

MFM PROJECT

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP EVALUATION

by Brenda Linton

Research Triangle Institute
1615 M Street, NW, Suite 740
Washington, DC 20036

Municipal Finance and Management
Project No. 5656
Contract No. CCN-0007-C-00-3110-0

May 3, 1996

Performance Management Workshop Evaluation
Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Municipal Finance and Management Project Overview

The Municipal Finance and Management (MFM) Project is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and is being carried out by a consortium of U.S. organizations led by the Research Triangle Institute (RTI). The project is working with eight pilot cities in four countries: Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan. Resident advisors were assigned to each city for an initial period of 18 months. Resident advisors helped prepare a workplan that articulated project objectives in each city and a set of activities for achieving these objectives.

MFM project implementation in Ukraine began in early 1994 in the cities of Lviv, Ternopil, and Kharkiv. Overall MFM project goals for Ukraine are to:

- Improve efficiency and effectiveness of local government.
- Increase transparency of local government operation and increase accountability of local government to the public.
- Improve local government services.
- Support establishment of effective representation of local government at the national level.

1.2 MFM Performance Management Workshop in Kharkiv

Background

The MFM Project has emphasized the importance of municipal management and accountability for democratic governance in Ukrainian pilot cities. Resident advisors have championed the use of performance management as a tool for involving stakeholders, including citizens, in decision-making and planning for sustainability of reform efforts. In Kharkiv, the centerpiece of the MFM project is the belief that performance management is the key to improved service delivery and should be an integral part of how departmental managers and staff conduct their daily business. To that end, the MFM project sponsored a strategic planning seminar for senior staff during the project start-up phase; in addition, the project has provided ongoing advisory support to specific departments as well as the Mayor's office in the use of performance management techniques to address problems and challenges.

Municipal officials in Kharkiv have come to appreciate the value of strategic performance management for improving their knowledge of how well departments are functioning. Performance measurement provides officials with the information they need to better serve their constituents. The concepts of transparency and accountability have taken root in Kharkiv and are flowering in city initiatives such as televised public discussions on budgeting and health care, the dissemination of public information products on housing and youth problems, and the establishment of a municipal staff training center.

In order to support counterparts' interest in directly applying performance management techniques to their work, the MFM program in Kharkiv sponsored a two-day performance management workshop in February 1996 conducted by Tom Cook and Brenda Linton. Twenty-three participants attended the workshop, including senior staff from city administration and city council departments, professors and graduate students from the School of Sociology at Kharkiv State University, and local MFM staff (see Appendix A for a complete list of participants, their job titles, and the organizations they represent).

Methodology

The workshop methodology was designed to produce an intensive and practical training experience (the workshop agenda is shown in Appendix B). The format was highly participative, using facilitated discussion of key concepts, case studies, and small group exercises. The emphasis of the workshop was application of the principles, tailored to the Kharkiv context. Considerable time was spent in discussing concepts and using tools related to team-building. As part of the final exercise, which incorporated all previous lessons, participant teams produced detailed action plans for addressing two pressing problems in Kharkiv, health care and small business development.

1.3 Purpose and Organization of the Workshop Evaluation Report

This workshop evaluation report presents an analysis of 17 evaluation forms completed at the end of the workshop (six participants were unable to attend the final session of the training due to work obligations). A sample workshop evaluation form is contained in Appendix C. The purpose of the evaluation is to collect information that can be used to (1) evaluate the methodology, technical content, and relevance of training methods and materials to the intended audience; (2) improve the content and format of future deliveries of performance management training in the NIS region; and (3) expand the workshop to a 1- to 2-week format. The results of this training evaluation will also be incorporated into the MFM final report.

The report is divided into three sections. Section 1 provides background information on the MFM project and describes the workshop methodology and organization of the evaluation report. Sections 2 and 3 present the analysis of the workshop evaluation responses. Section 2 contains

a summary of responses to qualitative questions on learning, presentation, materials, logistics, and general comments. Section 3 contains a numeric evaluation of responses related to these same topics as well as workshop content. In responding to questions in Section 3, participants used a five-point scale in which one is “not valuable” and five is “very valuable.”

Although the workshop materials, presentation aids, and evaluation forms were prepared in English and translated into Russian for training delivery, this evaluation report, standing as an internal document, is presented in English only.

Performance Management Workshop Evaluation
Section 2: Qualitative Responses

2.1 Learning

On the first day, you were asked to cite your main learning objective for the workshop. Was this objective met? Why or why not?

The majority of participants who responded to this question (about 75%) felt that the workshop met their main learning objective. Two participants said that the workshop refreshed or built on knowledge acquired in other training. Several saw the course as an opportunity to communicate with other participants and to learn effective teamwork skills and methods of organizing people to solve problems. Participants acquired a lot of new information, particularly regarding methods of presenting information and managing work in the United States. Participants interested in information technologies and their application to management in Ukraine felt that this topic was insufficiently covered.

Individual learning objectives included:

- ▶ planning
- ▶ efficient management
- ▶ new types & methods of management
- ▶ legal support for privatization
- ▶ use of information technologies
- ▶ interaction among management levels
- ▶ approaches to health care budgeting
- ▶ applying western budgeting
- ▶ inter-departmental coordination
- ▶ staff & human resource development
- ▶ comprehensive information flow
- ▶ effective use of statistics
- ▶ public relations in implementing development programs

What are the three most important things you learned in this workshop?

Responses fell into three general subject categories: (1) team building and communication skills necessary for more effective teamwork and inter-agency cooperation; (2) specific management tools, such as a systematic approach to performing tasks, development of evaluation criteria, and weighted voting for group decision-making; and (3) human resource development and creation of higher standards for hiring personnel. Participants extolled the benefits of the group exercises

for generating and openly communicating ideas “without fear and reproach” as well as mutual understanding and sociability. Several comments focused on comparisons between the Ukrainian and U.S. perspectives; i.e., both countries have similar ways of viewing major problems, but the U.S. trainers are more likely than Ukrainian trainers to support lectures with visual aids.

Was the case study a useful learning tool? Why or why not?

Almost three-quarters of the participants who responded to this question agreed in general that the case studies were useful in providing practical application of the principles and theories introduced in the workshop. Real examples were appreciated as a means of better understanding the training material. Several trainees suggested ways to improve the case studies, such as providing more specific examples from “real life” or with more relevance to the professional interests of the participants. One person thought that the experience of foreign countries was especially useful, while another suggested that examples from the NIS region would have been more interesting.

Were the small group exercises helpful in applying the concepts? Why or why not?

Participants were unanimous in their approval of the use of small group exercises. A common theme of the responses was that working in groups helped to promote a better and more immediate understanding of the concepts through practical application. Doing role playing of real situations helped participants to turn conceptual knowledge into new skills. Each member of the group was given the opportunity to express his or her opinion, enabling even members without expertise in a given area to contribute to solving problems and making decisions. To some, teamwork decision tools such as weighted voting seemed simple in theory but when put into practice, promoted the emergence (and understanding) of real differences in opinion among group members. One participant likened the group exercises to a TV show called “Erudites Club,” in which a group of six people must work together to supply the answer to a question in one minute.

Do you think you will be able to apply what you have learned to your job? How?

All participants who responded said that the information somewhat or wholly applied to their everyday work. Several qualified their affirmative response: e.g., “The concepts are applicable if the specialists in a group or unit have approximately the same level of experience,” and, “One must take into consideration the specific situation and technology.” One person commented that use of the techniques depends on whether or not the department head asks for the opinion of the staff rather than simply assigning work. Specific comments on applicable tools included the use of well-defined criteria for making management decisions; team decision-making and problem-solving strategies; mechanisms of developing and implementing programs; and a systematic approach to work. In general, a new approach makes people re-examine stereotypes in behavior by thinking not only about what they are doing but how they are doing it.

2.2 Content

Of the workshop topics covered, are there any for which you would like to have had more information or depth of coverage?

Participants asked for more coverage of strategic planning, program logic, analysis and presentation, and using information for decisions. One trainee wanted to see a more specific treatment of strategic planning in the context of the city's economy. There were three requests for additional focus on performance management principles and tools. Two participants felt that the presented material was well balanced and that no additional information was needed on any topics. Several new topics were suggested: evaluating team discipline, performance management for multi-tasking, positive thinking, and the management of effectiveness. One participant invited the trainers to come back and teach a course on "how to become a boss."

Workshop Topics

Overview of Performance Management

- ▶ What is Performance Management?
- ▶ Why is it important?
- ▶ Users/uses of information

Building Teamwork Skills

- ▶ A systematic approach
- ▶ Task and process
- ▶ Decision-making
- ▶ Active listening
- ▶ Supportive development
- ▶ Observation and feedback
- ▶ Learning from success

Performance Management Principles & Tools

- ▶ Participation
- ▶ Strategic planning
- ▶ Program logic
- ▶ Performance indicators
- ▶ Analysis and presentation
- ▶ Using information for decisions
- ▶ Action planning

2.3 Presentation

Was facilitation, particularly the use of flip charts, valuable for promoting productive discussion?

Note: The word "flipchart" was translated into Russian on the evaluation form as "chart" or "diagram."

Participants praised the use of facilitation and flip charts. One person elaborated that visual aids always promote a better understanding and retention of the topic. Another suggested that although these techniques helped, personal computers should also have been used in the

workshop. One participant was confused by the word “diagram” stating that none were used; rather, participants mostly engaged in discussion about management skills.

Were visual aids used in the workshop effective?

Participant responses were positive, citing that visual aids were very effective and made learning easier.

Do you have any suggestions for improving the workshop presentation?

The range of responses regarding the quality of the presentation varied from “acceptable” to “excellent.” Specific feedback was also mixed; e.g., one participant suggested that the trainers establish better communication with the audience, while another praised the friendly style of the trainers and their rapport with the trainees. The level of presentation was considered sufficient given participants' unfamiliarity with U.S. training methods.

2.4 Materials**Do you have any suggestions for improving the written materials?**

The majority of respondents felt the level and content of written materials was suitable. Participants provided the following suggestions for improvement: (1) use color graphs and diagrams, (2) include more case studies, and (3) decrease the overall amount of material and increase the amount of illustrative material. One person cited mistakes in grammar and a few instances of inaccurate translation.

2.5 Logistics**Do you have any comments on the schedule, facilities, length of the workshop?**

All participants who responded were satisfied with the training schedule and logistics. One person noted that some participants could not devote an entire day to training because of the nature of their work. Another participant expressed appreciation for good preparation and delivery of the training, excellent organization, efficient use of time, good training conditions, and professionalism and friendliness of the instructors. A suggestion regarding workshop length was to increase the overall training to 3 or 4 days while shortening the daily sessions.

2.6 General Comments

Additional comments, suggestions, complaints?

Participants provided a high level and variety of comments/suggestions. The most frequently cited answers were (1) include more practical and realistic examples, problems/solutions, and case studies; (2) reconfigure small group work to reduce the number of people in groups and/or create different groups for each task; and (3) conduct similar seminars that combine senior and junior managers. Responses were split regarding the content of illustrative examples -- some preferring examples drawn from U.S. experience and others requesting those more relevant to local conditions.

Specific suggestions included:

- Develop a more intense schedule
- Encourage nontraditional decisions, approaches, and opinions
- Encourage new ideas (rather than using existing programs) in group exercises
- Simplify methodology for use in college management curricula
- Conduct training in specific areas, e.g., health care, personnel
- Distribute material early to participants to increase output

Appendix A: Performance Management Workshop List of Participants

**PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Avdeyeva Tatiana Ivanovna
Head of Forecasting and Information
Department at General Administration
for Planning of the City Council

Galatsan Alexander Viktorovich
Head of Prevention and Treatment
Department at General Administration for
Health Care and Social Issues of the City Council

Kadygrob Vasily Ivanovich
Head of Land Use and Cadastre
Department of General Administration for
Land Resources of the City Council

Lazurenko Alexander Vladimirovich
Head of the Information
Department of Inspection Division

Mirgorod Valentina Fedorovna
Chief Legal Advisor at General Administration
for Consumer Market of the City Council

Miroshnik Viktor Danilovich
Head of the Department at General Administration
for Personnel Management of the City Council

Nefedov Alexander Nickolayovich
Head of Current Control Sector at General Administration
for Housing, Public Utilities, Electric and Thermal Power,
Environment of the City Council

Soldatenko Angelina Abramovna
Head of PR and Press Service of the City Council

Stanchev Mikhall Georgiyevich
Head of International Relations
Department of the City Council

Stepanov Igor Germanovich
Head of Small and Medium Businesses
Facilitation Department at General Administration
for Economic Development of the City Council

Sukhinin Vladimir Vlacheslavovich
Head of Information and Analytical
Department at General Administration
for Economic Development of the City Council

Tokar Alexander Ivanovich
Head of the Personnel Department
at General Administration for Personnel Management

Dublikash Tatiana
School of Sociology at Kharkiv State University

Melnichuk Yulya
School of Sociology at Kharkiv State University

Beznosov Mikhail
School of Sociology at Kharkiv State University

Kovalenko Zoya
Forecasting and Information Department
at General Administration for Planning of the City Council

Kalchenko Yuliya
International Relations Department of the City Council

Tsaran Vladimir
Business Registration Department

Nikolayevskiy Valeriy Nickolayovich
School of Sociology at Kharkiv State University, Dean

Talalay Tatiana Ivanovna
RTI, MFM, Kharkiv

Novikov Igor
RTI, MFM, Sumi

Aleksandrovskiy Sergey
RTI, MFM, Kharkiv

Origorlev Nikolay
RTI, MFM, Kharkiv

Appendix B: Performance Management Workshop Agenda

Municipal Finance and Management (MFM) Project Performance Management Workshop

Kharkiv, Ukraine
February 14-15, 1996

Workshop Methodology

The format for the workshop will be discussion-participation. Key principles will be presented in facilitated discussions and attendees will use the principles in conducting several exercises. The emphasis will be on practical application of the principles, tailored to the Kharkiv context.

Pre-workshop set-up and briefing of facilitators/interpreters (4 hours)
(RTI staff)

Day 1

Introduction (0.5 hours)

Facilitated Discussion (1.25 hours)

1. Overview of Performance Management
 - a. What is performance management ?
 - b. Why is measurement of performance important ?
 - c. Who are the users and what are the uses of performance information ?
 - d. Example uses of performance management principles and information products
 - e. What is the direct relevance of performance management for Kharkiv

- Break - (0.25 hours)
2. **Group Exercise** (1 hour)
 - a. Divide into smaller groups
 - b. Each group identifies one or more factors helping and hindering the use of performance management in Kharkiv
 - c. Each group reports back to the whole group

- Lunch - (1 hour)
3. **Discussion and Exercise: Building Teamwork Skills** (1.5 hours)

Facilitated Discussion (2 hours)

4. Performance Management Principles and Tools

a. Key issues:

- participation of stakeholders
- strategic planning
- program logic
- performance indicators
- analysis and presentation
- using information for decisions

- Break - (0.25 hours)

b. Designing a performance management plan of action

c. Performance management challenges and how to handle them

5. **Participant review of Day 1 and preview of Day 2 (0.25 hours)**

Day 2

1. **Presentation of Group Exercise (0.5 hours)**

2. **Group Exercise - Performance Management in Kharkiv (2.5 hours)**

Participants divide into two groups and develop a performance management plan for a Kharkiv city department on one of the following areas, or one of their own choosing:

Department

Objectives

Health & Social Issues

Cost reduction (unified health budget)
Public participation in health care decisions

Economic Development

Pilot privatization of street cleaning,
garbage collection, burial services

Budget & Finance

Budget scenarios, statistical analysis &
reporting
Role & organization of Revenue Division

Education & Youth Problems

Computer-based management, curriculum
design, & scheduling
Parent involvement in planning

Personnel

Unified personnel system for the city

- Lunch - (1 hour)
- 4. **Report from Groups** (2 hours)
 - Break - (0.25)
- 5. **Plenary Discussion** - Performance Management in Kharkiv: Next Steps (1 hour)
- 6. **Workshop Evaluation and Closing** (0.75 hours)

Post-Workshop Facilitation Debriefing and Evaluation Report (4 hours)
(RTI staff)

Appendix C: Performance Management Workshop Evaluation Form

**Municipal Finance and Management (MFM) Project
Performance Management Workshop**

Kharkiv, Ukraine
February 14-15, 1996

Workshop Evaluation Form

Thank you for participating in the MFM Performance Management Workshop. We are very interested in hearing your reactions, thoughts, and comments on the workshop so that we can improve future workshops. Please take a few minutes to respond to the following questions.

Learning

1. On the first day, you were asked to cite your main learning objective for the workshop. Was this objective met? Why or why not?
2. What are the three most important things you learned in this workshop?
3. Was the case study a useful learning tool? Why or why not?
4. Were the small group exercises helpful in applying the concepts? Why or why not?
5. Do you think you will be able to apply what you have learned to your job? How?

Content

6. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being very valuable and 1 being not valuable, rate the value to you of the workshop topics:

	<u>Not Valuable</u>			<u>Very Valuable</u>	
<u>Section 1 - Overview of Performance Management</u>					
What is Performance Management?	1	2	3	4	5
Why is Performance Measurement Important?	1	2	3	4	5
Users/Uses of Performance Information	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Section 2 - Building Teamwork Skills</u>					
A Systematic Approach	1	2	3	4	5
Task and Process	1	2	3	4	5
Decision-making	1	2	3	4	5
Active Listening	1	2	3	4	5
Supportive Development	1	2	3	4	5
Observation and Feedback	1	2	3	4	5
Learning from Success	1	2	3	4	5
<u>Section 3 - Performance Management Principles and Tools</u>					
Participation	1	2	3	4	5
Strategic Planning	1	2	3	4	5
Program Logic	1	2	3	4	5
Performance Indicators	1	2	3	4	5
Analysis and Presentation	1	2	3	4	5
Using Information for Decisions	1	2	3	4	5
Designing a Performance Management Plan of Action	1	2	3	4	5

7. Of the topics covered, are there any for which you would like to have had more information or depth of coverage? If yes, which ones?

Presentation

8. Was facilitation, particularly the use of flip charts, valuable for promoting productive discussion? If not, please explain.
9. Were visual aids used in the workshop effective? Why or why not?
10. Do you have any suggestions for improving the workshop presentation?

Materials

11. Were the written materials you received:

Understandable	Yes	No
Informative	Yes	No
Useful	Yes	No

12. Do you have any suggestions for improving the written materials?

Logistics

13. Do you have any comments on the schedule, facilities, length of the workshop?

General Comments

14. Please feel free to make additional comments, suggestions, complaints below.