

*Cultivating an Outcomes-Focused Organizational Culture
in Human Services:*

The Evolution of Outcome-Based Management and Budgeting in San Mateo County

KATHRYN MAURER AND AMY THOMPSON

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Outcome-Based Management (OBM), as implemented in San Mateo County, is one of the only comprehensive models of outcomes-based budget planning that seems to exist among the Bay Area counties. We studied OBM to see if we could bring back to our own counties an established tool to help prioritize spending on programs that achieve results.

We found that OBM is a successful tool for planning and goal setting and for aligning programs with agency and county strategic plans and visions. OBM also provides a framework for priority setting and resource allocation, although we are less certain of its ability to serve as a tool for budget development at the program level in its current configuration. OBM does work to advance a dialogue around outcomes

and evidence-based practice, fosters accountability, and results in a “smooth” budget process. OBM helps cultivate a culture of critical thinking managers who are focused on asking the right questions, and feeling accountable for what they achieve.

We both recommend implementing OBM immediately in our agencies to address the urgent need to do the best job possible at allocating resources effectively and aligning programs and services to the outcomes needing to be achieved. However, we also recommend tailoring OBM implementation with a “bottom up” approach to better fit the current landscape and fiscal environment and maximize the benefits for “programs.”

Kathryn Maurer is a Senior Human Services Analyst with the County of Santa Cruz Human Services Department.

Amy Thompson is the Deputy Finance Director with the Alameda County Social Services Agency.

*Cultivating an Outcomes-Focused Organizational Culture
in Human Services:*

The Evolution of Outcome-Based Management and Budgeting in San Mateo County

KATHRYN MAURER AND AMY THOMPSON

Introduction—Why San Mateo County and Outcome-Based Managements?

Since the 1980's, human services agencies have been struggling with the challenge to shift from a service-oriented model to an outcomes-driven approach to management. It is not enough any more to “simply” offer services to justify spending public funds. Administrators are charged with mandates and public pressure to achieve results with the funds they receive. In nearly every arena of human services, performance outcomes are now linked to funding levels for state and county agencies whether in the form of fiscal sanctions or performance incentive funds.

It is probably safe to say that all Bay Area social services agencies are fervently looking for ways to prioritize spending on programs that achieve results. That is certainly the case in the counties of Alameda and Santa Cruz. Given the current fiscal constraints being faced now, we need to use data-driven performance results to ensure we are allocating resources effectively. We need to provide a mechanism for program, fiscal, and executive staff to be better informed about, and dialogue better around, what strategies to expand, keep, re-target, or defund during the budget development process.

A lot has been written and shared over the years through the BASSC Executive Leadership Development Program (BASSC) about San Mateo County's Outcome-Based Management (OBM) and budget

planning process.¹ Being one of the only comprehensive models of outcomes-based management and budget planning that seems to exist among the Bay Area counties, BASSC interns flock to San Mateo County to learn about the process and make recommendations for OBM implementation back at their home sites. While it would be an interesting study to track the effect of the interns' recommendations back at the ranch, our study again made an attempt to look for an established tool that we could bring back to our agencies to help facilitate communication between “program” and “fiscal,” and focus priority-setting around budget and resource allocations.

Based on what we had learned through BASSC, we formed a premise that OBM, or a form of it, could assist both of our agencies in addressing some specific and serious challenges being faced today in an environment of high turnover at the senior management level, significant fiscal deficits, and increased pressure to meet mandated outcomes and performance standards. However, we also acknowledge that the current leadership and fiscal environment at our agencies—and at the level of our County Administrator's Office—have elements that both lend themselves to outcome-based management and budgeting, while at the same time make it difficult to implement such an ambitious initiative on a full-scale level. We, therefore, wanted to assess the feasibility of implementing

¹See References for a full list of OBM-related BASSC studies.

a “custom fit” form of OBM to meet the demands of the current environment.

History of OBM—The Seeds of Culture

While it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide a history of OBM in San Mateo County, a look at where OBM came from—and where it is going—is key to reflecting on its strengths and challenges. Strictly speaking, OBM is the process used in San Mateo County to develop and report on outcomes and performance measures for the Budget Book and align the work of departments to the Shared Vision of the County Board of Supervisors. To some degree, all Bay Area social services agencies implement a form of outcomes-based management and budgeting during the budget development cycle each year. It is common for agencies to have a process in place to report to the County Administrator’s Office progress towards achieving stated goals and objectives, and plans for allocating future resources towards outcomes.

However, without a system such as OBM, program planning and evaluation presented in agency Budget Books is generally not integrated between programs that may intersect in populations served and services provided. Budget Book performance measures may not be well defined or supported by robust data management systems and may be difficult or impossible to track over time. Additionally, program staff not involved in budget development may not identify with the measures, or may not even be aware they exist. Finally, without an OBM framework, there is little to no alignment between the agency mission, strategic goals, program plans, budget development, and staff and contract performance monitoring.

Nearly ten years ago, San Mateo County implemented a comprehensive visioning, performance management and resource allocation project to address those deficits. In 1999, through an initiative of the County of San Mateo’s Board of Supervisors, the county partnered with the community to draft Shared Vision 2010, a strategic plan that articulated what stakeholders wanted the county to look like in

ten years. An accompanying tool was developed—OBM—to further define the progress measures, implement a uniform data management system to support them, and incorporate evaluation of agency performance into budget development. The Human Services Agency (HSA) was chosen as one of the first OBM pilot agencies, and by 2003 all divisions had an OBM Plan.

As a component of OBM implementation, HSA developed the San Mateo Human Services Analytical Reporting Project (SHARP), a data warehouse designed to “synthesize data from disparate systems to enable the management team to make sound business decisions based on the guidelines of OBM” (Cruz, 2001). Consultants were brought in to train HSA managers on Shared Vision 2010, managing with data, and implementing OBM in their program areas. A Planning & Evaluation (P&E) Unit was also formed during this time to take on the facilitation of OBM plan development and outcome reporting.

OBM Today . . . and Tomorrow

All of the above implementation efforts have resulted in an “OBM culture” pervasive today throughout the agency. HSA operates under an “OBM Budget” aligning multiple services through four program areas: Economic Self Sufficiency, Family Strength, Community Capacity Building, and Program Support.² OBM plans are prepared for each program area and include a narrative description of the program, past year accomplishments and performance results, and future year(s) performance targets and proposed strategies.

Performance measures fall under one of three measurement criteria: a) What/How Much We Do; b) How Well We Do It; and c) Is Anyone Better Off. Additionally, “headline measures” from each program area are singled out to become “Agency Overview Measures” and brought to the front of the Budget Book and Agency OBM Plan. In the Appendix, Table 1 describes the type of data measured for each

²At the time of our research, we learned that HSA had redefined the areas for FY 08–10, and will now have OBM Plans for five outcome areas: Economic Self Sufficiency, Child Welfare Services, Prevention and Early Intervention, Program Support, and Office of the Agency Director.

outcome area by measurement criteria, and Table 2 exhibits the specific performance measures for Economic Self Sufficiency being proposed for the next reporting period (FY 2008–2010).

Reports of performance measure data are generated semi-annually. Performance is compared to previous years, and the results are discussed at multiple levels of agency management. Occasionally, negative performance on OBM measures can trigger changes in business practices and resource allocation, as is the intended purpose of OBM. However, most of our informants shared the experience that, to date, negative performance in OBM measures has resulted primarily in further efforts to redefine OBM performance measures and improve data collection methodology.

P&E facilitates OBM plans and performance reporting throughout the agency. The P&E Management Analyst collaborates with the County Manager's Office (CMO) to report outcomes through the county's OBM Oracle database that captures the data and locks it in at mid-year and end-of-year performance reporting times. The analyst also prepares performance measure documentation methodology sheets to ensure validity and reliability of consistent measures over time.

Even after 10 years of life, OBM is still undergoing refinement in San Mateo County. Several times throughout our interviews OBM was referred to as a living and evolving process, although everyone focused on its strengths and opportunities for improvement. For example, at the time of our interviews, the P&E manager was actively involved in working with directors to create a new five-year strategic plan for the agency, and the aim has been to synchronize the strategic plan goals with the initiatives, outcomes, and measures in the annual OBM plans. Another improvement includes a county-wide effort to move to a more client-centered data reporting system for OBM that would allow for the sharing of client data across county departments that mutually contribute to county-wide performance measures. Finally, a focus area of OBM improvement particularly important to the agency director involves aligning individual employee performance plans more closely to

OBM outcomes. Doing so would enable employees to clearly see their contributions to successful outcomes and take ownership and accountability in quality improvement efforts. "We could call it OBM Plus," the director shared with a smile.

Characteristics and Strengths of OBM

OBM is a complex "system," "process," "methodology," "tool," "framework," "strategy," or "map"—to use the variety of terms our interviewees used to describe it. It is also still widely recognized to be imperfect. Yet we found that OBM meets the expectations of everyone to whom we spoke as a way to align goals and objectives with strategic plans, agency visions, and community commitments. It provides a management system to attempt to allocate resources toward specific outcomes, even though some question how much impact OBM has had on improving those outcomes. Most significantly, our informants cite the value of OBM in providing a uniform system across county departments and agency divisions that integrates priority-setting, performance measurement, and budget development.

Some of the key characteristics of OBM that users in San Mateo County value are that it:

- is driven toward client/customer outcomes;
- involves internal and external stakeholders;
- drives the organization toward progress and continuous improvement;
- aligns goals and objectives at all levels of the organization; and
- strives to give managers the tools and information to set goals and expectations with employees and monitor progress throughout the year.

OBM is also attributed with helping to improve cross-departmental communications, build partnerships, "smooth" the budgeting process, and create a sense of communal purpose. In fact, it can be argued that OBM is responsible for creating an entire organizational culture around outcomes and data-driven performance measures alive and well in San Mateo County's HSA today. Summarized below are what we found to be the key strengths of OBM and the benefits of its implementation in San Mateo County.

A SHARED LANGUAGE AND PURPOSE

One of the ways OBM works to improve cross-departmental communication and build partnerships is by developing a shared language and purpose. This shared language helps focus discussion and decision-making, and the shared purpose gives everyone a sense of being “on the same page.” These characteristics of OBM help break down inevitable program silos.

A “SMOOTH” BUDGET PROCESS

Perhaps one of the most noticeable strengths of OBM is the improved communication it encourages during the budget season between programs and divisions within HSA and between HSA, the CMO, and the Board of Supervisors. OBM is credited with helping to “smooth the overall budgeting process” to use the words of retiring Finance Director, John Meermans. Before the OBM framework was in place, change proposals or new initiatives would flow in without a clear link to the county’s vision or strategic plan. Now, program management is less likely to put forth proposals that are not aligned with the county’s strategic plan. They are also much more likely to articulate goals, outcomes, and performance measures early on in program planning for the new fiscal year. This has led to a more structured budgeting methodology with an inherent natural sorting process for decision packages involving new spending. Budget presentations to the Board and dialogues with the CMO are much smoother given the common language and clear sense of priorities in place within the OBM framework.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND COMMITMENT

Part of the reason OBM works as well as it does in San Mateo County today is because of the level of commitment coming from the CMO as well as the accountability measures that are in place. As discussed earlier, the CMO office invested heavily in resources that would be used to manage OBM. It quickly became apparent to county agencies that OBM was not just another “flavor of the year” sensation.

Importantly, though, HSA staff does not feel threatened by OBM. The CMO has taken great ef-

forts to make sure people do not view OBM as a punitive process or a form of negative control. There is no hard and fast funding consequence to not meeting a target. Rather, data and performance measures are used to help guide decision-making. In short, measures are in place to ensure that agencies are thinking about and able to explain the reason the target is or is not being met. This “strengths-based” accountability built into San Mateo County’s OBM methodology has promoted a shared sense of ownership in accomplishment as well. As one of our informants put it: “OBM has helped us go from an ‘I did it’ or a ‘She did it’ approach to a ‘We did it’ environment.”

Challenges—What OBM Is Not

While OBM may be effective in evaluating overall agency performance and assisting the CMO in priority-setting for county-wide resource allocation, we are less certain of its ability to serve as a concrete tool for budget development at the program level in its current incarnation. Based on our research and interviews, we found that multiple challenges currently limit the viability of OBM as a program evaluation and resource allocation tool. The primary challenges identified by our interviewees include:

- Difficulty defining the “right” performance measures;
- Issues of reliability and validity of the data used to measure the indicators; and
- Evaluating the multiple factors that impact specific outcomes.

Similarly, staff involved in budget development at HSA and the CMO cautioned against linking OBM too closely to specific budget line items. Although OBM appears to be very good at justifying and even prioritizing new spending, it is not as strong at evaluating the effectiveness (both programmatic and cost) of existing projects. While it is not the intent to link OBM to the budget at the “widget” level, there is general agreement that OBM should eventually be able to help judge the relative success of a specific delivery strategy.

One challenge in bringing it down from the “60,000-foot” CMO level to the program level has

been the choice of performance indicators. Although staff generally supports the concept of managing by outcomes, the performance measures in place often are not indicative of what they feel their day-to-day work is trying to accomplish. For some, updating the measures for the budget book has become more like a drill rather than a useful way of evaluating the relative success of their programs.

At HSA, there has been a dialogue around what measures would be more appropriate in all OBM outcome areas, and an expressed desire to change them. As mentioned earlier, HSA is currently working to update their measures for the FY 2008–10 OBM Plan. When we spoke with the Self-Sufficiency Director, she was especially excited about the process and working closely with the P&E team to develop informative measures that she can share with her staff on a monthly basis to effectively gauge the progress of their programs.

Key “Take-Aways”

The last question we asked of all of our interviewees was: “What advice would you give to our agencies if considering implementing OBM?” We happily received an outpouring of strategies and “lessons learned” from our hosts and informants in San Mateo County. While we have identified in the last section recommended action steps specifically for our own agencies, we have also culled from our interviews key “take-aways” we can offer to both of our agencies as well as other counties considering OBM implementation.

TAKE-AWAY #1: TAILOR OBM IMPLEMENTATION TO THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE

Moving towards a county-wide, outcome-based management and budgeting system, as San Mateo County has done, is a large task that requires significant planning and resource allocation of its own. It is not always feasible to attempt this type of process change especially given the fiscal constraints faced today. We have concluded that it is currently more important for OBM to be used as a tool for evaluating the outcomes of specific agency strategies,

rather than a performance monitoring system at the level of the county manager/administrator. We believe that it is possible to “custom fit” OBM to programs within our agencies where goals are already conceptually agreed upon and the strategies to achieve the goals have already begun. This type of “bottom-up” approach could allow the use of OBM as a budgeting tool sooner rather than later, since program and fiscal staff would be driving the goals and performance measures versus the CMO. Performance measures would also be more meaningful to “program”—one of the key pieces of advice shared by nearly every one of our San Mateo County informants.

TAKE-AWAY #2: FORM AN “OBM” TEAM WITH AN EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT LEADER

OBM can only be effective as a cross-departmental effort with ownership shared between program, fiscal, and evaluation. Divisions sharing accountability in specific measures also need to partner in development of OBM plans. An OBM team approach develops that shared sense of commitment, accountability, and belonging at the heart of OBM. We also heard repeatedly in our interviews that having an “OBM cheerleader” at the top is key to success and buy-in. While in San Mateo County this “cheerleading” comes from the CMO, we recognize that in tailoring OBM implementation to our agencies, the pom-poms are best held by a member of the Executive Management Team.

TAKE-AWAY #3: SHARE OBM RESULTS FREQUENTLY AND WIDELY

Sharing results on a regularly scheduled basis to a wide audience within the agency and with community partners is one of the surest ways to build interest in and commitment to OBM outcomes. Quantitative results should always be accompanied, by qualitative analysis—the story behind the numbers—as San Mateo County’s model suggests. When building an OBM calendar and process, it is essential to define reporting frequency and methods of report dissemination and build in time for feedback, dialogue, and follow-up requests.

TAKE-AWAY #4: USE OBM TO BUILD AN OUTCOMES-BASED ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Although we have not yet seen evidence that OBM works well as a specific budget development tool that our program and fiscal staff can use to make decisions about extending or discontinuing a specific contract with a service provider, or the return on investment of adding five new staff to a Welfare-to-Work Early Engagement initiative, OBM has clearly been successful in promoting an outcomes-based organizational culture at HSA. We can focus on cultivating this culture in both of our agencies at the same time we work to develop OBM as a more practical budgeting tool. OBM can do this through advancing a dialogue around outcomes and evidence-based practice, as well as creating a culture of critical-thinking managers who are focused on asking the right questions and feel accountable for what they achieve.

TAKE-AWAY #5: SECURE THE NECESSARY IT INFRASTRUCTURE BEFORE LAUNCHING OBM

The availability and integrity of the data used to measure performance are both keys to OBM success. Early and ongoing Information Technology (IT) input to the OBM Team can help shape the performance measures into realistic, viable and meaningful data. Moreover, it is essential to know beforehand if current data systems will be capable of handling a sophisticated evaluation structure. It is key to conduct an up-front analysis of current capabilities of current data infrastructure, and a realistic analysis of the feasibility of IT investments in the near future, before embarking on an agency-wide project that may be chasing outcomes one will not be able to report on for years to come.

Recommendations

Interestingly, although we were studying OBM in San Mateo County through the lens of our own agency cultures and landscapes, we have reached similar conclusions and recommendations applicable to both counties. Our primary conclusion is that some form of OBM can assist both of our agencies in addressing some of the major challenges we face to-

day. We see the need for OBM plans in the landscape of diminishing resources and increasing pressure to meet mandated outcomes. We also recognize the value of OBM in providing a structural framework to strengthen an agency that can be weakened by high turnover at the senior management level.

We acknowledge that any new planning and evaluation effort requires additional resources—at least in the form of staff time dedicated to the effort, information technology infrastructure to support it, and training. We also know well the challenge of allocating resources to a new effort in times like these. We, nevertheless, have a strong conviction that we should implement some form of OBM now. Given the fiscal landscape we are going to be in for the foreseeable future, we strongly encourage our directors to implement an outcomes-based management system to do the best job we can at allocating resources effectively and aligning our programs and services to the outcomes we know we need to achieve.

Alameda County Recommendations

I am fortunate in that our finance director is a strong advocate of outcome based budgeting and already had ideas on how best to begin implementation in our agency. The strategy below is partially a result of conversations we have had throughout the length of my BASSC project.

There are currently two areas within the Social Services Agency (SSA) that are uniquely situated to be a good fit for a “bottom-up” approach to an OBM pilot: Employment Services contracts and IV-E Waiver reinvestment strategies. Under our Employment Services Department (ESD), CalWORKs vocational training and job placement contracts are being restructured for the 2008-09 fiscal year with the hope of positively impacting our work participation rate and better preparing clients for the workforce. In the Children and Family Services Department (CFS), we have a limited timeframe under the Title IV-E Waiver with which to generate and reinvest savings into preventative strategies that reduce the rate at which children enter the foster care system, and the length of time they spend in the system.

These two areas are a particularly good fit for an OBM pilot in that we have a set of strategies already in place attempting to address widely agreed upon goals. We are also highly motivated to employ successful measures that will achieve timely results and have flexibility in the way we structure services to achieve those results. Given this, it is critical the county develop a systematic way of gauging the effectiveness of our current strategies in order to determine if changes need to be made..

In order to specifically address the above needs, and to begin to cultivate and shape a culture around outcomes within the entire organization, it is recommended that Alameda County consider implementing the following steps:

1 Form an integrated team of program, finance, and evaluation and research staff for CFS and ESD to decide upon and further develop the employment and IV-E Waiver strategies to be measured. For each item/strategy we would need to:

- Articulate the goal being served
- Describe the strategy
- Determine key data for gauging success
- Set up methods of collecting data
- Agree on a time frame for evaluations and decision making

2 Share progress and results of the CFS/ESD OBM pilot with other departments at regularly scheduled Senior Management Team meetings. Ultimately we want to create buy-in for OBM throughout the agency by demonstrating how it can be used as a practical tool to ensure we are structuring services to have the greatest impact on clients.

3 Incorporate OBM into the 2009–10 fiscal development cycles by reviewing the pilot results to determine where/how resources might need to be reallocated to obtain more effective results. Identify investments in other departments that would benefit from an outcome based management approach as a way to expand and broaden the scope of OBM in FY 2009–10. Departments should feel better able to take ownership of their budgets if tools are in place allowing them to evaluate the link between what they are spending, and outcomes they are trying to achieve.

A culture cannot be developed overnight, and admittedly even the success of these two pilot areas will not immediately transform the way Alameda County SSA does business. However, with the support of the agency director, hopefully a culture can begin to be shaped around outcomes. In order for this to happen, lessons learned from our internal pilot need to be integrated with the key San Mateo County take-away discussed earlier to solidify and formalize an Outcome Based Management and budgeting process within the agency.

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

While the investment during the pilot phase will mainly be in terms of the opportunity cost of staff time, expanding OBM will necessitate additional staff in Program Evaluation, Data Management, and possibly Contracts. We are currently in the midst of an RFI for a data warehouse, which should increase our capacity to develop viable data gathering methods to evaluate a wider set of strategies. I would argue that given we are on the path to making such a large investment in IT infrastructure, it becomes even more important to take a serious look at administrative staffing needs to ensure we maximize the impact our increased data capacity can have on achieving successful client outcomes.

Santa Cruz County Recommendations

Despite a formal commitment to improve client outcomes, a value to provide “effective service,” and several key outcomes-based planning and evaluation initiatives,³ the County of Santa Cruz Human Services Department has not yet implemented a formal, department-wide process to evaluate the strategic impact of investments in programs and services on client outcomes, and assist in priority-setting for resources. During my internship, I learned that nearly

³The Department has participated in efforts on several occasions over the years to develop outcomes-based strategic plans and data-driven outcomes evaluation both internally and in collaboration with other public and private community partners. The most notable of these efforts is the recently completed Child Welfare Services System Improvement Plan based on a comprehensive outcomes-based self-evaluation process. Other outcomes-based planning & evaluation efforts include the Community Programs Outcomes Reporting and Contracts Management website, the UC Davis-led Strategic Planning & Knowledge Management sessions, and the CalWORKS Plan Addendum Logic Model for Program Improvement.

five years ago the Human Services Department embarked on an OBM-like planning process to develop performance indicators to measure progress towards outcomes in terms of “How much we do,” “How well we do it,” and “Are clients better off?” A lot of good work went into this planning process, and a good product was produced that details indicators, possible data sources, reporting methods and frequency, relationship to mandates, and the resources required in tracking the outcomes. I understand, however, that every division encountered significant barriers when attempting to implement the evaluation plan, and the project was abandoned until some of the barriers—most of them around issues of accessibility to data—could be resolved.

While we may have not yet resolved all of the barriers that stalled our prior outcomes-based performance monitoring project, I would like to propose that we are now better equipped to complete this effort. We now have a Planning & Evaluation unit and director to facilitate this effort. We have an established contract with the Children’s Research Center for child welfare outcome data; we will soon have access to more CalWIN data through the CIS environment. We have an agency-wide Information Management Planning Council to strategize IT needs and investments. And we know more about “what it takes” to implement OBM through the findings from this and other BASSC studies.

I would therefore like to propose that the Human Services Department Director:

- 1 Convene an “OBM Team,” led by the Deputy Director—a proven champion for outcomes-based management—and staffed by the P&E unit.

- 2 Direct the OBM Team to employ a “bottom-up” approach to OBM plan development using the 2004 Performance Indicators by Division document as a springboard to identify current goals, outcomes, performance measures and performance targets *at the program level* and one-by-one. I would recommend starting with the Division of Family & Children’s Services, which would be able to leverage planning and evaluation work conducted through the recent SIP process, and CareerWorks, which has

been actively involved in strategic planning efforts to increase the WPR.

- 3 Direct IT to assess the current IT infrastructure and make recommendations for needed IT investments to support the reporting of the specific performance measures. Care should be taken to ensure the infrastructure is sufficient to support key measures, while working towards building a robust reporting system through data warehousing with an accompanying “dashboard” portal to the data, such as is available with Business Objects InfoView, when the fiscal landscape is more optimistic.

- 4 Assess the feasibility of tying OBM to budget development. At a minimum, incorporate OBM Plans and Evaluations into Budget Book narratives.

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Without good data to support the evaluation of OBM, it will never be possible to truly link performance evaluation to resource allocation and planning in a meaningful way. And, without good data, it will be difficult for OBM planners—and the broader audience of the agency and community partners at large—to value the “opportunity costs” that will have been invested in terms of management and staff time for OBM planning and development. It will therefore be essential to build into OBM implementation a fiscal plan for strategic IT investments to support this effort. While this additional cost will be challenging to budget for in the short term, I am confident that these costs will be offset by the savings incurred over the long-term and greater efficiency of staff and other resources needed to deliver effective programs.

Acknowledgements

We would like to extend our sincerest appreciation to Beverly Johnson, Director of the San Mateo County Human Services Agency, for extending the invitation to us to do our internship in San Mateo County and benefit from the years of OBM experience there. We also would like to thank all of the people we interviewed for their hospitality and generosity with their time. From the moment of the kick-off orienta-

tion, graciously facilitated by John Joy, through each and every one of our interviews, we were consistently impressed by the willingness of everyone to candidly share their OBM experiences with us.

We would like to especially acknowledge our two hosts, Dr. Alexis Halley and Robert Manchia, for helping us focus our project and connecting us with a diverse group of valuable interviewees. The encouragement and support they provided throughout the process was very much appreciated.

We were very fortunate to be able to spend time with the following members of the County Manager's Office and employees of the Human Services Agency:

- County Manager's Office—Reyna Farrales, Deputy County Manager; Jim Saco, Budget Director; Dennis O'Rourke, Management Analyst; Joanne Ward, Management Analyst
- San Mateo County Human Services Agency—Beverly Johnson, Agency Director; John Meerams, Director of Finance; Elsa Dawson, Director of Self Sufficiency; Deborah Patten, Contract Supervisor; Amy Kaiser, Business Systems Group Manager; Patrick Enriquez, Business Systems Group Supervisor; Bill Harven, Management Analyst, Planning and Evaluation.

We would also like to acknowledge and thank our BASSC organizers and instructors for helping to facilitate a great program. Additionally, the guidance, advice and feedback they provided to us as we worked to complete our 15-day assignment was extremely valuable in helping us arrive at our final deliverable.

Finally, we want to thank our directors at our home agencies, Cecilia Espinola of the County of Santa Cruz Human Services Department and Yolanda Baldovinos of the Alameda County Social Services Agency, for giving us the opportunity to take part in this extraordinary learning experience.

References

- Chu, D. (2005). *Moving Toward Outcome Based Management*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies—Class of 2005.
- Cruz, D. (2002). *A Model for Data Warehouse Project Management*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies—Class of 2002.
- Galloway, D. (2001). *An Inside Look at Outcome-Based Management: San Mateo County*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies—Class of 2001.
- Lerabale, C. (2003). *Outcome-Based Management in the San Mateo County Human Services Agency*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies—Class of 2003.
- McQuary, D. (2006). *Managing with Data in San Mateo County: Measuring What Should Get Done*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies—Class of 2006.
- Nestore, T. (2003). *Outcome-Based Management In San Mateo County—Implications For Contra Costa County*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies Class of 2003.
- Perkins, S. (2007). *Planning and Evaluation Function in San Mateo County: How to Use Data to Inform and Influence Program Development*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies—Class of 2007.
- Rellar, J. (1999). *Performance Information and the Management System: Performance and Outcome Measures*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies Class of 1999).
- Rosenberg, M. (2000). *Promoting Outcome-Based Management Systems*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies—Class of 2000.
- Sanchez, L. (2003). *Outcome-Based Management: A Planning Tool for High Level Management*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies—Class of 2003.
- Silva, G. (2006). *Methodical Analysis Gets the Job Done: Outcome-Based Management in San Mateo County*. BASSC Participants' Case Studies—Class of 2006.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1
OBM Performance Measures Summary

Measurement Criteria	Type of Data Measured
What/How Much We Do (Workload)	# of Clients Served
	# of Activities Performed
	# of Calls/Requests for Service Inspections Completed
How Well We Do It (Quality)	Staffing ratios
	% Satisfied with Services
	% of Clients Completing Program
	Compliance
	Unit Cost
Is Anyone Better Off? (Outcomes)	Timeliness
	Trained/Certified Staff
	# and % of Clients Showing Improvement in Skills, Attitude, Behavior, Circumstance
	# and % Healthier, Safer, Self-Sufficient

TABLE 2
Proposed FY 2008-10 Economic Self Sufficiency Performance Measures

Measurement Criteria	Performance Measures
What/How Much We Do (Workload)	Number of Participants Using PeninsulaWorks Centers
	Number of Veterans Served
	Number of Youth Receiving Employment Services, Including Jobs For Youth
How Well We Do It (Quality)	Number of Food Stamp Applications
	Percent of Sanctioned CalWORKs Families Who are Re-Engaged in Welfare-to-Work Activities
	Percent of WIA-Enrolled Participants Leaving Intensive and Training Services with Employment
Is Anyone Better Off? (Outcomes)	<p>Average Hourly Wage at Placement for WIA-Enrolled Customers upon exiting training programs (Headline Measure)</p> <p>Percent of CalWORKs Participants Leaving Cash Aid With Employment (Headline Measure)</p> <p>Percent of CalWORKs Welfare-to-Work Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaged in WTW Activities • Reporting Employment