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FOREWORD

Thank you to the National Development and Reform Commission of China, State Law Office and the Asian Development Bank, State Information Center and IBM China Corp., for the invitation and the opportunity to learn and share at this interesting conference. I want to thank the State Development and Reform Commission for inviting me to the Conference Committee. I am glad to be here as a teacher and learner not to profess that my colleagues and I know the right way to engage in strategic planning. As a teacher I live through the experiences of my students, and I learn that I may share some insights from our experiences. I think this is a useful analogy of the process of capacity building: that the more we learn and share that learning the more there is capacity in communities to learn.

I realise that this Conference comes as China is well and truly expert in the development of long-term plans. For several decades China has prepared, implemented and learned from long-term plans. Indeed some scholars of strategy say that Chinese philosophers of war were first to document the lessons of strategic planning, such as in the writings of Sun-Tzu (c. 400 BC).

So I feel daunted in sharing the comparatively little experience we have in this field.

In preparing this talk I found the English version of the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) http://www.chinacp.com/eng/cp_concepts.html focused on "Cleaner Production in China" which cited Environment Australia, and Victorian Environment Protection Authority. But did you know about the South Australian Government's work on implementing ISO 1400 in the Upstream Petroleum Industry?

Like the Cleaner Production Promotion Law approved by the National People's Congress June 2002, the South Australian Government approved a revised Petroleum Act in 2000 (PIRSA, 1998a). The mechanism for the reform in the measurement and transparency of environmental impact and the regulation of the upstream petroleum industry came from a class discussion with one of my Masters students, Michael Malavazos in MESA in 1998.

The Chinese National Ninth Five-Year Plan for Environmental; Protection and the Long term Targets for the Year 2010 (http://www.zhb.gov/english/plan/nine.htm ) all "Major Planned Indices " are stated in quantitative terms of discharged tons of pollutants - what of quality outcomes and quality of life indicators? There are 7 Major measures stated in qualitative terms. But how are they being measured, monitored and evaluated? How will the next generation feel the impact of the outcomes of the Cleaner Production Promotion Law, how will it be measured monitored and evaluated? How will the environmental management be improved?

I don't profess to have the answers to these questions. Nevertheless, there may be some useful insights into these questions from the experience of my students and I in South Australia. I will also focus on the local and provincial levels of Government, rather than the national, not only because that is where my main experience has been, but also because that is most often where the national strategic planning and policy implementation has come unravelled (e.g. Pressman, & Wildavsky, 1973, 1983).

However little our experience is compared to the Chinese, I cannot completely cover all the work my colleagues and I have been involved with while integrating systems of performance management.
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and evaluation with strategic and operation (project) planning. But I will introduce what I see as the ‘pros’ and the ‘cons’ of our work and provide some references of relevant papers which elaborate on these issues for those who want more.

The proposed 30 minute talk will examine the insights which might be gained from learning about the strategic planning process from three analogies: visioning, weaving and attaining. As we learn from each analogy we can see the lessons in some examples in the South Australian context.

For clarification or follow up of any of the points made below, please feel free to contact:

Dr Colin A. Sharp; Associate Professor of Management
Flinders Institute of Public Policy and Management, Flinders University
Ph: +61 -8 - 8201- 2629; Fax: +61 -8 - 8201- 2273
Email: colin.sharp@flinders.edu.au
URL: http://www.ssn.flinders.edu.au/fippm/

Or

Dr Colin A. Sharp, Managing Director
P.E.R.S.O.N.A.L. (Research & Evaluation) Consultancy Pty Ltd
78 Capella Drive, Hallett Cove; South Australia, 5158
Phone & Fax: (+61 -8) 8387 5569;
Mobile: +61 - 419 390 030
Email: PERSONAL.RESEARCH@bigpond.com
URL: http://www.users.bigpond.com/PERSONAL.RESEARCH/
THREE WAYS TO WEAVE EVALUATION INTO PLANNING

1. Visioning - Consultative Processes as a basis for strategic planning and evaluation

According to a famous French modern poet visioning is about leadership as well as shared values and goals:

"If you want to build a ship,
than don’t drum up men to gather wood, give orders, and divide the work.
Rather, teach them to yearn for the far and endless sea.
As for the future, your task is not to foresee it,
but to enable it"

from “The Wisdom of the Sands” by Antoine de Saint-Exupery
(b. June 1900 - d. July 1944; see http://www.westegg.com/exupery/)

This inspirational analogy helps to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the strategic leadership process. On the one hand building a common shared community vision can lead to greater motivation and cooperation among stakeholders, but it often entails a great deal of time and effort in the consultation and engagement with the community affected. Here is an example of how the effort put into community visioning process can help in integrating short-term and long-term planning. It also shows the process of capacity building by sharing and learning and suggests the importance of the integration of education and evaluation in that process.

1.1 Community consultation for a vision of the City of Mitcham in the year 2030.

Australia has three levels of elected Government. In South Australia the State (i.e., second level or provincial) Government passed a law (section 120 of the Local Government Act of 1999) which made the districts (City Councils) report annually to the state, and the local constituents, on each three to five year strategic plan to be developed with community consultation. In 1999 & 2000 the City of Mitcham (the Local Government district in which Flinders University resides) developed such a plan for the ensuing 5 years. But it was not able to engage the community in that process. In preparation for the next plan the management and Council of the City decided to develop a thorough consultative strategy to engage the

---

1 FIPPM has been involved with a number of local government programs through our teaching of a Graduate Certificate in Local Government Management (see http://www.ssn.flinders.edu.au/fippm/courses/gcpsm.php). It is useful to also consider the innovative work at the City of Marion, also a neighbour of Flinders University, especially see their Community Plan, and Corporate Plan: http://www.marion.sa.gov.au/Web/webmar.nsf/SearchAlldocs/Community+Plan+:+Working+Together and their sustainability index see http://www.marion.sa.gov.au/Web/webmar.nsf/Lookup/Sustainability which is part of the local effort towards the United Nations Local Agenda 21 see http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/sustainability/la21.html

2 The population is about 60,000 in an area of about 127 km² see www.id.com.au/mitcham/commprofile/
community as much as possible. To do so they approached me at Flinders Institute of Public Policy and Management (FIPPM) to assist them. As part of a partnership which began early last year, between Flinders Institute of Public Policy and Management (FIPPM) and Mitcham City Council the following brief was agreed to advise on the planning and delivery of the consultative process (over the ensuing 9 months\(^3\)). It is summarised here to illustrate one of a number of possible processes for developing a common vision in the community, which can then be the basis for a strategic plan and associated budget priorities.

1.1.1 Aim:
The aim of the community consultation was to establish an agreed vision for the future of the City through a consensus-building and non-adversarial approach that will:
- Provide the opportunities for as many as possible of the stakeholders in the community to be involved.
- get participants to think strategically (with a focus on the long term)
- highlight those issues that need greatest attention, and indicate the level of resources expected to address those issues.

1.1.2 Why a Vision for 2030

The literature on sustainability suggests that we need to at least talk about "inter-generation equity" meaning what we do now will have its costs and benefits in the next generation. Its another "rule of thumb" in the literature on sustainability that this means we have to be accountable for the results or outcomes of our plans in 20 to 30 years time (or roughly the time it takes for a generation to come into its own). Also we know that it takes about that long to be able to develop a good environmental, and urban infrastructure like roads, water catchments and re-vegetation programs. So communities have to plan and save for them now to have the benefits in 20 to 30 years time! That's why we targeted the year 2030. A draft timeline and snapshot of responsibilities is set out in Table 1.

1.1.3 Lessons Learned

The process of community consultation has recently reached its peak and we are awaiting the decision of the Elected Members and then we will report (Further details will be available at: http://www.mitchamcouncil.sa.gov.au/content/council/stratplan/stratplan.htm). So it is only possible at this stage to speculate as to the outcome of the process. However, here are some of my perceptions and learnings:

* it is useful to have joint partnership with City Council staff & researchers and teachers;
* involvement of graduate research students (especially PhDs) is a way to build capacity & share learning;
* the community should get plenty of opportunity to participate (reminder letters, papers, rate notice and WWW site) and several "entry points" and each meeting they have another opportunity, and different times for their participation;

---

\(^3\) This section is drawn from the Strategic Planning Brief Building Tomorrow's Mitcham Today (by Richard Bowey, Cam Opie & Meredith Nunan, City of Mitcham, 7 May 2003). I also acknowledge the collaboration and contribution of my colleague Dr Janet McIntyre and former student Jon Deakin (an Elected Member for Holdfast Bay, a neighbouring council in Adelaide see http://www.holdfast.sa.gov.au/), as well as the various international and local graduate students who helped with various tasks.
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* at the consultative meetings:
  - Elected Members encouraged to attend as observers & to listen **not** to hold the floor;
  - all community attendees get equal turns to say their piece, and everyone listens, without interruption;
  - make it clear that the aim is **not** to write the vision statement, but to develop a community understanding and clarification of what the strategic options (scenarios) are and what they might cost and what trade-offs are likely;
  - it is important that the participants give indication about how they would make those choices and not leave it to the Elected Members and Council Staff;
  - every type of session sought the immediate reaction of participants using an anonymous evaluation form so we could gain feedback and respond to concerns as they emerged, as well as improve the process the next time.

* equal status given to Steering Committee and Evaluation Committee (each composed of Elected Members and non-elected volunteer community representatives as well as experts) and to be recognised as sub-Committees under the Council, which gave them credibility and resource support;  

* it is important to have an emergent approach to the design of the consultative process and meeting agenda and procedures, not sticking to rigid or academic processes.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2003</th>
<th>Background / context paper</th>
<th>Council to prepared (in consultation with FIPPM) and distribute background paper to inform Stage 1 participants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|           | Context Statement           | • information sheets  
|           |                             | • issues  
|           |                             | • constraints  
|           |                             | • opportunities  |
| August 2003 | Stage 1 - Vision workshop | Vision workshop: about 120 participants attended, plus 20 staff & 5 international students as observers  
|           | FIPPM - workshop leader/facilitator   | to write-up workshop outcomes  
|           | Council – staff to act as facilitators/scribes for small groups | Provide administrative and technical support  
|           | Three sessions in the day started divergent then converged on 9 issues. |

---

4 Mitcham is not the only City in Australia to make a commitment to the importance of evaluation in its strategic planning process, see also [www.noosa.qld.gov.au/strategicplanning/](http://www.noosa.qld.gov.au/strategicplanning/) and Vasiliauskas (2003).

5 I have been involved with many community consultations applying the Nominal Group Technique (see Delbecq, & Van de Ven, 1971; Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975) e.g., Multi-Purpose Services (Andrews, Dunn, Hagger, Sharp, & Witham, 1995). But these consultative exercises were designed for efficiency and short-term effectiveness. To enable a longer-term commitment from the community it is important to engage the stakeholders in the design of the consultative process as well as the content of the exercise (see Heron, 1999; Heron, & Reason, 2000)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept/Oct 2003</th>
<th>Stage 2 - Issue workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(based on the focus issues derived from the stage 1 vision workshop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIPPM &amp; Council Staff distilled the findings of the day and identified four issues/areas as foci for small groups to flesh out:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• land use, environment and transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• economic development; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open to new participants as well as the participants as per stage 1 (vision workshop) three to six focus group meetings (from 5 to 45 participants) in each group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIPPM– observers of each workshop;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To help integrate the write-up of workshop outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council staff to act as facilitators/scribes for small groups &amp; workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide administrative and technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Elected Members undertake broader community consultation to inform the issue workshops. For example:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information Summary in Council News</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus Groups attended by residents &amp; community groups (short - 2 hour / long - 4 hour);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• attend/hold neighbourhood meetings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• collaborative techniques used in preliminary information gathering stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Each topic area had a special two hour information session with local experts, open to the whole community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November 2003</th>
<th>Consultation on Stage 1 and Stage 2 outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(to inform Stage 3 Summit workshop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council initiates survey/questionnaire to obtain feedback on community priorities, concerns and values. Collaborative techniques to be used may include(as necessary):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Activities held with students and staff of schools;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Householder Survey and Business Owner and Employee Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• street tents;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• written surveys and web responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mid to late February 2004</th>
<th>Stage 3 - Summit workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summit workshop: attended by about 60 participants as per vision workshop including others as identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants given 7 dots⁶ to allocate across a range of strategic options for three possible scenarios: Best case (fully funded - e.g. from borrowings or rate rises), Probable (partially or fully funded, but may involve partnerships), and Minimal (mostly by advocacy and partnerships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flinders University - leader/facilitator of workshop to write-up workshop outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council staff to act as small group facilitators/scribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide administrative and technical support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶ The use of dots came from a previous Council consultative process; the focus on 3 scenarios came from FIPPM.
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1.1.4 What next?

Once the allocation of dots gave an "indication" of the preferences of the non-elected participants, the ranking of the strategic options was fed back to the participants and the Elected Members. At a subsequent meeting of the Elected Members the same allocation of preferences was conducted. A similar list of priorities emerged from the two processes, which raised the perception that some of the Elected Members had changed their views. The staff then have the task of processing and collating the material into a proposal for the long-term (the year 2030), as well as the short-term, to put to the Council in preparation for the vote on the next 5 year plan and the next annual budget. The Evaluation Committee has the task of setting up the process for followup into the next generation. The Flinders Institute of Public Policy and Management has the task of monitoring the process and reporting on it to students, and other communities.

So far it seems that there is a great deal of common ground which has emerged from the community participants and the Elected Members arriving at similar priorities for the short to long term. There appeared to be a high degree of satisfaction with the process reported from those who participated (indeed the evaluation forms from the 33 respondents showed high satisfaction ratings on average). It remains to be seen what the outcomes will be. It also should be followed up as to the needs of the groups who did not take the opportunity to be personally represented in the process (e.g the 25 to 35 year olds). But the aim of getting "participants to think strategically" (with a focus on the long term) seems to have been achieved. This case study shows the importance of planning for, and integrating the evaluation into, the consultative and planning process, towards the long term as well as the immediate reaction of participants.

2. Weaving: Models for Integrating the Planning and Evaluation Process

_Yun chou wei wo_  
i.e, devising strategies within a command tent  

History has shown that devising strategy in the 'command tent' is one way to prepare well for the strategic tasks of Government. Planning can be facilitated by having a _model_ of the relationships being developed and to plan every aspect in an integrated manner using that model. Thus perhaps we could paraphrase another proverb 'one shared planning model is worth a thousand plans'. Indeed according to the information provided there may be as many as 6,000 plans from different levels and regions of the Chinese Government to deal with in the planning process. So it should be easier to understand and use these various plans if we 'weave' them together with a common framework and/or a common thread.

2.1 "EVALUATION" - ITS MEANING & METHODS

_E-valu-ation_ is derived from the concept of making judgements about the _value_ of something based on certain criteria (see Scriven, 1991).
Program evaluation has traditionally been aimed at being a useful investigative tool of management for decision making about the need for the operation or administration (including its outputs and outcomes), and the performance of the operation (see Patton, 1986).

2.2 Using Common Evaluation Criteria

Another advantage of devising strategy in the 'command tent' is the opportunity to coordinate around a common set of evaluation criteria, and measures of performance. In Australia the public sector has adopted a standard approach to performance information (see Sharp & Lindsay, 1992; Sharp, 1994; Sharp, Roffey & Lewis, 1993) requirements in terms of:

♦ efficiency
♦ effectiveness and
♦ appropriateness

of their strategies and operations, and the needs, goals and satisfaction of the stakeholders.

To gather a balanced approach to these performance measurements managers and evaluation practitioners should at least follow a strategic analysis of the organisation’s management and corporate governance. One such analysis has identified that there are at least four basic areas where those responsible for the management and corporate governance of the organisation, must have relevant and current information: needs, goals, satisfactions and transfers.

The most used definition of evaluation in the Australian context was that of the "Baume Report", which stated that "social program evaluation is the process of thoroughly and critically reviewing the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of any program or group of programs." (Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare, 1979a, p. 5). The Baume Report's definition of evaluation has been an influential framework for most of the states and the Commonwealth government agencies. As such it will provide the most relevant criteria for evaluation of the Chinese Clean Production and Local Government projects. The relationship between these criteria, can be demonstrated in the Figure 1 below.

Referring to Figure 1 (which shows a common model of evaluation), the three types of evaluative criteria which the evaluation of Local Government services must address are:

- **Efficiency** is a measure of outputs over inputs, or the amount of output (e.g. the specific tasks completes by the graduates from a training project or employment skills program) for the given inputs (the resource consumed in $ and people costs).

- **Effectiveness** is an estimate of relationship between the outcomes for the intended recipients and the objectives of the project. It is a measure of the extent that output achieves objectives (i.e., did the project encourage the clients to achieve the intended outcomes).

- **Appropriateness** is an indication of the relevance of program objectives to actual community or young people's needs.

Generally this model uses the terms:

- **Input** to describe the financial, physical and human resources which are allocated and consumed to enable a program or project to operate.
FIGURE 1: Relationship between Evaluative Criteria in Determining Effectiveness of Training

Context: Organisational Cultural, Economic, Political, Legal, Social & Ethical Norms

This diagram (based on Sharp, Roffey & Lewis 1993; and Sharp, 1994) gives a perspective on the relationship between the three main evaluation criteria.
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Processes to mean the operations of the project or program which include the participation of the stakeholders, e.g., the medical treatments administered.

Outputs to refer to the tangible products or immediate results created by the project or program (e.g. the number of clients surviving surgery).

Outcomes for the more or less intangible consequences for the clients of the outputs (e.g. the increased well-being following the surgery).

From Figure 1 we can say that:

**Appropriateness**: is the degree of match or fit between the program's objectives and outcomes compared with the expectations or needs of the clients and other stakeholders. For example, appropriateness relates to the following questions:

- how acceptable is the program to those who have an interest in the program?
- did its staff do 'the right things'?
- is this a "quality" program?

**Efficiency**: is the comparison of inputs (costs) and outputs, usually the cost per unit product or service (e.g., person hours per client serviced by the surgical team per day). Not to be confused with "cost/effectiveness" which refers to the efficiency with regard to the objectives (or benefits) of the program. Did the staff 'do things right'?

**Effectiveness**: is the degree of match or fit between the program's performance and its objectives; i.e., how well does it meet its objectives?

2.3 Evaluation Models and Tools

A commonly used evaluation planning tool is called *program logic* (see Lenne & Cleland, 1987; Funnell, & Lenne, 1990; Funnell, 1997; Mayne, 1999) around a common model or common goals or intended outcomes of the strategy or plans.

Logical inference is also important in the design of a program in order to clarify the goals and objectives of the program or service, in the context of the strategic plan and management policies of the whole organisation. A technique often used in program evaluation to link the evaluation with the total cycle of the program's planning, initiation, operation, outcomes, impact and decision processes, is called "program logic" or implementation analysis. The technique is based on the logical inference of linkage from one element of the program to the next. It is used to analyse the overall framework of objectives into a logical causal relationship (see Lenne & Cleland, 1987). Generic outcome hierarchies can be developed which can be used a templates or guides to review the training program's implementation and the results obtained (see Lenne & Cleland, 1987, here as attachment 1)..
2.3.1 Program Logic

Basically the **program logic** method involves the following steps:

- **⇒** clarify the (1) **purpose and (2) type** of the program being reviewed (whether it is focused on individual skills or competency development training per se, or more broadly educational, or advisory; versus an organizational culture or attitudinal change management program, etc.);

- **⇒** identify (3) who are the **intended participants** (e.g., level of experience, existing competencies; numbers and types of job positions);

- **⇒** what do they (4) **need**? (e.g., build skills, competence, confidence; vs knowledge, experience, understanding?)

- **⇒** how can we demonstrate (5) that the training program **influenced the participants** and contributed to the reduction in need, or satisfaction of desired outcome? how can we determine whether any differences obtained were intended or unintended?

- **⇒** determine the (6) **logic of the relationships** between the components of the program

- **⇒** develop and use a (7) **relevant outcomes hierarchy** to generate specific indicators or statements of outcomes for the program (e.g., specify attributes of the stakeholders and what their expectations are for what type of results, etc.);

  - specify **efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness** indicators in terms of program inputs, process, outputs and expected outcomes.

Above all there must be continuing interactive processes of monitoring and evaluation of performance of the participants and the program, e.g., use **benchmarking** (see LGSA; Sharp, 1994b, 1994d, 1994f; Talbot & Sharp, 1994) to compare the program outcomes you generate with those from outcomes hierarchy used in comparable organisations, or programs, to see whether there are major differences and to interpret why such differences might occur:

  - a) decide whether any of these differences are unsatisfactory and take appropriate steps to rectify;

  - b) identify what factors would have contributed to the successful achievement of these outcomes (by consultation with key informants and other stakeholders, and by reviewing the implementation processes conducted);

  - c) which of these factors were due to the operation of your program and can be demonstrated to be controllable?

  - d) which of these factors were not due to the operation of your program or did not appear to be controllable?

  - e) determine whether these factors can be brought under managerial control in the program;
f) what are the activities which can operate to produce success factors in future?

g) examine the program and outcomes again in terms of the generic hierarchy and determine the level of information required to monitor and manage the process in future.

For example, Figure 2 shows how this method of program logic may be applied to the design of evaluation of a training program such as might be used in teaching communities about the China Clean Production program. Funnell (1997; Lenne & Funnell, & Lenne, 1993) focus program logic on developing an outcomes hierarchy, ie. an *ex ante* approach, starting from design of a program to incorporate the various components and measures to meet its intended target outputs and outcomes.

Figure 2 also draws on another approach to program logic in the way auditors may use it *post hoc* to assess the contribution of the program to the observed outcomes. This is what the Auditor-General’s Office of Canada calls “attribution analysis” (Mayne, 1999), which means, *after* the program is operating, examining the outcomes and attempting to use program logic to interpret what contribution the program made to those results. Again this means identifying the factors that were and were not able to be controlled.
FIGURE 2: EXAMPLE OF PROGRAM LOGIC & OUTCOMES HIERARCHY: China Clean Production Training
(Adapted from Funnell, 1997; Mayne, 1999)

Program Components

Inputs
- (program resources provided for its work)

Activities
- (how the program carries out its work)

Outputs
- (goods and services produced by the program)

Reach
- (the recipients of the outputs)

Immediate Outcomes
- (the first-level effects of the activities and outputs)

Intermediate Outcomes
- (the benefits and changes resulting from the activities & outputs)

Ultimate Outcomes
- (the final or long-term

Components Able To Be Controlled

Examples in a Community:
- staff skills, equipment, budget
- materials, analytical model
- training sessions
  - negotiating other services, identifying audience,
  - teaching trainers, followup, service notes
- air quality reports, medication levels
  - referrals given, number of people trained,
  - information provided, equipment used
- industry leaders/ community leaders
  - community groups / workers / schools
- trainee reaction/satisfaction with training
  - learning of participants / trainers
  - program qualitative objectives,

Components Unable To Be Controlled

Examples in a Community:
- community's health, cultural appropriateness
- weather, infrastructure (roads/ drains/ sewage,
- community / industry activities
- other distracting training, community / industry

- community / industry responses
- response of other services,

- ethnic groups /cultural differences
- how the message is spread to extended family & friends

- discomfort with setting / rejection of ideas
- dissatisfaction with presenter
- intervention by others

- dissatisfaction with costs
- other pollution interventions
- family/community not changing

- air slow to change
- community attitudes slow to change
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| consequences of the program | tourism improves | other health complications |
I have developed what I call the **NA-GA-SA-T® model of strategic performance measurement**, to identify the key minimum types of information required to be able to monitor the performance on the organisation (Sharp 1989, 1991, 1996). The purpose of such a model is to give guidance on key information required to give a basis for strategic evaluation in the service of the organisational governance. This model is based on the gathering of useful and current information on **Stakeholders’**:

- **Needs**, (e.g. what people want and what they need)
- **Goals & Outcomes** (what the program is trying to achieve and the results in terms of the needs and outcomes for the participants)
- **Satisfactions** (the degree to which expectations may have been met or not) *and*
- **Transfers** (the learning, competence and capacity building which can be passed on to others involved).

All those accountable for performance evaluation run the risk of **goal displacement** if they do not follow a strategic approach to measuring performance in terms of stakeholders’ needs as well as organisational and management goals.

So for corporate governance **performance evaluation** has to recognise the importance of non-financial performance evaluation in an ‘balanced’ approach which keeps focus on not just the goals of the corporate strategy, but also the **needs** of the stakeholders. In corporate governance terms the key stakeholders, include not only the ‘customers’, ‘clients’ of the organisation, consumers or end users of the Government or voluntary services, but also the Boards of Directors as their representatives. Also **Strategic Evaluation** must account for the role of the critical third party regulators (e.g., the Australian Companies and Securities Commission, the Australian Consumer and Competition Commission) in the reporting of performance.

In order to appreciate the relevance a common framework or model, it is useful to examine a case study of systematic use of evaluation in establishing a client focused quality management system in community based health and aged care in Australia, viz: the Multi-Purpose Services (Commonwealth/State funded) are community based health and aged care centres in rural and remote Australia. Initially there were 7 in the pilot evaluation we conducted (see Andrews, Dunn, Hagger, Sharp & Whitham 1995; Dunn, 1997) but because the evaluation showed how successful they could be, now there are many Multi-Purpose Services across Australia.

### 2.3.2 NAAGASAT® Performance Measurement Model

The model addresses the risk of information overload and considers the fundamental information needed to be able to appropriately monitor the performance of the organisation and its management. But not all organisations want to integrate the financial with the non-financial performance. Some want a framework for evaluation of effectiveness and appropriateness of the organisation or its programs. For example a simpler approach has been tried by public sector and third sector human services organisations like: the Australian Youth Foundation (AYF & Sharp, 1996; Seres, 1997), and Multi-Purpose Services (Andrews et al, 1995; Dunn, 1997), the Department of Family and Community Services of SA: Committee on Performance Measurement on developing outcome based measures suitable for performance monitoring in contracting of outsourced services (see Baulderstone and Sharp, 1997); the Petroleum Group of Mines and Energy of SA, Department of Primary Industries of South Australia): especially *EnviroWatch* using Goal Attainment Scaling in monitoring and evaluating environmental...
impacts of natural resource industries with provision for close involvement of various stakeholders and community interest groups (see Malavazos and Sharp, 1997, as explained below).

The model involves various techniques like Nominal Group consultative processes (Delbecq, A. & Van de Ven 1971; Delbecq, et al, 1975) for needs assessment and satisfaction assessment (not just using survey questions) and Goal Attainment Scaling (Kiresuk, Smith & Cardillo, 1994) which will be elaborated later.

Figure 3 is an overview of the program logic of the NAGASAT\textsuperscript{\textregistered} model of performance measurement for evaluation as it was applied in the development of the management information system and evaluation of the Australian Multi-Purpose Services (see Andrews et al 1995; Dunn, 1997). Basically the methodology links performance measurement to the basic accountability points for strategic plans. The needs of the stakeholders, the goals of the program, the processes and outcomes (Goal Attainment Scaling and assessing satisfaction of stakeholders about process and outcomes) and the degree of transfer of knowledge for learning and continuous improvement. An example of GAS applied to a program within the Multi-Purpose Services is shown in Figure 7 (at the end).
**FIGURE 3: EXAMPLE OF PROGRAM LOGIC OF NaGaSaT IN THE MULTI-PURPOSE SERVICES (SOUTH AUSTRALIA)**

(To link Needs, Goals and Satisfactions for Transferability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION PROCESS:</th>
<th>DATA TO BE OBTAINED:</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIENTS NEEDS IDENTIFIED</strong> (Nominal Group process)</td>
<td>⇒ Needs of elderly people in rural areas  -  - asthma death in Streaky Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNED OUTCOMES DERIVED FROM NEEDS</strong></td>
<td>⇒ access Flying Doctor Service           - identify site for airstrip for RFDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ access asthma education program        - needs trained Nurses to teach program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTCOMES STATED IN TERMS OF GOAL ATTAINMENT SCALES</strong></td>
<td>⇒ develop airstrip for Flying Doctor Service       - asthma attacks reduced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICES PROFILED ACCORDING TO NEEDS TO GIVE EFFECT TO PLANNED OUTCOMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Goal Attainment Scales scores          - client GAS Scores linked to Program scores - community health indicators improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ Program GAS scores linked to strategic goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEY STAKEHOLDERS SATISFACTION / REACTIONS TO TRAINING SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>⇒ Satisfactions &amp; Areas for Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Satisfaction survey questionnaire data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNINGS TRANSFERRED</strong></td>
<td>⇒ Report written /Data Disseminated</td>
<td>Program GAS Scores compared across MPS sites- community capacity improves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⇒ MPS site GAS scores linked to strategic goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**IMPROVED PROGRAM MANAGEMENT** ⇒ **IMPROVED CAPACITY OF HEALTH AND AGED CARE SYSTEM IN REMOTE AREAS.**
FIGURE 4: AN ATTEMPT AT A COMMON MODEL FOR EXPLAINING EVALUATION

PROGRAM EVALUATION MODELS & DEFINITIONS
Based on Sharp, Roffey & Lewis (1993)

Context: Cultural, Economic, Political, Legal, Social & Ethical Norms
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Figure 4 is based on Figure 1 but also shows how needs, goals, satisfactions and transfers relate to the over all program as part of the Local Government organisation as a system in the context of the social, economic and political forces. Also Figure 4 shows the important relationship between these forms of performance information and the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions (see below).

Here we can only focus on one aspect of the performance measurement: Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) because it also shows how a measurement tool can help facilitate the outcomes of strategic planning. This will be explained further in the next section.

3. **Attaining** – Planning and measuring the degree of attainment of intended outcomes.

---

**Leading a Horse to Water versus Getting It to Drink**

"The shift from service goals to outcomes often proves difficult in programs and agencies that have a long history of focusing of services and activities. But even where the difference is understood and appreciated, some fear or resistance may emerge. One reason is that service providers are well schooled in the proverbial wisdom that 'you can lead a horse to water, but you can’t make it drink.'

This familiar adage illuminates the challenge of committing to outcomes. The desired outcome is that the horse drinks the water. Longer-term outcomes are that the horse stays healthy and works effectively. But because program staff know they can’t make a horse drink water, they focus on the things they can control: leading the horse to water, making sure the tank is full, monitoring the quality of the water, and keeping the horse within drinking distance of the water. In short, they focus on the processes of water delivery rather than the outcome of water drunk. Because staff can control processes but cannot guarantee attaining outcomes, government rules and regulations get written specifying exactly how to lead a horse to water. Funding is based on the number of horses led to water. Licenses are issued to individuals and programs that meet the qualifications for leading horse to water. Quality awards are made for improving the path to the water – and keeping the horse happy along the way.

Whether the horse drinks the water gets lost in all this flurry of lead-to-water-ship. Most reporting systems focus on how many horses get led to the water, and how difficult it was to get them there, but never quite get around to finding out whether the horses drank the water and stayed healthy."


---

The lesson in this metaphor is about the problems of relying on only quantitative data when the values and outcomes are only meaningful in qualitative terms. Also it is important to identify the enabling (intermediate) outcomes (in this case that the horse drink the water) so that the higher-order outcomes can be more readily planned to be able to be seen to be achieved and
attributed to the program or strategy being evaluated (refer back to program logic and the outcomes hierarchy).

The importance of being able to measure both the efficacy (e.g., ex ante evaluations, like cost benefit analysis and risk assessment) as well as the effectiveness of the outcomes of strategy (post hoc evaluation), were identified by Sun-Tzu (c. 400 B.C.) in the Ping-fa [The Art of War]. Here we will look briefly at how we might better integrate these lessons into planning and evaluation with a current Chinese example and some South Australian examples.

3.1 Accounting for the Non-Financial performance?

The Chinese National Ninth Five-Year Plan for Environmental Protection and the Long term Targets for the Year 2010 (http://www.zhb.gov.emglish/plan/nine.htm ) identify "Major Planned Indices " which are stated in quantitative terms of discharged tons of pollutants and economic indicators. These are clearly stated and the measures are readily identified. But the “7 Major measures” are stated in qualitative terms implying usually non-financial or non-economic data. I could not find out from the WWW site how they are being measured monitored and evaluated. My guess is that it may be a bit like the ‘leading the horse to water’, but not necessarily attaining the desired measurement of the expected outcomes. I’m not suggesting that I teach the Chinese experts how to get horses to drink, but rather let us consider 30 years of research on combining qualitative and quantitative measurement with a focus on achieving intended qualitative outcomes.

This is a common global public sector performance measurement problem. From the inception of the USA’s Program Planning & Budgeting System (PPBS) there have been concerns about the role and usefulness of performance indicators in the evaluation performance and accountability for resources (see Winston, 1991, 1992, 1993).

It is not just the public sector or human services that have focused on the importance of the qualitative data, this issue has also been woven into the fabric of the private sector, for example, in Britain. According to the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales’ Corporate Governance Group7 (Jenkins, 1998; Myners, 1998) the effects of globalisation, the increased strategic significance of intangible assets (e.g., corporate knowledge) and new technology (specifically the Internet and the WWW) are likely to cause Companies and Company Boards of Directors to re-examine the reliance on financial measurement of performance for corporate reporting.

‘Widening the scope of performance measurement
Non-financial information will become a far more significant factor in understanding the leading indicators of value. Many companies are now using the balanced business scorecard. The RSA Inquiry Tomorrow's Company highlighted a very clear program in enhancing a wider and more inclusive assessment of what drives a company rather than being confined to strictly financial measurements alone.’ (Myners, 1998, p. 4)

Some of the main problems of the recent approaches to using performance indicators (Talbot & Sharp, 1994; Winston, 1991, 1992, 1993) are that:

---

7 Chaired by Sir Brian Jenkins, Chairman of Woolwich Pty Ltd, the Corporate Governance was set up in 1995, and has an excellent WWW site at: http://www.icaew.co.uk/corp_gov/
* often they are collected for the sake of having data for accountability for the use of resources, a conformance approach rather than a focus on performance – ie. giving more appropriate qualitative data to facilitate the front line manager’s ability to improve management and performance;
* often they are process-oriented and not outcome-oriented;
* there are too many indicators to be assimilated into a manageable decision making process;
* decision makers seldom know how the data have been obtained, and so do not understand and/or do not trust the data;
* the data collected often has little relevance to the real work processes and outputs of those workers at the client interface who generate the data (those who have hands-on involvement in the program being monitored), therefore they have no incentive to keep the information up to date and the whole system becomes unreliable or out of date;
* there is little feedback to the workers at the client interface, so there is little awareness of the end usefulness of the data, also there is little incentive to be accurate because the data are not seen as relevant to the operations at the client interface and the effects that decisions based on this data have on the program overall. Thus the data can be out of phase or simply inaccurate.
* often there is little indication in the statement of the objectives about what is an acceptable level of performance or attainment of the objectives, even if a target level is specified on a particular “measure” it is often not specified as to what range of performance is expected; e.g., is 10% higher or lower on a particular “measure” satisfactory or not, what is the margin for “error”?
* statements of objectives are often not useful in operational terms because they are usually lengthy, and divorced from the operational plans or data collection forms.

However, it is important as a group development process and a system awareness exercise to go through the process of developing goals and information pertaining to the effectiveness of the performance of the organization towards those goals. Clear, agreed carefully documented observation and measurement are the bases from which an effective performance information system can be derived, if there is the expertise and the will to do it properly, and an understanding of the limitations of the methods.

The important point to note is that nearly all the content of the Cleaner Production in China refer to efficiency and effectiveness measures and concepts. But quality of life and tourist amenity are all about appropriateness of the environment or program in terms of the clients' needs and expected outcomes.

Goal displacement is a risk of strategic planning that is driven top down, and focusing only on economic indicators. This distinction further assists in determining how to define appropriateness of the service in terms of the community needs and organisational policies, and how appropriate are the program's objectives in the current context? Although the program or policy may have been appropriately designed to meet the stakeholders’ needs in the beginning, people change. It is likely that over a 5 year planning period (and especially over a longer term) people's expectations and needs will change. During the process of engagement with a service provider they may be dissatisfied but may or may not express that reaction until they have waited to see if the results were beneficial. Or they may feel vulnerable while they are under the service regime, and only feel they can express their reaction after they have left the program or completed the service.
One method for overcoming the limitations of economic performance indicators, and of goal displacement is to focus on the goals as expected outcomes, such as in Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS).

### 3.2 Goal Attainment Scaling in environmental regulation

A student who adapted a measurement technique from one of my lectures and turned it into a transparent environmental impact assessment and evaluation as the basis for applying the ISO 1400 environmental management standard to regulation of the Upstream Petroleum Exploration in South Australia. His name is Michael Malavazos, he is a senior Petroleum Engineer working for the South Australian Department of Mines and Energy (now Department of Primary Industries and Resources, see PIRSA 1998a, 1998b) the technique is Goal Attainment Scaling (see Malavazos 1995, 1998; Malavazos & Sharp 1997). The technique was invented for the evaluation of de-institutionalisation of mentally ill patients in the USA. My colleague, Dr Tom Kiresuk was trying to find out how to measure the effectiveness of the community-based programs for the former hospital patients. He found it was best to ask them what their goals were and got them to estimate what the expected outcomes of those goals would be if they could attain them. He developed a 5 point scale of the degree of attainment those expected outcomes (see Kiresuk, Smith & Cardillo, 1994).

Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) grew out of the need for some outcome oriented measures of effectiveness in the subjective area of mental health programme evaluation in the USA in the 1960s (see Kiresuk et al, 1994). Basically the GAS technique works by having all key participants involved in an evaluation get together to form an agreement about the most important aspects of the expected outcomes of the program upon which they are about to embark. This shared vision of the intended outcomes of the goals of a plan can help clarify the attainment of the goals (see Sharp & Kiresuk, 1993). By formatting a scale around the expected outcome to include the highly desirable and less desirable outcomes for the expression of the goals and/or objectives, the technique allows a measurement of the degree of attainment, and forces participants to document in an unambiguous way the likely and unlikely results. When the program is completed and the participants are accountable for what they have done, they will at least then have a common benchmark for estimating the effectiveness of the program.

Figure 5 shows a generic GAS Follow-up Guide in which participants are requested to fill in the graded statements (or behaviourally anchored ratings) as performance indicators (Note that the columns can be re-arranged to suit the users, and the description in the left column of Figure 5 is just there as a guide, it would normally be a close statement of the potential outcomes, as in the examples in Figures 6 & 7). Then during the process of the program the stakeholders indicate (by a tick beside each true statement) which of the categories from the most favourable outcome down to the least favourable outcome appropriately describes the situation at present. The descriptive statements about expected outcomes must be as specific and objective as possible in behavioural terms. Each outcome level has an associated rating (in this case +2 to –2, although it could be stated in terms of 100% of goal attainment as the mid level of the scale, and say 80%, 90% to 110%, & 120% as the range); and each goal may be related to the other goals by a weighting which would be used to multiply the rating to obtain an overall GAS score (see Kiresuk & Lund, 1978, p.343- 347 for the formula). An example of GAS applied to environmental impact assessment for the “eco-tourism” use of coastal sand dunes within ISO 1400 environmental management requirements, is shown in Figure 6 (at the end).
The steps involved in developing the scales and implementing this method would be as follows (as illustrated in the evaluation of the Multi-Purpose Services program described earlier):

(a) form a group of key participants in the project who will act as the Evaluation Steering Committee, and will coordinate the Goal Attainment Scaling process;

(b) the Evaluation Steering Committee identifies the goal areas as part of the planning of the project (they could use the NaGASt ® model of performance measurement for evaluation, as a basis for planning the measurement and evaluation of the goals or plan, so that there is an integrated program logic linking needs and goals, as suggested above);

(c) the Evaluation Steering Committee identifies the sub-goals contained within these goal statements for each program; In the Multi-Purpose Services example, there was a Federal-State agreement stating the broad goals of re-distribution of funds from administration to service delivery; within that goal the South Australian MPS sites had goals relating to the needs for service in health care in the community (including mobility of the elderly), as well as reducing the number of bed days of health care to be provided in the nursing homes and re-distributing the resources into home based care (see Figure 7).

(d) establish time frame (including the start and the followup period) for the evaluation appropriate to the sub-goals for each programme (e.g., say the health care program has monthly meetings to review progress, so the Goal Attainment Scales should identify the outcomes according to monthly targets, as well as annual targets);

(e) establish the expected outcomes for each sub-goal, care should be taken to ensure that these outcomes are realistic, relevant and stated so that all can agree that they have been achieved or not, and the wording is impartial regarding the value of the outcome, ie. "less than expected" is not necessarily "bad");

(f) label the headings of the GAS table using the sub-goals as the "scales";

(g) fill in the other cells of the table to specify the +2 to the -2 rated outcomes for the other goal areas in clearly observable terms;

(h) decide whether or not to derive a numerical index, ie., are the scales to be used in calculations such as when the analysis of scores is required for the evaluation of the project and the subsequent decision-making in Program Budgeting or benchmarking (see Sharp, 1994b, 1994d, 1994f; Talbot & Sharp, 1994); if there is to be data analysis then follow the procedures recommended by Kiresuk and Lund (1978), and see Appendix A in Kiresuk et al (1994, p. 273).

(i) decide whether the scales will need to be weighted for a fairer comparison of the performance towards the overall desired outcomes (if not weighted then it is convenient to use the GAS look up tables in Appendix A of Kiresuk et al. 1994).

FIGURE 5
### GENERIC GOAL ATTAINMENT SCALE FOLLOW-UP GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL 1 <em>8</em></th>
<th>GOAL 1</th>
<th>Levels of Predicted Attainment of Goal</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Behavioural description of level of <strong>much higher attainment</strong> of Goals than expected)</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUCH more than expected outcome</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Behavioural description of level of <strong>higher attainment</strong> of Goals than expected)</td>
<td></td>
<td>MORE than Expected level of outcome</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Behavioural description of <strong>EXPECTED level of attainment</strong> of Goals)</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPECTED Level of outcome</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Behavioural description of level of <strong>lower attainment</strong> of Goals than expected)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LESS than Expected level of success</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Behavioural description of level of <strong>much lower attainment</strong> of Goals than expected)</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUCH less than expected outcome</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*8* NOTE: this is a generic description, normally the Goal columns would be a close statement of the potential outcomes, as in the examples in Figures 6 & 7.
**FIGURE 6: EXAMPLE OF GOAL ATTAINMENT SCALING**

**AIM: ECOTOURISM WITH MINIMAL IMPACT ON COASTAL SAND DUNES**  
(Malavazos, 1995; Department of Primary Industries & Resources South Australia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Score</th>
<th>Goal 1</th>
<th>Goal 2</th>
<th>Goal 3</th>
<th>Goal 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero impact upon Aboriginal &amp; other heritage sites</td>
<td>Negligible rubbish in situ</td>
<td>Minimal impact upon vegetation</td>
<td>Minimal disturbance to dune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>• Site has been reported and tourists deviated to avoid site by at least 100m</td>
<td>• No evidence of rubbish within whole dune scape</td>
<td>• No removal of vegetation</td>
<td>• No dune cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No swales cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>• Site has been scouted, flagged, reported and line deviated to avoid site by at least 50m</td>
<td>• No rubbish in sample area</td>
<td>• Priority 4 herbs and shrubs less than 1m removed</td>
<td>• Minor dune cut less than 0.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sand stacked along side of cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Windrows in swale less than 0.1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>• Site has been avoided by at least 10m, reported and flagged</td>
<td>• Maximum of 2 items of rubbish per km sampled</td>
<td>• Priority 3 and 4 shrubs less than 2m removed</td>
<td>• Dune crest cut 0.5-2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Less than 30% of tree branches removed</td>
<td>• Sand stacked along side of cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No trees removed</td>
<td>• Side cut 0-1.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Winrows in swale less than 0.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>• Site has been narrowly avoided (less than 10m), not reported and not flagged</td>
<td>• 3 to 4 items of rubbish per km sampled</td>
<td>• Shrub &amp; trees greater than 2m removed, including root stock</td>
<td>• Dune rest cut 2-4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trees less than 2m removed</td>
<td>• Sand ramped onto corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Side cuts 1.5-3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Off-line trafficking evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Windrows in swale greater than 0.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>• Site has been damaged as a result of the operation. Line traverses site. Site not reported, not flagged</td>
<td>• 5 items of rubbish or more per km sampled</td>
<td>• Trees greater than 2m removed, including root stock</td>
<td>• Dune crest cut greater than 4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sand ramped onto corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Side cuts greater than 3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Claypans cut</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.3 Other GAS Application Areas:**

GAS has many applications in the design, management and implementation of organizational changes or new programmes, such as:

* **Project Management Committees**
  This technique helps to formulate agreed goals and indicators which are stated in such a way as to have a longevity which should survive changes in committees and project staff;

* **New Projects**
  In the context of the evaluation of new projects this technique could be very useful to help clarify and clearly state the expected outcomes of the project, as well as providing a method for the assessment of progress of that study;

* **Program Budgeting** (PB)
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One of the big problems of PB is how to integrate the indicators into some meaningful index which can be used in the monitoring and evaluating of performance of the program in relation to its goals and budgets. GAS can provide a method of developing goals, indicators and an index all in the one procedure. This of course requires the use of the method of calculating weights and the Goal Attainment Score referred to by Kiresuk and Lund (1978: 346-348).

* **Comparison of effectiveness of programs**

Often the sensitivity about evaluation is concerned with the comparison of programs, such as in benchmarking (see Sharp, 1994d; Talbot & Sharp, 1994). GAS can help to diffuse this issue by providing a common framework and some more reasonable basis for comparisons according to the degree of attainment of their respective goals which accounts for the starting level of performance.

* **Overcoming the limitations of Management By Objectives**

MBO was fashionable for the new management reforms of the 1980s. But soon managers found it difficult to cope with all the performance indicators needed to test their organization’s performance according to the proliferating objectives. Also there was the problem of what was an acceptable level of performance; what indication of performance was there if the objective was not met, or exceeded? Goal Attainment Scaling allows the summarisation of many performance indicators into a simple followup guide (see Kiresuk, et al., 1994), and it accommodates the differing levels of performance commonly found in reality.

* **Integrating Risk assessment into planning & evaluation**

The potential to incorporate the prediction of the driving and restraining forces which create a dialectic of change, and expose the organisation or individual to fluctuating risk (depending on the net effect of the force field) has not been developed yet. GAS offers a goal oriented measurement system which can be adapted to the demands of risk management (see ANAO, 2000; Australian Standards/New Zealand Standard 1995. Risk Management AS/NZS 4360).

As explained in the Multi-Purpose Services example above (Andrews, Dunn, Hagger, Sharp & Whitham 1995; Dunn, 1997) the strategic planning used an outcome focused performance monitoring and evaluation system for quality management system.

**3.4 Limitations of Goal Attainment Scaling**

Like any measurement technique Goal Attainment Scaling has its limitations, and Kiresuk, Smith and Cardillo (1993) point out the several limitations of Goal Attainment Scaling. The main issues to deal with are (see Dunn, 1997; Sharp, 1993; 1997; Malavazos, 1995, 1998; Malavazos, & Sharp, 1997):

- only micro-focused relative change is assessed, so there should be a complimentary “absolute” level indicator or global scale to compare the performance in a more macro context (in the Upstream Petroleum case the Department of Primary Industries & Resources compared the GAS data with full ecological impact survey by experts over a significant period in various sample ecological sites, found sufficient validation of GAS, see Malavazos, 1995, 1998, PIRSA, 1998b);
- because of the nature of the highly flexible and individualised approach, some temptations or biases are expected, such as becoming too optimistic in setting the goal or assess the level of performance, this requires an independent auditor to occasionally check on the external validity &/or accuracy of the goal setting and assessment; this can also be assessed
by plotting the Goal Attainment Scaling data over a period of sessions and across different raters (see Kiresuk et al., 1994); But this auditing may not prevent attempts at fraud and deception where there are vested interests and incentives associated with the outcomes, so some form of peer review Quality Assurance process is also warranted.

- there is an inherent tendency for goal setting to raise expectations and to lift performance (like a “placebo effect”) which helps in the attainment of the planned goals; but GAS can allow for this, for as performance improves, it is important to “shift the goal-posts” to raise the standards to continue to motivate change and to keep the scales sensitive to small changes (see Sharp & Kiresuk, 1993).

4. CONCLUSION

This brief introductory talk has focused on three metaphors of the lessons I have learned from my students and my own experiences in weaving evaluation into strategic planning. I hope I also provided a means of introducing some of the tools and techniques of evaluation that my students and I have found useful. I hope that this has been useful to you and that you may be able to draw your own insights into the experiences I have shared in: visioning, weaving and attaining in the strategic planning process.
**FIGURE 7: EXAMPLE OF GAS APPLIED TO MULTI-PURPOSE SERVICES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**GOAL:** The Multi-Purpose Services programme will improve the quality of care for clients *by the first annual report*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Predicted Achievement of Goal</th>
<th>Scale 1: Use Community Bus to increase outings of elderly at home and in care facilities</th>
<th>Scale 2: Greater numbers of People supported in their homes by Community Care (DOH = Day Only Hours in Community Care Services)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUCH MORE</strong> Than Expected Outcome (+2)</td>
<td>90% elderly have 1 outing <em>per month</em></td>
<td>DOH = 400 to 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORE than EXPECTED Outcome (+1)</strong></td>
<td>70% elderly have 1 outing <em>per month</em></td>
<td>DOH = 300 to 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED LEVEL OF OUTCOME (0)</strong></td>
<td>50% elderly have 1 outing <em>per month</em></td>
<td>DOH = 200 to 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LESS than Expected Outcome (-1)</strong></td>
<td>30% elderly have 1 outing <em>per month</em></td>
<td>DOH = 100 to 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUCH LESS</strong> Than Expected Outcome (-2)</td>
<td>10% elderly have 1 outing <em>per month</em></td>
<td>DOH = &lt; 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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