

## INDEX

### A

- Accountability: benchmarking for improving, 161–170; benefits of benchmarking for, 164–170; examples of increased attention to, 162–164; federal legislation for improving, 163; fiscal transparency in, 165–166; internal, increased through benchmarking, 166–167; internal and taxpayer in public sector, 110; in nonprofit sector, 163–164; principle of, 162; of public and nonprofit executives, 162; and public trust, 161; of state and local governments, 110–111; worksheet for evaluating, 216–218
- Administrative staff, as key benchmarking team players, 120–121
- America's Second Harvest, 139; determining performance measurement indicators in, 144; mission of, 143; networking and network activity report of, 144; selection of benchmarking partners in, 144
- American Water Works Association Research Foundation (AwwaRF), benchmarking for customer satisfaction in, 108–109, 111
- Ammons, D., 110
- Anheier, H. K., 127
- Association of Local Government Auditors (ALGA), benchmarking and best practices surveys, 177
- Association of Pacific Islands Public Auditors, and incorporation of best practices in program audits, 149
- Audit plan: and audit objectives, 184; determination of audit scope in, 184; staffing concerns in, 184–185; standards and guidelines for steps in, 183; use of solution-driven method in, 183–186
- Audit staff, as key benchmarking team players, 120–121
- Auditor recommendations, 178; as actions to be taken, 176; development of 185; organizations' obligation to consider, 174
- Audits: assurance of well-grounded findings in, 174; basic benchmarking skills for conducting, 175–176; benchmarking of auditor's own process in, 177; data collection and analysis in, 176, 185; development of comparative conditions in, 177–178; and development of a finding, 175; establishing criteria for solutions in, 181;

- integration of solution-driven method in, 182–183; research in, 175; searching for and implementing promising practices in, 181–182; solution-driven benchmarking method used in, 179–182; and tasks required for benchmarking, 173–174; using traditional benchmarking in, 176–179
- Austin, Texas, public links to city management strategies in, 118–119
- Australia's Local Government Ministers' Conference, multifaceted benchmarking studies and best practices in, 152–153
- Award programs, as reliable sources of promising practice, 23–24
- B**
- Baldrige National Quality Program, overview of, 14
- Bangalore, India, successful benchmarking initiatives in, 156
- Barcellos, S., 20
- Benchmark, defining, 11–12
- Benchmark training costs, 21
- Benchmarking: auditors' unique role in, 174; areas for future research in, 189–190; common steps in, 13; and continuous improvement, 19, 74; data collection challenges in, 82; evaluation focus in, 42–43; enhanced decision-making process for, 169–170; formal training in, 191; historical context of, 12–16; idea of importing practices in, 18, 21–22; implementation, and stakeholders' buy-in, 190; importance of sustaining momentum of, 188–189; and internal accountability, 166–167; Internet's impact on, 18–19; as key management tool in state/local governments, 123; necessity of monitoring and measuring, 187–188; and organization's unique characteristics, 191; performance indicators in, 14; and public/nonprofit entities' accountability, 164; recalibration as standard operating practice in, 74; and resistance to change, 72; roles of department and division heads in, 119–120; scope creep in, 67; search for best practices in, 14; technological advances and need to reevaluate, 141; and transition to learning organization, 170
- Benchmarking challenges, 79–82; and adoption of streamlined method, 83; hurdles and delay, as, 81–82; in implementation, 82; *industrial tourist* syndrome as, 80; self-deception trap in, 80–81
- Benchmarking champions, expectations of, 120
- Benchmarking learning process, stages in, 188–189
- Benchmarking measures: process and output categories in, 42–43; role in traditional versus solution-driven method in, 58; selection of, 42–43, 204
- Benchmarking methods/methodologies: compared by characteristics, 56–59; conceptual differences between types of, 54–56; and continuous improvement, 190; lack of documented success in, 190; and organization size, 58–59; resource requirements in, 58; selection of, 53–60; in training programs, 17; and transition from TQM to reinvention, 15–16; worksheet for selecting, 207
- Benchmarking models, 64
- Benchmarking partners: choosing similar and appropriate stakeholders as, 114–115; identifying and selecting, 68; roles of, 13

Benchmarking preparations, 49–61; consideration of desired outcomes and strategic goals in, 51; and customer/constituent benefits, 51–52; focus on critical and strategic processes in, 60–61; method selection in, 53–60; pitfalls to avoid, 60–61; readiness assessment steps in, 49–53; and resource needs, 52–53; selection of processes in, 60; weighing costs and benefits in, 52; worksheet for determining readiness in, 205–206

Benchmarking taxonomy, need for developing, 189–190

Benchmarking teams: implementation plan of, 13; important activities of, 65–66; member selection process in, 65; tasks of, 53–54

Best practices, 15; award programs as, 23–24; defining/use of term, 13, 21, 22; early promotion of, 21–22; emerging industry trends and, 23; evolving attitudes toward, 21–22; importing successfully, 73–74; local government's early focus on, 104; and performance-based budgeting, 23; search for, 88; self-declared, 22; sources of, 22–24

Blackwood, A., 128, 129

Bradley, J., 136

Budget staff, as key team players, 120–121

Bullock, K., 110

Burke, J., 107

## C

Camp, R. C., 12, 153

Carl Bertelsmann Prize, performance-based competition for, 24

Carmona, R., 169

Christensen, M., 117

Citizen surveys, as measure of quality, 38

Citizens, public sector benchmarking access for, 118–119

CoMET (Community of Metros) benchmarking studies, 154–155; establishment of common measures and best practices in, 155

Conover, J., 168

Continuous improvement practice, 97; and solution-driven benchmarking method, 19

Corporate benchmarking method, 64

Crisis preparations, benchmarking and best practices in, 168–169

Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, Fiscal Accountability and Best Management Practices award for, 110–111

Customer satisfaction, as key purpose for benchmarking projects, 108–110

Customers, public sector benchmarking roles of, 118–119

## D

Definitions and basic concepts, worksheet for, 198–199

*Department of the Navy Benchmarking Handbook* (Kraft), 64

Desired outcomes: identifying, 29; linked to outputs, 29–30

Developing countries, U.S. financial support for benchmarking in, 20

Discovery Gateway (Utah Children's Museum): best and promising practices in design process, 138; research and evaluation process in design of, 137–138; solution-driven benchmarking steps of, 138–139

## E

Efficiency, as fundamental goal for benchmarking, 107–108

Eichelberger, G., 111

Elected officials: and benchmarking for accountability, 162–164; and benchmarking readiness assessment, 118; public sector benchmarking roles of, 118

Eleven-step traditional benchmarking method, 64–74; data requests in, 70–71; defining process/function to be benchmarked in, 67–68; defining purpose and scope of, 66–67; examples of, 74–79; importance of completing all steps in, 69; importing and adapting best practices in, 71–72; need for continuous improvement in, 81; new best practice implementation in, 72–73; reconsideration of measurement system in, 73; summary of, 65 *fig. 4.1*

eNonprofit Benchmarks Study: sources of data and statistics for, 141–142; use of e-mail for advocacy in, 142

## F

Federal government, TQM and process improvement in, 15

Federal government benchmarking: and private sector's benchmarking influence, 104; and training activities, 19. *See also specific agency*

Federal Quality Institute (FQI), promotion of TQM by, 15

Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board (FRTIB), GAO criticism of benchmarking methods used by, 178

Festen, M., 133

Fiscal transparency: in public and nonprofit accountability, 165–166; and user-friendly budgets, 165

Foster children placement, benchmarking study on, 94–95

Frumkin, P., 127

## G

Gaebler, T., 15, 108

Ghobadian, A., 12

Gomes, D., 143

Government agencies, evolving use of performance measures in, 39–40.

*See also specific agency*

Government Auditing Standards, 183

Government executives, global benchmarking activities of, 103

Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), 16

Graduate School, USDA, Government Audit Training Institute: Executive Leadership Program's snow removal benchmarking study, 93–94; Pacific Islands Training Initiative/Virgin Islands Training Initiative (PITI/VITI) for knowledge- and skill-building of public sector employees, 148–150; Performance Auditing course, 174–175

Guam Memorial Hospital Authority (GMHA), 20; benchmarking readiness in, 49, 50; successful solution-driven benchmarking in, 89–91

Guam's Island Government Finance Officers Association: promotion of benchmarking tool in, 150; solution-driven method use by, 150

GuideStar database, and fiscal transparency, 165

## H

Harris, J., 92

Hartman, D., 78

Henderson, S., 20

Howard, M., 103, 106, 111

## I

ICMA's Center for Performance Measurement, 24

Imber, J. B., 127

Importing practices, risks in, 22, 24

Independent Sector, 128; as leadership forum for charitable giving programs/foundations, 163–164; and volunteer adoption of governance best practices, 163

Inputs: defining, 31, 34; selection of, 42

Internal staff, impetus for benchmarking created by, 119

International City/County Management Association: and benchmarking partnerships, 76–78; performance measurement involvement of, 76

International community benchmarking: in developing regions, 148; examples of, 148–156; general characteristics of, 147–148; readiness worksheet for, 215; stability of methodology of, 147–148

International government executives survey, goals of, 111

Internet and Web-based communication: and data collection costs, 71; forums for information sharing and improved transparency in, 166; and opportunities for nonprofit managers, 142–143; and performance data accessibility, 119; and public officials missteps, 164; technology, public sector use of, 23

IPOLO model of operations: components and process in, 31–32; link between outputs and outcomes in, 32–33

IPOLO model of performance measures: categories of, 33–39; cycle time and timeliness in, 36; error rate in, 38; examples of categories in, 37 *tab* 2.1; flow of performance measurement process in, 35; input and output components of, 34; productivity in, 35, 36; quality category in, 36–38; unit cost in, 36

## J

Jensen, A., 40–41

## K

Kettl, D. E., 108

Killmartin, B., 103, 106, 111

Kozlosky, C., 109

Kraft, J., 64

## L

Lake County, Indiana, benchmarking forum in, 167–168

Latimer, S., 149

Layton City, Iowa, management process in, 40–41

Layton, Utah, commuter rail system benchmarking study, as example of solution-driven benchmarking, 95–97

Learning organizations, created through benchmarking, 121–122; use of benchmarking methodologies in, 170

Learning performance measurement language, worksheet for, 200–201

Legislature-mandates benchmark systems, 105

*Level Best: How Small and Grassroots Nonprofits Can Tackle Evaluation and Talk Results* (Festin & Philbin), 133

Lipsky, M., 127

Local government benchmarking: and accountability to citizens, 123; and fiscal transparency issue, 165; goals of, 106–107; importance of coalitions in, 106; less formal approaches to, 122–123; peer influence on, 104; pressures for efficiency in, 107; value for tax dollars goal of, 109–110

## M

Management information system (MIS), and data collection requests, 70

- Medlin, S., 34, 51
- Missouri Accountability Portal (MAP), 166
- Moe, R. C., 108
- Municipal management, use of informal measurement process in, 40–41
- N**
- National associations, organization and facilitation of benchmarking studies by, 106
- National Partnership for Reinventing Government, 15
- Neighbor, H., 154
- Niger, World Bank's commissioned benchmarking study of, 154
- No Child Left Behind Act, 33
- Nongovernmental organizations, solution-driven benchmarking of, 18–19
- Nonprofit sector: categories of, 128–129; corporate donor ties to, 132; creative problem-solving practice in, 136–137; defined, 128–129; estimated size of, 128; financial and administrative resource limits in, 136; government grants as revenue source for, 132; growth of, 1960–2000, 129; historical reliance on instinct in, 133; as incubator for solutions, 136; independent sector in, 128; magnitude and influence of, 129–132; and nondistribution constraint, 128; performance management process in, 44; and public accountability, 132; revenues generated in, 129; unique and diverse organizations in, 129
- Nonprofit sector benchmarking: accountability pressures in, 124; adoption of, 12; board members' role in, 134; competition and communication in, 135; congressional actions addressing accountability in, 163–164; discovery process in, 133; examples of, 135–141; fiscal transparency in, 165; leadership as basis of first step in, 134; model of performance measures and strategic purpose for, 28–31; pressures and responses to benchmark in, 132–133; search for best practices in, 127; solution-driven approach to, 18, 128, 133–134; streamlined approach in, 134
- North Carolina Benchmarking Project, broad coalition and process in, 113–114
- O**
- O'Neill, M., 127, 129
- Ontario, Canada, municipalities: Mandatory Performance Measurement Program in, 107–108; and provincial government partnership with, 107–108
- Oregon state government benchmarking: emphasis on outcomes and partnerships in, 104; incorporating general public in, 118; setting and publishing of performance standards by, 104–105; unique approach of, 105
- Organization size, and benchmarking method, 58–59
- Organizational cultural change, solution-driven benchmarking resulting from, 97
- Organizational learning, simple model for, 188
- Osborne, D. E., 15, 108
- Outcome measures: defined, 39; links between outputs and, 38, 39; and long-term strategies and goals, 38
- Output measures, as benchmarking focus, 42–43
- Outputs: and achievement of outcomes, 29, 32–33, 38; defined, 34–35; and

- desired outcomes, 29–30; determination of, 29; multiple, need for, 33
- P**
- Pacific region, international benchmarking in, 148–150. *See also* Graduate School, USDA, Government Audit Training Institute
- Park City Municipal Corporation, and user-friendly budgets, 165
- Partner organizations: data collection from, 70–71; and performance between processes, 71–72
- Partners, use of term, 13
- Patrick, R., 109
- Pegnato, J. A., 108
- Perez, L., 89–91
- Performance Institute, best practices database of, 24
- Performance measures/measurement: basic model of, 28–31; as benchmarking, 119; challenges in public and nonprofit sectors, 43–44; choosing, 69–70; and citizen priorities, 119; in city management, 40–41; compared in benchmarking process, 41–42; desired outcomes in, 29–30; difficulty of linking outputs to outcomes in, 32–33; federal government use of, 33–40; funding as inputs in, 31; and implementation of best practices, 41–42; improvements and, 42; and overall public perception of government, 119; process in, 30, 119; used to identify performance problems, 41. *See also* IPOLO model of performance measures
- Performance-based budgeting (PBB), 23
- Philbin, M., 133
- Pollak, T.H., 128, 129
- Poister, P. H., 18
- Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act (PAEA), 167
- Private sector benchmarking, traditional approach to, 11, 64
- Problem-solving models, solution-driven method distinguished from, 98
- Process, defining, 30, 34
- Process measures: linked with output measures, 42–43; worksheet for developing, 202–203
- Process owners, as key team players, 120–121
- Promising practices: sources of, 23–24, 214; use of term, 22
- Public organizations, model of performance measures and strategic purpose for, 28–31
- Public relations, benchmarking to improve, 167–168
- Public sector accountability: of executives, 162; fiscal transparency and benchmarking in, 165; internal and taxpayer, 110
- Public sector benchmarking: adoption and evolution of, 12, 14, 15–17; benefits of involving appropriate stakeholders in, 112, 114; efficacy of, 121–122; evaluation of stakeholders to include in, 112; formation of broad coalitions in, 113–114; identifying significant stakeholders in, 117–121; involving similar partners in, 114; performance management process in, 43–44; prevalence of, 103; and private sector advances, 23; ranking of goals in, 106; reinvention activities and practices in, 15–16; requirement for strategic plan in, 16; use of less formal approach to, 122

## Q

Quality: defined, 38; measures, 36–38

## R

Recalibration, as standard practice in benchmarking, 74

*Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector* (Osborne & Gaebler), 108

Reinventing government initiative, benchmarking and performance comparison in, 15–16

Resort Community Benchmarking Group, partnering with similar municipal governments, 114–115

Resource requirements, in traditional versus solution-driven method, 58

## S

Salt Lake County, Utah, solution-driven benchmarking project in, 122–123

Scotland's VisitScotland (tourist board): best practice categories in, 151–152; comprehensive international benchmarking effort of, 150–152

Segal, G., 165, 166

Senior leaders, benchmarking study roles of, 119–120

Shaping America's Youth (SAY), benchmarking efforts of, 168

Shister, G., 164

Simple model of performance measures: components of, 28–31; and linkage between organizational strategies and daily operations, 28

Small governments, solution-driven benchmarking of, 18

Smith, S. R., 127

Solution-driven benchmarking method, 17–19; audit plan integrated with, 219–220; auditors' use of, 179–182; causes of failure in, 98; comparative analysis and overview of, 53–59, 85–86; complexity of, 57; distinguished from common sense, 97–98; elements of a finding linked to, 222; examples of, 89–97; facilitation of, 18–19; funding/ implementing best practices in, 88–89; further development needed in, 190; impetus for, 18; implementation vulnerability in, 98; involvement of managers and leaders in, 57–58; local government level, example of, 122–123; monitoring progress in, 89; problem-solving criteria in, 88; and process analysis, 58; search for best practices in, 86; steps taken in, 19, 54, 55 *tab*3.1; worksheet for work steps in, 211–213; writing audit steps for, 221

Southern Utah Recycling Coalition (SURC): as example of solution-driven benchmarking, 93; search for promising practices in, 90, 92; waste stream analysis project of, 91–93

Speller, S., 12

State government, and fiscal transparency issue, 165

State government benchmarking: and community coalitions, 106; goals of, 106–107; peer influence on, 104.

*See also specific state*

State legislatures, bill to improve states' fiscal transparency, 166

Strategic plan: development of, 31; and organization's desired outcomes, 29, 31; and team charter, 13

Summers, A., 165, 166

## T

Technology, facilitation of benchmarking through, 17, 18–19

Thompson, J. R., 108

Total quality management (TQM), 12–13, 14

Traditional benchmarking method, 17; auditors' use of, 176–179; benefits of, 63; checklists for, 208–210; compared with solution-driven method, 53–59; complexity of, 57; discovery and defining of problem in, 86–87; examples of, 74–79; and faulty processes as source of organization's problem, 58; five steps in, 87; identifying and evaluating important measures in, 63; and implementation of proven best practices, 63–64; involvement of managers and leaders in, 57–58; simple and sequential actions in, 64; steps in, 53–54, 86–89. *See also* Eleven-step traditional benchmarking method

Transformation of function, benchmarking for, 111

## U

U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI): benchmarking study of royalty management programs, 78–79; benchmarking training in, 20; and search for promising practices, 182

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): benchmarking project in, 19; Program Assessment Review Tool (PART), 52–53; Superfund benchmarking evaluation, 74–75

U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), benchmarking in, 41

U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO): criticisms of benchmarking

studies, 178; reason for name change of, 162–163; use of performance measures in, 39–40

U.S. Postal Service, benchmarking for internal accountability in, 166–167

USDA Child & Adult Care Food Program (CACFP), 140–141

USDA executive development programs, benchmarking projects in, 19

Utah Benchmarking Project: defined purpose of, 116; leaders' pivotal role in, 120; organizations involved in, 115; participating partners in, 116; survey instrument created in, 116–117; use of technology in, 71

Utah Food Bank Services (UFBS), 139, 140; accountability to donors and volunteers in, 140; formal and informal benchmarking in, 139–140; internal performance measures used in, 140, 141; services and service delivery in, 139, 140

Utah's Zoo, Arts, and Parks Tax, non-profits' solution-driven approach to, 135–136

## W

Walden, R. M., 161

Web 2.0 communication advances, 23. *See also* Internet and Web-based communication

Welsh, W., 22

Whitney, S., 138

Wiki online communities, public sector use of, 23

Williams, S. E., 153

## X

Xerox benchmarking methodology, overview of, 13

<http://www.pbookshop.com>