



NAGASAT^o model of performance measurement for evaluation
**FOUR TECHNIQUES OF PERFORMANCE
MEASUREMENT & EVALUATION**

Prepared by Associate Professor Colin Sharp

© Dr C.A. Sharp and

P.E.R.S.O.N.A.L. (Research and Evaluation) Consultancy Pty Ltd,

Copyright, April, 1998; June, 1999

The material provided here is copied for the use
of the SA Office of Recreation & Sport only.

1. THE NA-GA-SA-T^a FRAMEWORK

As outlined in the Australian Youth Foundation's S.T.A.R.T. model (see AYF & Sharp, 1996) using *program logic* the strategic design of the program and planning its evaluation can be coordinated towards a common purpose. Program logic helps to clarify the basic assumptions and expectations of the program. But by identifying where we are going we can better understand the steps to get there.

As shown in Figure 1 the *Na-Ga-Sa-T performance measurement and evaluation framework* basically uses program logic to link the methods with the design of a program. As part of the planning process for the program and the evaluation, it uses group consultation methods to identify the needs of the clients, the goals to be achieved to meet those needs and degree of satisfactions of the stakeholders in the whole process.

In the next few pages various figures help to provide a model of how this *Na-Ga-Sa-T evaluation framework* works.

2 NEEDS ANALYSIS & ASSESSMENT

The needs of the stakeholders, especially the intended recipients, or clients, of the service, should be the foundation of the organisation's strategy and planning (Delbecq, Van de Ven Gustafson, 1995; Isaac & Michael, 1995). By identifying and prioritizing the needs of the clients, the organisation can then clarify its strategic plan and goals (Attkisson, et al. 1978).

Document PE # 23 outlines a useful approach to needs assessment.



3. GOAL ATTAINMENT SCALING

Once the needs of the customers are identified, individual and generic goals can be developed.

Goal Attainment Scaling is highly participative and empowering technique for staff and customers to take control of their own plans and outcomes. Basically it identifies the expected outcomes in terms of a 5 point scale which is anchored in terms of the range of expected behaviour of the client over a set time period. This is relatively straight forward and can be conducted with minimal case worker input (Kiresuk ,et al, 1993).

These Goal Attainment Scales can be scored and used as a regular performance monitoring tool for clients and case workers, as Kiresuk and Choate (1994) review (see Document PE # 24).

But remember, like any performance measurement and evaluation tool, GAS has its strengths and weaknesses (see Document PE # 23).

4. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

All people want some feedback on performance - managers need it to improve programs. By developing and conducting a group process to consult with customers on their satisfaction or developing a survey questionnaire any evaluation should ensure this important data is captured to add to the continuous improvement of the program management. But assessing satisfaction is often a mismanaged and/or misunderstood process. Most importantly there should be some data collected on the satisfaction of all stakeholders for at least two stages of the program or service: at the last point of contact (to reflect on current satisfaction with process and content) and at least one followup assessment of satisfaction (with outputs and outcomes attained).

The minimum of key stakeholder groups to ask about their satisfaction are the customers (clients, end-recipients of the service) and the *staff* (service providers). Indeed, there is a reasonable literature (Gotleb, Grewal & Brown, 1994; Oliver, 1981, Ostroff, 1992; Peterson & Wilson, 1992; Schlesinger & Zornitsky, 1991; Schneider & Bowen, 1985; Schneider & Bowen, 1995; Schmit & Allscheid, 1995) suggesting that no only do employee attitudes to the organisation (e.g. degree of trust of supervisors and respect for management) and their jobs (e.g. fairness of pay; degree that the organisation's products or services meet the need of customers) affect their perceptions of quality of their service, but they also seem to affect the degree of satisfaction of the customers about the service received. So it is important to look for measures of satisfaction from both the staff (e.g., attitudes about the organisation and the quality of service, organisational climate and morale) and the service recipients (customer satisfaction).



Such surveys or interviews should separate out the satisfaction with the *process* from the quality of the content and outcomes for the customers.

Document PE # 25 refers to the basics of assessing customer and staff satisfaction for evaluation purposes. Document PE # 26 follows the literature to establish the program logic of the linkages between staff satisfaction and customer satisfaction through the useful analysis of Schmit and Allscheid (1995).

5. TRANSFERABILITY

These performance measurement tools and the data they generate are likely to be worth less if they are not utilised, and if the evaluation does not have transferability into the organisation. Documents PE # 27 and PE # 28 emphasise the importance of organizational culture in the planning for, and the carriage of, the evaluation recommendations.

REFERENCEs

Australian Youth Foundation & Sharp, C.A. 1996. *Do-it-yourself Evaluation Manual: An integrated approach to project management and evaluation*. Sydney. Australian Youth Foundation.
See <http://www.youngaustralians.org.au>

Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H. & Gustafson, D.H. (1975) *Group Techniques for Program Planning: A guide to nominal group and delphi processes*. Glenview. Illinois, Scott, Foresman & Co.

For further information:

Dr Colin Sharp

Managing Director, P.E.R.S.O.N.A.L. Consultancy Pty Ltd;

PO Box 378 Stirling, SA, Australia, 5152;

Ph: +61 - 8 8387 5569; **Mob** = 0419 390 030

Fax: +61 - 8 8387 5568

Email: PERSONAL.research@bigpond.com

URL: www.peresonalresearchandevaluation.com