

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

Linking Results to Public Debate

By:

John English and Evert Lindquist

Department of History and Political Science, University of Waterloo

Department of Political Science, University of Toronto



New Directions – Number 2

©L'Institut d'administration publique du Canada, 1998
The Institute of Public Administration of Canada, 1998

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED/TOUS DROITS RÉSERVÉS

The Institute of Public Administration of Canada

The Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC) is the leading Canadian organization concerned with the theory and practice of public management. Its scope covers governance from the local to the global level. It is an association with active regional groups across the country. The Institute recognizes and fosters both official languages of Canada

IPAC/IAPC
1075, rue Bay Street
Suite/bureau 401
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 2B1 CANADA

Tel./tél: (416) 924-8787
Fax: (416) 924-4992
e-mail/courriel: ntl@ipaciapc.ca
Internet : www.ipaciapc.ca

L'Institut d'administration publique du Canada

L'Institut d'administration publique du Canada (IAPC) est la principale institution canadienne qui s'intéresse à la théorie et à la pratique de la gestion publique tant au niveau local qu'au niveau mondial. C'est une association composée de groupes régionaux actifs à travers tout le pays. L'Institut reconnaît et promeut les deux langues officielles du Canada.

Abstract

Ce rapport donne un compte rendu des trois tables rondes qui ont été tenues à la fin de l'automne 1997 et au début de l'hiver 1998. Des journalistes, universitaires, députés, fonctionnaires fédéraux et provinciaux se sont réunis afin d'étudier comment la gestion du rendement et le rapport sur le rendement affectent les délibérations publiques dans l'ensemble des politiques gouvernementales.

This is a report from a series of roundtables convened to discuss issues of performance and accountability in public administration. The approach was innovative in that it involved those outside the usual representatives of government organizations. Journalists and members of parliament were also invited to participate in what proved to be a wide-ranging discussion on performance management.

Performance Management: Linking Results to Public Debate

by
John English and Evert Lindquist

“There has been little performance measurement on performance management.”
Ian Clark, November 1997

INTRODUCTION

Canadian governments restructured in the 1990s. They changed how they developed policy, delivered programs and services, reported on activities and accomplishments, and conceived of governance and public administration. Accountability has been a pervasive theme underpinning many of these reforms, one that has emerged in business planning, Program Review, alternative service delivery (ASD), and, most recently, performance reporting by the federal government. Indeed, an important justification for these new practices is that they would produce better information for the attentive public – journalists, members of Parliament, academics, and citizens – to hold the government to account. These changes, however, have received little attention in the public domain. Media coverage has been negligible, and MPs have largely gone about their business as they have in the past. Researchers continue to contribute to the theory and practice of public administration but seem to have dealt less with particular instances of governance and accountability. In Canada’s capitals, many felt the foundations shudder, but many throughout Canada did not notice what had happened to their governments.

To extend more broadly the understanding and discussion of the restructuring of government, the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, the KPMG Centre for Government Foundation, the Public Policy Forum, the Treasury Board Secretariat, and the Canadian Centre for Management Development sponsored three roundtables in the late fall of 1997 and early winter of 1998 to discuss how “results” could be linked to public debate and to explore the implications and “performance” of the concept of performance management. The format itself was innovative: rather than simply have another discussion with representatives from government institutions most strongly identified with performance management – the Treasury Board Secretariat, the Office of the Auditor General, and senior public servants – the organizers invited representatives of the larger community of actors who should be interested in performance management: journalists, members of parliaments and academics, and former public servants. They asked these participants to begin a dialogue on the impact the reforms have had on their work. One federal minister, Ron Duhamel, and two provincial officials – Peter Underwood,

deputy minister in Nova Scotia, and Richard Goodkey of the Treasury Department of Alberta – also made presentations.¹

In their discussions, participants explored different facets of performance management and pointed to reasons why the concept has had less impact upon public debate than had been expected. They indicated the extent to which government restructuring and performance management have affected their work. Participants also explored how the ideas associated with performance management were linked to alternative service delivery, whether transparency had actually increased as a result of these reforms, and considered the implications for managing and monitoring government activities across jurisdictions. In considering ways to improve public reporting associated with performance management, parliamentarians tended to focus on how scrutiny of the estimates might be improved, while academics called for a stronger committee system and more analysis of how Parliament might be made more effective in holding government to account. Journalists were, on the whole, sceptical about current attempts to improve reporting of results but argued that greater clarity and transparency were important to them for their work.

This paper will describe in more detail the ideas and issues identified by the participants. The richness and detail of the discussion, its varied texture and contrasting nuances, cannot be captured easily in a short report. Rather, our purpose here is to capture the tone and broad contours of the dialogue, to capture the enthusiasm and worries of participants, and most importantly, to identify the ideas for making further progress on improving the reporting of government to ministers, parliamentarians and the public.

What is Performance Management?

The roundtables opened with an iconoclastic presentation by Ian Clark of KPMG that began, traditionally enough, with the definition of performance management given by John Mayne of the Office of the Auditor General. According to Mayne, performance management is “managing (and reporting) based on what programs are achieving for citizens and at what cost. This implies agreeing on expected outcomes, measuring progress toward them and using that information to improve performance and report results.”² Clark, by his own declaration, was “ambivalent” towards the concept, and, although he accepted Mayne’s definition of what was essential to make performance management work, he added significant caveats.

Many of the best public-service managers, Clark pointed out, do not use performance management; indeed, they do not like it. Moreover, there is little interest in or attention paid to the concept by those who should care: members of Parliament and journalists. Although performance management has been linked to performance measurement and to reduced expenditures, the connection is not always clear. If you want to reduce expenditures, Clark argued, you do not need elaborate mechanisms like performance management. In summary, he suggested that “there has been little performance measurement on performance management.”

Others quickly responded to Clark’s arguments, most notably Alan Winberg of the Treasury Board Secretariat. He pointed out that, at a recent meeting of the Performance Management Network at the OECD, senior officials responsible for performance management agreed that “achieving results in a manner consistent with the values and expectations held by citizens is a fundamental goal of government.”³ Performance management, he asserted, is here to stay. He emphasized, however, that performance management must not be equated with performance measurement – it is a broader concept, one that recognizes that not all government activity can be measured precisely and by using the same techniques, and one that focuses on improving reporting and accountability. According to Winberg, half of all federal government activities now use the “performance management concept.” Winberg, along with Secretary of State Ron Duhamel, claimed that performance management is a response to the demand from citizens that they know “what is going on and why.” Indeed, the first roundtable took place just as the president of the Treasury Board tabled seventy-eight departmental performance reports for the year ending 31 March 1997, with the government’s overview report *Accounting for Results 1997*.

Several participants who were elected representatives had invested considerable energy in advancing reforms related to performance management. Ron Duhamel and Marlene Catterall had played a role in efforts to improve the reporting to Parliament as part of the Liberal government's commitment to improving the Expenditure Management System when they served as parliamentary secretaries to the Treasury Board.⁴ Duhamel described how, as parliamentary secretary, he had chaired the parliamentary working group as part of the Improved Reporting to Parliament Initiative – one outcome was the splitting up of the Estimates Part III into spring reports, which focused on plans and priorities, and fall reports, which focused on performance. Similarly, Catterall and another participant, John Williams of the Reform Party, described how they had worked together as members of the House committee on procedure and house affairs to strengthen the ability of parliamentarians to handle the Estimates.⁵ Their recommendations, presented just before the 1997 election, have yet to be adopted, but notable among them was the proposal to establish a standing committee on estimates.

The ASD discussion illuminated differences and betrayed some confusion, particularly about the intended audiences and users of performance management information. Marlene Catterall spoke passionately about what all of this meant for the “front-line worker” for whom “activity” was often judged to be “result.” In her view, performance management was too often a “tool” for managers rather than something meaningful for front-line workers. Kathy O'Hara reviewed the emerging interest in performance indicators on the part of governments in Canada. While acknowledging that interest, she emphasized strongly the need to stimulate citizen engagement, public debate, and coordination across levels of government. Alan Winberg agreed with O'Hara's comments and sought to clarify terms with a diagram that shows performance management as embracing all of these views. As many participants argued, performance management is not only about internal management of programs but also about the clients who receive public services and the citizens and elected representatives who must debate outcomes and the directions public policy should take.

Source: President of the Treasury Board, *Annual Report to Parliament, Accounting for Results 1997*. (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997), p. 5.

Is Performance Management New or Better?

Our preliminary discussions also explored whether or not the ideas underpinning performance management were really new. In his presentation, Ian Clark defined “performance management” as using performance information effectively and “performance measurement” as obtaining the requisite performance information. Using these definitions, Clark argued that performance management was at least thirty years old, and he compared what he was hearing in 1997 to what he had learned at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University in the early 1970s. He argued that there was the same impulse to clarify objectives, to measure expected results, and to manage expenditures more effectively. As Clark quipped, “Performance management is apparently so logical, it will not go away.” Evert Lindquist also pointed out earlier initiatives were the creation of the Office of the Comptroller General in the late 1970s and the introduction of the Part III of the Estimates in the early 1980s. The notion of performance management did not spring full-grown from the ideas of Canadian academics and officials in the 1990s, and neither did the impulse to measure.

In her presentation, Barbara Wake Carroll of McMaster University pointed out that the 1990s were different, not least because the influence of private-sector methods on the concepts holds even greater sway than it did a few decades earlier. However, Carroll identified several challenges that have long confronted those who seek to measure government activities. Can government activities be measured well, particularly since the most difficult and complex problems are left to the public sector? What do selected indicators actually measure? Once indicators are identified, does this not create incentives for ministers and officials to work towards what is measured and to ignore that which is not measured? Should the focus be on short-term results or longer-term impacts? Can governments actually meaningfully measure the impact of programs, when the relationships between different variables are unclear or not within the control of governments? These and other questions were stimulated by Carroll’s presentation, and the challenges she identified clearly have not been conquered by the new regime. Lindquist suggested another reason why performance management has taken root, however tentative, in the 1990s: the current regime is less rigorous and ambitious than the earlier attempts of the 1970s and therefore receives more support from ministers and officials.⁶ One important example of this thinking is Winberg’s assertion that a “one-size-fits all” approach” is no longer considered an appropriate basis for guiding the measurement of programs and activities.

Many participants expressed concern that rhetoric of “getting government right” has drawn too heavily on the language of the private sector and that too many people now believe the rhetoric that government should operate in a more “business-like way.”⁷ Some cautioned that private-sector rhetoric and methods were not always appropriate in the public sector. Clark reminded participants of Wallace Sayre’s remark that “the private and public sectors are alike in all unimportant respects,” while Carroll warned that one often forgets that governments can, and perhaps must, do the kinds of things the private sector cannot do. Indeed, if governments are left only with the “messy” and unprofitable programs, particularly after significant recourse to ASD arrangements, might not the adoption of performance management serve to further undermine the credibility of government?

In short, there were many reservations, cautionary notes, and modest claims about the notion and principles of performance management. Whatever the disagreements on particulars, we believe that most participants agreed with the opening remarks at the 8 December roundtable made by Richard Goodkey of Alberta Treasury: “I guess we all seem to agree that measuring the effectiveness of public programs and services is a good thing.” Participants also seemed to agree that the release of *Accounting for Results*, as well as seventy-eight performance reports for federal departments and agencies, did constitute an important milestone in the federal government. It was an innovation that certainly deserved scrutiny and warranted further debate.

Performance Management, ASD, and the Problem of Transparency

Perhaps the most interesting and sharp exchanges occurred when speakers and participants probed the connections between the principles associated with performance management and the recent alternative service-delivery initiatives announced by the federal government. These discussions were somewhat unfocused in that the roundtables were not intended to focus only on performance management as it applied to ASD, although this is clearly an important development to consider. The debates moved in several stimulating but inconclusive directions, all of which suggests that sustained attention deserves to be given to these themes. They merit more attention, with more information at hand.

Karen Mosher of the ASD Crown Corporation Sector of the Treasury Board noted that many ASD arrangements – which span partnerships, special operating agencies (SOAs), service agencies, and decentralized delivery arrangements – were adopted in the 1990s due to new technologies, international trends, fiscal pressures, and horizontal issues such as child poverty. In part, the challenge is one of finding new and innovative ways of delivering programs and services. Alternative Service Delivery, she argued, is one of a number of new tools that governments can use to achieve the broader objectives of creating a federation that works, providing responsive

and results-oriented service, and promoting partnership and collaboration. Where and when ASD arrangements will be effective as a means of doing so, of course, remains a matter for discussion.

Others, particularly the journalists, were less enthusiastic about endorsing the motivations associated with performance management and ASD. Hugh Winsor, for example, argued that ASD initiatives had been essentially driven in Ottawa by the Program Review process and deficit-cutting and not by any overriding commitment to improve services and accountability.

Even if many participants disagreed on the motivations behind the Program Review and the interest in ASD, there was considerable agreement that governments should not enter into ASD arrangements unless outputs and outcomes could be precisely measured. Arthur Kroeger, for example, suggested that ASDs are best utilized for delivering relatively routine services. Indeed, Kroeger and Clark further suggested that ASDs should only be initiated where performance measurement was possible, since this would be a crucial element of the accountability regime; other participants agreed that under these circumstances performance *measurement* would be essential.

In this connection, Mosher argued that ASDs certainly challenged the government and its partners to probe carefully the implications of “shared accountability.” She argued, nevertheless, that such arrangements could succeed so long as there were explicit performance expectations, clear roles and responsibilities, and appropriate accountability regimes in place. She enumerated the elements of what such an accountability regime would be in the context of ASD: clear roles and responsibilities; explicit performance expectations; balanced expectations and capacities; credible reporting; and reasonable review and adjustment. Mosher argued that performance management and ASD build on the more traditional regimes of oversight previously developed for overseeing Crown corporations and “contracting-out.”

Discussion soon left the domain of principles and led into interesting and provocative debate about whether the transparency of service providers had, in fact, been improved. Some participants worried about the loss of accountability in the case of ASDs, particularly when normal access to information and Treasury Board oversight do not apply.⁸ While NAV Canada is often touted as a successful ASD, many participants pointed out that far less information is available about near accidents and safety records. John Williams responded that his party certainly had no objection to “letting business do what business can do” but that NAV Canada, in his view, was not privatization but simply the removal of service delivery from accountability. Others worried about whether the ASD would maintain traditional ministerial responsibility although others minimized that concern. Brian Crowley argued politicians would ultimately only agree to transferring power if there was also a transfer of responsibility: there would have to be another credible person to blame for failure.⁹ The issue of transparency was, perhaps, the greatest concern for participants at the roundtables, one that could only be explored properly with more detailed information on the practices and reporting of particular departments and agencies.

In reviewing this discussion, one participant suggested that it could be depicted as implicit yearning for the “good old days” of government. It expressed a yearning for those days when the permanent public service delivered more service, when central systems and rules produced more

information, and when there were no concerns about the deficit to force hard choices. This was not to suggest in any way that participants wanted to return to past practices and circumstances; rather, our discussion evinced a concern that, in the rush to reduce deficits and experiment with ASD, some valued attributes we took for granted with more traditional public administration may have disappeared. Some noted a paradox. The need to rethink accountability in the context of ASD may have stimulated the interest in performance management, and yet the greatest transparency and progress in performance management may exist when those programs are directly delivered by the governments and their public services. The evidence for this argument existed in the release of the plans and priorities documents and the performance reports.

Moving Beyond Managers: Engaging Key Constituencies

As the roundtables proceeded, participants agreed that if performance management is to succeed several key groups must be engaged. Who these groups were became clear, as did the difficulties in securing engagement. Few MPs outside of contributors to the report on the business of supply, had shown much interest in business plans, results reporting, and other innovations. Journalists argued that the results information contained in *Accounting for Results* and the fall performance reports would not be useful for their reporting. It was also recognized that, despite the enthusiasm of many public servants for the recent innovations, others remained sceptical and worried about their impact. In short, in order to improve reporting stronger links had to be developed between insiders and outsiders, politicians and officials, journalists and governments, and, of course, all of the above with citizens.

What incentives must exist for these key groups to use performance information and for governments to commit to results? Brian Crowley of *The Globe and Mail* argued provocatively that a politician would always need instant results to present to an electorate. In politics, there would rarely be enough time to discover if a program had achieved rational results. Indeed, while “results” may be good for many stakeholders, for ministers “results” may lead to demands for their resignation and, if not at the political level, then for officials to be penalized if promised “results” were not obtained. This troubled others as well. Crowley also pointed out that, first, ambiguity is indispensable in politics and, second, that politicians cannot afford to wait for the long term. Peter Aucoin buttressed this view with his presentation, in which he argued that many facets of performance management regimes, and not simply the motivations of governments and ministers, are inherently political. Many participants agreed with these ideas. However, several MPs took issue with the assumption that they had only a short-term focus on re-election; they argued that they do not spend most of their time mulling over prospects in the next election.

Reg Alcock spoke from the perspective of one who has served as a senior public servant in Manitoba, a member of the Manitoba legislature, and a member of the House of Commons. He stressed how the smaller confines of the Manitoba legislature facilitated parliamentary scrutiny of expenditures and officials. Other parliamentarians generally concurred in this analysis, but others, such as John Williams, worried that the average MP might drown in the detail and might not have the incentives to review and utilize the information. They argued that greater use of performance information in Ottawa might occur if the following conditions were met:

- Parliamentarians have clear information and more time to evaluate that information.
- Parliamentarians gain recognition for committee work by the party and in the press.
- Standing committees have much more financial and research assistance.
- A standing committee on estimates, along the lines recommended by the subcommittee on the business of supply, existed.
- Officials took committee appearances seriously and came well prepared with adequate information.

These ideas were predicated on the assumption that MPs would like to have better responses from officials and that better understanding of what ministers and officials are doing is important to them and to their work with constituents.

The reactions of journalists were equally interesting and even more sobering. Hugh Winsor had earlier claimed that the performance reports did not contain the kind of information that would interest journalists. In his presentation, Paul Adams summarized the journalists' reaction by noting that the ideas underpinning performance management are familiar to journalists. However, these ideas are unsatisfying, since journalists become interested in management issues when something goes wrong; performance documents often emphasize "business as usual" or the achievements of governments. Bluntly put, bad news trumps good news. Even more important was the question of trust: Adams and others pointed to the malleability of results commitments and the "wobble room" that seems to be left even in the most robust undertakings. Why, they asked, should journalists invest much time in monitoring performance information when the government will inevitably be evasive and when journalists cannot counter easily with alternative information?

Reflecting the view of other journalists at other roundtables, Adams did urge two ways in which journalists might use performance results. First, results should be presented consistently so that they can be evaluated more easily over time. Consistent, comparable and complete data would provide journalists with the material they need to evaluate the work of government. Conciseness is more important than comprehensiveness, since too much data might simply overwhelm. Second, a "narrative" or a "story" should accompany results information. This view, interestingly, coincided with others who strongly urged the need for "stories" to engage citizens and to make "results" more easily understood. Indeed, Richard Goodkey argued that public servants should develop "logic models" that outlined how the factors affecting the outcomes and outputs associated with particular services or key results areas were linked – in this way, the responsibility of different programs and levels of government could be more accurately discerned.

The academic participants focused less on their broad roles as researchers and teachers and instead considered how they might support the work of parliamentary standing committees. Peter Aucoin echoed many of the worries about the weakness of committees but argued that it would be futile to link the results initiative to some efforts to increase influence on the processes of resource allocation and internal management. Rather, Aucoin suggested that it would be better to link the use of performance-related information by committees – such as indicators, evaluations, audits and reviews – to a greater commitment to hold governments to account. Even though Canadian MPs lack the power of their congressional counterparts, Aucoin said that the British experience suggests that think-tanks, academics, and parliamentarians can work well together. Indeed, Aucoin suggested that academics could be useful in illuminating how other jurisdictions approach the kinds of problems faced by Canadian governments, but this would require more interaction and sharing of information among officials, politicians, and academic researchers. Lindquist added that academics can bring an important “outside” perspective to bear on committee deliberations, since academic specialists will often have considerable knowledge of historical and organizational context crucial for properly interpreting performance indicators.

Performance Management Across Jurisdictions

Accounting for Results and the recently released performance reports clearly focused on how the federal government manages its own affairs. However, much of the inspiration for, and learning about, performance management has occurred across jurisdictions. Moreover, a critical challenge for all Canadian governments is how to manage accountability better in areas where more than one level of government is active, such as health, transportation or the environment.

In such fields, the outcomes at which governments aim often result from a variety of sources, including federal, provincial and municipal policies and programs, as well as activity in the private and voluntary sectors. These outcomes are complex in origin and nature, and the use of performance management to achieve multijurisdictional outcomes poses a significant challenge. Governments must assess how their own programs and policies contribute to the overall result – say, lower unemployment or a drop in the mortality rate. Nevertheless, these kinds of outcomes are at the centre of much public debate and, in the end, are the ones that preoccupy citizens. Three very interesting presentations addressed the topic of performance management in a multijurisdictional environment.

Richard Goodkey reviewed the Alberta experience with business planning, deficit reduction, and performance reporting, noting that the province had drawn on the experience of other jurisdictions. Goodkey indicated that it had taken several years for departments to develop useful performance indicators and that only now was it developing more complicated stories or “logic models” of how the actions of different programs and governments affected desired outcomes. He believes that, if governments could better specify these linkages, it would lay a foundation not only for measuring performance across jurisdictions but also for disentangling their contributions. Kathy O’Hara, then working with Canadian Policy Research Networks, also broached the subject of managing performance across jurisdictions with regard to the “Social Union” project and discussions between federal, provincial and territorial governments on how to

redesign social programs and establish common objectives. Not unlike that at the top of the chart from the Treasury Board on page 4, O'Hara saw outcome measurement as a means for increasing citizen engagement as it pertained to federal–provincial discourse. Perhaps as interesting, O'Hara's analysis suggests that performance management may be a useful tool, not only for *disentangling* the activities of different governments, as Goodkey says, but also for *coordinating* them. And, indeed, Nova Scotia deputy minister Peter Underwood provided a concrete case by providing an overview and analysis of the environmental harmonization initiative of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment. Federal and provincial governments have attempted to clarify roles and responsibilities and improve environmental management through an outcome-based approach to cooperation. Underwood pointed out how the draft text agreed upon in 1995 – the so-called “framework agreement” – made specific reference to objectives and principles and to the need for greater transparency. This was seen as a first step. Next, ministers will use the new framework to clarify roles and responsibilities and put parameters around permissible activities.

Although discussions did not dwell long on these matters, certainly not in proportion to their significance, it would be unfair to suggest that participants regarded them as unimportant. Rather, these matters deserve separate and sustained treatment in similar forums with diverse groups of participants. And, indeed, IPAC is pursuing this, although much work remains to be done.¹⁰

Moving Forward: An Action Plan for Improving Performance Management

One of us has argued elsewhere that the major obstacles to the development of a “results-based management culture” are found not so much in the public service but in the lack of interest on the part of Parliament, the media, and the public.¹¹ The roundtable discussions, on the whole, supported that opinion. John Mayne of the Office of the Auditor General commented during the final roundtable that, within government, there must be a long-term commitment to the process, because any “culture shift” requires time. It also requires external support; unless parliamentarians, journalists, and citizens become an integral part of that process, the progress made inside the federal government on performance management will not endure. As one participant said, these groups have to “buy in.” During the last roundtable, there emerged some common ground on where the proponents of performance management could usefully expend their energies. Several actions were identified.

There is, currently, limited understanding of, and considerable scepticism about, performance management and reporting and what that concept implies. Nevertheless, Alan Winberg argued that the government is very willing to get suggestions and feedback from parliamentarians and journalists in order to produce information that these groups can use. Ron Duhamel, speaking from the perspective of a minister, spoke about the complexity of objectives and stressed that it is exceedingly important that a large number of actors be involved. As an early proponent of performance management, Duhamel believes that the path forward has many thickets on it but the direction is right. With this momentum in mind, roundtable participants identified, in effect, several “principles” that should inform the activities of the advocates for performance management inside and outside government. These principles include the following:

- There must be modesty in the claims for performance management, and there must be focus in its application and the avoidance of exaggerated claims.
- There are areas of government activity where reporting on performance measurement is not suitable or meaningful for budget allocation, although such performance information is often useful as an internal management tool.
- Those committed to performance management, however modest in their claims, must recognize that full adoption will require a culture shift and will be a long-term process.
- Even if standing committees do not have the power to allocate resources, they can and should play a greater part in scrutiny of the activities of officials and ministers.
- If the government believes that actors outside the government and the public service are linchpins for reform, then it should systematically engage the wider community and citizens in order to monitor progress and assess the effectiveness of reforms and to ensure that government priorities with respect to the kind of information available, and the manner in which it is provided, reflect those outside of government.

Although these ideas were not presented as “principles” during the discussions, there was general agreement on them. They represent more a proposed posture for the government and cautionary advice rather than a set of specific actions and recommendations.

The roundtables did generate several specific ideas and recommendations for furthering and improving the performance management initiative to date. One set focused more on the government and the public service, while the other set dealt with ways to improve how MPs and standing committees could improve oversight activities in Parliament. With respect to improving how the government conveys information, the following specific recommendations were made and received general approval:

- Particular focus should be given towards improving the web sites of government departments and agencies; they should contain more background information and narratives.
- Graphics should be employed to convey more effectively the work of departments and agencies in web sites and performance reports.
- The Treasury Board Secretariat should continue to improve linkages in information at levels of aggregation (“cascading”).
- Ministers and public servants should work further with journalists to clarify what kinds of information would be most suitable for their purposes.
- The government should strive for consistency in reporting, and common standards must emerge across departments and agencies over time.
- Consistent, comparable, and complete reporting would meet journalists’ essential requirements.

The ideas noted above were related to the recommendations that focused squarely on Parliament and its standing committees. These recommendations included the following:

- Standing committees should have greater resources to engage outside consultants and research assistance.
- The work of the committees should become more accessible to the public through web sites and television.
- A separate committee on estimates should be established, as was recommended by the House of Commons subcommittee on the business of supply.

- Ministers and senior officials must give both time and information more generously to committees.
- A study should be commissioned to examine what is required so that committees might better deal with estimates.¹²

Concluding Remarks

Canadians today are more sceptical about government and about their politicians than ever before. Even though they have more education than earlier generations and technology that gives them access to information beyond the wildest dreams of their grandparents, Canadians today trust their politicians less often, vote less regularly, and engage in political party work more rarely. The advocates of performance management believe that better reporting is an important means for improving accountability, regaining credibility, restoring trust, and engaging citizens and elected representatives in the work of government.

By the end of the third and final roundtable on 23 February 1998, most participants no doubt agreed that the discussions had subjected the presumptions of performance management, as well as recent innovations, to considerable scrutiny. All participants were exposed to new ideas and alternative views, and the proceedings brought forth several concrete and useful recommendations. Debate was lively, disagreements many, and even though many of the participants did not know each other well, our sense was that most participants believed that the roundtables had worked.

The roundtables had, in many ways, lived up to early expectations, which sought to initiate an ongoing discussion between the public administration community and key members of the broader public-policy community on the usefulness of performance management for improving government. The discussions have begun; many questions remain. We believe, therefore, that sponsors should consider supporting additional roundtables with similarly diverse participants to focus on particular aspects of the challenge of implementing performance management.

EndNotes

¹ A complete list of presentations and participants will be found in Appendix A.

² Quoted in Ian Clark, “What’s New after 30 Years’ Effort at Performance Management? Reflection of an ambivalent participant,” Paper presented at Roundtable on Performance Management, 17 November 1997.

³ Alan Winberg, “Chairman’s Statement,” OECD Public Management Service: 1997 Meeting of the Performance Management Network. November 1997.

⁴ The relevant documents are President of the Treasury Board, *Accounting for Results 1997* (Ottawa, Minister of Public Works and Government Services, October 1997); and President of the Treasury Board, *Getting Government Right: Improving Results Measurement and Accountability* (Ottawa, Minister of Public Works and Government Services, October 1996). See also, Auditor General of Canada, “Reporting Performance in the Expenditure Management System,” in *Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons April 1997* (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997), ch. 5. On this subject more generally, see Evert Lindquist, “Getting Results Right: Reforming Ottawa’s Estimates,” in Leslie A. Pal (ed.), *How Ottawa Spends 1997-1998: Balancing Act: The Post-Deficit Mandate* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp.153-190.

⁵ Their report appeared as House of Commons, Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, Sixty-fourth Report on *The Business of Supply: Completing the Circle of Control* (April 1997).

⁶ Lindquist, *How Ottawa Spends*.

⁷ The Lindquist comment is drawn from the article in *How Ottawa Spends*. Other comments are those of the participants in the roundtables.

⁸ INSERT FOOTNOTE ON ROBERTS STUDY FOR THE CANADIAN NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION Crowley

⁹ Crowley illustrated his presentation with the example of the senior parliamentarian asked by a rookie for advice. The veteran gives the rookie four envelopes, each to be opened yearly. The advice they gave was: year one, blame the previous government; year two, blame the provinces; year three, blame your officials; and year four, prepare four envelopes.

¹⁰ IPAC has so far undertaken three projects specifically examining the implications of alternative service delivery and the use of performance management for intergovernmental change. The report of the first project, “Citizen-Centred Governance: Implications for Inter-Governmental Canada”, by Luc Bernier and Rod Dobell, is printed in *Alternative Service Delivery: Sharing Governance in Canada* (IPAC-KPMG 1997, Toronto), edited by Robin Ford and David Zussman; the report of the second project is entitled “Report on the Roundtables on Performance Measurement in a Multijurisdictional Environment,” by Paul Thomas (IPAC-KPMG-Ministry of Transportation of Ontario 1998, Toronto) both are available from IPAC’s national office in Toronto; the third report is forthcoming from IPAC in the summer of 1998 and will be available from IPAC’s national office and on its web site at www.ipaciapc.ca.

¹¹ Lindquist, *Ottawa Spends*

¹² Ian Clark of KPMG suggested that this study be funded jointly by the KPMG Foundation and, perhaps, the Treasury Board or even Parliament.

¹³ Don Lenihan, "Performance Management: Linking Results to Public Debate," Institute of Public Administration, Sept. 1997.

ANNEX 1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**Performance Management:
Linking Results to Public Debate
Ottawa**

Paul Adams
Journalist
CBC Radio
Toronto

Reg Alcock
MP, Winnipeg South (Liberal)
Ottawa

Jane Anido
Journalist
CBC Radio
Toronto

Peter Aucoin
Professor
Department of Political Science
Dalhousie University
Halifax

Marian Campbell
Treasury Board Secretariat
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Barbara Wake Carroll
Professor
Department of Political Science
McMaster University
Hamilton

Marlene Catterall
MP, Ottawa West/Nepean (Liberal)
Ottawa

Laura Chapman
Executive Director
Policy and Research Secretariat
Privy Council Office
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Ian Clark
Partner
KPMG
Toronto

Brian Crowley
Editorial Writer
Editorial Board, *The Globe and Mail*
Toronto

Maurice Demers
Coordinateur
Réseau International sur la Gouvernance
Centre Canadien de Gestion
Ottawa

Hon. Ron Duhamel
Secretary of State
(Science, Research and Development, Western Economic Diversification)
Government of Canada
Ottawa

John English (Rapporteur)
Department of History and Political Science
University of Waterloo
Waterloo

Richard Goodkey
Group Leader, Performance Measurement
Treasury Department of Alberta
Government of Alberta
Edmonton

Gurmont Grewal
MP, Surrey Central (Reform)

Ottawa

Éric Hufty
Coordonnateur - Mise en place des UAS
Réforme administrative
Conseil exécutif
Gouvernement du Québec
Québec
Jocelyn Jacques
Sous-ministre adjoint
Secteur stratégique et liaison
Bureau fédéral du développement régional
Québec

Nola Juraitis
Chief of Reporting and Social Sector
Treasury Board Secretariat
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Arthur Kroeger
Consultant
Ottawa

Donald G. Lenihan
Director of Research
Institute of Public Administration of Canada
Toronto

Evert Lindquist (Rapporteur)
Department of Political Science
University of Toronto
Toronto

Kathryn May
Journalist
Ottawa Citizen
Ottawa

John Mayne
Principal
Office of the Auditor General
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Geoff McIlroy

Research Officer
Institute of Public Administration of Canada
Toronto

Karen Mosher
A/Assistant Secretary
Crown Corporations and Privatization Sector
(Alternative Service Delivery)
Treasury Board Secretariat
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Neville Nankivell
Journalist
Financial Post
Toronto

Kathy O'Hara
Research Fellow
Director, Social Union Project
Canadian Policy Research Networks
Ottawa

Brian Pagan
Manager, International Programs
Treasury Board Secretariat
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Colin Potts
Treasury Board Secretariat
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Jennifer Smith
Research Director
Public Policy Forum
Ottawa

Susan Snider
Research Assistant
Public Policy Forum
Ottawa

Monte Solberg
MP, Medicine Hat (Reform)

Ottawa

John Tait
Special Advisor
Privy Council Office
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Martin Ulrich
Director
Results Measurement and Accountability
Treasury Board Secretariat
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Peter Underwood
Deputy Minister
Department of the Environment
Government of Nova Scotia
Halifax

Fraser Valentine
PhD Candidate
Department of Political Science
University of Toronto
Toronto

John Williams
Chair: Public Accounts Committee
MP, St. Albert (Reform)
Ottawa

Alan Winberg
Assistant Secretary
Government Review and Quality Services Sector
Treasury Board Secretariat
Government of Canada
Ottawa

Hugh Winsor
Journalist
The Globe and Mail
Toronto

Judith Wolfson

Deputy Minister
Intergovernmental Affairs
Government of Ontario
Toronto

David Zussman (Chair)
President
Public Policy Forum
Ottawa

About the Authors

John R. English is professor of History and Political Science at the University of Waterloo. He was a member of Parliament (Kitchener-Waterloo), 1993-97 and served as parliamentary secretary in Intergovernmental Affairs and to the Privy Council.

Evert Lindquist is director of the School of Public Administration, University of Victoria. He is also chair of IPAC's Research and Professional Practices Committee.

¹ A complete list of participants can be found in Annex 1.

² Quoted in Ian Clark, "What's New after 30 Years' Effort at Performance Management? Reflections of an ambivalent participant." Paper presented at Roundtable on Performance Management, 17 November 1997.

³ Alan Winberg, "Chairman's Statement," OECD Public Management Service: 1997 Meeting of the Performance Management Network, November 1997.

⁴ The relevant documents are President of the Treasury Board, *Accounting for Results 1997* (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services, 1997); and President of the Treasury Board, *Getting Government Right: Improving Results Measurement and Accountability* (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services, 1996). See also, Office of the Auditor General, "Reporting Performance in the Expenditure Management System," in *Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons April 1997* (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 1997), chapter 5. On this subject more generally, see Evert Lindquist, "Getting Results Right: Reforming Ottawa's Estimates," in Leslie A. Pal, ed., *How Ottawa Spends 1997-1998: Balancing Act: The Post-Deficit Mandate* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1998), pp. 153-190.

⁵ Their report appeared as Canada, Parliament, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, *Sixty-fourth Report on The Business of Supply: Completing the Circle of Control* (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1997).

⁶ Lindquist, "Getting Results Right," in Pal, *How Ottawa Spends*.

⁷ This comment by Evert Lindquist is drawn from the article in *How Ottawa Spends*. Other comments are those of the participants in the roundtables.

⁸ Alasdair Roberts, "Limited Access: Assessing the Health of Canada's Freedom of Information Laws" (1998). A summary and the full report can be found at <http://qsilver.queensu.ca/~foi/>.

⁹ Crowley illustrated his presentation with the example of the senior parliamentarian asked by a rookie for advice. The veteran gives the rookie four envelopes, each to be opened yearly. The advice they gave was: year one, blame the previous government; year two, blame the provinces; year three, blame your officials; and year four, prepare four envelopes.

¹⁰ IPAC has so far undertaken three projects specifically examining the implications of alternative service delivery and the use of performance management for intergovernmental change. The report of the first project, “Citizen-Centred Governance: Implications for Inter-Governmental Canada,” by Rod Dobell and Luc Bernier, is printed in *Alternative Service Delivery: Sharing Governance in Canada* (Toronto: IPAC and KPMG, 1997), edited by Robin Ford and David Zussman. The report of the second project is entitled “Report on the Roundtables on Performance Measurement in a Multijurisdictional Environment,” by Paul Thomas (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Transportation, IPAC and KPMG, 1998). Both are available from IPAC’s national office in Toronto. The third report is forthcoming from IPAC in the summer of 1998 and will be available from IPAC’s national office and on its web site at www.ipaciapc.ca.

¹¹ See Lindquist, “Getting Results Right,” in Pal, *How Ottawa Spends*.

¹² Ian Clark of KPMG suggested that this study be funded jointly by the KPMG Foundation and, perhaps, the Treasury Board or even Parliament.

The New Directions Series

The Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC) has, for many years, sponsored issue-oriented working groups of public servants and academics to find practical solutions to emerging issues. The Institute assembles groups of experts working on public-sector reform and public policy to discuss, compare, analyse, document and advance the understanding of critical issues and themes. While these reports are published in the language in which they were written, the executive summary is provided in the other official language.

The projects continue to explore a wide range of issues. In its continuing commitment to exploration and exchange, IPAC launched this series. Publications in this collection highlight critical findings and analysis from our action-oriented research activities. Besides advancing the understanding of current best practices, this work also serves to advance the understanding of what these initiatives mean with respect to the broader concerns of public-sector reform. These reports are available free of charge to IPAC members. Orders can be placed by contacting the IPAC national office in Toronto (www.ipaciapc.ca).

La Collection *Nouvelles Directions*

Depuis plusieurs années, l'Institut d'administration publique du Canada (IAPC) commandite des groupes de travail axé sur les grandes questions en administration publique. Composés de praticiens et de théoriciens, ces groupes d'experts se réunissent pour apporter des solutions pratiques aux nouveaux enjeux qui confrontent les administrateurs publics. Spécialisés dans les secteurs de la réforme administrative et des politiques, ils discutent, comparent, analysent les problèmes et questions critiques qui sont soulevés et documentent leurs observations, faisant ainsi avancer la compréhension dans ces domaines. Des rapports découlant de ces études sont publiés dans la langue dans laquelle ils sont soumis. Un sommaire exécutif est présenté dans l'autre langue officielle.

Nombreuses questions d'actualité sont continuellement étudiées dans le cadre d'activités de recherche. L'IAPC a donc lancé cette collection afin de poursuivre son engagement d'explorer et d'échanger. Les publications qui paraissent dans *Nouvelles Directions* mettent en relief des conclusions et analyses importantes qui sont tirées de notre recherche active. Tout en faisant avancer la compréhension des meilleures pratiques en vigueur, ces études permettent de mieux saisir leur importance en ce qui a trait aux préoccupations plus générales concernant la réforme du secteur public. Ces rapports sont offerts gratuitement aux membres de l'IAPC. Pour obtenir des exemplaires, prière de communiquer avec le bureau national de l'IAPC à Toronto (www.ipaciapc.ca).

Other Reports in the Series/ Déjà parus dans la collection

1. *Management and Performance Measurement in the Jewellery Industry: A Golden Opportunity?* By Ann Rauhala.
2. *Performance Management: Linking Results to Public Debate.* By John English and Evert Lindquist.
3. *From Controlling to Collaborating: When Governments Want to be Partners.* By Jim Armstrong and Donald G. Lenihan.
4. *Improved Reporting to Parliament.* By Jim Thomas.
5. *Crossing Boundaries: Privacy, Policy, and Information Technology.* By Harvey Schachter.
6. *Collaborative Government: Is There a Canadian Way?* Edited by Susan Delacourt and Donald G. Lenihan.
7. *Business Planning in Canadian Public Administration.* Edited by Luc Bernier and Evan H. Potter.
8. *Making Government the Best Place to Work: Building Commitment.* By Monica Belcourt and Simon Taggar.
9. *To Better Serve Canadians: How Technology is Changing the Relationship Between Members of Parliament and Public Servants.* By Jonathan Malloy.
10. *Service North of 60.* By Frances Abele and Katherine Graham.