Creating Stronger Linkages between Community Indicator Projects and Government Performance Measurement Efforts

By the Community Indicators Consortium
A Report Funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation

April 30, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

A significant portion of the Community Indicators Consortium's (CIC) 2005 conference--supported, in part, by a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation--focused on creating a dialogue on the linkages between community indicators and government performance measures. A key assumption surrounding the dialogue was that if citizen-driven community indicators and government performance measurement were better linked, community indicators would have more influence on what government does to improve the community, and government performance measures would become more relevant to the community conditions of greatest concern to citizens. The potential benefits of establishing stronger linkages between community indicators and government performance measures include:

- providing evidence of government service performance improvement related to citizens' priorities, as reflected by their indicators,

- increasing citizens' confidence in their local government's progress towards societal goals reflected by the indicators and measures,

- enhancing the use of data by citizens and public officials for public debate, decision-making, and allocation of scarce resources, and

- increasing the clarity of the contributions made or needing to be made by various sectors of society to improve community conditions.

The goal of this report is to expand on ideas presented at the conference concerning the potential to strengthen links between community indicators and local government performance measurement. Specifically, this report discusses the three key issues: (1) commonalities and differences between community indicators and government performance measurement efforts, (2) barriers to creating linkages between community indicators and government performance measures, and (3) potential strategies for reducing and/or eliminating barriers to creating linkages between community indicators and government performance measures. The intent of this report is to advance the dialogue on building stronger linkages between community indicators and government performance measurement and to identify a broad agenda for further research and action for that purpose. As a result, the report also includes some suggested/recommended next steps.

Information contained in this report comes from three primary sources. One source was a content analysis of presentations and discussions on this topic at the CIC 2005 Conference. A complete list of sessions and discussions is identified in Appendix 1. A second source of information was comments by a panel of experts on community indicators and government performance measurement. This expert review panel was convened in Arlington, Virginia, on December 6, 2006. After reviewing an initial draft of this report, the expert panel provided comments, suggestions and additional information that enhanced the discussion of the issues and ideas raised in the draft report. A listing of the panel of national experts is shown in Appendix 2. The third source of

information was the U.S. Government Accountability Office's (GAO) November 2004 report on the state of the practice of indicators.[1]

To put the information presented in this report in context, it will be important to remember the scope of the report. Specifically, the discussion of indicators and government performance measurement only focuses on those at the State level and below. National indicator efforts, such as the Federal government's Healthy People 2010 and the Heinz Center's *The State of the Nation's Ecosystems*, and the Federal government's Government Performance Results Act efforts were considered outside the scope of this report.

COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COMMUNITY INDICATORS AND GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT EFFORTS

Interestingly, discussion among conference participants revealed a perception of wide differences between community indicators projects and government performance measurement efforts. However, even in those cases without a direct linkage, there seem to be many more commonalities among the two types of efforts, and the individuals who work on them, than there are differences.

One significant difference involves the types of measures used. Community indicators focus on conditions within a State or local community and usually involve outcome measures. Conversely, government performance measures typically focus on the performance of government services and programs although sometimes a few of these measures are outcome measures. Community indicators typically focus on higher level community conditions such as affordable housing, access to quality health care, job creation, and open space. Government performance measures typically focus on the things government is supposed to accomplish--direct results of services provided, service quality, response times, the amount of service (output) provided, or service efficiency (e.g., cost per unit or output delivered or cost per unit of outcome achieved). Even when both community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts include outcome measures, those incorporated into community indicators tend to be broader, societal outcomes and those incorporated into government performance measures tend to be more narrow programmatic outcomes.

Related to the topic above, community indicators are often indirectly linked to activities that one entity controls and thus, it can be challenging to show how actions influence changes to community conditions. Conversely, government performance measures are typically linked to government programs or activities so performance changes are more likely to be connected to specific government influence. Of course, these linkages are less clear when a government uses outcome measures.

---

[1] GAO, *INFORMING OUR NATION: Improving How to Understand and Assess the USA's Position and Progress*, GA0-05-1, (Washington, DC: November 10, 2004).

Additionally, community indicators measure things that are important to a wide range of stakeholders and are often identified and selected through consensus-building. Government performance measures, on the other hand, typically measure things that are important to elected officials and government managers and are often identified and selected on the basis of the interests of government agencies. As a result, community stakeholders—citizens, civic groups, non-profits and businesses—are usually more interested in the data reported by indicator projects than performance measurement data reported by governments.

Community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts also face sustainability issues although they differ in nature. Community indicator projects are typically managed by independent, non-government organizations and thus are insulated from political interests. However, they are typically dependent on fundraising and in-kind services for operating funds which can be challenging. The sustainability of government performance measurement efforts is controlled by elected officials and thus, these measurements rely on political support for their continued existence. However, governments fund their performance measurement efforts either through annual appropriations or as part of general operating costs so obtaining more stable funding can be somewhat less challenging.

One of the similarities is that both community indicators and government performance measurement are quantifiable and measurable. Many community indicator projects, like government performance measurement efforts, use goals and targets to measure progress. The Alaska 20/20 indicator project, for example, contains vision statements for five topics—communities, economy, education, environment, and government—three objectives for each vision statement, and 49 indicators to measure progress.

Another similarity is that the value of data from community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts are dependent upon having credible and reliable data. Any challenges to the credibility and reliability of their data can lead to community members and government managers not using the data for decision making.

There are also several examples where linkages between community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts currently exist. Indicator projects in five jurisdictions were identified as examples of where such linkages exist. These examples were grouped according to whether the linkages exist as a result of action (a) within government or (b) within government with community stakeholder oversight.

Examples of linkages from within government:

- Oregon Benchmarks' broad societal indicators are linked to selected performance indicators of some state agencies. These indicators are also used to measure progress toward achieving the goals articulated in the staff's strategic plan—Oregon Shines.

- The Commonwealth of Virginia recently established "Virginia Performs" which contains seven long-term goals and indicators of progress for each goal and a symbol to identify whether the State government's influence for each indicator of progress is

significant or limited. Additionally, state government agencies are supposed to link their performance measures to the same long-term goals.

- City of Charlotte's broad neighborhood quality of life ratings (stable, transitioning, and challenged) are used by the City Council to track overall community improvements as part of their strategic plan and to help make programmatic decisions.

- Washoe County Nevada used Truckee Meadows Tomorrow's Quality of Life Indicators and 2005 Community Report as part of the process to revise the County's strategic goals.

Example from within government with community stakeholder oversight:

- Santa Monica developed a Sustainable City Plan which contains eight goal areas and indicators for each goal area. Two types of indicators are included in the Plan—system level and program level indicators. System level indicators measure the state, condition or pressures on a community-wide basis for each goal area. Program level indicators measure the performance or effectiveness of specific programs, policies, or actions taken by the City government or other community stakeholders.

BARRIERS TO INCREASED LINKAGES BETWEEN COMMUNITY INDICATORS AND GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Conference participants identified four broad barriers to linking community indicators and government performance measures. These four barriers are:

- Limited knowledge of community indicators and government performance measurement linkages at the state and local levels.

- Different focuses and purposes between community indicator projects and government performance measures.

- Difficulties in assigning accountability for improving community conditions.

- Low-levels of trust impede access to data.

Limited Knowledge of Community Indicators and Government Performance Measurement Linkages at State and Local Levels

The depth and breath of knowledge among practitioners in the fields and the public appear limited even though some good examples of linkages between community indicators and government performance measurement at the state and local level do exist (e.g., Oregon Benchmarks, Virginia Performs, Santa Monica Sustainable City Plan, and Truckee Meadows Tomorrow). People in communities interested in measuring and improving community conditions and government performance therefore may not be able to see the value of linking such measurement systems. This challenge is further complicated by the lack of a ready source of promising practices to learn from and emulate.

Conference participants were also concerned about obstacles to the challenge of communicating community conditions and government performance and increasing public awareness and engaging the public. These obstacles included:

- Government managers having a tendency not to want to, or have the means for, publishing or widely disseminating information about their governments' performance.

- Government rarely asking citizens what they want to know before reporting government performance to them. What government professionals find useful to measure and what they think the public wants to know can be quite different from what citizens really want to know.

- Government staff, involved in performance measurement, often are management analysts and technical experts, not communications professionals. Even when they want to ask citizens what's important to them, many times they do not know how best to solicit the information.

- Some civic organizations are beset by similar communication and awareness problems as government despite the fact that they tend to have more citizen involvement in selecting indicators. Many civic organizations involved in indicators initiatives may have difficulty getting media attention and building awareness with the public beyond those who are directly involved with a specific indicators project. There are, however, examples of community indicator projects that have overcome this obstacle. One example is the Santa Cruz County Community Assessment Project which annually sends out a 16-page summary report on its indicators and associated data to every household in the County. This effort is paid for by one of its member organizations.

Different Focuses and Purposes between Community Indicators and Government Performance Measurement

Conference participants identified several broad differences in focus and purpose between community indicators groups and government performance measurement. These differences included:

- Civic community indicators groups tend to measure "high-level" community and societal conditions that contribute to, for example, overall quality of life, community health, community well-being, or community sustainability.

- Government performance measurement tends to be narrowly focused on the delivery of specific services provided by government.

- Community indicator systems show trends in community conditions to alert people to when and where there is a need to improve conditions.

- Government performance measures are usually intended to help manage government services.

Additionally, differences in focus and purpose were identified regarding land use planning, development, and sustainability. These differences included:

- Many civic community indicators groups have a major focus on sustainability. However, while land use planning and regulation and related economic development efforts can have a major impact on sustainability, these functions are rarely measured and reported by government from a sustainability perspective.

- If performance of land use and economic development functions are reported at all by government, they tend to be reported only from a business and economic perspective (e.g., the response time to get plans or permits approved, number of jobs created). While economic success is generally one element of community sustainability, it is important not to ignore that other elements often associated with sustainability are affected by land use planning and regulation, such as environmental sustainability, community health, and community social development or equity.

Difficulties in Assigning Accountability for Improving Community Conditions

Conference participants raised the issue of accountability for improving community conditions' often being beyond the ability of any one unit of government or public and non-profit organizations to control or influence. Some conference participants thought that community indicator groups wanted government organizations to join in taking more responsibility for improving the broad conditions measured by community indicators. In their opinion, government organizations were hesitant to join in because they did not want to be held accountable for conditions they thought was beyond their control. A source of this concern on the part of these organizations is that their actions at most only partially influence the high-level conditions measured by community indicators.

For public health indicators the accountability issue was often reversed (i.e., government public health departments report on indicators of community health that require actions outside of government to influence). Specific issues discussed were:

- Government public health departments collect data on community health indicators, but other actors are responsible for actions to improve community conditions.

- Public health agencies presenting at the conference were not only focused on improving community health generally but also on eliminating health disparities between demographic groups so even the poor and others often marginalized can attain largely the same health outcomes as majority groups in society.

The issues raised above are important because the ultimate result of a community indicator project is to identify community conditions that need improvement and then take actions to improve those conditions. Some community indicator projects have developed mechanisms for broader accountability for improving community conditions. For example, Truckee Meadows Tomorrow has developed Quality of Life Compacts. These Compacts are formal, voluntary agreements between Truckee Meadows Tomorrow and one or more organizations, businesses, individuals, and/or local governmental entities that work together to improve performance on targeted quality of life indicators. The Santa Cruz County Community Assessment Project identified organizations and groups

to champion community involvement to achieve its community goals and associated indicators. For example, the Workforce Investment Board is the champion for the economy goal and the Santa Cruz Probation Department is the champion for the public safety goal.

Low Levels of Trust Impede Access to Data

Conference participants were also concerned about the tensions and sometimes low levels of trust between civic organizations and government regarding the use and reporting of data for measurement. One reason for this situation is that all publicly reported government data was viewed as inevitably part of the political process and so such data could be seen by civic groups as subject to manipulation. Also, government officials sometimes see civic groups as primarily critics of government and thus, could see them as providing data to show what government is doing wrong. Additionally, concerns were expressed about the limited transparency of data sources and information on the reliability and limitations of data presented by both types of measurement systems.

Some community indicator projects have overcome these concerns by developing partnerships with governmental organizations which can provide data for the indicator project and by ensuring that these governmental organizations have their own data quality standards. For example, the Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance, which produces Vital Signs, developed data partnerships with various City of Baltimore departments such as the health and police departments and the Mayor's CitiStat initiative in addition to obtaining data from other governmental units (e.g., the Circuit Court of Baltimore City and Maryland state agencies). The most recent Vital Signs report also states that its data providers developed data handling standards for quality control and documentation purposes. The Alliance's staff also checked data items and documents for any errors.[2]

The Governmental Accounting Standards Board published 16 suggested criteria for use in preparing reports on performance information. There are many common issues regarding data quality and transparency for both community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts, and applying these criteria to reporting data associated with community indicator projects could prove not only useful but a way to gain clarity and common ground.

POTENTIAL STRATEGIES FOR REDUCING AND/OR ELIMINATING BARRIERS TO CREATING STRONGER LINKAGES BETWEEN COMMUNITY INDICATORS AND GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

There was broad agreement that there are benefits to be gained by linking community indicator projects and government performance measurement. Such linkages could result in bringing a wide variety of resources together to improve community conditions and

---

[2] Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance, Vital Signs IV, Winter 2006.

could help eliminate the idea that it is some other group's responsibility for taking actions to improve community conditions. Three broad potential strategies were also identified for reducing and/or eliminating such barriers. The possible strategies focused on (1) building collaborations among individuals involved in community indicator projects, elected officials and government managers, (2) creating mutually supportive advocacy, (3) establishing networks involving community indicator and government measurement practitioners and academics to share and exchange information and knowledge, and (4) identifying promising practices of linkages between community indicators and government performance measurement to advance knowledge regarding such linkages and examples that could be emulated.

Collaboration

Conference participants viewed collaboration across organizations and sectors in a community as an important and necessary element for advancing linkages between community indicators and government performance measurement. One suggestion for fostering collaboration was to create a "shared vision" and a sense that government and non-government organizations can help achieve each other's goals by working together. One method would be to identify "partners" in the community. Each partner, including government, can then take responsibility for its actions or shorter term results and be held accountable for performance of their actions or results together, as in Truckee Meadows Tomorrow's Quality of Life Compacts.

Indicator projects can also do outreach to citizens and organizations to identify non-traditional assets, such as volunteers with skills or time to contribute to an effort, to address an issue or help collect data. These volunteers can be mobilized to collect data relevant to either community indicators, government performance measures or both. One such example is the Center on Government Performance's Computerized Neighborhood Environment Tracking (ComNET). The Center trains community representatives to use hand-held computers to collect data on street level conditions. ComNET has been used by community groups in at least eight jurisdictions.[3]

Successful collaborations require trust, and trust is built over time. Government and non-government organizations need to understand each others' measures, data issues, and purposes for using data. Direct collaboration to improve conditions and performance might not be possible at first, but creating awareness and understanding would be a first step.

Participants also saw access to and use of data as a significant issue needing to be addressed. One suggestion to address this issue involved sharing data between government and civic groups. Government is often a key source of data for community indicators groups, and there are examples of cooperation between government organizations and civic indicators groups in sharing and using each others data. One

---

[3] The jurisdictions are New York City; Des Moines, IA; Philadelphia, PA; San Francisco, CA; Seattle, WA; Worcester, MA; Yonkers, NY; and Connecticut.

example cited was the cooperation between the Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance and the City of Baltimore Mayor Office's CitiStat.

Another suggestion was that government and non-government organizations consider the use of data in "before the fact" planning to target efforts, holding discussions across systems and issues, and making data use part of the budget process. Suggestions for determining data selection included tailoring community indicators to the requirements of city government needs, using performance feedback, and getting decision makers to consider community indicators when reviewing performance information.

Mutually Supportive Advocacy

Participants saw advocacy as an important way to create stronger, better linkages between community indicators and government performance measurement. Significant to this goal is increasing elected officials' awareness of community indicators and how they can relate to government performance measures. Once the awareness has been increased, elected state officials and City and County Councils could legislate that governments look for opportunities to link government performance measures with existing community indicators. One tactic to reach this end would be to develop guidance for state and local government performance reporting to develop consistency and compatibility with reporting of community indicators. Key allies could be engaged to push the need to focus on community conditions through the use of indicators and to encourage elected officials to use their advocacy of indicators as positive talking points in their campaigns. Political pressure may also become a necessary tool. It is important to recognize the importance of cooperative effort and to ensure that government alone does not take the blame for bad results.

Another suggested tactic focused on increasing public awareness and involvement. For example, Truckee Meadows Tomorrow presented examples of both advocacy by its members and collaboration with government and private organizations (such as in its Quality of Life Compacts) to get organizations to be accountable for taking measurable actions intended to improve Truckee Meadows Tomorrow's regional indicators. Several success stories were also shared during the conference about engaging community members in determining goals, indicators, and labels for ratings, and focusing on developing citizen driven solutions. Some indicator projects have had more success when they focus on engaging community members about municipal issues and have developed local constituencies for change. Another idea suggested was to engage citizens in the process by reporting at different levels of detail and issuing "follow-up" memos to track progress. Pointing out worsening trend lines and using peer pressure to get groups and people involved can move people to action. Conversely, award ceremonies and celebrations for improving results are good ways to engage community leaders and partner organizations.

Establish a Network of Community Indicator and Government Performance Practitioners and Academics

Suggestions for establishing such networks at national, regional and local levels included:

- Establish networks of community indicators groups that can take up this issue and promote more linkages, and encourage existing networks or interest groups of governments and government officials to take up this issue.

- Get community indicators practitioners and government measurement practitioners talking with each other and networking together. The new "Progress and Performance Network" in the Pacific Northwest was mentioned as model that could be emulated. These conversations can help overcome barriers to successful collaboration and focus on specific concerns such as determining how to use each other's systems and data.

- Establish links across or networks among local collaborative groups involving both governments and community indicator groups. One such example is the newly established Public Performance Measurement and Reporting Network that CIC participates in. The Network is located on the Web at www.ppmm.net.

Identify Promising Practices of Existing Linkages between Community Indicators and Government Performance Measures

While there was a lot of interest among conference participants in creating stronger linkages between community indicators and government performance measures, the level of knowledge of existing and promising practices that could promote more cases of such linkages was limited. A list of approximately 46 community indicator projects that may either already demonstrate community indicators-government performance linkages or showed promise of creating useful links has been identified (see Appendix 3). While this is an extensive list of indicator projects, it does not capture all possible candidate projects.

There was a strong desire among conference participants for efforts to identify promising practices and publicize them for communities to learn from and emulate. Some of the efforts suggested to increase the body of knowledge are:

- Research projects to identify, demonstrate, and document best practices, including practices by individual government and civic organizations and practices by partnerships or collaborative groups.

- Build and maintain a knowledge base of good practices for community and government organizations to seek as models for linking community indicators and government performance in their own communities. The knowledge base can help organizations already experienced in measurement learn ways to create links with others that will make their indicators more influential, and it can help organizations that are starting indicator efforts to develop their initiatives in ways that promote links with government performance.

- Help indicators groups, government measurement practitioners, local collaborative groups, and researchers and data intermediaries learn from each other. Compile and share:

  o Indicators used for different conditions, issues, and services;

  o Technology used, especially open-source software;

  o Logic models or value chains of how desired community outcomes are achieved, including roles of different players in the community (e.g., parents reading to their kids, neighbors cooperating with police, businesses adopting sustainable practices, schools hiring qualified teachers, government and nonprofit organizations providing quality services, governments adopting and enforcing policies and codes).

CONCLUSIONS

As mentioned at the beginning of this report, its purpose is to advance the dialogue for building stronger linkages between community indicator projects and government performance measurement and identify a broad agenda for further research and action. The initial concept behind the track on this topic at the conference was that there are wide differences between community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts. This concept appears not to be as accurate as originally thought. In fact, there appear to be more similarities than differences between community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts. Not only are there several efforts where these two types of efforts are linked but they also face some of the same challenges.

The 46 identified community indicator projects that may either already demonstrate community indicators-government performance linkages or show promise of creating useful links give promise that more information on these projects can help build stronger linkages. More information and research on these projects and identification of other lesser-known projects is needed.

The limited sharing of issues between the practitioners in the two communities and the insufficient understanding of all the good work that is currently on-going and being tried are the most significant obstacles to overcome in creating stronger linkages between community indicator projects and government performance measurement. Stronger linkages between the two communities also can be developed by joining together to do research on common issues and problems.

NEXT STEPS

The group identified four potential next steps that could be taken to build stronger linkages between community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts. These are:

- Seek out the leading examples of community indicator and government performance measurement efforts. The Community Indicators Consortium (CIC) has been trying to do this through its Innovation Awards Program which is sponsored by the Urban Markets Initiative at the Brookings Institution. Now in its second year, CIC solicits nominations of indicator projects in the United States and internationally that best demonstrate positive change in their communities and the power of indicators to drive that change. The purpose of the Awards Program is to (a) celebrate the successes of outstanding indicator projects and the people who create and manage them and (b) add to the public body of knowledge about community indicator projects' best practices. In 2007, CIC received nominations of community indicator projects in Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, Australia, Canada, and England.

- Develop a research agenda that identifies the most significant issues facing community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts.

- Develop working groups involving community indicator organizations (e.g., CIC), major government interest organizations (e.g., National League of Cities, International City/County Management Association, and National Governors Association) and performance measurement organizations (e.g., the American Society for Public Administration's Center for Accountability and Performance and the newly formed Public Performance Measurement and Reporting Network). These working groups could develop ideas on projects that they could work on together as well as develop an advocacy agenda. One potential project would be to identify and study promising practices of existing linkages between community indicator projects and government performance measure efforts including lessons learned in developing these linkages.

- Continue to have the topic of creating stronger linkages between community indicator projects and government performance measurement efforts as a track or major issue at future CIC conferences as well as other conferences such as the American Society for Public Administration's annual conference and Governing Magazine's annual Managing for Results conference.

In addition to the potential next steps listed above, one next step that has already started is research on the 46 community indicator projects identified in Appendix 3. Students in the Public and Non-Profit Program Evaluation class at The George Washington University are doing this research for CIC as part of their evaluation project for the spring 2007 semester. CIC intends to release this research as a companion document to this report later in 2007.

Further, other ideas for increasing the public's awareness of community indicators, government performance measures, or both were identified. Because these ideas are not specifically related to this report's focus but add to the body of knowledge they have been included in Appendix IV.

APPENDIX I

LISTING OF CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS AT THE DECEMBER 2005 CIC CONFERENCE

Plenary Presentations:

Community Indicators and Government Performance Reporting: Differences and Issues, presented by Ted Greenwood: Sloan Foundation

How Truckee Meadows Tomorrow (TMT) has Made its Quality of Life Indicators Influential in its Region, and Gotten Local Government to Act and Report on its Performance, presented by Karen Hruby for Kathy Carter, President, TMT

Public Health Disparities and Performance Strategies to Reduce Them, presented by Marilyn Metzler, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Panel Presentations and Workshop:

Santa Monica Sustainability Indicators Linked to Government and Community Performance, presented by Dean Kubani, Sustainable City Coordinator, City of Santa Monica

Community Indicators and Local Government Performance Management Workshop, presented by Paul Epstein, Epstein & Fass Associates

Truckee Meadows Tomorrow (TMT): Quality of Life Compacts Influence Government Performance, presented by Karen Hruby, Executive Director, (TMT) and Elaine Lancaster, Washoe Education Association and TMT member.

Community Indicators, a Balanced Scorecard, and Citizen Engagement Drive Neighborhood Development, presented by Stanley Watkins, Neighborhood Development Director, City of Charlotte, North Carolina

Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance (BNIA), presented by Peter Armstrong, BNIA

CitiStat, presented by Dourakine Rosarian, Mayor's Office, City of Baltimore

Using GASB Criteria to Improve Community Indicators Reports and Link with Local Government Performance, presented by Jay Fountain, Government Accounting Standards Board, Paul Epstein, Epstein & Fass Associates, and Ben Warner, Jacksonville Community Council Inc.

Working Session with Montpelier Planning Commission on Housing, Natural Resources, and Transportation.

Public Health and Community Indicator Partnerships to Address Health Disparities: presentations by Cheryl Wold, Los Angeles County Public Health; Sandy Ciske, King County Public Health; and Charlotte Kahn, Boston Indicators Project.

Discussions

Discussion forum among conference participants regarding barriers to, and strategies for, linking community indicators and government performance measurement.

Follow up to Seattle meeting: Building the Performance Management Network. Chantal Stevens, Sustainable Seattle, reported on the Progress and Performance Network being started in the Pacific Northwest, leading to a broader discussion of how networks could stimulate linkages.

APPENDIX II

LISTING OF PANEL OF NATIONAL EXPERTS AND OTHER MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS

Panel of National Experts Maria P. Aristigueta, Associate Professor, School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy

University of Delaware

Barbara J. Cohn, Vice President, (Fund for the City of New York,) National Center for Civic Innovation

Jeff Elder, Director, Social and Economic Research, United Way of America

Chris Hoenig, Chair, Key National Indicators Initiative Executive Committee; Vice President of Strategy, Business Consulting Services, IBM Global Services

Dr. Marc Holzer, Dean, School of Public Affairs and Administration and Director, National Public Productivity Center, Rutgers University-Newark

John Kamensky, Associate Partner, IBM Business Consulting Services and Senior Fellow, IBM Center for The Business of Government

Richard Keevey, Director of the Performance Consortium and Director of State Operations, National Academy of Public Administration

Tom Kingsley, Director, the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership, The Urban Institute Ted Greenwood, Program Director, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation

Dr. Kathryn Newcomer, Professor of Public Policy and Public Administration and Director, School of Public Policy and Public Administration, The George Washington University,

Robin O'Malley, Senior Fellow and Program Director, The H. John Heinz Center for Science, Economics, and the Environment

Other Major Contributors

Paul Epstein, Principal, Epstein and Fass Associates

Ken Jones, CIC Consultant

Allen Lomax, Senior Analyst, US Government Accountability Office

APPENDIX III

LIST OF COMMUNITY INDICATOR PROJECTS THAT EITHER DEMONSTRATE OR SHOW PROMISE OF LINKAGES BETWEEN COMMUNITY INDICATORS AND GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Alaska 2020: www.alaska2020.org

Boston Indicators Project: www.tbf.org

Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance: www.bnia.org

Central Texas Sustainability Indicators Project: http://www.centex-indicators.org/

City Scan and Civic Radar – Hartford, CT: www.city-scan.com

City Connect, Detroit: http://www.cityconnectdetroit.org
City of Portland Oregon's *Service Efforts and Accomplishments: 2005-06, Sixteenth Annual Report on City Government Performance*, A Report from the City Auditor, December 2006.
http://www.portlandonline.com/shared/cfm/image.cfm?id=142289

Communities Count: www.communitiescount.org

Community Indicators Initiative of Spokane County (Washington): www.communityindicators.ewu.edu

Community Vision, Osceola County: www.communityvision.org

Dallas Indicators (Texas): http://www.dallasindicators.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1777

Hennepin County Community Indicators: http://wwwa.co.hennepin.mn.us/portalsite/HCInternet

Index of Silicon Valley (California): www.jointventure.org

Jacksonville Community Council, Inc: http://www.jcci.org/default.aspx

Kids Count: www.kidscount.org

Long Island Index (New York): http://www.longislandindex.org/

Maine Marks: http://www.mainemarks.org/

Maine Measures of Growth in Focus 2006: http://www.mdf.org/megc/measures/MOG2006.html

Miami United Way: http://www.unitedwaymiami.org/

Milwaukee: www.nonprofitcentermilwaukee.org/datacenter/

Multnomah County Oregon, *Marquee Indicator Report, FY 2008 Budget Cycle*:
http://www.co.multnomah.or.us/auditor/FY08%20Marquee%20Indicators%20Report.pdf

Neighborhood Facts-Denver: http://www.piton.org/default.asp?nav_id=4

New York City Mayor's Management Report: http://www.nyc.gov/html/ops/html/mmr/mmr.shtml

New Yorkers For Parks: www.ny4p.org

Northampton Community Indicators (Massachusetts):
http://www.northamptonma.gov/opd/uploads/listWidget/4027/Indicators.pdf

Oklahoma County Vital Signs: http://www.unitedwayokc.org/

Orange County, CA: http://www.ocgov.com/ceocommunity.asp

Philadelphia: www.metrophilaindicators.org

Pittsburgh Today (Pennsylvania): http://www.pittsburghtoday.org/web/home.jsp

Portrait of Peel, Ontario: http://www.portraitsofpeel.ca

Prosperity Pensacola: www.haas.edu/pdfFiles/Indicator_Report_revised.pdf

Redmond 2022 (Washington):
http://www.ci.redmond.wa.us/intheworks/Redmond2022/implbenchmark.asp

SCOPE-Sarasota County: http://scopexcel.org/communitytools_reportcard.html

Santa Cruz County Community Assessment Project: www.santacruzcountycap.org

Santa Monica: www.smepd.org

Social Assets and Vulnerabilities Indicators: www.savi.org

The State of Chattanooga Region Report (Tennessee): www.researchcouncil.net

The State of the Region (Southern California): www.scag.ca.gov/sotr

Spartanburg (South Carolina): www.uwpiedmont.org/community_indicators.php

Sustainable Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania), Regional Sustainable Indicators Report: http://www.sustainablepittsburgh.org

Sustainable Seattle: www.sustainableseattle.org

Truckee Meadows Tomorrow: www.quality-of-life.org

Virginia Performs: www.vaperforms.virginia.gov

West Michigan Community Indicator Projects: http://cridata.org/indicators/index.html

Worcester Regional Research Bureau (Massachusetts): www.wrrb.org

Yampa Valley Community Indicators Project (Colorado): www.yampavalleypartners.com

APPENDIX IV

OTHER IDEAS FOR INCREASING THE PUBLIC'S AWARENESS OF COMMUNITY INDICATORS, GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE MEASURES, OR BOTH

Not all of the ideas generated specifically related to the topic of this report. However, they are included in this report because they offer some valuable ideas for increasing the public's awareness of community indicators, government performance measures, or both. These ideas included:

- Creating report cards like the Kids Count or using simple grades to evaluate efforts can make indicators projects clearer to both the press and the public.

- Using multiple modes of communication is important for communicating data and results. Web sites should be easy to navigate and contain well-organized data. Summary reports released to the press and public presentations can help reach people not connected to the internet or not in the habit of getting information online. For example, Jacksonville Community Council, Inc. finds that distributing CD-ROMs of its reports in addition to web and print versions captures more readers.

- Using visuals or success stories about a particular indicator or measure can help to better communicate data as an important element.

- Educating the media on how to release, explain, and use data.