
Percent of supply shipments received and placed in inventory w/in three business days of receipt	process	Eff/Quality	Inter
Amount of vendor discounts taken	input	Efficiency	Inter
Number of grant applications awarded: Federal grants	input	Efficiency	Inter
Number of grant applications awarded: State grants	input	Efficiency	Inter
Number of grant applications awarded: Other awards	input	Efficiency	Inter
Value of awarded grants (millions)	input	Efficiency	Inter
Total for Department: Federal awards (millions)	input	Efficiency	Inter

Aerojet Rocketdyne’s InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

Total for Department: State awards (millions)	input	Efficiency	Inter
Total for Department: Other awards (millions)	input	Efficiency	Inter
Administration Budget Unit: Personnel Administration			
Deputy Sheriff trainee: applied	input	Efficiency	Inter
Deputy Sheriff trainee: tested	process	Eff/Quality	Inter
Deputy Sheriff trainee: passed written/oral	output	Eff/Quality	Inter
Deputy Sheriff trainee: Hired	output	Eff/Quality	Inter
Deputy Sheriff trainee: Entering the academy	input	Eff/Quality	Inter
Days lost to industrial injury/illness: sworn staff	input	Efficiency	Inter
days lost to industrial injury/illness: Professional Staff	input	Efficiency	Inter
County Service Budget Unit: County Services Bureau			
Part I crime rate report: Criminal homicide	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate report: Forcible rape	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate report: Robbery	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate report: Aggravated assault	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate report: Burglary	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate report: Larceny theft	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate report: Motor vehicle theft	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part I crime rate report: Arson	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: disorderly conduct	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: drunk/drunken driving	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: federal offense w money	input	Efficiency	Inter/intra
Part II crime rate report: forgery/fraud	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: liquor laws	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: miscellaneous misdemeanors	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: narcotics	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: non-aggravated assault	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: offense against family	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: receiving stolen property	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: sex crimes	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: vagrancy	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: vandalism	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: vehicle law	input	Efficiency	Inter
Part II crime rate report: weapons law	input	Efficiency	Inter
All Other crime report: Accidents	input	Efficiency	Inter
All Other crime report: locate stolen vehicles	input	Efficiency	Inter
All Other crime report: mentally ill	input	Efficiency	Inter/intra
All Other crime report: missing/found persons	input	Efficiency	Inter
All Other crime report: non-criminal	input	Efficiency	Inter
All Other crime report: person dead	input	Efficiency	Inter
All Other crime report: reasonable cause arrests	input	Efficiency	Inter
All Other crime report: suspected child abuse report	input	Efficiency	Inter/intra
All Other crime report: suicide	input	Efficiency	Inter
All Other crime report: vehicle law citations	input	Efficiency	Inter
All Other crime report: vehicle stored/impounded	input	Efficiency	Inter
Total number of indicators 140			

DCFS

Aerojet Rocketdyne's InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

Performance Measures	Type	Policy Value	Collaborative
Early Intervention			
Percent of children receiving Family Support services who do not have a recurrence of substantiated abuse and/or neglect while receiving Family Support Services	Output	Eff	Inter
Percent of children receiving services who do not have a recurrence of substantiated abuse and/or neglect w/in 12 months after receiving Family Support Services	Output	Eff	Inter
Percent of children receiving Alternative Response services who do not have a recurrence of substantiated abuse and/or neglect while receiving Alternative Response	Output	Eff	Inter
Percent of children who do not have a recurrence of substantiated abuse and/or neglect within 12 months after receiving Alternative Response services	Outcome	Eff	Inter
Crisis Intervention			
Percent of children receiving Family Maintenance services who remained in the home of parent or guardian requiring court intervention	Output	Eff	Inter/Intra
Percent of children with substantiated referral of abuse and/or neglect that did not have a subsequent substantiated referral w/in 12 months	output	Eff	Inter
Percent of children who do not have a recurrence of substantiated abuse and/or neglect within 6 months of receiving Voluntary Family Reunification	outcome	Eff	Inter
Percent of children receiving Family Preservation who do not have a recurrence of substantiated referrals of abuse and/or neglect while receiving Family Preservation	outcome	Eff	Inter
Percent of children who do not have a recurrence of substantiated abuse and/or neglect within 12 months after receiving Family Preservation services	outcome	Eff	Inter
Percent of five-day response referrals w an initiated f2f contact w/in 5 days	Input/process	Eff	Inter
Number of children receiving Voluntary Family Maintenance services	Input	Eff	Inter
Number of children receiving Voluntary Family Reunification services	Input	Eff	Inter
Number of families who received Family Preservation services	Input/process	Eff	Inter
Intensive Services			
Percent of children receiving Family Reunification services removed from the home of parent or guardian requiring court intervention	Input/process	Eff	Inter/Intra
Percent of children w/out a substantiated allegation of abuse and/or neglect w/in 12 months of returning home	Input	Eff	Inter
Percent of children who remained in home of parent or guardian at least 12 months after DCFS case closure	Process	Quality	Inter/Intra

Aerojet Rocketdyne's InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

Percent of children w/out a substantiated allegation of abuse and/or neglect in out-of-home care (Foster Family and Foster family home)	Input	Quality	Inter/Intra
Percent of children w/out a substantiated allegation of abuse and/or neglect out-of-home care (relatives homes and small family home)	Input	Quality	Inter/Intra
Percent of children that entered foster care within 12 months of being returned home	Input	Quality	Inter
Percent of youth exiting care through Emancipation services	Input	Choice	Inter
Percent of youth who received independent Living services and are living in a safe and affordable housing upon service determination at age 21	Input	Choice	Inter
Percent of youth who received Independent Living Services and who obtained a high school diploma or GED upon leaving foster care (ages 18-21)	outcome	Eff/Choice	Inter/Intra
Percent of youth who received Independent Living Services and are enrolled in higher education (ages 18-21)	outcome	Eff/Choice	Inter
Percent of youth who received Independent Living services and are employed full or part-time (ages 18-21)	outcome	Eff/Choice	Inter
Permanency			
Percent of children in out-of-home care who returned home w/in 12 months of removal	output	Eff/Choice	Inter
Percent of children in out-of-home care who returned home w/in 13-59 months of removal	output	Eff	Inter
Percent of children in out-of-home care who returned home w/in 60 months of removal	output	Eff	Inter
Percent of children who returned home from relative care	Input	Eff	Inter
Percent of children adopted w/in 24 months of removal home	Input	Eff	Inter
Percent of children adopted by a relative w/in 24 months of removal from home	Input	Eff	Inter
Percent of children who attained legal guardianship w/in 24 months of removal from home	Input/Output	Eff	Inter
Percent of children who attained legal guardianship with a relative w/in 24 months of removal from home	Input/Output	Eff	Inter
Administration - Finance and Budgets			
Percent of times Department met CEO deadline for submittal of budget status reports and annual budget request	Input/process	Eff	Inter/Intra
Percent difference between 11-month estimate of net county cost	Process	Eff	Inter/Intra
Percent of Interdepartmental billings billed w/in 30 days of the month end	Process	Eff	Inter/Intra
Percent of vendor payments offering discount where discount was achieved	Process	Eff	Inter/Intra
Percent of payment vouchers w errors when check is issued	Pro/output	Eff	Inter
Percent of quarterly state claims submitted on time	Process	Eff	Inter/Intra
Administration - Human Resources (payroll and			

Aerojet Rocketdyne's InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

personnel)			
Percent of performance evaluation completed at the time of semi-annual reports	Pro/output	Eff	Inter
Percentage of budgeted permanent positions not filled (vacancy rate)	Process	Eff	Inter
Percent payroll adjustments made by Department to correct prior period pay	Process	Eff	Inter
Number of Staff on long-term leave (LTL)	Process	Eff	Inter
Percent of staff who returned to work from LTL	Process	Eff	Inter
Average number of days LTL staff were on leave	Process	Eff	Inter
Administration - Purchasing and Contracts			
Percent of supply requests processed w/in established and identified timeframe	Process	Eff	Inter
Average number of days elapsed from date of purchase request to date of purchase order issued	Process	Eff	Inter
Percent of solicitations completed by the established and identified due date	Process	Eff	Inter
Percent of contract w outcome or performance based statement of work as percentage of total Department contracts	Process	Eff/Quality	Inter
Percent of contracts monitored according to planned monitoring schedule	Process	Eff	Inter
Percent of contracts monitored meeting performance targets	Output	Eff	Inter
Percentage of contracts requiring Board approval that initiated work prior to contract execution or after expiration date	Process	Eff	Inter
Administration - IT (internal support only)			
Percent of time key departmental systems are operational during normal business hours	Process	Eff	Inter
Percent of Help Desk calls competed w/in departmental standard	Process	Eff/Quality	Inter
Percent of request for services responded to w/in identified departmental standard	Process	Eff/Quality	Inter
Administration - Facility Management			
Percent of facility service requests conformed with requestor and processed within standard timeframe	Process	Eff	Inter
Percent of facilities requiring investments in the next five years	Input	Eff	Inter
Annual dollar amount of facilities requiring investment in the next 5 years	Input	Eff	Inter/Intra
Number invested in preventative facility maintenance	Process	Eff	Inter
Administration - Strategic Planning			
Number of years plan elapsed since departmental plan has been updated	Process	Eff	Inter
Administration - Risk Management			
Number of new workers' compensation claims reported	Input	Eff	Inter
Ratio of new workers' compensation claims reported to the total employee count for the Department	input/process	Eff	Inter
Workers' Compensation Trust Fund costs as a percentage of total employee payroll dollars for the	Process	Eff	Inter

Aerojet Rocketdyne's InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

Department			
Number of new tort liability claims reported for the Department	Input/process	Eff	Inter/Intra
Tort Liability costs as a percentage of total operating budget for the Department	Process	Eff	Inter/Intra

Total of 64 indicators

DMH

Outpatient Mental Health Services			
Percent of clients who are satisfied or very satisfied with services and the quality of life	output	Quality	Inter
Percent of all clients receiving outpatient services who are identified with substance related disorder	input	Eff	Inter/intra
Percent of clients with open outpatient cases have received outpatient services w/in 90 days previously	input	Eff/Quality	Inter/intra
Percent of discharges from an acute hospital, seen within 7 days, at an outpatient facility:	input	Eff	Inter/intra
Children (15 and under)	input	Eff	Inter/intra
Transition age youth (16-25 years)	input	Eff	Inter/intra
Adults (26-59 years)	input	Eff	Inter/intra
Older adults (60 years and over)	input	Eff	Inter/intra
Percent of urgent field visits made within a frame of time:	input	Eff	Inter
Urgent field visits made in 45 minutes or less	input	Eff	Inter
Urgent field visits made in 46-60 minutes or less	input	Eff	Inter
Urgent field visits made in 46-60 minutes	input	Eff	Inter
Urgent field visits made in 61-90 minutes	input	Eff	Inter
Urgent field visits made in 90 + minutes	input	Eff	Inter
Psychiatric Hospitalization Services in 24-Hour Facilities			
Percent of clients re-hospitalized within 1-30 days of discharge:	input	Quality	Inter
Children (15 and under)	input	Quality	Inter
Transition age youth (16-25 years)	input	Quality	Inter
Adults (26-59 years)	input	Quality	Inter
Older adults (60 years and over)	input	Quality	Inter
Percent of clients re-hospitalized within 31-90 days of discharge:	input	Quality	Inter
Children (15 and under)	input	Quality	Inter
Transition age youth (16-25 years)	input	Quality	Inter
Adults (26-59 years)	input	Quality	Inter
Older adults (60 years and over)	input	Quality	Inter
Public Guardian			
Percent of Lanterman-Petris-Short (LPS) investigations completed within 30 days	process/output	Eff	Inter/intra
Percent of LPS clients homeless prior to conservatorship	input	Eff	Inter
Percent of LPS clients living in appropriate living arrangements and receiving treatment after	input	Eff	Inter/intra

Aerojet Rocketdyne’s InThinking Network Ongoing Discussion

August 2014

Henrik Minassians – To Link or Not to Link - Lessons in Collaborative Designs

conservatorship			
Total number of LPS cases investigated per Deputy Public Guardian annually	process/output	Eff	Inter/intra
Total number of active LPS cases investigated per Deputy Public Guardian annually	process/output	Eff	Inter/intra
Administration			
Percent of Board-approved contracts executed, renewed, and/or terminated w/in DMH standard timeframe	process	Eff/Quality	Inter
Percent of performance evaluations completed by due date	process/output	Eff	Inter
Number of facility service requests fulfilled w/in DMH standard timeline	process	Eff/Quality	Inter
Percent of information system Help Desk trouble calls resolved during initial call	process/output	Eff/Quality	Inter/intra
Percent of information system Help Desk trouble calls resolved during initial call or w/in 24 hours of the call	process/output	Eff/Quality	Inter
Number of DMH information system related Help Desk contacts handled per end user	process	Eff	Inter
Number of overall Information System related Help Desk contacts handled per end user	process	Eff	Inter
Number of DMH Information system related contacts handled	process/output	Eff	Inter
Total number of information system related contacts handled	output	Eff	Inter

Total number of indicators 38

BIOGRAPHY

Henrik Minassians is the Director of Regional/National Educational Partnerships & Services for Graduate & Professional Educational Services and Programs at The Tseng College, California State University, Northridge. He also teaches courses in Public Policy and Administration at CSUN. His research interests include implementation and evaluation issues in higher education and health care policy. His applied research has focused on accountability programs in higher education and the effectiveness of indicators used for performance measurement. Henrik has written on the implementation of public programs in higher education and healthcare.

Before coming to CSUN, Henrik worked as a senior research associate for the higher education program at the Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, New York. Recent publications include: Performance Reporting: "Real" Accountability or Accountability "Lite" (2003); Reporting Higher Education Results: Missing Links in the Performance Chain (published by Jossey-Bass, 2002); State Performance Reporting Indicators What Do They Indicate? (In Planning for Higher Education, 2002); Performance Reporting: The "No Cost" Accountability Program, (2002); Linking State Resources to Campus Results: From Fad to Trend, (2001); Performance Funding and Budgeting: An Emerging Merger? (2000); and Myths and Illusions: The Media and AIDS Policy (with Stella Theodoulou, 1996); "Good Cities and Healthy Communities in the United States" Journal of Urban Design and Planning (with Zeynep Toker)(Accepted for publication in October 17, 2011); Core Concepts in American Government: What Everyone Should Know The chapter titled "Bureaucracy" (with Lawrence Becker) (accepted for publication in fall of 2010).

Henrik has experience working for public agencies as well as not-for-profit organizations. In addition, he taught public policy and American politics courses at State University of New York-Albany. He currently teaches public policy classes for the MPA program. Henrik holds a Ph.D. in public policy from the Nelson A. Rockefeller College of Public Policy and Affairs at the University at Albany-SUNY.

CONTACT

Henrik can be reached by e-mail at henrik.minassians@csun.edu for additional information about this Ongoing Discussion.

WEBSITES

<http://www.csun.edu/social-behavioral-sciences/urban-studies-planning/henrik-minassians>

<http://www.csun.edu/~minassih///>

LINKEDIN

<https://www.linkedin.com/pub/henrik-minassians/51/827/3bb>