ABSTRACT

Assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of local public planning agencies, when it has been done at all, has either been undertaken by a team of experts as a single cross-sectional analysis, or has developed out of the program budget fulfillment concept, which measures efficiency more often than effectiveness. A comprehensive approach, including both a full-scale initial assessment repeated every five or ten years, along with an ongoing impact effectiveness assessment process tied into a multi-year program budget, is a rarity if it exists at all. Yet effectiveness evaluation is owed to the public and is becoming a requirement for federally funded programs and projects.

A methodical approach to comprehensive assessment design requires eight steps: definition of efficiency and effectiveness, identification of their criteria, devising tests or indicators of whether the criteria are met, determining in what arenas the tests or indicators will be applied, selecting the methods of testing which are most suitable to the chosen arenas, designing instruments for their application, evaluating each element of comprehensive assessment, and selecting those elements which are most appropriate to the local situation.

A review of the literature of planning and management confirms the need for two definitions of effectiveness. Impact effectiveness is defined as the ultimate outcome, intended or unintended, of plans and planning. Intermediary effectiveness includes the many steps leading up to impact effectiveness, such as plan preparation, plan adoption, plan implementation, and advice and guidance provided to the chief executive, council and the public.

Efficiency is defined as the economy of resources with which planning is carried out and plans are produced. The issue of quality of plans and planning is raised in the context of both efficiency and intermediary effectiveness. Quality is regarded as an aspect of both. It is essential to intermediary effectiveness. It is also a qualifying factor in efficiency by requiring that economy in the use of resources does not result in inferior work.

Seven sources are recommended for extracting effectiveness criteria: state planning enabling legislation, federal guidelines for funding assistance, state standards for local planning, local exercise of planning authority, the management of constraints in the planning environment, the quality of planning as characterized in planning literature, and selected "new" planning theories.

Following the establishment of definitions and criteria, tests, methods, and arenas are explored. These are then assigned to initial and ongoing assessment elements, each of which has two major sub-sets — internal and external assessment. Those in turn are comprised of staff self-evaluation, staff evaluation by the citizen commission, citizen commission evaluation by staff, citizen commission self-evaluation, and agency evaluation by elected and appointed officials and by publics.
Each of these includes, as separate sub-elements, intermediary effectiveness, impact effectiveness, and efficiency. Thirteen criteria are developed for selecting the most cost-effective of these several elements for local use. Application of the selection criteria indicates that ongoing internal assessment is more effective at less cost than initial assessment or external assessment. The latter are recommended, however, to cover some of the deficiencies of ongoing internal assessment. These deficiencies include inability to deal with any misfit in role perceptions by planning's bosses and clients, the difficulty of attaining objectivity, the problem of measuring long-range impacts, and the virtual impossibility of assigning an appropriate share of credit to the planning agency for long-range outcomes in which many actors participate.

A number of instruments are devised for measuring agency efficiency and effectiveness. These require extensive field testing to determine their validity and reliability.

Approved by:

Chairman, Thesis Committee
Each of these includes, as separate sub-elements, intermediary effectiveness, impact effectiveness, and efficiency. Thirteen criteria are developed for selecting the most cost-effective of these several elements for local use. Application of the selection criteria indicates that ongoing internal assessment is more effective at less cost than initial assessment or external assessment. The latter are recommended, however, to cover some of the deficiencies of ongoing internal assessment. These deficiencies include inability to deal with any misfit in role perceptions by planning's bosses and clients, the difficulty of attaining objectivity, the problem of measuring long-range impacts, and the virtual impossibility of assigning an appropriate share of credit to the planning agency for long-range outcomes in which many actors participate.

A number of instruments are devised for measuring agency efficiency and effectiveness. These require extensive field testing to determine their validity and reliability.

To H. F. M., with love
PREFACE

The purpose of this paper is to provide a tool for local public planning agencies -- their staffs and citizen commissions -- for improving their accountability to their "bosses" and "clients."

During the past two decades varied attempts at planning agency and planning program evaluation have emerged. Increasingly, planners are asking themselves whether their goals and objectives are consonant with the perceived needs of the public, whether the planning process and its products contribute to meeting public objectives, and how the performance of planning agencies can keep pace with changing public perceptions and aspirations.

But the art and science of evaluation are underdeveloped, underexercised, and fragmented. This paper, therefore, is an investigation in breadth rather than in depth. It brings together current concepts and data, and evaluations that have been designed or performed. It indicates what is lacking, attempts to fill a small part of that lack, and sketches the outlines of what remains to be done before comprehensive effectiveness and efficiency assessment of local public planning agencies will be possible.
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INTRODUCTION

Local Planning Agency Evaluation:
the State of the Art

A methodical approach to the design of local public planning agency assessment requires definition of terms, identification of criteria of effectiveness and efficiency, devising tests or indicators of whether the criteria have been met, determining in what arenas the tests will be applied and what methods of testing are suitable to specific arenas, designing instruments for test application, evaluating elements of comprehensive internal and external assessment, and selecting those elements which are most appropriate to the local situation.

There is no available evidence that this methodical approach has ever been undertaken. Aside from the American Society of Planning Officials (ASPO), which has been the leader in the field of planning agency assessment and in promoting "good planning practice," few organizations are engaged in assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of planning agencies or in setting standards for such assessment. Self-assessment by planning agencies is rarely undertaken and is never comprehensive.

Progress toward a methodical approach to comprehensive assessment design is being made in a fragmented way. Of the eight steps in designing a comprehensive assessment plan -- definitions, criteria, tests, arenas, methods, instruments, elements, and their selection -- five have received varying levels of attention in the literature of planning, management, or both. Definitions of efficiency and effectiveness (mainly implied) which are appropriate to planning agency goals and operations are beginning to emerge. A few criteria of efficiency and effectiveness (from which implied definitions are deduced) and one test of effectiveness are found. One method of testing effectiveness is recommended, and one minor instrument for testing potential effectiveness is provided.

A review of this fragmentary material with brief comments follows.

Definitions. Until recently, there was little agreement in the literature of management or planning on the distinction between efficiency and effectiveness. Production of reports and performing other planning activities was frequently classed as effectiveness, although, strictly speaking, it is an indication of efficiency, provided that it is accomplished with a reasonable economy of resources. Effectiveness is not the output of planning, but its outcome (Thomas, 1971).

Despite this distinction, because outcomes are usually long-range and, therefore, cannot provide feedback in an ongoing evaluation process, two definitions of effectiveness are developed in this paper: intermediary effectiveness which includes output, implementation of proposals, and short-range outcomes of program and project implementation; and impact effectiveness, which is the ultimate or long-range outcome of plans and planning, including both intended and unintended impacts on the human environment. These two definitions can be observed in the way planning is assessed publicly.

For example, Russell Van Nest Black (1967, page 15) and other critics of the outcomes of planning are employing an impact definition of effectiveness. By comparison, a League of Women Voters brochure (1970) instructing the public on evaluating their local planning agencies, uses an intermediary definition of effectiveness by emphasizing program comprehensiveness, timeliness and quality of outputs, and public involvement.
The focus is on quality of planning products and processes rather than on the planners' responsibility for the outcomes of planning. Aware of the multiple influences on eventual outcome, the League addresses potential rather than actual effectiveness.

Criteria. Management literature and planning publications devoted to planning agency assessment are more successful in identifying criteria of efficiency than effectiveness. Efficiency of organization, operations, and management are addressed by Dennis O'Harrow (1966) and James H. Pickford (1968), both writing for ASPO. Adequacy of funding, staffing, and salaries is an implied criterion of efficiency in ASPO's annual Planning Advisory Service reports (Wrobel, 1975). ASPO's evaluation of the Jacksonville, Florida, planning agency (1971) investigates organizational efficiency, among other things. A consultant's report for Sonoma County, California (1974) reviews the planning agency's communications, processes, products, organization, and management.

Output criteria are the most usual measures of intermediary effectiveness. An article in Planning Advisory Service (1958, pages 1-12) addresses goal achievement in output and activity terms and provides a ten-page checklist of activities, standards, practices, resources, and requirements in major areas of planning concern at that time. The few self-studies undertaken by planning agencies are based on the program budget process with the focus on productivity.

Frank So (1962, page 5) suggests "good practice" as a criterion for planning agency assessment. It is not clear whether good practice is an indication of efficiency or effectiveness. The League of Women Voters criteria are more explicit -- comprehensiveness of program, timeliness of studies, and professionalism of work.

ASPO's design for assessment of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (1969) employs as effectiveness criteria the acceptance and implementation of planning proposals. A subsequent assessment of the Jacksonville, Florida, planning agency by ASPO (1971) employs as effectiveness criteria, outputs, activities, the confidence of clients and decision makers, the quality of work, and implementation of proposals.

Over all, stipulated criteria for planning agency effectiveness assessment are meager. They exist elsewhere, however, and can be extracted from sources not specifically intended for assessment purposes (see Part One).

Tests. A key contribution to testing planning agency effectiveness is provided by Frank So (1962), in emphasizing the importance of keeping records to provide baseline data for future evaluations. The data recommended, however, do not relate to the characteristics of the community environment on which planning should be making a favorable impact over time, but easy-to-measure "simple units" of agency effectiveness in dealing with the community and its decision-makers, such as visits and calls.

Methods of testing. The method of assessing planning agency effectiveness and efficiency recommended by ASPO, the principal agency in the field, is their own "team of experts" approach. The Management by Objectives school recommends the control method of periodic internal checks on fulfillment of annual or multi-year program objectives.

Instruments. ASPO's 1958 checklist of planning activities is a sort of questionnaire intended to be self-administered and self-scored by planning directors. It is now obsolete, and no other instruments for testing planning agency efficiency and effectiveness have appeared in planning literature.
Although considerable technical assistance is available from ASPO for planning agencies which request it, published materials to aid agencies in setting up their own assessment programs are meager or partially obsolete.

Obstacles to Advancing the Art of Agency Assessment

Substantial obstacles to a comprehensive evaluation design are responsible for the current state of the art. In addition to the difficulty of devising appropriate definitions, criteria, tests, and methods, there is the problem of attribution of effects: planners have little power, and so many actors are involved in any outcome that it is virtually impossible to determine the effectiveness of the planning agency's role in that outcome.

Further, planners are properly concerned that an assessment, which is bound to find shortfalls as well as accomplishments, might damage the agency politically. This may argue for internal self-assessment as opposed to ASPO's "team of experts" approach. Yet even self-assessment, however skillfully administered, must have a high cost in time, effort, and above all, affectivity. Much of the affectivity generated should hopefully be productive, but some of it is inevitably counterproductive. Either decision -- to call in experts or to perform a self-assessment -- implies a high level of courage on the part of every member of the agency. Thus, the lack of pressure on most planning agencies to assess their effectiveness beyond a product and project checklist, frees them to spend their time on planning tasks which are assumed to be more productive than searching for a way to determine the impacts of their accomplishments on the human environment. The increasing interest of local governments in program budgeting addresses this problem, but only partially, as will be demonstrated.

Need to Advance the Art

The mission of the planning agency is to provide advice and assistance to decision makers and operating agencies toward maintaining and enhancing the human environment and increasing individual access to all available choices, in the context of long-range needs and resources. The public, which funds the planning function, has a right to know whether this mission is being accomplished. Russell Van Nest Black (1967, page 15), on the fiftieth anniversary of the American Institute of Planners, presented a broad assessment of the effectiveness of planning in addressing major urban problems nationwide and found substantial failures. Among them were failure to influence the total urban environment, to relieve slums, mediocrity, ugliness, and traffic congestion; failure to bring to bear an effective linking of the vast human, fiscal, and technical resources of the nation on those problems; and failure to overcome the fragmentation of local government, which he describes as one of the greatest obstacles to local planning progress. Whatever the merits of Black's criticisms in nationwide scope, for the local planning agency long-range impact assessment is essential to guide reevaluation of problem identification and solution strategies in terms of public values, goals, and objectives. For example, toward reduction of traffic congestion cited by Black and required in standard planning enabling legislation, the strategy pursued in the past -- improving the street system and constructing alternative routes for the private automobile -- has not only failed to achieve its objective, but has spawned another "evil" (a value-judgment illustrating the problems of value definition for assessment purposes): the scateration and sprawl of urban developments.

Frank So (1962, page 5) states, "Every planning agency should
periodically take a long critical look at where it has been and where it is going." John W. Dyckman (1969, page 300) adds urgency to ASPO’s statement: "Evaluation of performance is essential to improvement of the craft"; while John Friedmann (1969, page 317) casts that urgency in ethical terms:

But difficulty of measurement should not be taken as a convenient escape from personal responsibility. It may be that no sanctions are taken in case of failure, but the planner should act as if such sanctions would in fact be imposed. Only in this way can he ultimately hope to gain respect for himself as a person, as well as a professional.

A harbinger of federal requirements for local planning assessment appeared in the Federal Register on August 22, 1975 (pages 36856-36865). The Department of Housing and Urban development, which funds "701" planning grants to local agencies, lists six criteria for measuring "performance" as a basis for avoidance of funding cuts. The criteria cover program administration, timeliness, achievement of objectives in developing plan elements, agency capability for coordination, implementation activities and intergovernmental relations, and the agency’s progress in implementing policies, plans, and programs, particularly those related to housing and land use objectives.

But implementation of programs is not a criterion of mission accomplishment; it is an intermediary objective. The problem is that to determine whether the human environment has been enhanced over the long range is itself a long-range project. Standards and baseline data must be established, and periodic checks must be made. Therefore, if frequent assessments are to be made for the purposes of program redirection and organizational control in the interim, the planning agency must satisfice with output rather than impact measures of effectiveness, and with measures of the quality of output and the efficiency with which outputs are produced.

The standard approach of local government administration to accountability in the 'seventies is the program budget or such management systems as planning, programming and budgeting (PPB) or management by objectives (MBO) oriented to annual outputs. As these practices advance, they seek to determine what public objectives are served by outputs. In the case of agencies which provide material services such as trash collection, measurement is simple and direct. But because of the complexity and the abstract nature of the staff advisory function, the questions of whether the correct current and future objectives are being addressed, how well they are being addressed, and whether the objectives are achieved cannot be answered adequately in an annual or even a multi-year program budget context. Thus, review of local planning agency effectiveness and efficiency must be undertaken both initially, in depth and breadth, and on an ongoing basis.

**Objectives Governing the Elements and Design of a Comprehensive Evaluation**

To know whether and how to readjust planning values, goals, objectives, roles, methods, outputs, processes, or organizational relationships in response to changes in its environment is the primary purpose of agency assessment. To serve that primary purpose, the elements of the evaluation design must include identification of values, goals, objectives, and roles of planning and of the "bosses" and "clients" of planning to compare their "fit." In surveying the perceptions of its bosses and client groups (Terry, 1968, page 138), the planning agency must first achieve consensus among staff and citizen commission on the identity of the many diverse clients and bosses in the community (Drucker, 1973, page 138). This identification and consensus are objectives in themselves. Additional
objectives in surveying clients' perceptions of the agency's effectiveness and efficiency are to elicit their concepts of the agency's mission and roles and to relate those concepts to the clients' evaluations of the agency. Where there is a lack of fit between the perceptions and values of clients and planners or bosses and planners, it may be possible, in the assessment process, to influence value systems in terms of those of professional planners (Drucker, 1973, page 792), or in terms of the values of each other, in areas of conflict.

As recommended by Frank Beal (1966, page 3), the evaluation can serve as an educational tool: to inform or reeducate on the mission, goals, objectives, interrelationships, methodologies, resources, and applications of planning. By highlighting agency accomplishments, resources, and programs, internal morale and public respect for the agency and for the profession of planning may be reinforced. Thus, an external assessment of the planning agency, via clients' and bosses' perceptions, should be designed not only to yield information for agency improvement, but to alter favorably the perceptions themselves to the extent that any unfavorable perceptions may arise from insufficient information on the part of those surveyed.

Internal assessment should seek perceptions of efficiency and effectiveness problems, their causes, and their possible remedies (Davis, 1967, pages 65-6). Improvement through the process of self-examination, sensitization, and self-regulation, as well as through directed change, are staff assessment objectives.

Assessment objectives of the citizen commission are to provide them with a sounder basis for allocation of their scarce time (ASPO, 1969, page 12); to identify and disclose external problems which affect the efficiency and effectiveness of the agency, and to gain insights into constraints against planning and how to manage them.

A number of assessment objectives are operational: to establish baseline information and a system for periodic or ongoing evaluation of the agency, its sections, and its individual staff members; to measure the significance of change in internal and external perceptions of the agency's performance and role; to measure the significance of change in the environment; to attribute to the planning agency a fair share of the responsibility for favorable environmental change; and to be prepared for assessment requirements which may be imposed in the future by government at the local, state, or federal level.

Scope and Organization of This Paper

This paper provides a reasonably detailed practical guide to comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of local public planning agencies based on criteria available in planning and management literature. It supplements these criteria to the extent possible, provides designs of a few specific assessment instruments, arrays methods and analyzes them on the basis of criteria for their selection, and describes the work that remains to be done to provide a comprehensive array of assessment techniques and devices.

Part One establishes the framework for agency evaluation, identifying what is to be assessed and the criteria for assessment. Chapter I defines effectiveness and efficiency and identifies sources of information for their criteria. Chapters II, III, and IV deal with different aspects of effectiveness criteria: the legal basis for planning, planning constraints, the quality of plans and planning, and the "new" planning theories particularly in terms of managing constraints. From these reviews the dual classification of effectiveness emerges as "intermediary" or...
instrumental effectiveness and outcome or "impact" effectiveness.
Chapter V deals with efficiency criteria as found in planning and
management literature and Chapter VI with the citizen commission and
the locus of the planning agency in the local governmental structure.

Part Two blends the theories of planning and management in a
comprehensive assessment design. Chapter VII discusses application of
the criteria to testing the quality of planning and plans and measuring
intermediary and impact effectiveness. Chapter VIII explores tests of
the efficiency of the planning staff and the citizen commission. In
Chapter IX the tests and measurements described in the two preceding
chapters are set in the context of arenas, methods, and instruments
for applying the tests. Chapters X, XI, and XII assign the tests to
elements and methods appropriate for initial internal and external
assessments and for an ongoing assessment process, and describe how an
agency can select those elements, methods, and instruments which can be
accommodated with the time and other resources available to it for
assessment purposes.

Chapter XIII, Conclusions, summarizes the recommendations of this
paper, evaluates its contribution to the state of the art of local public
planning agency assessment, and enumerates the research projects necessary
to provide adequate, valid, reliable measurements of the impact of
planning on local communities.
I. DEFINITIONS AND SOURCES

The search for a definition of planning effectiveness has one central concern: to resolve the conflict between the need for short-range feedback in the process of agency and program assessment and the reality that the effects of planning are frequently not observable for many years. Definitions of effectiveness (frequently linked to efficiency) and the criteria to be used for their measurement are found, at least by implication, in the literature of both management and planning. Both support the view on which this paper is based, that two definitions of effectiveness are needed to resolve the conflict between short-range assessment needs and long-range outcomes. As previously stated, the terms adopted to designate these two definitions are intermediary effectiveness and impact effectiveness. A brief review of the literature supporting this dual definition follows.

Defining Effectiveness in a Management System Context

The contributions of management literature to the concepts in this paper come from the Management by Objectives (MBO) school and its variants (Reddin, 1971; Tosi and Carroll, 1973; Odiorne, 1973; and Morrissey, 1975), whose origins trace back to Peter Drucker (1954). Initially devised for business, it is recently being adapted and advocated for government by a number of its proponents. The general approach to measurement of "control" in business through MBO has been through setting objectives in terms of "effectiveness areas" (Reddin, 1971, page 29) and determining at the end of the budget year or other review period how well those objectives were met. The criterion of business effectiveness in the past was usually output. Output alone, however, does not measure effectiveness. Only when the intended impacts of output are stipulated is there a basis for judging effectiveness. This view is gaining increasing acceptance in MBO literature. Although, in business and industry, profit provides a direct and short-range measure of impact, some responsible managements are beginning to look beyond profit to social impacts (Drucker, 1973).

Attempts to transfer the MBO technique to government have not yet proven themselves out. The more successful efforts have been directed at those government departments whose services are concrete or have measurable results; for example, "fire loss averted in dollar replacement value" or "average response time" to a fire call (Connellan, 1975, page 3). Connellan's contribution to "long range" evaluation is a "rolling five-year plan" (page 2).

In 1972, Dale D. McConkey published a creative adaptation of MBO to staff organizations. His work demonstrates understanding and sympathy for the difficulty of setting measurable staff objectives in the MBO process (pages 36 and 76), and provides alternatives and rationale for setting non-measurable objectives. This concept is a major contribution to the integration of the staff agency in systematic management evaluation and control.

W. J. Reddin (1971, page 40) discusses "effectiveness areas for knowledge workers," which he lists as "personal competence, consulted in areas of competence, advice accepted, and advice accepted leads to improvement." This is a clear progression from intermediary or output effectiveness to impact effectiveness. It does not consider the measurement of "improvement."
In "Management by Objectives for Public Administrators," Jim L. Tarter (1974, page 4) describes "program effectiveness in the public sector" in terms of cost/benefit, response time, high quality, and increased utilization of human resources." (Response time may be effectiveness in some situations; it is surely efficiency in others.) Tarter states that public administrators are responsible to the taxpayers for the effectiveness of their programs, and that MBO is one way of not only measuring but assuring the effectiveness of public employees. By contrast, McConkey (1972) sympathizes with staff agencies which are put in a position of having to be salesmen for their advice in order to be effective. He states that in such cases effectiveness defies objective measurement.

John W. Humble (1973, page 27) recognizes that the effectiveness of government services is difficult to measure because "the ultimate decision power lies in value judgments of the electorate."

Rodney H. Brady (1973, page 67), in adapting MBO to government, asserts that effectiveness of government, which he calls "benefits," should be measured in terms of progress toward objectives, conceding that "in most cases it will be years before the real benefits . . . can be evaluated effectively." To make future objectives more realistic in the long-range planning process, Brady recommends (page 71) annual reviews which evaluate successes and failures in achieving objectives, elicit the reasons for any failures or revisions of objectives during the year, and lead to measures which attempt to prevent a recurrence of the causes of any failures. He also advocates sub-objectives or "milestones" for accomplishment, to be monitored at intervals throughout the year (page 73). Brady's effectiveness criteria are thus outputs or intermediary objectives (some of them very short-range) in concession to the impracticality of waiting for years to evaluate the "real benefits."

The major contributions of the MBO school to planning agency effectiveness evaluation are recognition that "benefits" or impacts constitute long-range effectiveness, that, in government, the value judgments of the electorate control decisions, that progress toward objectives must be measured if an agency is to have interim effectiveness indicators, and that some objectives are not measurable.

Effectiveness as Defined in Planning Literature

Effectiveness concepts in planning literature also include both intermediary and impact effectiveness, and some writers recognize a progression from one to the other. For some writers, the need to measure accomplishments immediately governs the working definition selected. For example, the Maryland NCPPC evaluation design previously mentioned (ASPO, 1969) identifies three key objectives of "effective performance" of a planning agency: influencing region-shaping development decisions, producing high-quality technical work, and having the confidence of the governments served.

Richard Bolan, in a paper delivered at a conference of the American Society of Planning Officials (1971, page 387), states that the indicator of effectiveness of a planning agency is generating commitments to action. This is an intermediary effectiveness objective.

Some who are impatient for results or frustrated by the political process appear to eschew long-range planning altogether, advocating borrowed incremental theories (Lindblom, 1959; Webber, 1965; Mann and Wiers, 1973), which count any positive official action as an effective outcome. Advocacy planners (Davidoff and others) count as effective those plans which are made
with the people or which establish a process leading to implementation. This assumes that the values and objectives of those planning together are valid for describing and achieving an enhanced human environment.

Nicholas P. Thomas (1971, page 433), in dealing with the evaluation of regional planning councils, recommends a progression from intermediary to outcome effectiveness with such questions as,

Did the chief executive make decisions based on the planning agency's recommendations? If further studies were requested, did they result in decisions? Were the behaviors of the public or decision-makers changed as a result of planning recommendations? Did recommendations serve a perceived need? And, over time, did the planning agency serve as an agent of change? (Emphasis added.)

Introducing the element of change comes close to an impact definition of effectiveness. The quality of life resulting from the change must also be addressed in dealing with the effectiveness of the local public planning agency. Few planners would define change as good in itself. Classical planners generally define the quality of change in terms of middle-class values of increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of service provision through locational arrangements of facilities, increasing general convenience through coordinated development of buildings and activities on the land, and protecting or enhancing the natural, social, and economic environments.

Frank Beal, in a Planning Advisory Service report (1966, page 7), defines effectiveness as the "benefits" (impact) of a planning program. (Compare Rodney H. Brady.) Among them he lists good living, safety, security, of property values, beauty, and money saved on projects and programs through planning: the classical approach to planning.

Advocacy planners, who succeeded the classical planners in the 'sixties (in the universities more than among practitioners) define the quality of change in terms of the values of underprivileged client groups. Determination of these values is another issue. Futurists (not necessarily planners), beginning in the late 'sixties and gathering momentum in the mid'seventies, define the quality of change in terms of institutional adaptivity to the needs of a changing society.

A fifty-year assessment of the planning profession (Black, 1967) lists as "accomplishments" the number of plans produced and the number of related ordinances produced (sequenced intermediary effectiveness); the "effectiveness of plans in bettering the shape and character of things planned" (by what standards is not specified); advances in the art and science of planning; "things done in accordance with plans" (intermediary effectiveness); and application of accepted planning principles in residential, industrial, and commercial development, and redevelopment. The "failures" listed by Black come closer to an impact definition of effectiveness than the "accomplishments": influence on the total urban environment, abating urban scatteration, giving rational form to the expanding city, relieving the sprawling mass of the city, relieving slums, relieving traffic congestion, relieving mediocrity and ugliness, and making the city a healthful and pleasurable place for living and working. All of these reflect the physical planning bias of classical planning.

William Peterson, a social scientist evaluating planning (1966, page 136), is also concerned with failures. He asserts that the emphasis on the physical plant is wrong. Physical planning, he states, should be only a step in the means-end continuum that causally relates the physical city to the socio-economic city. Evaluating failures, in Peterson's view, is more important than evaluating successes, because failures may invalidate a hypothesis (page 139) which may then be discarded as a basis for resource allocation. Evaluating successes has a trap in that the implementation of
a project may not realize the goals of the project and may even generate problems of its own. Peterson is thus advocating an impact definition of effectiveness -- and apparently long-range effectiveness, since unintended outcomes often show up only after many years. He also recognizes the role of intermediary objectives, recommending the utilization of Meyerson's "middle-range bridge" (1956) to achieve plan implementation through operating agencies (page 156).

Mann and Wiers (1973, page 8) define the "success" of a planning agency by the "measurable improvement of the situations of the community and/or client groups affected by the implemented proposals it makes." By whose value standards the "improvements" are to be judged, when and how they are to be measured, and how credit for their accomplishment is to be attributed remain open questions.

In summary, both planning and management are moving toward an outcome or impact definition of effectiveness. More criteria must be developed and value assumptions must be made. At the same time, intermediary effectiveness objectives such as production of studies and reports and winning commitment to recommendations for action are of such magnitude, each with numerous subsets, that they warrant subordinate effectiveness status and evaluation on their merits.

In adapting the MBO evaluation approach to governmental staff agencies, the wording of objective statements may determine whether their achievement indicates impact effectiveness, intermediary effectiveness or merely efficiency. Achieving an output objective in timely fashion or with an economy of resources may be efficiency (provided that economy was not achieved at the expense of quality).

The level of effectiveness that can be determined from the fulfillment of an output objective in the context of planning is highly time-bound. For example, the production of a report represents a low level of intermediary effectiveness no matter how efficiently it is produced or how high its quality may be. Its ultimate adoption and implementation through strategic efforts of the planning agency represent successively higher levels of intermediary effectiveness. Impact effectiveness, in terms of the mission of planning, can be measured only in the fairly long range, when the outcome of an adopted and implemented recommendation can be observed or measured. Some impacts on the community may be apparent after only five years or even less; but others may take a decade or longer to become manifest.

Today's impacts are the results of products and activities of an agency whose staff may have turned over completely in the lengthy interim, while the impacts of today's products and activities may not be perceptible until the agency's present staff has long since departed. As if this were not sufficiently frustrating, the planning agency must share with many other actors the credit (or blame) for the ultimate outcome of its efforts; and thus far, no mechanism is available for apportioning the proper share of whatever credit may be due.

Sources of Effectiveness Criteria
Criteria of intermediary effectiveness and of the intended and unintended impacts of planning must come from several sources. Statutory planning enablement is the basic source (So, 1962, page 3), declaring the intent of the state in authorizing local governments to plan. A mixture of impact effectiveness criteria and intermediary effectiveness criteria will be found in planning enabling legislation: "lessen congestion in the streets" and "prepare a comprehensive guide to development." Local implementing
legislation indicates the intent of the local government. Other local laws, regulations, or resolutions may also contribute to planning effectiveness criteria, for example, adopted standards for recreation and public open space, or water and sewer extension policies. At the state level, statutes enabling local actions which guide or control development or set standards for public facilities and services, such as annexation law, erosion control regulations, flood plain regulations, and environmental impact statement requirements, may be culled for criteria of planning effectiveness. A number of federal regulations and guidelines for local funding assistance parallel these sources of planning effectiveness criteria, among them, the requirement of comprehensive planning and functional planning for certain categorical grants, the requirements for environmental impact review, and the requirement for "A-95" state and regional review of projects proposed to be funded. The scope of this paper does not permit searching out and assembling all of these criteria, nor would the time available to a local planning agency for effectiveness assessment permit covering every criterion. Those criteria which the locality has had to meet over a period of time in its program and its intergovernmental relations, and those it may have failed to meet, with consequent loss of funding, are among the relevant criteria for any specific local agency.

The legal basis for planning provides the absolute minimum criteria which must be met by a local public planning agency, but these are not sufficient. Legislation has not, in all cases, caught up with advanced thinking in the planning profession, nor with the values of all segments of the population. Additional effectiveness criteria can be culled from recent planning and related literature, including psychology, sociology, political science, and "futurism." The insights of these disciplines are expanding the boundaries, the consciousness, and the techniques of planning.

Criteria of effectiveness should not, however, be limited to the mystique of professionals. To the extent feasible, the public should be consulted through various interaction techniques. Indirect information is available from transcriptions of public meetings, letters to the press, phone calls to the planning office, visits, citizen commission meetings, and the meetings of special interest groups. Information from these sources, although possibly non-representative, tends to become the folklore of planning. For this reason the assessment design should seek to determine more objectively the values of clients and bosses of the planning agency and the fit between their objectives and those of the professional planners. Since values are in conflict in our pluralist society, the effectiveness of outcomes is often a value judgment dependent on who is doing the judging. Planning agencies may therefore choose to accommodate majority values or plural values where this is possible. Once a determination has been made, through the democratic process, of the values which are to be the basis of a specific plan or other recommendation, the statement of objectives stemming from those values provides an objective basis for evaluating the eventual outcome of the implemented plan or proposal.

The best course for avoiding confrontation among those who hold conflicting values is to look to the statutory basis for planning: the state planning enabling legislation and the local implementing ordinance or resolution. The language of these acts is the primary source of the goals and objectives of planning for the local community, presumably determined through the democratic process at the time of enactment. Such acts may have been amended from time to time to reflect changing physical, social, or economic conditions, new opportunities, or changed aspirations.
The effectiveness criteria (goals and objectives) in the following chapters come from state statutes, federal regulations, planning and related literature, and the constraints to planning effectiveness which arise in large part from conflicting value systems.

II. EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA -- THE LEGAL BASIS FOR PLANNING

Planning Enabling Legislation

Minimum effectiveness criteria which must be met by any local public planning agency are spelled out in the state planning enabling legislation and local planning implementing legislation under which the agency operates (Frank So, 1962, page 3). These requirements differ somewhat from state to state. Initially they derived from classical planning as described in the model state planning enabling act of the 1920's. Classical planning is characterized by emphasis on physical planning, comprehensiveness of scope within the limitations of physical planning, and "product" rather than "process" orientation. As currently practiced, classical planning is cyclical in its process, receiving feedback from the environment, and reevaluating, updating, and refining its products and activities periodically. Primarily a "staff" activity, it cross-cuts and coordinates the concerns of many line agencies.

An example of state enabling legislation is the North Carolina special act which enables joint city-county planning in Forsyth County and Winston-Salem (1947). It establishes these primarily "physical" goals:

... the general purpose of guiding and accomplishing a coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development of the city (and county) which will, in accordance with present and future needs, best promote health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development... adequate provision for light and air... promotion of the healthful and convenient distribution of the population and its housing...
promotion of good civic design and arrangement . . . wise and efficient expenditure of public funds . . . adequate provision of public utilities and other public requirements.

The first portion of the purpose statement is a reiteration of the police power under which such planning implementing mechanisms as zoning and other regulations are empowered. They represent long-range goals which may be adapted to the "impact effectiveness" elements of the planning agency assessment design.

The products and actions authorized by the statute may be interpreted as "intermediary" objectives for the purpose of assessment design:

The joint city and county planning board shall prepare and adopt a general development plan or plans for the entire city and county area (including) . . . public areas and reservations for the purpose of conservation . . . food and water supply . . . sanitary and drainage facilities . . . protection of urban development . . . such other features as may be important to the development of the county . . . the general location, character, and extent of streets or roads, viaducts, bridges . . . parkways, playgrounds, forests, reservations, parks . . . airports and other public ways, grounds, places, and spaces . . . the protection of urban development . . .

In addition to the preparation and adoption of the general development plan, the planning agency is required to prepare, adopt, and administer subdivision regulations, and it may prepare and recommend zoning ordinances.

The statute also requires these actions by the planning agency:

. . . encourage the cooperation of local municipalities within the county in any matters . . . which may concern the integrity of the county plan . . . advise the Board of county commissioners with respect to the formulation of development programs . . . and budgets for capital expenditures . . . make recommendations to any public authorities . . . or individuals, with reference to the location of any buildings . . .

and it may make recommendations to the county commissioners and the city's board of aldermen on any matters referred to it.

The North Carolina general planning enabling act, as amended in 1972, is more broad and general in its language. It permits a planning agency to make studies in a service area expanded beyond its physical jurisdiction and to "determine objectives to be sought in the development of the study area"; to prepare and adopt plans for achieving these objectives; and to recommend "policies, ordinances, administrative procedures, and other means" for implementing the plans; to "exercise any functions in the administration and enforcement of . . . means for carrying out plans . . . and (to) perform any related duties."

Selected related North Carolina statutes which further extend the tools of planning and its comprehensiveness permit economic development planning, urban renewal, annexation, minimum housing standards, and historic district zoning, among others.

The structure of statutory authorization in North Carolina can be conceptualized in a sequence from long-range goals or purposes to intermediary objectives consisting of plans and other products, with outcomes and actions arising from the plans lying in a mid-range time frame. Table 1 illustrates the relationships established by North Carolina law.

Federal Guidelines

The federal government requires comprehensive planning as a condition for many funding grants. Among federal agencies which have contributed to the nationwide expansion of planning through this requirement are the Environment Protection Agency (EPA), the Department of Transportation (DOT), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Corps of Engineers, and others. Several decades of classical planning revealed certain flaws in terms of public objectives. In recent years, new federal requirements have been added to comprehensive physical planning. The intent is to expand the scope of planning into
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Effectiveness: Long-Range Goals</th>
<th>Intermediary Effectiveness: Plans and Other Products</th>
<th>Actions and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Development:</td>
<td>General Development Guide:</td>
<td>(a) Plan adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Coordinated</td>
<td>(1) Streets, roads, viaducts, bridges,</td>
<td>(b) Cooperation of municipalities encouraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parks, airports, terminal facilities</td>
<td>(c) Board of County Commissioners and Board of Aldermen advised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Adjusted and harmonious</td>
<td>(2) Public and private utilities, water supply,</td>
<td>(d) Recommendations made to public authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sanitary facilities, drainage</td>
<td>(e) Recommendations made to corporations and individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Efficient and economical</td>
<td>(3) General location of buildings and other</td>
<td>(f) Urban development protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public property</td>
<td>(g) Wise expenditure of public funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Public areas, conservation, forests,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reservations, food supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Waterway developments, playgrounds, parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Civic design and arrangement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Capital budgets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Effectiveness: Long-Range Goals</th>
<th>Intermediary Effectiveness: Plans and Other Products</th>
<th>Actions and Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Promote, in accordance with present and future needs</td>
<td>Supplementary Legislation</td>
<td>(a) Ordinances prepared and recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Health, safety, morals, order, convenience, economy</td>
<td>(1) Zoning ordinances</td>
<td>(b) Ordinances adopted and administered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Subdivision regulations</td>
<td>(c) Studies and recommendations prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Historical districts and buildings</td>
<td>(d) Recommendations adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Acquisition of open space</td>
<td>(e) Recommendations implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Minimum housing standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Community appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Annexation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8) Environmental impact review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
explicit social concerns and to improve the quality of planning and plans through specific processes, particularly the process of citizen participation (CP).

The rationale underlying guidelines for federal categorical funding grants is an exchange of financial incentives for acceptance of national goals and objectives by local governments, and assurance that services purchased are cost-effective. Bolan (1973, pages 226-8) states, however, that the philosophy of federalism rests on two premises: 1) that two levels of government must exist -- federal and state/local -- in recognition of a commonality of interests and problems at one level, and diverse territorial characteristics at the other level; and 2) that the larger and more powerful federal government protects minority interests from the indifference or hostility of the majority at the state/local level. This is being acted out in school integration and open housing, for example. An additional reason for federalism is the irrationality of state and local territorial boundaries, which often do not provide appropriate jurisdictions for the planning and administration of, for example, river basin programs and projects such as water supply, water quality, sewerage, flood control, and other interjurisdictional programs such as air quality control.

Quality and process criteria for planning assessment as required by federal guidelines include social responsiveness of plans, citizen involvement in the planning process, evidence of implementation successes, coordination of federal, state, and local resources, development of innovative programs, an interdisciplinary approach to planning, an expanded comprehensiveness, the optimum utilization of existing resources, the examination of alternatives in the plan preparation process, the use of cost-effectiveness criteria in selecting alternative functional plans,
regional review of projects to be funded in part by federal grants, and the use of environmental impact statements in plan evaluation.

Environmental impact statements are structured by guidelines of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) to improve the quality of plans by examining impacts on the natural systems and the socio-economic systems in the context of immediate, short-range, long-range, and irretrievable effects. In cases of harmful impacts, the review process must seek mitigating mechanisms and alternatives, and must evaluate trade-offs of favorable and unfavorable impacts.

The Corps of Engineers (1975, page 31720) evaluates comprehensive planning in its areas of responsibility as "overly expensive and of limited value to decision-makers." A new approach proposed by the Corps for their river basin planning is integration of all entities with land use and land and water responsibilities and expertise -- that is, making maximum use of existing resources. DOT requires federally assisted planning to be multi-modal, to be based on a comprehensive mid-range general development plan, and to include participation of an array of officials and citizens. HUD funds comprehensive planning and requires that it include a housing element and an effectiveness assessment, inter alia. EPA, as a condition for sewerage funding, requires, in addition to numerous engineering criteria, that functional planning be performed in the context of comprehensive general planning and standard projections of population and economic growth. Functional plans must be interjurisdictional, if appropriate, and cost-effective based on a survey of population and industrial density and cost comparison of all available technological and design alternatives. Implementation mechanisms must be spelled out.

Project review at the state or regional level, as a prerequisite for funding ("A-95 Review"), examines the relationships of projects to regional conditions and plans based on local and regional needs and evaluates the soundness of the proposals in terms of planning principles (Harman, 1972).

Meeting these and other requirements not stipulated in this paper is not prima facie evidence of effective planning in terms of final outcome; however, intermediary effectiveness is achieved through meeting a higher level of criteria than might otherwise be applied in all cases, and through enabling the local community to receive federal funding assistance for projects and programs which would otherwise be beyond local taxing or bonding capacity and which have the best probability under current technology and socio-economic solutions of having a favorable eventual impact on the community.

Table 2 illustrates selected federal planning guidelines as effectiveness criteria in an input/output relationship.

As the federal government proceeds with its new policy of devolution of the policy-making function to the state/local level through block grants and revenue sharing, planners will have to evaluate old categorical program guidelines for their continuing applicability to program effectiveness.

The Emerging State Role in Local Planning

As the federal government begins to taper off its influence on state/local policy, the state appears to be increasing its influence on city and county policy in areas affecting planning. Some states are making local planning mandatory, or requiring that local governments adopt plans. In North Carolina, neither is yet the case; however, the number of regional management acts has increased. This provides a new dimension for
### Table 2

**Federal Guidelines for Local Input to the Planning Process, as Intermediary Effectiveness Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process or Input</th>
<th>Intermediary Effectiveness</th>
<th>Federal Objectives</th>
<th>Local Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen participation</td>
<td>Socially responsive plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Public acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Implementation satisfies perceived needs (impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical and horizontal coordination of</td>
<td>Expertise maximized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple funding sources maximized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governmental resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary approach</td>
<td>Innovative programs and projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variety and choice maximized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives tested</td>
<td>1. Optimum utilization of existing resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Dollar savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Optimum utilization of technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cost-effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Optimal design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on natural and socio-economic systems</td>
<td>Damage minimized or mitigated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trade-offs optimized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyzed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A-95&quot; regional/state review</td>
<td>Proposal in conformance with regional plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resources used effectively and optimally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process or Input</th>
<th>Intermediary Effectiveness</th>
<th>Federal Objectives</th>
<th>Local Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Multi-modal study</td>
<td>1. Comprehensiveness expanded</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal funding maximized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Multiple involvements in study</td>
<td>2. Responsiveness increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Implementation directed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Implementation assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
planning as well as the possibility of diminishing the local role in planning and strengthening the state and regional roles. Local planning in North Carolina will be affected by legislation which is expected to ensue from studies and recommendations of the Council on State Goals and Policies and the State Land Policy Council. The North Carolina Coastal Management Act has expanded the role of planning in the eastern part of the state, but there is not yet a mountain management act, and the prospect of a piedmont management act appears remote at this time. Other land and water use regulations and controls in North Carolina preempt or establish the boundaries of local planning and regulatory action, among them water quality control, floodway regulations, sedimentation and pollution control, air quality control, and environmental impact review. Tax policy is emerging in statutes as an implementing mechanism for planning, although as now drafted North Carolina statutes are too hedged about with conditions to have much impact. The emerging state role in local planning in North Carolina makes more explicit the effectiveness criteria which may be applied to the products of the local public planning agency engaged in comprehensive physical planning. Whether similar state/local shifts are occurring elsewhere has not been investigated for the purpose of this paper.

Local Exercise of Authority

Approval by the local governing body of the planning agency's annual program budget, or assignment of any unprogrammed project or task to the agency at any time, may extend its authority, establishing new goals or objectives and new criteria for determining the agency's effectiveness. When an assigned task or ongoing responsibility is a relatively simple one -- for example, approving new or changed street names -- the outcome objectives may be stated in terms of simple immediate effectiveness criteria such as Duplication avoided, or Confusion avoided. The avoidance of duplication and confusion has important long-range and cumulative impacts such as fire trucks arriving promptly, mail arriving, and so forth. More complex staff assignments may have both intermediary and impact effectiveness criteria. For example, a program of initial comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of a planning agency and ongoing monitoring of agency accomplishments would have as intermediary effectiveness criteria all of the objectives discussed in the Introduction to this paper, and as impact effectiveness criteria, all of the impact criteria discussed throughout this paper.

Examples of other programs and tasks, adapted from a local planning agency's program budget, which illustrate the exercise of local authority under the statutory provisions "... make recommendations ... on any matters referred to it ..." or "... any related duties," are provided in Table 3. Table 3 illustrates how programs and tasks may lend themselves to both intermediary and impact effectiveness determinations. It will be noted that several intermediary effectiveness outcomes can be identified as prerequisites to impact effectiveness.

In summary, a local public planning agency, in adapting the evaluation design in this paper or setting up its own design, can start with a listing of its authorizations, programs, projects, and tasks, stating their goals and objectives and the criteria for judging their effectiveness in short-range
### TABLE 3
SELECTED TASKS FROM A PROGRAM BUDGET, ILLUSTRATING INTERMEDIARY AND IMPACT EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Intermediary Effectiveness Criteria</th>
<th>Impact Effectiveness Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identification and recommendation of a system of goals and policies for community development</td>
<td>a. Report prepared</td>
<td>Decisions supported by report lead to improvement (the character of the decisions and improvements would be stipulated here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Report recommended by planning commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Report adopted by council as a guide to decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Report cited in support of decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fostering the use of the goals and policies as decision criteria</td>
<td>a. Information system operational</td>
<td>Decisions supported by information lead to improvement (specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Information inputs and outputs meet inter-agency needs and convenience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Assistance to executive and council provided by agencies, utilizing information from the system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Decisions made on basis of information provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assistance in developing an inter-agency information system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fostering utilization of the information system to assist decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3 -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Intermediary Effectiveness Criteria</th>
<th>Impact Effectiveness Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Provision of staff services to ad hoc committees and boards</td>
<td>Staff services lead to decisions</td>
<td>Decisions supported by staff services lead to improvement (specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provision of staff services to permanent special-purpose authorities and commissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provision of information and assistance to industry recruiters</td>
<td>Information and assistance lead to recruitment</td>
<td>New industry leads to fulfillment of part of community’s economic development goals and objectives (specified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(intermediary) or long-range (impact) perspective. It can also compare its recent programs with its authorizations to evaluate the comprehensiveness of its activities.

III. EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA -- COPING WITH CONSTRAINTS

Despite the widening authority of planners to participate in developing goals, standards, and problem solutions for the many aspects of the human environment, the outcome of planning in some localities falls short of the planners' expectations. Plans may not be adopted or implemented, recommendations may be disregarded, information and advice may not be sought in the planners' areas of competence. Such situations may be due not to the quality of planning and of the plans themselves, but to the political climate in which planning must take place. An important element of professional planning competence is the ability to understand and work within and around the constraints in the planning environment. Much of planning literature during the past decade or two has been devoted to this issue. The design of an effectiveness assessment should take into account the skills of the planners in operating under less than optimal conditions, and the "new" planning which addresses this and related issues. This chapter attempts a comprehensive list of planning constraints and examines a few possible responses to those constraints as intermediary effectiveness criteria.

Constraints which affect the substance, process, and outcomes of planning are classifiable as political, conceptual, financial, and capacity constraints, or constraints in the system. Political constraints may be further subdivided into those relating to council and to the chief executive, political constraints resulting from intergovernmental relations,
and those for which planning agencies themselves may be responsible.

Not all constraints exist in every locality; but at least some combination of the constraints which follow seems to exist in many local situations.

Political Constraints Relating to Council

Elected officials, as laymen, may be unfamiliar with planning, its substance, methods, resources, values, and goals. They may be unpaid, with little time to spare for familiarizing themselves with the citizen commission and its staff and the planning program, beyond their contacts through contested rezoning petitions. Because of a lack of information, or because they do not share the values and goals of the planners, or because they may have a different perception of the planners’ role in government, they may be indifferent or even opposed to the planning program or its recommendations. An unenthusiastic attitude toward planning may arise from the misconceived view that any planning standards constitute a brake on development (Sellars, 1975, page 13). This attitude may be fostered by individuals or groups who fear their opportunities may be curtailed by planning or zoning. This view is especially likely to receive support during periods of high unemployment. At such times, the long-range trade-offs of environmental character may be ignored in reaching short-range decisions.

For officials who must face reelection every few years, the concept of long-range planning is unrealistic; even if they accept the principle of guarding against the foreclosure of long-range options in making short-range decisions, other considerations rank higher in their frame of reference.

A specific short-range planning recommendation which is a hot political issue may cost an incumbent his reelection (or he may fear it will).

Council members are buffeted by many special interests. Power blocks and influential individuals and groups in a community may press for conflicting objectives (Wildaver, 1971, page 415; Dye, 1969, pages 248-55), which keep officials in a state of indecision. The political environment includes minority groups who also may have conflicting objectives and values and may be involved in power struggles with each other as well as with the majority or with an elite group or groups.

The values of elected officials themselves may be in conflict on some issues. Any official may hold conflicting values on a given issue; for example, he may value cost-effective governmental operations and at the same time want to provide non-cost-effective services to hardship cases as a form of cost spreading or vote getting.

Mogyo Maruyama (1973, page 345) states that voters are in flux, both as to their place of residence, which they may change to another ward or town after an election, and as to their expectations of their representatives. Thus guidance from the electorate may be uncertain. Public apathy or misunderstanding of “future” issues may result in absence of open support for planning, giving any opposition an open field when planning issues are at stake before the council.

Political Constraints Relating to the Chief Executive

Whether the chief executive is an elected official or a trained professional, common problems and attitudes serve as political constraints to planning and plan implementation. Foremost is the need of the executive to solve day-to-day problems quickly and with as little friction as possible. The executive seeks advice in this context and may be disinterested in long-range considerations (“Planning for Executive Influence,” 1974,
There may be a basic lack of congruence between the planners' goals and the objectives of the executive. He/she may believe that the planners' time should be spent assisting him directly rather than addressing an unpredictable future. Mason Haire (1967, pages 45-6) attributes this mental set to management in general, but this is particularly true of the professional public manager because he is heir to the many political problems of the elected officials at whose pleasure he serves (Dye, 1969, page 234).

An executive may adopt a style that is counterproductive for planning, believing that management by conflict (Kelly, 1970, pages 299-94) assures that important issues are brought to the fore and fully explored. A few executives may feel that management by neglect causes problems to disappear. The chief executive may be so busy that he requires one-page executive summaries of all recommendations, thereby blocking adequate communication on complex issues, and ignoring extensive or intensive studies.

The professional manager, as opposed to the elected executive, may be highly mobile, seeking to establish a national reputation for his innovative problem-solving performance. In such case, his interest in local long-range planning may be marginal.

A professional manager who is maneuvering for maximum power in relation to council may withhold information from it (Kelly, 1970, page 305) or he may obfuscate issues for his own purposes. This type of manager will brush aside the organizational principle that an advisory function should be quasi-independent (Drucker, 1973, page 799; Dye, 1969, pages 241-48) and will insist that planning should be a subordinate department whose director he can hire and fire, thus controlling his findings and recommendations.

Failing this, he may ignore or attempt to discredit the planning agency's proposals and advice.

**Political Constraints in Intergovernmental Relations**

The effects of fragmented local authority and power have received much attention in the literature of political science (Hawkins and Dye, 1971, page 497, for example). Power conflicts and value conflicts may create a difficult environment for planning. In horizontal relationships, a planning agency may find itself caught in a cross-fire of contending bodies. Failure to accept or implement plans is only one of the hazards. The planning agency may be regarded by each local unit as the agency of another. Or a planning agency may be used as a cat's paw when politically unpopular recommendations are sought.

Vertical as well as lateral conflicts may occur. The federal government and some state governments have influenced the priorities of local governments for the past two decades through project and program funding. Federal categorical grants obliged localities to comply with sometimes distasteful guidelines. When the local planning agency is the mediator for compliance with such guidelines, it may become the beneficiary of local distaste for inappropriate or unpopular requirements. The federal government is now addressing one aspect of the issue of inappropriate requirements (Intergovernmental Study Committee on Policy Management Assistance, 1975).

Interdepartmental power struggles or value conflicts impact a planning agency's program and make heavy demands for coping behavior. Planning agencies are virtually powerless to implement their own plans; without a good relationship with line agencies, a program or project can
be undermined. In times of rapid change, the roles of line and staff agencies may have to be redefined, and authority may be offered to or taken from the planning agency in the process, creating periods of inter- and intra-departmental tension and perhaps counterproductive maneuvering.

The expansion of the "third sector" (McGill and Wooton, 1975, pages 445-55) in overlapping roles with local government departments creates another set of tensions, the outcome of which may be either to involve the planning agency, or to deal it out of significant areas of concern. Among the private service providers, and between them and their public department counterparts, there may be a kind of sibling rivalry which can make attempts at coordinating, surveying, and planning both difficult and painful.

Political Constraints Relating to the Planning Agency

According to some of the "new" planning theories (Chapter IV), planning agencies must accept their share of responsibility for political difficulties if planners fail to recognize the importance of adapting to the political process. Unfortunately for some communities, adaptation may mean unwillingness of planners to raise any controversial issues, thereby limiting their usefulness to decision makers (Levin, 1976, page 10). But decision making is a process of political choice in an environment of conflicting values (Cans, 1973, page 224); in a pluralistic political situation, the "new" theorists say, the planner has the responsibility to adopt a strategy for goal consensus and to martial a coalition for support of his proposals. If consensus is not possible, the alternative is plural plans, according to Davidoff and others. (The practical difficulties of plural plans in some areas is not at issue here.)

In attempting to rally support, planners may have to contend with apathy as well as opposition. Even with political support, citizen participation techniques may not draw people in numbers, nor achieve constructive input to the decisions of council. Citizen input may be concerned with minor or self-serving issues; the outcome of the participation process may be disappointingly trivial or even counterproductive. Yet "CP" is now a federal requirement for certain funding programs, and planners must share with local government administration the responsibility for leadership to make it succeed.

The ability to resolve or accommodate conflicting values in the planning process and the art of achieving goal consensus both require cultivation. The upper middle class usually supports proposals which benefit the community, which address environmental concerns, or which would result in economy or efficiency (Wilson and Banfield, 1964). As organized groups, however, their interest levels fluctuate over time. The planner faces a difficult decision whether to cultivate their support of challenged positions.

Failure of a local public planning agency to perceive opportunities in meeting urgent ad hoc demands and in performing maintenance tasks (O'Harrow, 1966, pages 18-24) which divert it from its established program can also constrain its effectiveness.

Conceptual Constraints

The problem of "conflicting and changing epistemologies" (Maruyama, 1973) has been raised in the context of political constraints but bears summarization with conceptual constraints as it is pervasive outside of the political context as well as within it. Planners, their bosses and
their clients, may all suffer from conceptual problems. The difficulty of grasping long-range issues, or relating them to current problems, the conflict between long-range goals and short-range solutions, conflicting short-range priorities, the inherent constraint of broad problem definition as opposed to exact solution strategy, the tendency to apply old solutions to new problems, selection of the wrong level of problem definition which may produce inappropriate solutions (Cartwright, 1973, page 179), conflicting concepts of the mission and roles of planning among planners, their bosses, and their clients, lack of goal consensus, the rapidly changing and conflicting values and goals of all the actors in the planning environment, the difficulty of communicating values and goals, and the difficulty of goal-setting under these circumstances (Young, 1966, page 81), the normal tendency to seek and accept emotional rather than rational solutions to problems, the resistance of community and bureaucracy to change, combine to form a tangled net against which planning must strain.

Financial Constraints

The planning process is slow at best, and with insufficient staff due to inadequate funding, may proceed at less than an optimum pace. As plans are developed, the issue of implementation arises. Plan implementation may require substantial public expenditures for facilities which are the "hardware" of public services (Hightower, 1969) and which provide incentives and direction for private development investments. Should plans be scaled down to fiscal capacities, or is the planner responsible for identifying the sources of funds for implementing the plans he has formulated? Complicating the chronically inadequate tax base of localities for major capital expenditures are a number of other constraints in the fiscal environment: the statutory limitation on borrowing, the economic mood of the community with respect to bond referenda, conflicting tendencies to depend on benevolent "seed money" for new programs and an unwillingness to accept seed money for fear of long term financial commitments, dependency on inadequate state and federal supplements, negativism toward state and federal conditions for funding assistance, including fear of the effect of categorical grants on local priorities, and misgivings at the federal level concerning the effects of revenue sharing on local tax efforts. Despite these attitudes toward non-tax funding and non-local funding, and in the face of the high costs of some programs and projects and the mismatch between service needs in the urban core and local financial resources in the urban fringe areas, local governments display an unwillingness to reform their obsolete tax structures.

Capacity Constraints or Constraints in the System

Capacity problems exist in both planning agencies and their political environments. The authority of planning agencies is restricted by statute to an advisory role; they have little power, and sanctions for circumventing their advice are often lacking. Planning enabling legislation in some states is permissive rather than mandatory (although this is changing). Local governments which choose to implement the authority to plan by funding a local planning agency are not, in every state, required to adopt or implement the resulting plans. They need not even request alternatives if they disapprove of a plan.

The ability of local governments to implement plans, if they choose to do so, is hindered by a multiplicity of fragmented, conflicting jurisdictions and powers.

The logistics of reorganizing service agencies and service delivery
systems to meet new problem definitions and solution strategies may give pause to the chief executive who properly hesitates to disrupt carefully balanced interagency relationships established over long periods.

The policy management capacity of local governments is believed to have been weakened by decades of federalism so that they are less able to respond adequately to the current federal policy of devolution of decision-making through revenue sharing (Intergovernmental Study Committee on Policy Management Assistance, 1975).

Local governments alone cannot solve all of the problems within their territory. Such problems as air quality, sewage collection and treatment, and social welfare may have to be dealt with at regional, state, or federal levels in some parts of the country. Monitoring and influencing policy at these levels requires continuing local effort.

Certain problems are best dealt with by the "third sector," including ad hoc committees and autonomous or quasi-autonomous boards, commissions, or authorities.

In the area of urban development, the real decisions are made not by government, but by private enterprise (Dye, 1969, page 245).

Finally, the courts are arrogating an increasing role in policy-making at all levels of government (Train, 1975, page 11).

Managing Constraints for Intermediary Effectiveness

Constraints in the planning environment are more readily identified than managed. Yet the degree to which planners manage constraints effects both their credibility and their effectiveness. Of the relatively few and largely theoretical ways around constraints, many are beyond the planners' role or capability, such as rationalizing the division of power among local governmental units, rationalizing tax policy and program funding, enlarging council or providing them with compensation for time spent in orientation sessions.

The planners' professionalism in coping with these constraints within their purview may be considered an intermediary effectiveness criterion with a number of sub-sets. Political constraints may evoke responses of quality improvement, process changes, educational efforts, power building, attempts to achieve goal consensus and to accommodate conflicting values, balancing the ongoing program with ad hoc assignments, and role adjustment. Role adjustment offers a wide range of responses from surrendering completely to fire-fighting at the direction of chief executive and council to reorganizing internally so as to segregate fulfillment of ad hoc demands from the ongoing program of the agency, with intermediate variations. The importance of role adjustment and the degree of adjustment will vary with the situation, which includes the general political environment, the political and professional security of the planning agency and its members, the style of the chief executive, and the needs of the community.

Some citizen supporters of planning and some planners themselves may toy with the prospect of increasing the power of planning agencies, perhaps on the English model. This model is not consistent with American values; but some improvement in the official power of planning seems necessary if planners are not to spend a disproportionate amount of their time on such maintenance tasks as unofficial power building. A few states now require that local governments adopt plans. Some federal agencies appear to be moving in the same direction. Even with plan adoption mandatory, however, constraints will probably still persist and planning agency efforts...
Many of the "new" planning theories and some standards of planning quality address the issue of management of constraints in the planning environment. Chapter IV reviews these theories and standards.
1) imaginative, innovative, pushing toward new frontiers; 2) full exposition of alternative strategies to reach goal or solve problem with clear indication of consequences of each; 3) planners' preferred alternative stated fully without compromise; 4) data, proposals, ideas described clearly and understandably; 5) sufficient, timely, accurate information used; 6) clear understanding of how private market works is reflected; 7) proposal reflects wishes of groups it is supposed to affect; 8) relations among functions and systems are explicitly shown; 9) hot or tough issues are dealt with; 10) studies and analysis are relevant to the important decisions being made.

ASPO's quality checklist provides a point of departure for discussion and elaboration, first, as to its comprehensiveness, and second, as to its applicability. Several major items could be added to this list: a) Solutions should fit the problem to be solved (Cartwright, 1973); b) Priorities should be established among any series of proposals which require large resource allocations; c) Update criteria should be a part of all mid-range and long-range plans; d) Criteria and standards for evaluation of the outcome should be a part of all plans and proposals; and e) All short-range and immediate proposals should be made within a mid-range or long-range context of needs and resources available to meet them. Other major additions can probably be identified.

Among ASPO's ten criteria several sub-sets might be added. To item 1, innovative solutions, should be added the caveat that solutions not be too far ahead of public consciousness. Item 5 addresses the timeliness of information used; this or an additional item should address the timeliness of programming the studies themselves, and the promptness with which requested studies are made. (Promptness goes beyond efficiency, as a delayed study may fail to influence a decision.) Item 6 addresses an understanding only of the workings of the private market; in addition, the soundness of all assumptions should be addressed. Sub-sets of item 7, which deals with the wishes and tastes of "clients" should be understood to include formal Citizen Participation (Cleveland, 1975, pages 3-6) and informal advocacy planning in the interests of pluralism (Maziotti, Davidoff, and others). Allusions to pluralism and clients raise the broader issue of accountability (League of Women Voters, 1970), as taxpayers and others are among those affected by proposals which may have limited target groups. Items 9 and 10, dealing with issues and decisions, might have as sub-sets the involvement of elected and appointed officials in the planning process and the building of support coalitions for plan and proposal implementation, unless these sub-sets are understood as part of item 2 which addresses strategies as well as alternative problem solutions.

In a recent position statement (1974, pages 12-15) the American Institute of Planners describes quality planning in terms of process and intent, as "... comprehensive, decision-oriented, coordinative, continuous, public interest oriented; to achieve these goals ... all government programs ... should be designed to encourage private capital investment, provide additional employment and human development opportunities, offer services and otherwise contribute to an orderly community growth and development process in accordance with policies" at all levels. In the following year's policy statement, AIP reaffirms its emphasis on fostering the welfare of society through citizen participation in problem solving and provision of benefits, and adds a requirement to the comprehensive continuing planning process: monitoring and evaluation of actions toward goals. While monitoring and evaluation are not altogether new requirements for federal programs, many planning agencies have not yet refined techniques for accomplishing this purpose. Yet such monitoring and evaluation are a part of the assessment of the planning agency's effectiveness. In the design of effectiveness assessment, the quality of plans and planning can be used as
criteria of intermediary effectiveness.

Quality criteria, as previously indicated, may be controversial and must be used with discretion. The perceptions of quality by bosses and clients may differ from each other and from the perceptions of planners. For example, a report meeting all ten of ASPO's quality criteria may be rejected by an elected official for the very reason that it deals with "hot or tough issues," or because he is opposed to the "planners' preferred alternative."

The "New" Planning Theories

The interrelationships between coping with constraints in the planning environment and the quality of planning and plans are addressed by the "new" planning theories which seek to increase the effectiveness of planning, particularly in the "soft" areas of services, service delivery systems, and meeting the psychological needs of people. A brief overview of these theories will reveal the extent to which they may be ripe for inclusion among local planning agency effectiveness criteria.

In the academic community, the search for new insights, a new philosophy, and a new planning process ranges from support for the planning practitioner bound by state and local law and by federal funding requirements to the classical planning mold, to extreme views which call for a restructuring of the social order. Mann (1968, page 347) points out that planning is no longer "one": the new planning introduces a "new uncertainty."

"Already, the ultra-new fringe is calling advocacy planning a reactionary tool of members of the establishment." Bolan (1967, page 234) describes the academic challenges to the long-range plan with its long term development goals against which short term development decisions are to be made. Citing academic planning theorists, he indicates that planning currently emphasizes process rather than products (plans); that the most practitioners can hope to achieve is problem-solving or opportunity-seizing; that there are practical limits to rationality; and that in any case the decision-making process is incremental rather than comprehensive. The effective alternative to classical planning, according to Bolan, is a process whereby "planning . . . responds in a manner carefully calculated to be appropriate to circumstances" rather than by the extremes of either classical comprehensive long-range planning or its polarized opponents. Bolan criticizes planners for altering their ways of selling classical planning rather than adapting their method to circumstances (page 235). As "ways of persuasion" he reviews six anticlassical theories -- Melvin Webber's "Politics of Information," Meyerson's "Middle-Range Bridge," the role of "Informal Coordinator-Catalyst," Braybrooke and Lindblom's "Disjointed Incrementalism," Paul Davidoff's "Advocacy and Plural Planning," and John Friedmann's "Adaptive and Contingency Planning" (pages 238–39).

Not a few of the new theories are descriptions or rationalizations for suboptimizing in the selection of planning goals and problem solutions. Some theories are nebulous concepts intended to inspire research or to spark innovative practical approaches to problem analysis and solution. Just as classical planning overemphasized physical facilities, implying their use for social ends, so the new planning philosophies overcompensate by overemphasizing social policy planning and the participative planning process, merely implying functional planning for the hardware of service provision. Since Bolan's summary in 1967, ferment in the planning field and in the related fields of sociology and political science seems to have increased. The accelerating concern for human problems and the continuing interplay of satisficing philosophies (Ylvisaker, 1970; Rondinelli, 1973;
Kalba, 1974) are illustrated in Table 4, in which are arrayed chronologically a sampling of new theories from 1955 to 1975.

A characteristic of these new theories is their hypothetical nature which sometimes makes it difficult to distinguish inputs or processes from intended outcomes or effectiveness criteria. At least two theorists (Friedmann, 1966 and 1969; Etzioni, 1968) link or fuse knowledge with action or planning with implementation. This creates a dilemma in attempting to adapt them to an effectiveness assessment design. Since many theorists address process rather than outcome (Michael, Davidoff, Friedmann, Etzioni, Horton and Leslie, Kalba, Hansen, Pilkler, Maruyama), their theories provide criteria of quality or intermediary effectiveness.

The inclusion in an evaluation schedule of such criteria as "utopianism and obsolescence avoided in a climate of uncertainty about the future," or "mutualistic symbiosis in a heterogeneous society" attained, however, is scarcely appropriate for the local public planning agency.

What remains after culling nebulous or inoperable criteria, if reordered in a future time sequence from immediate to long range, fits the conceptual scheme of this paper: the division of effectiveness criteria into intermediary and impact effectiveness. It is further apparent that intermediary effectiveness criteria extend over a continuum from "problem solving" to "improvement programs implemented," merging with impact effectiveness in the area of "change influenced." The impact criteria, too, are not absolute, but advance with time, from "money spent meets perceived needs" to "decentralization achieved." For the planning practitioner, the crucial importance of this approach to planning theories is that an agency can evaluate itself against reasonable intermediary effectiveness criteria initially (in consideration of the constraints in its environment), and thereafter establish increasingly demanding criteria for its performance in successive evaluation periods.
### TABLE 4
A SAMPLING OF "NEW" PLANNING THEORIES AND THEIR EFFECTIVENESS CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory or Process</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Bounded Rationality&quot; (Banfield, 1955, and others following)</td>
<td>Alternatives and consequences provided</td>
<td>Decision in terms of executive's or officials' valued ends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| "Middle-Range Bridge" (Meyerson, 1956, and others following) | 1. Information on state of system behavior  
2. Action programs oriented to middle-range future  
3. Post hoc testing of predicted consequences | Improvement programs implemented |
| "Science of Muddling Through" (Lindblom, 1959, and others following) | The means available influence choice of ends | The possible is implemented |
| "Choice Theory of Planning" (Davidoff and Reiner, 1962) | 1. Preparation of alternatives  
2. Explaining, bargaining  
3. Resolving value conflicts  
4. Guiding action | 1. Plural goals attained  
2. Individual preferences satisfied |
| "Disjointed Incrementalism" (Braybrooke and Lindblom, 1962) | Cost-effectiveness governs project choice | Cumulative partial improvements may approach goal |
| "Purposive Incrementalism" and "Politics of Information" (Webber, 1965) | Information provided based on urban theories | Change influenced rationally through multi-centered processes |

(continued)

### TABLE 4 -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory or Process</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "Rationalized Society" (Michael, 1963) | 1. Computer technology  
2. Extra-rational inputs  
3. Working with industry | 1. Problem solving rationalized  
2. Policies shaped in political value system |
| "Advocacy and Plural Planning" (Davidoff, 1965, and others following) | 1. Plural plans presented  
2. Scope includes socio-economic and other interests of public  
3. Advocacy process is client-oriented | The right course is chosen based on values, not facts |
| "Innovative" Versus "Allocative" Planning (Friedmann, 1966 and 1969) | 1. Legitimize and prioritize new social objectives  
2. Translate values into new institutional arrangements  
3. Guide through feedback | Implementation fused with planning |
| "Mixed Scanning" (Etzioni, 1968) | Knowledge and action linked | 1. Group consensus achieved for social tasks  
2. Capacity for goal attainment achieved |

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory or Process</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;New&quot; Practice and New Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>1. Facilities, services, aids, and regulations included</td>
<td>Tools are adequate to the dimensions of the problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hansen, 1968)</td>
<td>2. Involved in political interests and decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Regional planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissent in the Planning Agency</td>
<td>1. Work with public</td>
<td>1. Multiplicity of public interests balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Finkler, 1970, and others following)</td>
<td>2. Debate, negotiation, bargaining</td>
<td>2. Competing values ranked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Prepare minority reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketplace Decisions</td>
<td>1. Discard old assumptions</td>
<td>Money spent meets perceived needs/wants of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ylvisaker, 1970, and others following)</td>
<td>2. Provide the poor with funds for marketplace choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3. Charge fees for public services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory or Process</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Policy Planning&quot;</td>
<td>1. Goals (ends) identified</td>
<td>1. Public services upgraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gans, 1970, and others following)</td>
<td>2. Effective policies (means) determined to achieve goals</td>
<td>2. Delivery systems improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Undesirable consequences minimized</td>
<td>3. Eliminated: poverty, segregation, social pathologies, pollution, municipal financial crises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Postindustrial Society&quot;: Conflict and Sacrifice</td>
<td>1. Increase, disseminate knowledge</td>
<td>Solutions fit long-range human and natural resource problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Horton and Leslie, and others following)</td>
<td>2. Agree on goals, means</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sacrifice values which impede long-range adaptations or opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Integrate solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation and Competition</td>
<td>1. Citizen participation</td>
<td>Coordinated decisions reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sack and Boehm, 1970)</td>
<td>2. Developer participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Lobbying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Interaction</td>
<td>Covening, mobilizing, and controlling multiple interests</td>
<td>Effective plan implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Robinson, 1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory or Process</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Effectiveness Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Sector Planning</td>
<td>Public and private roles mingled</td>
<td>Improved allocation of public goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mehkin, 1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rondinelli, 1973)</td>
<td>2. Identification of opportunity costs</td>
<td>2. Policy proposals implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Strategic intervention in political process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grabow and Heskin, 1973)</td>
<td>2. Social experimentation</td>
<td>2. Society decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Consciousness and action merged</td>
<td>3. Human development facilitated in a communal society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Ecological ethic pursued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Centralization</td>
<td>Oppose mass bureaucratization which increases feelings of powerlessness</td>
<td>Pluralism, localism, voluntarism, regionalism, decentralization achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Niasbet, 1973)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Transactive Planning&quot;</td>
<td>1. Dialog between planner and client</td>
<td>1. Future value systems projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Friedmann, 1973)</td>
<td>2. Develop learning society</td>
<td>2. Mobility and social dynamics adjusted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. &quot;Understand patient before treating his wounds&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Theory or Process              | Inputs                                                                 | Effectiveness Criteria                                           |
| "Transepistemological Process"| 1. Generate cultural goals ahead of technology                          | Mutualistic symbiosis developed in a heterogeneous society      |
| (Maruyama, 1973)               | 2. Interweave different styles and principles                            |                                                                  |
|                                | 3. Grass roots conceptualization                                         |                                                                  |
|                                | 4. Gear for change                                                       |                                                                  |
| Contingency Planning           | Participation of private sector decision-makers in the public planning process | Utopianism and obsolescence avoided in climate of uncertainty about the future |
| (Kalba, 1974)                  |                                                                        |                                                                  |
| "Redistributive Justice"       | 1. Emphasize immediate needs in long-range planning                      | "The City Just," "The City Fair," or "The City Equitable"      |
| (Davidoff, 1975)               | 2. Address explicitly the maldistribution of goods and opportunities     |                                                                  |
V. EFFICIENCY

In the framework for evaluation developed in this paper, efficiency constitutes intermediary effectiveness. Efficiency of organization, management, and operations is essential to the effectiveness of any large and complex organization with a broad program and responsibilities for interaction with other agencies, governments, and with various publics. Conversely, an inefficient organization is likely to squander opportunities for effectiveness. Efficient management is, indeed, effective management. O'Harrow (1966, page 1) says of efficiency: "... a planning agency must get its own house in order -- through good internal administration and organization -- if it is to be effective in the community."

Areas of planning agency efficiency are considered in the contexts of organization, management, leadership, and morale.

Organizational Theory and Planning Practice

Organizing for efficient production to meet the needs of post-industrial society has taken a large step from theory to practice in the past few years (Toffler, 1970). The formal hierarchical organization (Mooney, 1947, and others) will undoubtedly retain vestiges for generations to come. What is new is the ways in which formal organization is being circumvented to meet changed perceptions of human relations and changed operational needs. Drucker (1954, page 138) describes the new modus operandi as a team approach to problem solving: "In any well run plant, the team rather than the hierarchy is the operating reality." He observes, however, that "Teamwork requires actually more internal organization, more cooperation and greater definiteness of individual assignments than work organized in individual jobs."

Davis (1967, pages 285-99) describes adaptation of the team concept to the management of scientific and professional employees. Characterizing them as highly motivated and defensive against administrative blocks (page 287), he describes "matrix organization" (also called program management or project management) as a solution to meeting the special needs of professionals. In the matrix organization, members have "permanent" assignments to which they return after the completion of temporary team assignments. Temporary assignments may last from days to years, and may carry with them temporary rank as well. An individual of subordinate rank in the permanent organizational hierarchy may lead a team with members of higher permanent rank than his. As Bennis suggests (1966, page 143), leadership will fall to those with special skills.

The team approach in which specialists are drawn together to perform a task, carry out a project or program, or solve a problem, while remaining in a traditional hierarchical position in the organization to perform ongoing responsibilities on a part-time basis adapts matrix organization to the needs of the planning agency. Team or task force planning permits the organization to adjust rapidly to changing output requirements. The team may be cross-sectional within the planning agency itself, or among departments of local government participating in a joint study, or a combination of these. Specialists from a nearby university or other private resource persons may be drawn in, as well as state and federal employees. The team approach to planning programs and projects fulfills the objectives of Organizational Development (Powers, 1974, page 155) and creates a climate for feedback, diagnosis, and improvement, essential
Davis (1967, page 298) suggests a further adaptation of unstructured management in which team members select their own roles in completing the project, and establish their own operating conditions. This, too, is suitable to some planning projects. Surrounding this circumscribed area of freedom, however, is a caveat. According to Davis (page 298) there is evidence that scientific and professional personnel perform best when they are relatively free of organizational uncertainty such as funding and overall management practices and "housekeeping." This requires a managerial role of "filtering out organizational instabilities, enabling employees to work in a less disruptive environment" (page 299). Humble (1973, pages 54-5) describes the essential characteristics of teamwork, and also stresses the need for the teamwork approach to be complemented by "disciplined systems for organization planning and control" (page 9). He quotes McGregor to the effect that much management attention is necessary in building and maintenance of teams (page 37).

A further problem is raised by McGregor (1960, page 47) in the general context of the less rigorously structured "Y" theory organization. The "Y" organization assumes high individual motivation and greater realization of both individual and organizational goals, and therefore provides more individual freedom than the "X" theory organization with its rigid hierarchy and channelized communications. In the "Y" setting, which may find its extreme expression in the local public planning office with a superimposed matrix organization, ways must be found to establish and monitor the limits of each worker's authority and responsibility. As Drucker (1973, pages 232-34) points out in his criticism of "X" and "Y" theories, "to manage worker and working by putting responsibility on the worker and by aiming at achievement [makes] exceedingly high demands on both worker and manager." To add to the difficulties, the "Y" theory planning agency is likely to be imbedded in an "X" theory local governmental structure.

A specific aspect of management competence which is difficult to deal with in the matrix organization characteristic of planning is role prescription. Role ambiguity is the more likely condition, with some roles prescribed by management, others by team leaders, and still other roles prescribed by coworkers on the basis of knowledge or expertise, and some roles self-prescribed (Miner, 1971). Not all individuals, including professionals, are able to maintain high morale in this climate of uncertainty. It may make sense, under some organizational conditions, to define the roles of some workers more rigidly than others.

Employee attitudes toward role prescription or its lack may affect or be affected by motivation and other job-related attitudes, producing dysfunctional behavior (Golembiewski, 1973). Management response to this dilemma ranges from formal detailed job descriptions which are frequently updated, to brief, loose descriptions which provide wide latitude. Where the detailed description is used, there is variance in its application, some agencies cleaving to the letter of the description and others ignoring it to a greater or lesser degree.

To play dual or quadruple roles -- as knowledge expert and as a task-force member and possibly leader, either temporarily or on a part-time basis concurrently with his permanent assignment -- the planner must be highly flexible and adaptive. Yet individuals of high technical competence vary in their adaptive capacity. The skilled administrator...
recognizes this and adjusts assignments, role prescriptions, and the table of organization to his staff resources.

The need for adaptiveness and flexibility is not the only problem in staffing the local public planning agency. Funding a planning staff of adequate size and appropriate competencies may be beyond the ability or the policy of many local governments. Unlike private industry, government has limited flexibility for varying salaries and benefits. Planning agencies compete in a nationwide labor market for professional employees. Thus the salary level necessary to attract a particular specialist may be higher than that of comparable positions in local government or even in local private industry. There is likely to be tension among public personnel if planners' salaries are out of line with the salaries of other professionals.

To operate efficiently and effectively, required resources include not only standard items of office furniture, calculating equipment, drafting equipment, materials and supplies, and funds for computer programming and machine time, but costly specialized information such as aerial photographs taken at frequent intervals, large scale mapping with ground controls, topographic surveys, property line maps, soils mapping and analysis, land use surveys, and more. The costs of many of these resources are such that they may be unobtainable for some localities except with non-local funding assistance, by joint purchasing with neighboring communities, or by financing over a period of years. The planning agency which has all of these resources in reasonably up to date condition can operate with considerably enhanced efficiency and effectiveness. Space for location, storage, and easy access to these resources is essential. The location of the agency offices also may contribute to or detract from the agency's efficiency and effectiveness.

It must be close to -- preferably in the same building with -- other departments of local government to facilitate interactions, and accessible to the general public.

Clearly, then, the capability of the planning director and the citizen commission to compete effectively in the budgeting process for adequate local funding for staff and other resources, to obtain federal assistance grants, to cooperate with neighboring communities, and to influence policies of the local personnel department are all key elements in providing high quality planning processes and products which will have the desired impact on the community.

Managing the Planning Agency

The planning director, in his role as manager, must first of all have technical planning competence. He is responsible to the citizen commission, council, and the community at large for policy recommendations developed by his staff. Second, he must possess strategic or political skills (see "leadership") to promote the technical and policy recommendations developed in the planning program. His technical competence as a manager comes third, although it is just as critical to the success of the agency as are planning and strategy.

This section is concerned only with the third area of the director's competence -- management. The key areas for review of management competence in the planning agency are systems, roles, management of time, staffing, communication, and support and administrative services. In many of these areas of management activity, the director shares responsibility with other senior members of the staff, most of whom are required to be managers as well as planners in organizing and carrying out the work of the agency.
**Systems.** Management systems and partial systems in current vogue include Management by Objectives (MBO), Planning, Programming, and Budgeting (PPB), Operations Research (OR), a method of providing information for executive decisions on the best way to achieve a set of objectives (Miller and Starr, 1960; Lewis, 1970); Policy Analysis (Kraemer, 1973), a somewhat broader problem-solving technique than OR, which may have a built-in bias through the application of economic models to social decisions (Kramer, 1975, page 509); and Organizational Development (Powers, 1974), which is more of an attitude toward organizational change than an organizational system.

All five of these "systems" provide some insights for designing a planning agency assessment; however, MBO and PPBS are singled out here for their comprehensive approach to assessment of organizational effectiveness. In application to this study, the similarities of the two systems are more important than their differences. Both require an annual objective-setting process in each part of the organization, with vertical and lateral interaction to identify tasks and circumscribe roles for meeting the objectives and with built-in control criteria, that is, determining efficiency in terms of whether objectives have been met.

The characteristics of MBO which make it useful in this context are the rigor with which objectives and criteria are conceptualized and stated, and the applicability of MBO for testing the efficiency of organizational structure and management through systematic application. Reddin (1971) recommends a planning hierarchy for managers, commencing with articulation of the organization's mission and goals followed by the mission of each unit within the organization. This leads to a statement of each unit's functional areas or roles in the organization, and a listing of effectiveness areas for each function. The hierarchy branches out as it descends, listing standards for each effectiveness area and objectives for each effectiveness standard. The objectives then become the annual (or in some cases multi-year) program. The program must also include activity schedules and measures of objective attainment. These activities and measures become the management controls and evaluation criteria for the efficiency of the unit and its personnel.

**Roles.** MBO is recommended as a diagnostic as well as a control procedure. Upper management examines unit mission, function, and role statements to determine whether there are overlaps or gaps, and to make any necessary corrections. The process then moves down the organization until the boundaries of all jobs have been established. Questions suggested in using MBO as a diagnostic procedure (Reddin, 1971) can also be used, with adaptations, as evaluation criteria for the planning agency: Does the agency's mission come down from the top of the organization? Are roles examined both from the bottom up and the top down? Are there overlapping roles? Are there gaps in roles? Are responsibilities clearly defined? (Or better, should responsibilities be clearly defined?) Are the boundaries of jobs established? (Should the boundaries of jobs be established?) Are objectives used as control mechanisms? Are objectives used for employee and section evaluation (as opposed to evaluation of personal characteristics)?

It will be noted that Reddin's role circumscriptions are not considered appropriate for planners, whose multiple roles are discussed elsewhere in this paper. Role flexibility and a combination of generalism and specialization are as appropriate to planners as they are to today's managers. In the sense that every planner is "managing" situations in the
real world, he needs similar abilities to the manager who has a large group of subordinates for whose output and activities he is responsible.

Role flexibility appears to be essential for "contingency planning" (Reif and Bassford, 1973), described in management literature as spending an excessive amount of time responding to unpredictable emergencies (Odiorne, 1974). Odiorne (page 10) recommends that arrangements be made for meeting emergencies "Since the behavior of a time-pressed leader deteriorates over time." Extreme managerial responses to emergencies range from diverting the manager and breeding new emergencies, to managerial analysis of past emergencies to predict and prepare for the future (pages 8-10). Because prompt, high-quality contingency planning appears to be essential to the political viability of the planning agency, the problem of managing time is also crucial; how to allocate time so that the agency's committed program is not by-passed.

Managing time. Managing the conflicting demands on his time appears to be a universal problem of the administrator (Odiorne, 1974, page 10). In the planning agency the time of the entire staff, not solely the administrative section, must be managed effectively if ongoing responsibilities are to be fulfilled while ad hoc demands are being met. Management journals are replete with articles on managing time. McGill (1975, pages 12-14) suggests evaluating time spent against the manager's or agency's objectives. For the planning agency this may be too simple an approach. Many manage their time to meet their objectives through an extended working day. While this may be the normal expectation, it can and does sometimes become excessive. Management of the planning agency's time is complexly interrelated with staffing, funding, programming, managerial style, and the environment of planning. Initiation of MBO or simply program budgeting may exacerbate the

time problem initially by inducing overcommitment. Theoretically, at least, a self-adjusting mechanism in the program budgeting process will reduce the tendency to overcommitment in future years.

Staffing. The planner as manager is responsible for the recruitment of qualified subordinates, for their orientation to the agency and the community, for their ongoing professional development,* their morale, productivity, the quality of their work, the character of their relations with public and private sectors of the community, and the direct and indirect rewards necessary to avoid unnecessary turnover and assure loyalty and commitment.

The planning agency is of course not staffed exclusively with planners. According to ASPO (Wrobel, 1975), the ratio of support staff to professional staff nationwide varied with the size of the agency and the population served. For example, regional agencies in the population class 10,000 to 249,999 in 1975 had a ratio of 0.76 support personnel per planner. Support staff include typists, secretaries, draftsmen, illustrators, librarians, etc. Most of these people would be included in Drucker's definition of "knowledge workers" (1973, pages 176-77), but they also partake to some extent of the characteristics of production workers. Their management in terms of recruitment, rewards, morale, productivity, quality, and so on, are as important as the management of planners.

Communication. This broad subject cannot be adequately treated in this paper. For the purpose of assessment design only, four aspects of

* A characteristic of professionals not included in Nader's definition (Chapter IV) is the need for continuing education to maintain and advance knowledge and skills.
effective and efficient communication between the director and other
staff members, and between senior staff and others are recommended as
minimum criteria: 1) Meetings are kept short and to the point, following
a prepared agenda; 2) Meetings, if held, must produce a useful outcome;
3) Face-to-face directions and messages are clear and unequivocal; 4) Other
means of imparting information, such as circulation of correspondence,
memoranda, reports, and professional publications, make it unnecessary
for staff to depend on the "grapevine."

Communication outside of the agency requires a variety of skills
including public speaking, report writing, graphics preparation and
presentation, political persuasion, and eliciting citizen participation in
planning. Appendix C contains criteria for evaluating the quality of
some of these activities.

Support and administrative services. As indicated by Davis and
others, knowledge workers require a sense of security and certainty within
which they can be productive. This means that management is responsible
for providing adequate and timely secretarial services, drafting and mapping
assistance, a well-stocked technical library, and research and statistical
services. Records must be kept efficiently and adequately, housekeeping
must be of a high quality, maps and documents must be indexed and readily
accessible, supplies must be maintained, equipment must be kept in good
operating condition, and routine "maintenance tasks" must be assigned and
their performance must be monitored.

In the small agency, this volume of non-productive work may be
more burdensome than in the large agency which can afford specialists such
as a librarian and an office manager for whom these are meaningful
and productive roles.

Leadership and Supervisory Behavior

Of the many leadership characteristics described in management
literature, those which are most important in a local planning agency, not
necessarily ranking in the order given, are example and integrity (Drucker,
1954), direction and instructions, an open, participative style that
facilitates creativity, political skills, and public relations skills. "To
be a good leader, one must have the capacity to know and understand the
value system by which others operate" (Klemme, 1975, page 6). This applies
particularly to the management of a local public planning agency, where
leadership is both internal to the agency, and external in relation to the
diverse community. Terry (1968, pages 452-53), describes leadership as a
relationship existing and affected by the leader, the led, and the situation,
and the degree of acceptance of the leader's role by the group. Acceptance
may derive from inner motivation, the personality or leadership style of
the manager, the acknowledged technical competence of the leader, or
other factors. The key term "integrity," used frequently by Drucker (1954,
page 349 inter alia) appears particularly applicable to the leadership of
the planning director.

In management literature, the role of the manager is to make things
happen through leadership, planning, communication, managing time, and
other administrative activities. How those activities are carried out, in
the political environment of the planning agency, is at least as important
as which tasks are accomplished. An important leadership function,
therefore, is setting an example of professional demeanor and standards of
conduct. This is not solely the responsibility of the planning director,
but of all supervisory personnel including temporary team leaders and the
supervisors of support services such as drafting and secretarial functions.
Among the many leadership styles for making things happen, Odiorne’s "participative management" (1961, pages 64 ff) appears best adapted to the local planning agency in which management is necessarily in the hands not of professional managers but of professional planners. "Good participative management gives people personal satisfaction. People are better team players when they feel a part of the organization" (page 64). Odiorne describes "How to spring others' ideas into action" in terms which, for the purpose of agency assessment, could be converted into leadership effectiveness criteria: listen with interest and friendliness, make the speaker the central figure in the communication, check your prejudices, limit your advice, remember that people hear what they want to hear, listen to understand, be sensitive to the speaker's feelings, attitudes and motives, be neutral, repeat and rephrase to be certain of understanding, and question carefully (page 67).

The clarity and economy of direction and instructions must be finely tuned for knowledge workers, to communicate precisely what is required (Van Fleet, 1974) without appearing to usurp the worker's role in problem conceptualization and solution. Too little guidance may result in the wrong problem being solved; too much guidance will inhibit or destroy the worker's creativity and enjoyment of his work. In the problem-solving environment of planning, an optimal level of delegation, cooperation, mutual support, and conflict resolution is required. The planner as manager must create an ambience of openness and enthusiasm while maintaining professional discretion. He must practice management controls yet encourage "self-control" (Drucker, 1954).

Staff Morale

Morale, like leadership, is a broad subject which must be treated selectively here, in terms of the particular problems of planning agencies. Intra-agency and inter-agency relationships affect morale in the planning organization and influence whether things happen at all, as well as how things happen. Davis (1967, page 58) cautions, "Never underestimate the power of morale," which he defines as "The attitudes of individuals and groups toward their work environment and toward voluntary cooperation to the full extent of their ability in the best interests of the organization." Davis suggests construction of a morale profile by surveying employee attitudes on a schedule of fourteen criteria: job demands, working conditions, pay, employee benefits, friendliness and cooperation among employees, supervisor-employee relations, confidence in management, technical competence of supervision, effectiveness of administration, adequacy of communication, status and recognition, security of job and work relations, identification with the company, and chances for growth and advancement (page 72).

Davis' list can be elaborated to address specific issues in the operation of a local public planning agency. "Job demands" includes not only the volume of work, the amount of overtime required to fulfill objectives, and the ad hoc interruptions of the assigned work load (O'harrow, 1966, page 28), but also the character of the work assignments themselves, the utilization of the individual's skills, and the freedom or restrictions imposed on problem conceptualization and solution and on authority in carrying out the assignment. Working conditions is also a broad category, ranging from the kinds of rules and regulations imposed (Howard, 1968, pages 557-60) to the facilities, space, and other resources provided for performance of assigned tasks. Pay and benefits in the planning agency usually vary with agency size, and the underfunded agency may find it has a high turnover.
unless it satisfies with inept or disillusioned workers.

Mutual respect and support among employees is crucial to the operation of an effective planning agency. Where this atmosphere is lacking the director is faced with hard choices. The management of professional conflicts of opinion (see Finkler, 1971) is a real problem in agencies staffed with what Drucker calls "knowledge workers." Moreover, in local planning agencies, morale is significantly affected by success or failure in promoting the agency's program in the political arena (Levin, 1976). We have already seen the difficulties of this role (Chapter III); yet community and governmental opinions of the competence of the agency (Carroll and Tosi, 1973) are factors in agency spirit and individual morale.

Davis and others offer some clues to compensating for the frustration of planners: recognition of their professional values, provision for their professional development, recognition for their work and ideas, hiring and promotion practices that provide for fulfillment of professional aspirations, opportunity for discreet dissent, and the creation of an ambience of mutual respect and support. Status and recognition (Neal, 1966, pages 8-9) can be provided through opportunities for professionals to be recognized for their work in the national arena. In the local public planning agency, the status and recognition of management is equally important since management is a part-time activity of most professionals.

The agency which seeks to investigate its morale for the purpose of correcting vaguely sensed deficiencies must be prepared for three or four possible serious outcomes, probably in combination: the pain of probing and disclosure to individual members of the agency, the multiplier effect of any unfavorable findings within the group, the possibility of negative information being picked up by the press or others, the damage caused by publicizing of any unfavorable findings, and the exacerbation of problems if there is no ready program to correct revealed deficiencies.
VI. THE CITIZEN COMMISSION AND THE LOCUS OF PLANNING

IN THE GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE

The effectiveness of the local public planning agency is influenced by its structure and function, its locus within the local governmental structure, and the roles, functions, and activities, composition, biases and influence of the citizen commission. These three major concerns, if they are addressed at all, merit full scale studies utilizing the prestige as well as the expertise of a team of experts such as ASPO recommends. Inclusion of these major areas in summary form in this paper rests on three objectives: 1) to round out the comprehensive view of planning agency assessment, 2) to provide general guidelines and source references for any agencies wishing to make a self-assessment of their structure, function, locus in government, and the role of their citizen commission, and 3) to provide planning agencies with a basis for making a choice between self-assessment and assessment by experts -- or no assessment -- in these areas.

Structure and Functions of the Planning Agency

The local public planning agency has mixed line and staff functions. In the traditional planning department, administration of subdivision regulations is an operating function, while plan preparation and the provision of assistance to the executive and advice to council are staff functions (Pickford, in PAS No. 211, 1968, pages 245-46). Additional operating functions are found in the consolidated Community Development Department which may combine planning in a single administrative unit with development agencies such as urban renewal (Pickford, in Goodman and Freund, eds., 1968, pages 529-30), community development, building and zoning permits or environmental impact review. The advantages and disadvantages of consolidation of land use agencies are discussed by Moravitz (1964, pages 1-19). A study seeking to determine whether to initiate or terminate such a consolidation might include Moravitz's pros and cons, summarized in Table 5. It should be noted that several items are value issues, listed as both advantages and disadvantages in the table.

Pickford (Goodman and Freund, eds., pages 530-31) also describes the "Administrative Planning Agency," a theoretical independent regulatory agency similar to those in Puerto Rico and New York. This approach, in which the agency drafts, adopts, and enforces its plans and regulatory ordinances, must appear attractive to agencies whose plans are not adopted and implemented. Significant drawbacks would seem to include political and grass roots opposition, and the dangers inherent in reduction of checks and balances, and fragmentation of governmental authority.

Locus of the Planning Agency in Governmental Structure

Two basic alternatives, with variations, are available for locating the planning agency in the local governmental structure: as a department of the local government, subordinate to the chief executive, and as a quasi-independent operation under the supervision of an appointed citizen commission. The choice is largely dependent on the characteristics of the local government and whether the planning agency serves one or more political jurisdictions. In a single jurisdiction with a strong elected executive or a council/manager government, the planning agency is likely to be a department subordinate to the executive (Pickford, in Goodman
### TABLE 5

**CRITERIA FOR CONSOLIDATION OF PLANNING, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, AND CODE ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES**

#### Problems or Disadvantages of Agency Consolidations

1. Director must be primarily an administrator, spending 30% to 65% of his time on paperwork.
2. The planners make up only a small proportion of the total staff.
3. Planning takes up only a small proportion (10%) of the total time spent.
4. Administration takes up 20% to 25% of total time.
5. Inter-sectional friction is likely.
6. Difference in cycles of planning and line work must be accommodated.
7. The planning emphasis is almost entirely on physical planning.
8. Innovation is not encouraged.
9. Some trivial policy decisions loaded on planning which might otherwise be made at the operational level.
10. Very little coordination of planning with other departments is likely.
11. Concentration of short-range planning to the detriment of long-range general planning is likely.
12. "Newer" agencies incorporated in the Development Department may overshadow planning.
13. Intra-agency communication is costly and time-consuming.
15. In staffing, a broader range of technical competence is needed.
16. The consolidated agency may have to answer to more than one board or commission.

(continued)

### Advantages of Agency Consolidation

1. More inter-section cooperation; more flow of information between sections.
2. More visible results of agency activities.
3. More support from the community for the agency; more citizen involvement.
4. Increased understanding of political processes by staff.
5. Coordination increased in the planning process and in plans.
6. Better, more consistent decisions are made.
7. Planning involved in more immediate, problem-solving ventures.
8. Planning Director is held in greater respect by other departments.
9. Development agency must include code enforcement.
10. Comprehensive approach to community development is encouraged.
11. Long-range planning, conservation, and capital programming would be incorporated with community development.
12. Technical manpower would be pooled.

**SOURCE:** Francis S. Moravitz, "Municipal Development Departments," ASPO, PAS #189, 1964.
and Freund, eds., 1968, pages 523-24). In single jurisdictions where the executive is weak, the planning department may report directly to council (page 524). The advantages given for the department under the executive are that 1) the executive has clear authority for coordination of policies, 2) the staff has a direct channel to the executive, and 3) the staff has a strong influential sponsor for its recommendations (pages 529 and 544). Other writers find that these advantages are offset in part by over-emphasis on contingency planning, influence of recommendations toward the values of the executive (Banfield, Drucker, Dye and Hawkins), unbuffered vulnerability to political pressures, and absence of a forum for its proposals and influence for their acceptance. Variations of a structure in which the planning agency answers to the governing body with a citizen commission interposed place the planning staff directly under the purview of the commission, or place it under the chief executive with the commission serving a nominal coordinative function with the governing body. Diagrams of several alternatives may be found in Pickford (Goodman and Freund, eds.).

The quasi-independent citizen commission is almost a necessity where the planning agency serves more than one political jurisdiction, as it would be chaotic for an agency to attempt to serve directly two or more chief executives or councils in equal measure or in any fixed ratio. Supervision of the planning agency by an intermediary body, the citizen commission (Pickford, in Goodman and Freund, eds., 1968, page 524), resolves this problem with reasonable effectiveness. A diagram of the relationships of a planning agency to a city and county which it serves jointly is shown below. In this example, the number of jurisdictions served by the planning agency could be increased without changing the organizational structure; or additional jurisdictions could be served by contract with the citizen commission subject to the approval of the principal governments involved.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{COUNTY COMMISSIONERS} & \quad \text{CITY COUNCIL} \\
\text{JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION} & \\
\text{CHIEF EXECUTIVE} & \quad \text{DIRECTOR} & \quad \text{CHIEF EXECUTIVE} \\
\text{Departments} & \quad \text{Staff} & \quad \text{Departments}
\end{align*}
\]

Role and Functions of the Citizen Commission

In addition to its coordinative and buffering function in the preceding illustration, the citizen commission has a function in small communities which cannot afford adequate staff, or where local government has a weak or dispersed executive and administrative structure (Pickford, in Goodman and Freund, 1968, pages 528-29). Where citizen planning commissions exist, Pickford attributes these functions to them (pages 527-28): 1) reviewing and recommending plans, proposals, and zoning; 2) involving and representing citizens; 3) promoting and stimulating interest in planning, especially long-range planning; 4) advising government officials on development policies; 5) coordinating public and private agencies; 6) administering subdivision regulations; and 7) fostering an objective and neutral attitude in its recommendations.

The effectiveness of the citizen commission in accomplishing these and other objectives is coming into question. An ASPO study of the composition
of planning commissions nationwide, published in February/March 1965 (see Davies), found a preponderance of members had real estate interests and reflected a bias in their recommendations. There was also found to be a lack of representation of women, minorities, and divergent interest groups and occupational groups. This calls into question the assumption that the commission plays a role in representing community views (League of Women Voters, 1970, page 2; Stipe, 1972, page 12; Green, 1972, page 16).

An ASPO survey of planning directors in July 1965 (see Emmons) found most believed that the citizen commission still served a number of important functions, including influence for plan implementation. Suggestions for improving their effectiveness included criteria for their selection, changing the priorities for their attention, removing conflicts of interest, improving technical knowledge, and supplementing with ad hoc advisory committees on major policy issues.

The commission's ability to influence plan implementation is compared unfavorably with the British model by Stipe (1972, page 5). Whereas American planning commissions spend most of their time "haggling with developers over the details of preliminary subdivision plats, conducting endless zoning hearings, and in the end merely advising their governing boards," the British planning committee, which is accountable at the ballot box, has a strong influence on the decisions and actions of council.

A solution to the problems of representativeness, influence, and effectiveness is offered by Green (1972, pages 15-16). He suggests drastic reorganization of the citizen commission, making it much larger and more representative. Members of the board of education, the board of social services, the redevelopment commission, the housing authority, the recreation commission, the board of health, the library board, and others, would be included. A committee system would be established to lend expertise and influence to the solution of specific problems. The functions of the board would be first to provide "leadership for community-wide consideration of goals, objectives, problems, and policy alternatives" which are politically, economically, and socially realistic. They would lift plans from their pedestrian mold, "advise council on particular types of issues, and help coordinate governmental programs."

Assessment Criteria for the Citizen Commission

The citizen commission, like the agency as a whole, can be assessed for both efficiency and effectiveness. The range of its activities, the emphasis of its interests, its efforts to increase its knowledgability, the way it allocates its time, the efforts it makes to become involved in the planning process, its relations with the governing bodies and the community, help influence the outcome of planning aside from the weight of personal influence. From the sources previously cited, criteria for commission assessment have been assembled in Table 6.
TABLE 6
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR THE CITIZEN COMMISSION

1. Is the commission an adequate conduit for presenting citizen views on planning?
2. Is the commission large enough to be representative of the community?
3. Does the method of selection assure representativeness in terms of economic interests, geographical areas, and other commissions?
4. Does the method of selection assure accountability?
5. Are the members paid enough to take adequate time from their jobs for the necessary volume of planning activities?
6. Is the chief role of the commission review of subdivision plats and rezoning petitions, or goal-setting and planning for the solution of problems in a long-range context?
7. Does the commission have any direct or indirect power to enforce plans?
8. Does the commission have committees to provide expert assistance and to divide the work load?
9. Does the commission have mechanisms for communicating on a regular basis with other departments and agencies?
10. Does the commission communicate with the executive and the governing body on all pertinent matters?
11. Does the commission attend professional meetings and orientation programs to improve its grasp of issues and principles in planning?
12. Does the commission delegate minor decisions to its staff to free its time for major issues?
13. Does the commission provide program guidance to the staff?
14. Does the commission participate in problem conceptualization?
15. Does the commission participate in choice among alternative solutions?
16. Does the commission protect the professionalism of its staff?

VII. APPLICATION OF CRITERIA FOR TESTING EFFECTIVENESS

Intermediary Effectiveness

Chapters II, III, and IV provide criteria of planning agency effectiveness. Intermediary effectiveness criteria include program comprehensiveness as defined by law and by professional standards; the production of reports, plans, ordinances, and recommendations; the adoption of planning agency proposals; the performance of required processes in plan preparation; the fulfillment of program budget tasks; the management of constraints; the quality of products and processes; the shaping of policies for problem solving; resolving conflicts; and influencing decisions and their implementation.

Both simple and complex tests of these criteria are available.
A checklist of program elements tests comprehensiveness. Frank So's "simple units" (1962) have merit for quick feedback in interaction testing. A daily tally of brief staff contacts with the public and officials to provide information and advice in accord with statutory requirements provides a measure of effectiveness in meeting ongoing obligations and objectives. A checklist and description of units accomplished and under way, which require considerable time, effort, and interaction to produce, can also be maintained on a regular basis. Annual or more frequent staff progress reports are useful for internal control, executive information, and public education (Beal, 1966). McConkey’s "milestones" for tracking progress in the accomplishment of complex units can be adapted to planning projects and programs. Product and process quality can be scored on a schedule of criteria.

An example of the use of the milestone technique for a complex unit is "winning council’s commitment to support the planning program": a progression for recording milestones toward this objective could begin with creating a climate of support for the agency and its program and could reach the intermediary outcome of winning commitment to an annual program budget. The evaluation could then recycle through successive program budget years with the agency demonstrating consolidation of its public and official support by approval of an expanded program or refinement of outputs. Quality of work and other sub-objectives can be arrayed in temporal sequence and accomplishments of one year's planning activities or tasks toward the solution of specified problems can be measured or recorded. Problem solutions developed in the first year of program tracking can be monitored in the years following.

In a program budget, specific problems or problem areas are stipulated for study and specific steps toward problem solution, with their measurement criteria, are set forth. Every year's program includes both substantive elements and maintenance tasks, and measurement of effectiveness continues indefinitely at whatever intervals prove practical in terms of data and time available. Sub-sets of intermediary effectiveness occurring in successive years may include steps in the implementation process, such as 1) plan (or activity) completed, 2) plan adopted and recommended by citizen commission, 3) plan adopted by council, 4) initial implementation step taken (capital improvement program adopted), 5) secondary implementation step taken (projects funded), 6) final implementation steps taken (projects completed and operational).
At this point the assessment of intermediary effectiveness for a specific project or program makes a transition to assessment of outcome and impact effectiveness over an extended period of time.

Impact Effectiveness

Impact effectiveness is defined in the preceding chapters in goal terms as influence on the character of development, improvement in the health, safety, morals, order, convenience, economy, prosperity, and general welfare of the community, protection of the quality of the natural environment, elimination of poverty, segregation, social pathologies, pollution, and municipal financial crises, improvement in the allocation of public goods, and real achievement of pluralism. Some of these social and economic goals cannot be achieved by all local public planning agencies under current statutory or other authorization. The physical goals are theoretically attainable with planning guidance, assuming a favorable political and economic environment.

A simple method of measuring the attainment of a physical development goal is by visual evidence, sight checks by field inspection or by before-and-after photographs. This approach is appropriate if the planning objective is merely to effect a change in the physical environment, for example, slum removal, or neighborhood rehabilitation, or the removal of visual clutter. Other tests would include subjective perceptions, record checks comparing outcomes with expectations, cost-benefit assessment, assessment of institutional adaptivity, and developing scenarios to compare what the community might have been like in the absence of planning.

If the objective of slum clearance is not visual or health improvement or added value on the tax rolls, but rather improvement in the quality of life for former slum dwellers through relocating them in standard housing, a much more difficult assessment project faces the agency. In that case, quality of life would have to be defined in terms of the aspirations of slum dwellers: a difficult task for planners whose middle-class values and standards may not be universally shared. Further, a causal relationship would have to be demonstrated between relocation to standard housing and the achievement of quality of life aspirations. If objective measures could not be devised, the equally difficult task of designing an interview schedule which would not be biased by either the interviewer or the interviewee (Maruyama, 1973, pages 355-57) would have to be undertaken.

Slum clearance could have ultimate goals still more difficult to assess, for example, improving the self-image and socio-economic coping ability of relocated clients. To demonstrate the accomplishment of such a goal, longitudinal case studies would have to be undertaken over a long period of years. No part of the credit for accomplishment would be attributable to the planning agency unless it were engaged in social policy planning which contributed to the outcome. Further, the assessment of accomplishment of any goal or objective for slum clearance would have to weigh perceived negative factors, such as the trauma of relocation, among the costs in comparing costs with benefits.

Quality of life indicators for the community as a whole or for substantial subcultures in the community can be devised, although they will fail to measure such things as feelings, attitudes, ambience, race relations, etc., unless carefully designed and conducted subjective perception interviews are used. A few key statistical indicators are available. For example, the impact of a multi-year urban renewal program on the physical environment can be determined by comparing the number of
substandard units at the beginning of the period and at the end. This will also show whether code enforcement and other measures have prevented additional units from entering the substandard stock during the course of the renewal program. To control the findings, a test should be made of the crowding of relocated clients and others in standard housing at the two periods in time, to determine whether the former slum dwellers, although now in standard housing, have achieved this at the cost of privacy and living space. A further test should be made to determine whether the clients are still in town or have migrated out, and, if crowding is found, whether it is due to failure to provide an adequate number of replacement units, or costing the clients out of the sound housing market, or because immigration has swollen the number of low-rent housing clients.

A long-range increase in homeownership rates among households occupied by Blacks might be subjected to a similar analysis to determine whether the effect was due to deliberate public policy espoused by the planning agency and not caused by external factors such as "G.I." benefits.

This kind of cross-sectional data analysis has pitfalls which cannot be explored in depth here. It is sufficient to say that comparison of two points in time fails to disclose any dynamic processes or unintended effects which may have occurred in the interim. Whenever data are available for several points in time spaced relatively close together, observation of trends will provide somewhat sounder conclusions.

Analysis of statistical indicators may be normative, in comparison to the nation, the state, or the region in which the locality is situated, or in comparison with all cities or counties in the same size class or with similar economic characteristics or similar urban-rural composition. Comparisons can also be ranked, as in nationwide quality of life studies comparing cities with each other, which appear from time to time in the press. Prototypal comparisons may be made by a locality which attempts to demonstrate that it is better off than a nearby place, or which seeks to establish an "ideal" community as a standard to strive toward. A decision to make a prototypal comparison is likely to be situational and not necessarily in the best long run interests of the community or the planning agency, since prototypes are rough approximations at best.

The planning agency's periodic critical reviews will surely come to include statistical comparisons with baseline data as an ongoing obligation. To reassess its programs and priorities and those of the community, it will want to analyze the impacts of past programs and actions as well as current projects, and it will want to state explicitly what the intended outcomes of its current plans and activities are, for future evaluation (So, 1961). This must be done even though long-range results are not necessarily attributable to the planning agency. Since no single agency is responsible for long-range outcomes of policies and actions in a complex society, the interactions of agencies to produce outcomes can become a subject for study.

Table 7 provides examples of how the planning agency's total program can be based on predetermined goals which serve as impact effectiveness criteria for measurement or other testing. Accomplishments and failures are measured statistically, or documented by before-and-after photographs, or environmental data such as air quality monitoring, by special surveys, by subjective perceptions, and other techniques. (Evaluation methods and the vehicles for their application are considered further in Chapter IX.)
Table 7 illustrates that there is not only a way to measure or evaluate the achievement of each goal, but in many cases more than one method is available, providing either for more thorough assessment or for a choice based on time and data resources. The measurements listed are not intended to be definitive, however. Better methods are assumed to exist or to be developable in the future. In any case, the practical application of these techniques must be tailored and retailed to the planning agency's program as it changes over time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Goals for Impact Effectiveness</th>
<th>Measuring Accomplishments and Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Development (continued)</td>
<td>Neighborhood pride increased</td>
<td>Number of properties improved structurally or aesthetically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number and percentage of residents attending meetings for neighborhood planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number and percentage of residents supporting protective regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax valuation increased</td>
<td>Outreach programs to assist other neighborhoods to organize or plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supply/demand studies</td>
<td>Before-and-after valuations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (to accommodate new households)</td>
<td>Adequate supply at all income levels</td>
<td>Adequate variety of types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate variety of locations</td>
<td>Adequate variety of locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimum non-local public and non-public funding</td>
<td>Optimum non-local public and non-public funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe, sound adequate supply maintained community-wide</td>
<td>Safe, sound adequate supply maintained community-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Goals for Impact Effectiveness</th>
<th>Measuring Accomplishments and Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing (continued)</td>
<td>Value of housing maintained</td>
<td>Value maintained through protective zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Value increased but housing lost through non-residential zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage change in average tax valuation per unit in constant dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Street congestion reduced</td>
<td>Traffic diverted from a specific route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development stimulated in outlying areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard measures of delay and actual speed in relation to design speed or speed limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ratio of transit trip-miles to private vehicle-miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study of vehicle ownership in relation to transit routes and schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Air quality studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studies of rate of increase in traffic relative to rate of increase in population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desire-line studies in relation to transit routes and schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Record of coordination of zoning decisions with thoroughfare planning and land use planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Goals for Impact Effectiveness</td>
<td>Measuring Accomplishments and Failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (continued)</td>
<td>Recreational transportation provided</td>
<td>Number of miles of scenic routes landscaped and/or protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of miles of bike routes signed and/or constructed and/or protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Jobs provided for unemployed, under-employed, and new entrants to labor force</td>
<td>Change in unemployment statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up on high school, trade school, and college graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample survey of hidden unemployment and under-employment, with follow-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vitality of Central Business District enhanced</td>
<td>Traffic surveys downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daytime population surveys downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retail sales in downtown as percentage of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in nighttime activities downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in amenities downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in occupied office space downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public and private capital investments in CBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business opportunities provided outside of CBD</td>
<td>Community-wide standards for business zoning adopted and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Goals for Impact Effectiveness</th>
<th>Measuring Accomplishments and Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development (continued)</td>
<td>Public and private economy improved</td>
<td>Business opportunities meet national norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in per capita income, in constant dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in tax base, in constant dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in number of persons and households below poverty line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in patterns of neighborhood segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in social pathologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety and quality of job opportunities expanded</td>
<td>Change in economic base of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of migration patterns of college educated and technically trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison of decennial census of occupations by race and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Planning and Environmental Impact Review</td>
<td>&quot;Urban development protected&quot;</td>
<td>Measures of urban in-filling: vacant areas developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scatteration and sprawl contained</td>
<td>Ratio of suburban to urban development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Density or sparsity measures of suburban development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Goals for Impact Effectiveness</th>
<th>Measuring Accomplishments and Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Planning and Environmental Impact</td>
<td>&quot;Urban development protected&quot;</td>
<td>Visual and statistical evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review (continued)</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td>Visual, statistical, and narrative evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Neighborhoods conserved</td>
<td>Utilities, community facilities, and services utilization increased, but not beyond capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Historical areas and buildings conserved</td>
<td>Ability of government to locate and finance services to suburbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Utilization of urban infrastructure optimized</td>
<td>Comparative costs of services over time in constant dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Development coordinated, adjusted, harmonious, efficient, economical&quot;</td>
<td>Unit costs of services to urban and suburban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td>Changes in vehicle-miles or transportation to work, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes in road-miles per capita per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decline in number of rezoning petitions (adjusted for economic fluctuations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Goals for Impact Effectiveness</th>
<th>Measuring Accomplishments and Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Planning</td>
<td>Resources used effectively and optimally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Environmental Impact Review</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Water quality maintained or improved</td>
<td>Data from monitoring agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Air quality maintained or improved</td>
<td>Data from monitoring agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Soils stabilized in the development process</td>
<td>Data from enforcement agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Open space, scenic areas, fragile areas, agricultural land and</td>
<td>Acreage data and descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>woodland conserved, enhanced in the development process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Capacity of natural drainageways protected</td>
<td>Changes in flood elevations from monitoring agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade-offs optimized for development projects</td>
<td>Environmental impact statements; rezoning hearings; site plan review records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy and Educational Policy</td>
<td>Public services upgraded</td>
<td>Measures of progress toward pre-set higher standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service delivery systems improved</td>
<td>Services reaching more people with unit costs in constant dollars declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 7 -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Goals for Impact Effectiveness</th>
<th>Measuring Accomplishments and Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Policy and Educational Policy (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness of services improved</td>
<td>Number of welfare recipients enabled to hold down adequate jobs and leave welfare roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational opportunities expanded</td>
<td>Social pathologies reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Relevancy&quot; of educational program improved</td>
<td>Changes in specific morbidity and mortality rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change in number and variety of course offerings at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Buildings</td>
<td>Use of mobile classrooms and/or overcrowding minimized</td>
<td>Change in number and percentage of students in mobile classrooms or in substandard or overcrowded classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busing minimized</td>
<td>Change in number and percentage of student/miles of travel per year while meeting federal or court integration guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

### TABLE 7 -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Goals for Impact Effectiveness</th>
<th>Measuring Accomplishments and Failures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>Costs to residents minimized: trade-offs between cost of short response time and low insurance rates optimized</td>
<td>Changes in fire losses in constant dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Public Open Space</td>
<td>Variety of opportunities provided within reach of all residents in terms of pre-set standards</td>
<td>Changes in number and percent of residents served at adopted standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unique opportunities provided</td>
<td>Specific opportunities seized or lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>Least cost per unit of service</td>
<td>Unit cost accounting: comparison over time in constant dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service improved to pre-set standards</td>
<td>Records show whether standard was met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recycling optimized</td>
<td>Records of complaints show whether residents are satisfied with new standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Areas of planning agency efficiency are identified and described in Chapters V and VI as including effective organization, management, and leadership, good staff morale, appropriate locus of the agency in the local governmental structure, and efficiency and effectiveness of the functions, programs, and operations of the citizen commission.

Efficiency areas are described in Chapter V, criteria for evaluating the locus of planning in government in Chapter VI, Table 5, and assessment criteria for the citizen commission in Table 6. From the background information in Chapter V, tests of planning agency efficiency are developed and summarized in Table 8, which follows.

The Planning Staff

Efficiency is the economy of resources used to achieve an objective. In the framework of input/output analysis, the efficiency of a planning agency might be measured by estimating the dollar costs of reports and services, or the person-hour costs of each report or other service. However, many hours of uncompensated and unrecorded time go into planning agency products. Further, "knowledge workers," as Drucker calls professionals, are in a sense always at work, sifting and classifying experience, identifying problems and solutions, and keeping abreast of professional literature, among other things.

Planning agencies sometimes cite their per capita costs and compare them with other planning agencies at budget time. This is a poor measure, as it fails to account for the quality of service provided by planning
agencies with different per capita costs. The cost of outputs is also a misleading figure if it fails to take into account the quality, complexity, and scope of the output, and the cost of efforts to assure a favorable outcome or impact. (Even a high quality product, produced efficiently, is not a bargain if it is ignored, or if it is implemented but does no good or does harm.) Planning agency efficiency, then, is only crudely measurable in output units per input unit. Cruder still would be ascribing all or part of the costs of a planning program to the amount of federal funding captured by the locality as a result of having an established planning process and a comprehensive plan which meets federal guidelines. There is sometimes a temptation to point to a single valuable outcome and say that it alone justifies an individual's salary or even the entire agency budget for the year. This may be a measure of fortuity rather than efficiency.

If agency efficiency must be quantified, it will have to be hedged with reservations. Assuming a well-conceived program budget has been approved by the planning agency, the municipal executive, and the budget office, after some form of public input, then it may be said that the annual program objectives represent desired intermediary outputs. Further assuming that the agency is staffed with competent professionals with adequate time and resources to meet the program budget objectives at an accepted level of quality, then meeting those objectives in whole or in part is a measure of efficiency. Further, if a specific objective is met in a base year for a certain unit cost, and a similar objective is met in a subsequent year for a lower cost (corrected for inflation), then the agency's efficiency might be said to be increasing in cost/output terms.

There is something essentially offensive, however, in treating the cost of units of professional output as if they were machines rolling off an assembly line. In this paper, the fulfillment of realistic program budgets is accepted as the quantitative outcome of good management. The efficiency with which program budgets are fulfilled and the quality of products and activities must be evaluated by management to make efficiency measurements meaningful.

Resources available to evaluate the efficiency of the organization include administrative records such as tables of organization, job descriptions, program budgets, annual reports and other control records, reports and other outputs, the "simple units," complex units, and "milestones" developed for measuring intermediary effectiveness, and statistical comparisons of other agencies across the nation. Where resources leave off, perceptions of clients, bosses, and the staff itself can be obtained.

Resources are utilized to measure efficiency as indicated in Table 8. A few descriptive examples will suffice. In the area of organizational efficiency the use of tables of organization and job descriptions enable judgments as to whether the organization is flexible and adapts to changing resources and needs. Supplementary staff perceptions might be sought. Questions which might be answered include, Is the agency organized and operated in a rigid hierarchical structure, or are human resources used optimally through team problem solving? Are the agency's mission and roles understood in all levels of the organization? Are communication channels understood? Are communication channels efficient and effective?

In the areas of management efficiency, the promptness and timeliness
### TABLE 8
TESTS OF PLANNING AGENCY EFFICIENCY

#### A. Organizational Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table of organization reflects staff capabilities</td>
<td>Records show T.O. changed as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.O. is reorganized to reflect program changes</td>
<td>Records show T.O. changed as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team approach to problem-solving optimizes staff resources</td>
<td>Staff consensus on effectiveness of team approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team approach develops leadership</td>
<td>Subordinates assigned and trained to lead teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines of authority and responsibility are understood and respected</td>
<td>Staff consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines of authority not rigid; informality and initiative encouraged</td>
<td>Staff morale is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job descriptions do not inhibit initiative and creativity</td>
<td>Descriptions general, not rigid; frequently reviewed, revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of staff is adequate to meet community objectives for planning</td>
<td>Staffing compares to national average for communities in class size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual program budget is fulfilled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

#### TABLE 8 -- Continued

#### A. Organizational Efficiency (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff competencies are adequate to fulfill program budget</td>
<td>Staff educational levels compare to national average for communities in class size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff products rate well on quality scoring (see Appendix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and benefits are adequate to retain experienced staff</td>
<td>Compensation of professionals compares to national average for communities in size class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensation of secretaries, draftsmen and other non-planners compares to salaries for same occupations in local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fringe benefits compare to those in local private industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources are adequate to meet program needs (technical library, mapping, statistics, aerial photography, etc.)</td>
<td>Annual program budget is fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff products rate well on quality scoring (see Appendix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests of bosses and clients for information, mapping, etc., are fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding is adequate</td>
<td>Per capita funding compares to national average for communities in class size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff size is adequate (see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources are adequate (see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compensation and benefits are adequate (see above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### A. Organizational Efficiency (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding is adequate</td>
<td>Quarters are not too crowded for privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td>Furniture and equipment are efficient and comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location of quarters is convenient to bosses and clients</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

### B. Management Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director and supervisors are technically competent</td>
<td>See preceding pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A systems approach to goal setting, programming, budgeting,</td>
<td>Evidence in program budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheduling, controls, evaluation is used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System is continuously refined</td>
<td>Plans include evaluation criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans include base-line data for future comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System of record-keeping is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing assessment of programs and products is practiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison of annual program budgets indicates continuing improvement in quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program budget is used for personnel evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of staff are flexible, reflect individual skills,</td>
<td>Staff consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time is managed efficiently and effectively</td>
<td>Annual program budget is fulfilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc projects requested are completed in time to aid decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Time is managed efficiently and effectively (continued) | Staff consensus that program budget and ad hoc projects challenge their full capacities  
Staff consensus that overtime hours are not excessive |
| Staff is utilized to full competency and capacity | Staff consensus  
Use of consultants minimized |
| Professional development is ongoing and effective | Number and character of opportunities provided for increasing competency  
Promotion from within  
Sparing use of consultants (proportion of budget to consultants; staff consensus that consultants needed)  
Increased monetary rewards  
Privileges granted (attendance at conventions, opportunities for teaching, research, etc.)  
Personal recognition in press, memos, etc.; staff consensus on ambiences of appreciation, recognition |
| Communication is effective and efficient | Meetings are short; agendas are distributed in advance  
Staff consensus that meetings are fruitful (continued) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Communication is effective and efficient (continued) | Staff consensus that face-to-face direction is clear  
Staff consensus that circulation of reports, memos, literature, and correspondence make use of the "grapevine" unnecessary |
| Support services meet needs for agency effectiveness (secretarial, drafting, library and research) | Ratio of support to professional staff compares to national average for communities in size class  
Salaries and competency standards for support staff compare to local private industry  
Staff consensus that undue delays do not usually occur in provision of support services  
Staff consensus that library and research facilities and services meet their normal needs  
Staff consensus that library and research resources expand knowledge, provide new information and insights |
| Administrative services are consistent and maintain high standards | Evidence of adequate record keeping required  
Evidence (staff consensus) of high quality of housekeeping required  
Routine maintenance tasks assigned and monitored (staff consensus that supplies are maintained, equipment is serviced, etc.) |

(continued)
### TABLE 8 -- Continued

#### C. Leadership and Supervisory Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory personnel provide example of professional demeanor and integrity</td>
<td>Staff consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory personnel provide adequate program direction and accurate instructions</td>
<td>Staff consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory style encourages innovation, creativity, initiative, enthusiasm, openness, self-control</td>
<td>Staff consensus that authority and responsibility are adequately distributed, mutual support is provided, conflicts are resolved as expeditiously and painlessly as possible, creativity in problem-solving is encouraged, openness and self-control are encouraged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Political skills of director and staff are adequate                     | Plans and proposals are adopted
|                                                                         | Plans and proposals are implemented
|                                                                         | Respect for agency is evidenced in the media and in personal contacts with bosses, clients, and the community at large |
|                                                                         | Requests for staff services (number and complexity) from community and government
|                                                                         | Volume of intergovernmental linkages                                                            |

(continued)

### TABLE 8 -- Continued

#### C. Leadership and Supervisory Behavior (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Public relations program and public relations skills are adequate       | Number and character of requests for public speaking; number filled
|                                                                         | Existence of a written PR and public education program in the annual program budget, with assignments to responsibilities |
|                                                                         | Number and character of PR responsibilities executed during budget year
|                                                                         | Feedback from public (newscips, letters, phone calls, etc.)
|                                                                         | Number of opportunities provided to staff for training in PR skills
|                                                                         | Number of PR documents produced and distributed (annual reports, monthly reports, popular interpretations of technical reports, informational bulletins, etc.) |

(continued)
of output, including response time to requests for problem solving assistance, as well as program budget fulfillment (Tarter, McConkey) measure efficiency in managing time. Other measures are progress toward reducing overcommitment in the program budget (a multi-year test which requires records of uncompensated overtime worked) and progress toward reducing the volume of ad hoc demands through improved programming (Reddin).

Effective utilization of personnel resources may be measured in part by the share of budget allocated to consultants compared to resident staff (Reddin's "share of market"). ASPO's annual reports of planning agency staffing, salaries, budgets, etc., include consultant data for comparison purposes.

In the area of leadership, the effectiveness of communication can be assessed subjectively through perceptions of superiors by subordinates on the staff. External communications would be assessed through perceptions of clients, bosses, and others. Ballens and Bayes (1969, page 39) ranks counties on an index of political vitality, giving emphasis to the volume of intergovernmental linkages. An interagency linkage or interaction index could be constructed whereby the planning agency could monitor its progress in this respect over time.

Employee attitudes and the impact of instituting a management system (Carroll and Tosi, 1973) and/or a training program (Reddin, 1971) can be obtained and evaluated by soliciting perceptions before and after the change.

Agency Locus and Structure, and the Role of the Citizen Commission

These two issues are described in Chapter VI as being of such
magnitude and political sensitivity that the "team of experts" approach, as recommended for all assessment by ASPO, should be used. Some of the questions which may be asked internally, if this is the decision of the citizen commission, include: Are the agency's mission and roles understood and agreed to by staff, commission, the chief executive, and council? Is the agency's locus in the local governmental structure appropriate to its mission and roles? How does the citizen commission contribute to fulfillment of the agency's mission? What are the citizen commission's principal roles, and what should they be? What changes in the number, composition, method of selection, tenure, and compensation of the citizen commission would increase its effectiveness? What changes in operating procedures would contribute to its efficiency and effectiveness? Are information and orientation needed by members? By bosses and publics?

IX. ARENAS, METHODS, AND INSTRUMENTS FOR TESTING EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

Criteria for assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the local public planning agency are identified in Chapters II through VI, and tests of whether the criteria have been met are suggested in Chapters VII and VIII. The next steps in the design of a comprehensive assessment plan are identifying the arenas in which the assessment will take place, relating them to the methods of applying the tests or measurements, and designing the evaluation instruments for making the tests.

Arenas

Planning is a very public activity; hence its effectiveness and efficiency must be tested in the public arena eventually, either informally or formally. Formal testing, at least initially, is recommended to be an internal rather than an external process, however. In the emerging assessment design in this paper, the citizen commission is at times treated as part of the agency and at other times as a separate entity to be assessed on the basis of its roles and its efficiency and effectiveness. It follows that assessment of the commission by the staff or commission self-assessment by the Delphi or similar technique with informational aids provided by the staff, may be classified as internal assessment but is highly likely to enter the public arena.

Self-assessment of the staff by brainstorming, interviews, and questionnaires is also classified as internal; but once the citizen commission is asked to assess the staff, or is provided with the results
of staff self-assessment, the evaluation is likely to enter the public arena despite any exemption of personnel matters from open meeting statutes.

For these reasons, causes of any negative findings at the staff level should be corrected promptly before the assessment proceeds from staff to commission. Once findings have been made and any necessary actions have been taken at staff and commission levels, however, it may be wise to proceed with external elements of the assessment, as a structured approach is more likely to result in balanced findings than would arise from any speculation generated in the halls of government and in the press.

The external arena is arbitrarily divided into two sectors, bosses and publics, although it could be argued that publics are also bosses. Bosses, for the purpose of design of assessment instruments, are defined as the chief executive, council, and to some extent heads of administrative departments and operating agencies. This too is ambiguous, as operating departments are in a sense the clients of the planning process. They are treated here as bosses because without their acceptance of plans and planning, implementation is crippled. For similar reasons, selected state and federal agencies are also treated as bosses: without their approval of planning programs and products, significant funds for the local budget would not be forthcoming. An interview design to elicit chief executive and council perceptions of the efficiency and effectiveness of planning should require little modification for use with department heads or with selected state and federal agency representatives on the local scene. Each local planning agency which undertakes an assessment must decide which departments have or should have an important relationship to it.

The public sector is referred to in the plural, "publics," to emphasize its diversity of values and perspectives. Frequently the term "clients" is used to refer to those groups among the publics for whom services are specifically planned, as the clients of a health service delivery system, the clients of a housing program, or the clients of a branch library plan. But other publics who are not thus designated as clients also have a large stake in planning. Taxpayers support these services whether they avail themselves of them or not. There may be financial impacts of planning other than taxation on non-client publics. Land use regulations intended to protect the environment may satisfy (or not) client groups such as garden clubs, the faculty of the local university, or a chapter of the Sierra Club, but might be costly (or believed to be) and therefore opposed by the Homebuilders Association or other publics. Perceptions of the effectiveness of planning are therefore likely to be quite disparate. Without taking all values into account, the planning agency's assessment would produce biased results. It could be said that most agencies know in advance what the results will be; but this is not a reason for excluding any identifiable publics from the assessment process, except as a matter of sampling for purposes of economy of time and effort. The monumental problem is weighting the responses appropriately. Which publics should be given heaviest weight, and which least?

Tests and Methods

The arenas in which tests of effectiveness and efficiency are administered affect the methods of testing. For example, it may be easier and less costly to mail questionnaires to clients and bosses than to conduct personal interviews, but the percentage return on mailings is
usually low -- perhaps forty percent. In a study of this kind, one hundred percent returns may be essential, therefore justifying the cost of interviews. The cost is also justified by the opportunity to provide feedback.

The Delphi technique offers opportunity for interaction and for feeding information directly into the process. It utilizes expert knowledge and may disclose or resolve problems or issues which might otherwise have escaped the planners' attention.

When the planning staff is the arena for testing or measuring effectiveness, and comprehensiveness of program is the test, the checklist can be administered in questionnaire form. This is because the staff comprises captive respondents. The same test applied to the citizen commission could be used in questionnaire form if they were assembled for a regular meeting. Otherwise, because they are usually busy people and not compensated for their time in public service, the checklist would have to be administered in interview form. The same checklist administered to the chief executive, council, department heads and publics would have to be in interview form to assure total response.

The arena for Frank So's tally of "simple units" of effectiveness is the planning staff which must keep ongoing records. Later these records, summarized statistically, become part of monthly, annual, or other periodic reports which are evaluated in other arenas.

Other tests and methods of testing for intermediary effectiveness are program budget fulfillment, demonstrated by records of progress and evidence of output, both very much in the public arena. Scoring of reports and other products and activities on a quality schedule may be accomplished by questionnaire or interview if it is being done in the public arena, or by direct application of a scoring sheet if the evaluation is in-house.

For impact effectiveness, tests and methods include sight checks of environmental quality by tours and photographs, statistical indicators of improvement in the social or economic environment, tracing a historical series or making cross-sectional comparisons with other communities or with the state, region, or nation. The Delphi technique may be applied in this area also for eliciting informed opinions of the outcome of planning. Cost/benefit assessment is discussed elsewhere in this paper. Comparison of outcomes with expectations is a research project if the outcome is long-range.

Efficiency may be tested by a check of records to determine timely completion of assigned tasks, by statistical comparison with other agencies in the same population class nationwide, and by perceptions of staff members.

Instruments for Testing or Measuring

Nine instruments for effectiveness and efficiency assessment are recommended in this paper and are fully or partially designed (Appendices A through I). They are

A. A checklist for comprehensiveness of program
B. A tally sheet for recording simple units
C. A record sheet for recording milestones
D. A scoring sheet for evaluating the quality of a product or activity
E. A sample tabulation sheet for statistical indicators of impact on the community
F. A questionnaire for perceptions of effectiveness and efficiency
The comprehensiveness checklist (Appendix A) is self-explanatory. It includes all elements of the community's comprehensive planning, whether performed by the planning agency or others. Elsewhere in this paper it is indicated that some elements of the comprehensive plan are prepared at non-local levels, some by the third sector, and some by consultants. This is a valid division of responsibility, within limits, and the planning agency need not apologize for it. In adapting this questionnaire, however, a user agency might wish to provide the opportunity for respondents to indicate their knowledge of which agency is responsible for each item, and their approval or disapproval of this division of responsibility. This is particularly applicable to the use of consultants, a controversial issue in some places. Certainly consultants are indispensable in areas of special competence such as sewerage engineering. In less specialized areas the use of consultants may be dictated by insufficient staffing, the need for a non-local prestigious person to make an expensive or otherwise unpalatable recommendation, or for other reasons. There are times when it appears, after the fact, that funds for consultant services were not well spent. Either the study should not have been made at all, or it should have been made by local staff, perhaps with the assistance of local or non-local specialists. The planning agency may wish to survey public or departmental or even staff opinion on this issue.

The "simple units" tally sheet (Appendix B) also speaks for itself. It requires a high degree of dedication to note every transaction over the assigned time period. A recommended procedure is to assign the tally sheet for one month, evaluate the completeness of reporting, and then assign it for another month. If there is staff resistance to the bother of keeping this record, the volume of transactions can be projected for six months or a year and then the process can be repeated. If the staff do not find it burdensome, it can be an ongoing record. As designed it has seven parts: visitors assisted, calls made, etc.; and most of the parts have several subsets: local, federal/state, and other. A local planning agency may alter or add to the sets and subsets or remove any it feels are not significant to its operations.

Milestones for accomplishment of complex units (Appendix C) correspond to the tasks which are broken out of program budget assignments. Dates are recorded for major areas of accomplishment, such as information gathered, problems identified, goals agreed upon, and proposal implemented. Each has subsets covering the involvement in the planning process of key persons and agencies such as operating departments, the chief executive, clients, and other publics. This record sheet is applicable to a project which has an outcome. If it is used for a subordinate element of a large project, some of the items will not be applicable. It may also spin off additional record sheets. For example, item 7 covers implementation strategy. If the strategy includes major work items such as drafting a new ordinance or preparing a capital improvements program, those activities would be separately recorded.

Ongoing programs such as subdivision review, rezoning petition processing, and others, do not lend themselves to either the "simple units" or the "milestones" approach. Reporting forms should be designed to accurately reflect the responsibilities and procedures delegated to the planning agency by statute.
The scoring sheet for quality of products and activities (Appendix D) includes a maximum range of criteria. Not all criteria would be applicable in every case. Therefore the scoring should express total values assigned as a percentage of the maximum possible values. That is, if only ten of the 28 items are applicable to a specific product, the maximum score would be thirty -- indicating three points for "excellent" on each of the ten criteria selected. In this case, a sheet showing a total score of 20 would rate the quality of the product at 67 percent, equivalent to an average of two points per item, or "good." The design of this sheet indicates that each product is intended to be evaluated separately by several persons. The results of several scorings may be averaged. The date of evaluation and an identification number for the evaluator are recorded in the upper right corner. The date of the product is also recorded, although the effect on quality of the age of the product is not evaluated. The writer's agency is working on criteria for determining when a given product has obsolesced to the point that it must be redone.

Statistical indicators of change in the quality of life (Appendix E) are offered with misgivings. Assessment of the quality of life has failed at the national level more than once (Liu, 1973 and 1975), as quality of life is subtle, largely a matter of values and perceptions, and tends to defy measurement. Further, the data base for measurement is inadequate (Clay and Orr, 1976). Nevertheless it is essential that further efforts be made to design measurement techniques and to build the needed data base for the future. The examples offered in Appendix E, such as infant mortality and home ownership, are taken from standard data sources which provide a high degree of comparability over time. While they do not measure all aspects of the quality of life, they measure some of those aspects which have been the targets of huge governmental expenditures for several decades, and thus may have high, although narrow, validity. Slum clearance and Black homeownership have indeed been impacted by federal, state, and local spending. Appendix E calls for comparing local changes with changes at the regional, state, or federal level so that the amount of progress locally can be seen in absolute terms as well as normatively.

The difficulties of objective measurement have already been indicated. Although subjective perceptions may not be valid in some situations, often the perceptions are the realities for many people. Of necessity then, the local planning agency will have to satisfice with perceptions in assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization per se, of leadership styles and supervisory behavior (every senior planner in medium to large organizations is also a supervisor), other circumstances affecting morale of individuals and the agency as a whole, and the problems involved in effectiveness or its shortfall. Appendix F provides a questionnaire designed mainly for use at the staff level. It has been field tested only once and revised as a result. It is intended to provide information which will assist the director in identifying and correcting problems. Responses to the questionnaire can be summarized by line item for each major category of staff -- senior planners and other supervisors, junior planners, and support staff. This protects confidentiality yet provides clear indication of where problems are located. The form also calls for an employee identification number. This number can be recorded in confidence and used in readministration of the questionnaire at a later period to determine whether staff perceptions have changed significantly.
as a result of actions taken, and whether any problems remain. On the second scoring, in addition to summing the line items by class, the paired responses of each individual can be ranked among paired responses of all other members of the staff and tested for significance of difference by use of Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient.

The remaining three appendices are incomplete illustrative outlines of the scope of interviews with publics and bosses and within the citizen commission. Much thought is required to devise interview questions which will elicit accurate objective responses without introducing biases of the designer or interviewer. The assistance of specialists in the design of interviews should be sought unless a staff member has prior experience in this specialized field. In some communities, faculty from a local university may be available for consultation in the preparation of interview forms. First the planning agency must determine the scope of the investigations appropriate for each public or client group and each boss. Probably about three master forms can be constructed with an indication of questions which apply only to specific groups or individuals.

By now, the comprehensive assessment design emerges as a massive project beyond the time and other resources of the average local public planning agency. In the next three chapters the methods available for assessment are divided into initial assessment, internal and external, and ongoing assessment. Each element of these major groups and each method for accomplishing each element is appraised on a schedule of thirteen criteria to assist agencies in selecting elements and methods which meet their needs and their time constraints.

X. INTERNAL ELEMENTS OF INITIAL ASSESSMENT

The position taken in this paper is that a single method of evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of the local public planning agency is not adequate to demonstrate accomplishment nor to effect improvement in the many areas of potential effectiveness. Comprehensive assessment, however, is time-consuming, costly, and potentially painful. It can generate apprehensiveness and conflict and can threaten disclosure of deficiencies which could reduce the agency’s effectiveness in the political arena. Criteria are needed for selecting and programming the elements of a comprehensive assessment plan and the methods and instruments for pursuing those elements, to minimize input and optimize favorable outcomes.

The first decision to be made is whether assessment is to be a one-time project such as ASPO’s “team of experts” approach (1969, 1971) or a continuing process such as advocated by Beal (1966, page 6), So (1962, page 5), and every proponent of systematic management. Because of its duration and its operational control mechanisms, ongoing assessment is a superior management tool to initial assessment. Ongoing assessment, however, focuses narrowly on the annual program, which, because of the long lead time for comprehensive planning, represents only a fraction of the total program of the planning agency. Further, annual program emphasis may avoid or postpone examination of the quality of

* It should be pointed out that ASPO is also the sponsor of ongoing assessment. Both Beal and So wrote their proposals as ASPO staff members.
products and processes which contribute to effectiveness potential.

For these reasons, a broad assessment, repeated at intervals of five or ten years, may be necessary in addition to ongoing assessment. A start can be made with a comprehensive or selective cross-sectional evaluation, after which (or concurrently), an ongoing evaluation system can be installed if it is not already operational.

Criteria for Selecting Elements and Methods

Both initial assessment and ongoing assessment are subdivided into internal elements and external elements. The internal elements are applied first and followed by any necessary corrective measures (O'Harrow, 1966, page 1) before any of the external elements are applied.

Six elements of internal assessment are identified in Table 9 and five elements of external assessment are identified in Table 10 (Chapter XI).

For each of these, a number of tests are suggested for choice. Recommended criteria for choice of tests include:

1. Objectivity
2. Validity
3. Reliability
4. Limited potential for generating staff anxiety
5. Limited potential for generating political criticism of the agency
6. Least cost in time and funds for preparing and conducting the process and analyzing the results
7. Usefulness for educating publics and bosses
8. Indicating deficiencies for correction
9. Indicating whether statutory obligations are being met
10. Evaluating and/or defending the annual budget

11. Determining the agency's impact potential
12. Determining whether the agency is actually making an impact on the community
13. Multiple applicability

The first twelve of these criteria are applied in this chapter to each test for each of the six elements of initial internal assessment in Table 9, and in the next chapter to the five elements of initial external assessment in Table 10, to order or prioritize the tests so that if only the first one or a few in each set are applied, the results will be maximal. The elements themselves are ordered in accordance with those of the twelve criteria which are applicable, so that choices may be made among the elements themselves as well as among their tests. It will be noted that two criteria -- educating bosses and publics and evaluating the budget -- apply only to external assessment procedures, or to findings which are publicized. Since many of the tests or methods of assessment are equally applicable to internal and external elements and to ongoing elements, all criteria are applied in the initial review in this Chapter to those tests listed in Table 9. In this way the advantages and shortcomings of each test are laid out at once. In the next chapters only those tests not already reviewed will be covered, regardless of their applicability to other assessment elements.

The last criterion listed above, multiple applicability, refers to tests or instruments which are appropriate for several assessment elements. This criterion is applied in making a final selection of tests and elements for a specific agency assessment program, as in the illustration provided in Chapter XIII.
### TABLE 9
ORDERING THE INTERNAL ELEMENTS OF INITIAL ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Effectiveness Levels</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elements and Arenas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Intermediary Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Program comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>&quot;Simple Units&quot;</td>
<td>Tally sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>&quot;Milestones&quot; toward program budget fulfillment</td>
<td>Record sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Quality of products and activities</td>
<td>Scoring sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Retrospective perceptions</td>
<td>Anecdotes, Questionnaire or interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Sight checks</td>
<td>Photographs or tours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Statistical change</td>
<td>Statistical indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Outcomes in absence of planning</td>
<td>Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Questionnaire or interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Program budget fulfillment</td>
<td>Record keeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Changes in T.O.s, job descriptions, assignments</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff Self-Evaluation (continued)</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Periodic progress reports</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Comparison with other agencies</td>
<td>Statistical comparisons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff Evaluation by Citizen Commission</td>
<td>Intermediary Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Program comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Quality of products and activities</td>
<td>Scoring sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Sight checks</td>
<td>Photographs or tours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Statistical change</td>
<td>Statistical indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Questionnaire, interview, or brainstorming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff Evaluation by Citizen Commission</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Program budget fulfillment</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Periodic progress reports</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Comparisons with other agencies</td>
<td>Statistical comparisons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9 -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Effectiveness Levels</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation by Citizen Commission (continued)</td>
<td>Efficiency (continued)</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Citizen Commission Evaluation by Staff</td>
<td>Effectiveness and Efficiency</td>
<td>Program comprehensiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of intermediary and impact effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback to staff evaluation of citizen commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Citizen Commission Evaluation by Staff</td>
<td>Effectiveness and Efficiency</td>
<td>Program comprehensiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of intermediary and impact effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback to staff evaluation of citizen commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Element 1. Staff Self-Evaluation -- Intermediary and Impact Effectiveness

Four tests are listed in Table 9 in the order established by application of the appropriate criteria above for intermediary effectiveness and for impact effectiveness.

a. Comprehensiveness of programs: checklist. This test is given first priority, as it is 1) objective, 2) valid (assuming that correct determinations of agency and governmental level of responsibility are made for each item on the checklist), and 3) reliable; 4) it has very little potential for generating staff anxiety 5) has only moderate potential for generating political criticism, 6) is quickly prepared, administered, and analyzed, 7) has potential for educating publics and bosses on the scope of the agency's program, 8) indicates program deficiencies, 9) indicates whether statutory obligations are being met, 10) provides justification for past budgets if the program has been adequate, and for future budget increases if the program is deficient due to insufficient staff or other resources, and 11) indicates the agency's potential for impact on federal funding assistance for a range of local programs and projects; but 12) it does not indicate actual impact on the community. Since, in addition to not measuring actual impact, it tells nothing about the quality of the agency's products, resources, and activities, and hence their impact potential, it cannot stand alone as an evaluation method.

b. Simple units of intermediary effectiveness: tally sheet. The number of interactions with publics and bosses is 1) objective, 2) reasonably valid, 3) reliable, if instructions are given and followed carefully in its application, 4) has limited potential for generating staff anxiety,
5) has very limited potential for generating political criticism (except in special cases which will not be considered here), 6) is even less time-consuming to apply than the comprehensiveness checklist (requiring only a tally mark on a prepared form by each staff member following each action, and summing at the end of the reporting period), and can be done on a sample basis if not on a continuing basis, 7) is moderately useful for educating bosses or publics on the agency's workload, 8) has moderate value for correcting the deficiency of an imbalanced workload or biased focus, 9) has moderate value for demonstrating that statutory obligations are being met, and 10) has some value for informing the chief executive and council at budget time as to how staff time is being spent. It provides very little useful information on 11) the agency's impact potential, and 12) it has no value for determining the actual impact of the agency's activities. Because it is simple and quick to use and because it can supplement the comprehensiveness checklist as an indicator of how time is being spent, it is recommended for that purpose.

c. Milestones toward program budget fulfillment; record sheet. This represents a major addition to meeting the criteria for choice among methods of intermediary impact evaluation. Because it is part of a management system which may not be operational in many agencies, and requires approximately a year to start producing useful information after it is initiated, it is listed under initial assessment but discussed in the next chapter under ongoing assessment. Where it is already in effect, the agency will know or will be learning how to obtain maximum benefit from it.

d. Quality of products and activities; scoring sheet. This is an important supplement to the comprehensiveness checklist and the tally of simple units of interaction. 1) It can be reasonably objective if a report or other product is scored by several staff members and the results are averaged, 2) its content is valid within the reference frames of both classical and "new" planning theories (although not all planners may agree with all items on the scoring sheet in Appendix D); and 3) it is probably reliable (this can be determined with some assurance if it is used frequently); 4) it has considerable potential for generating staff anxiety and defensiveness, but other positive factors probably outweigh this; 5) its potential for generating criticism of the agency depends upon whether it is used in-house or externally and on what the findings are; 6) it takes very little time to prepare, administer, and score; 7) it is valuable for educating publics and bosses only if ratings are high, but 8) it is a strong tool for indicating and correcting deficiencies and for guiding the quality of future work; 9) it can be designed to indicate whether statutory obligations are being met, although it is not the best tool for this purpose; 10) it should be used to defend a budget adequate for recruiting and holding highly qualified personnel, providing them with necessary resources, and allocating sufficient time for them to do good work; 11) it is strongly predictive of the agency's impact potential, barring severe political or economic difficulties; but 12) quality criteria do not indicate actual impact on the community.

e. Retrospective perceptions of impact effectiveness. As a method of impact assessment, this is included because it is easy to do and can be made to sound convincing. Old hands on the staff describe what conditions were like in the community in a base period, what the planning agency did to improve those conditions, and what the outcome was. This
Anecdotal approach is sometimes used when an agency is under political attack. It has almost no value for correcting deficiencies in the agency program and its objectivity and reliability are questionable, but it is a valid approach under the circumstances described, if systematic record-keeping and evaluation have not been installed to prevent such crises.

An alternative form of effectiveness impact perception is elicited through use of a questionnaire or interview which may seek positive or negative perceptions, and causes of any perceived ineffectiveness, for the purpose of correction. As designed in Appendix F, the questionnaire or interview is a multi-purpose document and is therefore time-consuming to design, administer, and analyze. Part D, Planning Agency Effectiveness, is discussed here. Other parts deal with efficiency, goals, and roles. The effectiveness section is best understood and used in the context of the goals and roles section, which it follows.

The questionnaire or interview 1) is not necessarily objective, since it calls for perceptions, but the perceptions of all staff members can be averaged to remove some bias; 2) its validity is suppositional and can probably be improved; 3) its reliability remains to be tested and possibly improved; 4) it has high potential for generating staff anxiety; and 5) if findings are negative, it has a high potential for generating political criticism of the agency; as previously stated, 6) it is costly in time and effort, but this cost is spread over several areas of inquiry; 7) if used externally and selectively, it has considerable potential for educating bosses and publics and for 8) indicating deficiencies for correction (this applies also to its internal use); 9) it has very little application to meeting statutory obligations, or for 10) evaluating or defending the annual budget, except for the efficiency portions; but 11) it has considerable value for determining the agency's impact potential. It does not address 12) actual impact. The negative aspects of this instrument appear to outweigh the positive ones. It is recommended for agencies which are in doubt about their efficiency and effectiveness, but only if individual members are sufficiently secure to accept possible negative findings without feeling hurt.* Two important contributions of this method are insight into personnel problems and comparability over time. The same questionnaire or interview, readministered after any indicated corrective actions have been taken and a period of time has passed, can be used to measure the significance of any changed perceptions.

f. Sight checks: photographs or tours. This is a useful reinforcement for staff perceptions. A tour of a renewal area, a new highway, a public building, or whatever, is made, and pictures are taken. If the agency had foresight, it took pictures before the improvement; or if it is lucky, the press or a private citizen or some other agency did so, and these "before" pictures can be found and contrasted with the "after" pictures. Sight checks are objective, valid, reliable, and can be selective, so that they need not generate anxiety or criticism (although selectivity could be argued as non-objective); they cost little in time and money, they may educate publics and bosses, and they can be used to indicate deficiencies for correction and for meeting statutory obligations and defending the budget. They may be of some use for determining the agency's

---

* It may be argued that one of the important purposes of management is to promote this sense of security, and to remove, if possible, the organizational factors contributing to insecurity feelings. It should be remembered, however, that not all insecurity feelings have their origin in the organization, nor can the organization dispel all such feelings. Even when they are caused by organizational factors, probing may do harm as well as good.
impact potential but their primary purpose is to demonstrate actual impact on the physical environment. They are mainly a PR tool.

g. Statistical indicators. As described in the preceding chapter, these take time to work up, are not necessarily objective or valid, and may not even be reliable. By the time impact is reflected by statistics, so many factors have influenced the outcome that any attribution of credit to the planning agency must be carefully hedged by description of its role in obtaining grants, preparing plans, and so on. This caveat, however, applies equally to sight checks. While the sight check tends to emphasize the physical environment, the statistical indicators can be used to supplement it by emphasizing the socio-economic environment, as illustrated in Appendix E. Statistical indicators, because they are generally measuring long-range consequences, are not likely to generate anxiety or criticism except among the most sensitive people; their cost is slight and their informative value is high. They can educate, indicate deficiencies, indicate whether statutory obligations are being met, defend the budget for planning and for projects and programs as well, determine the agency's potential for impact, and its actual impact. Statistical indicators would be ideal for evaluating the planning agency were it not for the absence of adequate measurements, the long interval needed for impacts to be manifest, and the problem of attribution. These problems must be overcome. Ideally, every report, every plan, and every proposal should have as an integral element a measurement of the problem to be confronted and a proposed measurement of solution achievement -- in short, baseline data and goal or target data to enable measurement of progress toward the goal(s).

h. Outcomes in the absence of planning: scenarios. These are included in the list of methods of assessing the agency's effectiveness, as a last resort. If the problem of attribution is insurmountable, if the allegation is made that planned communities are no better off than unplanned communities -- witness the strip commercial zoning, the streets choked with traffic, and such arguments, if no other assessment mechanisms are immediately available, then perhaps the planners should ask themselves what the community might have been like without planning. Would the new highway have been built anyway, would strip zoning have been worse than it is, would the slums have been cleared. This may be a valuable exercise in humility, or it may be a real educational tool. Its objectivity, validity, and reliability are all questionable. It can be accomplished with a fine level of realism, or it can be highly subjective, biased and unperceptive. It can be informed by statistical data, sight checks, and other information, or it can be entirely impressionistic. It can be an internal element, involving only the staff and perhaps the citizen commission, employing the brainstorming method; or it can be set up as a formal external method using the Delphi technique or other interactive mechanism. It is not necessarily costly or time consuming, and may meet the informational needs of criteria 7 through 12. It may, however, require more interpersonal skills, imagination, and historical knowledge of government and political mechanisms than are available to the agency needing them most.

Element 2. Staff Self-Evaluation -- Efficiency

Table 9 lists five methods of evaluating efficiency. The first method, staff perceptions, has been discussed in part in the preceding
consideration of the questionnaire or interview in Appendix F. The first three parts of the questionnaire deal with various aspects of efficiency:

A. The organization, management, and workload of the agency
B. Supervisory behavior
C. Identification of bosses, clients, roles, and goals.

The latter have more to do with effectiveness than efficiency, yet they are an indication of the assumptions underlying certain aspects of organization and management. The disadvantages of this line of inquiry have already been mentioned. The questionnaire or interview has the advantage of being a multi-purpose document. The opportunity for anonymity afforded by a questionnaire has an obvious advantage over the interview in dealing with personalities. Staff perceptions of efficiency have high value for effecting change even if they are subjective, as this area deals with human relations where objectivity is of somewhat diminished importance. The value of staff perceptions of agency efficiency for educating publics and bosses and evaluating the budget is slight unless the findings are largely favorable. The questionnaire has little value for meeting statutory obligations and its validity and reliability are yet to be determined.

b. Program budget fulfillment. In the previous section, this is described as one of the better ways of determining intermediary effectiveness, assuming that a program budgeting process is in place. In the efficiency context, evidence that the program has been fulfilled demonstrates that the agency is using its time effectively. Since professional chief executives and budget officers are usually system oriented, they are impressed by achievement of objectives, and this should make succeeding budgets easier to get adopted. A well-known caveat, however, concerns satisficing in setting up the objectives in the first instance. Were they achieved because the agency set its sights too low? This brings into question the objectivity and validity of the program budget as a test of agency efficiency. As previously stated, the program budget will be discussed at greater length under ongoing assessment in the next chapter.

c. Changes in tables of organization, job descriptions, and assignments. Review will determine whether staff are being optimally utilized and whether the organization is continuously adapting to changing demands and resources. This process is somewhat subjective, is valid and probably reliable; its potential for creating anxiety is slight and for generating political criticism is probably nil. It takes very little time to do but the findings are probably not interesting to anyone outside the agency unless they are favorable. The review can indicate deficiencies for correction including capacity to meet statutory obligations. Favorable findings may have some effect on defense of the budget and determining the agency's impact potential. Efficiency criteria do not measure actual impact on the community.

d. Periodic progress reports. In the absence of a program budget, review of progress reports may aid in determining whether the agency is operating efficiently. They indicate productivity and the kinds of products, if any. If productivity is low, the question is whether the agency is understaffed, has suffered bad luck, has been undermanaged, or has been overburdened with maintenance tasks and ad hoc demands. Thus this method is usefully supplemented with a tally of simple units of intermediary effectiveness as a means of determining how time was used, and information
on man-hours worked. This method can be accomplished with reasonable objectivity and is probably valid and reliable. It is not likely to generate staff anxiety or cause political criticism unless it is clear that time has been wasted. It takes little time to accomplish this review and it has considerable value, in combination with simple units, for indicating deficiencies for correction. It is moderately useful for educating bosses and clients. It can help to determine whether statutory obligations are being met, and, if they are, it will help defend the annual budget. It will also help indicate the agency's impact potential.

- Statistical comparisons with other planning agencies in the same population class across the nation enjoys a respectability provided by the sponsorship of ASPO, which collects and publishes data annually on number of staff levels, number of personnel at each level, educational background, salaries at each level, ratio of support staff to professional staff, per capita expenditures for planning, and more. This information is useful at budget time and can also be applied to advise staff if they are well off in the agency. It has moderate value for correcting deficiencies, educating publics and bosses, and for meeting statutory criteria if there are substantial specialized demands on the agency. It is objective and reliable, and is a valid measure of management efficiency in the areas of staffing and budgeting. Staff and budget evaluation by comparison with other agencies in the same population size class can provide a strong indication of the agency's effectiveness potential, especially if the effectiveness of prototype agencies has been determined.

Element 3. Staff Evaluation by the Citizen Commission -- Effectiveness

Five tests by which the commission may evaluate the staff are listed in Table 9. All have been reviewed in the preceding sections. Table 9 does not include citizen commission assessment of the staff's intermediary effectiveness in the form of output since this is covered adequately by tests performed by the staff themselves. It is suggested, however, that the commission participate in reviewing any sight checks and statistical indicators developed by the staff, and that they articulate their own perceptions of impact effectiveness since they are the agency's link to the community. Methods for doing this include interviews, descriptive evaluations, and the Delphi technique. To save time, guided discussions at regular meetings can be taped, transcribed, and distributed to the members for further comment.

Element 4. Staff Evaluation by the Citizen Commission -- Efficiency

Four tests are suggested for this purpose, all of them the same as for self-assessment by staff -- examination of program budgets and other control records and reports, statistical comparisons with other agencies, and perceptions of staff efficiency -- except for examination of tables of organization, job descriptions, and assignments, which are considered outside the province of the commission. The same comments concerning these tests in previous sections apply to their use by the commission. Commission perceptions may be obtained by use of a questionnaire, through interviews, or brainstorming.

Element 5. Citizen Commission Evaluation by Staff -- Effectiveness and Efficiency

Some citizen commissions spend most of their time on rezoning petitions and perhaps subdivision review. The staff may wish to indicate to the commission that broader areas of concern would be appreciated.
In this case, application of the comprehensiveness checklist to the areas of commission concern, assessment of the quality and level of commission concern and involvement, and the staff's perceptions of the effectiveness of the commission in intermediary and impact outcomes of staff work may be revealing to the commission and may cause it to revise its emphasis, workload, and procedures. Of course the citizen commission may be doing a good job of meeting its statutory obligations and serving as a link between the staff and its bosses and publics. This is a valid approach to commission assessment, although objectivity and reliability of findings may be questionable. Depending upon staff relations with the commission, any of these methods may or may not cause anxiety. They need not cause political criticism, as citizen commissions ought to reexamine their mission, goals and roles from time to time, and modify their operations to reflect their findings. The staff role in this examination can be handled with tact. The methods recommended have been discussed in preceding sections.

Element 6. Citizen Commission Self-Evaluation

Whether or not the staff participates in evaluation of citizen commission activities, the commission itself can poll its perceptions of its efficiency and effectiveness for purposes of correction or publicizing its good work. Perceptions may be obtained through a questionnaire, interviews, or brainstorming. If there has been staff input, the commission's assessment process may include feedback from the findings of staff. All methods have been previously discussed.

Selecting Elements of the Internal Assessment

To this point, the tests proposed to be used for planning agency assessment have been evaluated on the basis of twelve criteria to enable agencies to select those which would provide them with optimal information and assistance at least cost in time, effort, affectivity, and political criticism. Similar information and a similar process can be used for selecting the elements of internal assessment.

1. Staff self-evaluation of effectiveness and quality. This can be accomplished by either objective or subjective methods. Self-evaluation is a valid procedure, assuming that valid criteria are applied. Findings may not be reliable, but biases can be partially removed by averaging. Staff anxiety will be generated, but probably to a lesser degree than if the evaluation were being done by others. Political criticism will not be generated unless any unfavorable findings are disseminated. On the other hand, the agency may be given credit for having the courage to take a hard look at its accomplishments and failures, with a determination to take any necessary corrective action. Time and cost involved in self-assessment will vary with the methods used, as will value for educating publics and bosses, indicating deficiencies for correction including the meeting of statutory obligations. The agency's willingness to assess itself and seek improvement should have favorable impact on budget approval. Depending on the objectivity of the methods used, self-assessment may have a high value for indicating effectiveness potential and actual impact effectiveness.

2. Staff self-evaluation of efficiency. The outcomes of planning are affected by many factors besides the professionalism of the staff, but efficiency is under more direct staff control. Therefore, there may be a tendency for planners to be more subjective, producing less valid and
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reliable findings in assessing their own efficiency than in evaluating their effectiveness. On the other hand, planners are often their own severest critics (Levin, 1976, pages 8 and 10). As in the case of effectiveness, there are dangers of generating anxiety and political criticism, but certainly the dangers are less than would be the case in assessment by others. The time and effort involved for efficiency assessment are moderate. If the findings are largely favorable, they may be used for educating bosses and publics ("We are an efficient organization; if we're not effective, it may be the fault of factors beyond our control.") If the members of the agency are honest with themselves, the assessment will reveal deficiencies for correction, and the capacity for meeting statutory obligations. An efficient organization, or one which evinces an intent to improve its efficiency, will have an easier time in the budget process even if its effectiveness cannot be proved, for an efficient organization is more likely to be effective than an inefficient organization.

3. Staff evaluation by citizen commission -- effectiveness. The members of the citizen commission are among the "bosses" of the planning staff and thus have a right and an obligation to assure themselves of the effectiveness and quality of staff work. They are outsiders in the sense of objectivity as compared to staff self-assessment, but insiders in that they are a part of the planning agency. For these reasons, commission assessment of staff could be regarded as more objective, more valid, and possibly more reliable than self-evaluation. The potential for generating staff anxiety and political criticism, however, are greatly increased since the process must be carried out publicly. As an educational device, staff assessment by the commission may be effective or not depending on the
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methods used and the findings. Deficiencies for correction will be found, although the commission may have less insight into the staff's shortcomings than the staff themselves. On the other hand, they may be aware of things that the staff cannot perceive. The process should reveal whether statutory obligations are being met and should strengthen the agency's hand in dealing with the annual budget. Impact potential and actual impact should be revealed by commission assessment of staff.

1. Staff evaluation by citizen commission -- efficiency. Much of what has been said in the preceding paragraph applies to commission assessment of staff efficiency. The process will probably be exceedingly painful and politically hazardous if the staff is found to be inefficient, however. It might also be argued that staff efficiency is an internal matter and the responsibility of the director, not the business of the commission. The commission probably should follow this line of inquiry only if there is very strong evidence of maladministration.

5. Citizen commission evaluation by staff. This process may be very subjective, as staff is not ordinarily privy to the forces that inhibit commission effectiveness or efficiency. For the same reason, staff findings may not be valid or reliable. Venturing to appraise its own "bosses" could be an anxiety-making enterprise for staff, and could generate considerable political criticism. It need not be costly in time and effort and could be an educational device. It might indicate deficiencies, as most citizen commissions have unbalanced memberships and biased views (Davies, 1965); but these imbalances result from the appointment process and cannot be corrected by criticism, but through political and legislative action. It would be brash and counterproductive, however, for staff to
initiate such action. Evaluation will disclose the extent to which statutory obligations are being met, and this would be salutary. There could be a reflection on staff, however, since it is the obligation of the director to provide information and assistance to the commission. There would probably be no impact on the budget making process. Commission evaluation by staff would, however, indicate the agency's impact potential and its actual impact on the community.

6. Citizen commission self-evaluation. The commission's ability to be objective and to reach valid and reliable conclusions will vary. Granted that this can be accomplished, it is far preferable that the commission evaluate itself than that its own staff undertake its evaluation, from the points of view of creating anxiety and possible political criticism. The commission, however, will certainly require informational input from its staff if it undertakes to assess itself. Unless both commission and staff are careful, staff could become involved in making substantive findings. The cost in time for commission self-appraisal is greater than if staff alone are involved, since the members of the commission are usually taking time from their private occupations to accomplish the assessment. Their findings will be educational for both clients and other bosses, and should indicate deficiencies for correction. The commission should learn from the process whether it is meeting its statutory obligations. If it is, it may use this information to assist staff during the annual budgeting process. Commission self-assessment should, if honestly undertaken, be a powerful tool for indicating potential for impact on the community and for determining actual impact.

XI. EXTERNAL ELEMENTS OF INITIAL ASSESSMENT

Most of the tests identified for internal assessment purposes in Chapter X are also suitable for external assessment. Tests for use in external assessment are ordered under five assessment elements in Table 10. The tests not already evaluated by application of the twelve criteria for choice in Chapter X are evaluated in this chapter.

Element 1. Staff Evaluation by Elected and Appointed Officials -- Effectiveness

Of the seven tests under this element in Table 10, all except cost/benefit ratio and feedback from the public and the media have been discussed.

Cost/benefit ratio. This is a familiar but not well developed technique. Its difficulty lies in quantification of benefits which may be intangible. Even some costs may be intangible. Cost-benefit assessment of the planning staff by public officials would require assigning staff of some other agency to identify the benefits of a planning program, assign those portions of the planning budget which are properly attributable to each benefit, and then either quantify each benefit for comparison with its costs or make a subjective decision as to whether each benefit exceeded its costs. This sounds fairly simple, but many extraneous factors enter the equation. For example, one benefit of a general development plan is that the federal Environmental Protection Agency requires it as a condition for sewerage funding of 75 percent. In some
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Elements and Arenas</th>
<th>Effectiveness Levels</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation by Elected and Appointed Officials</td>
<td>Intermediary Efficiency</td>
<td>Program comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Quality of products and activities</td>
<td>Scoring sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Impact Effectiveness</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Interviews or other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Statistical change</td>
<td>Statistical indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Cost benefit ratio</td>
<td>Cost benefit analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Outcomes in absence of planning</td>
<td>Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Feedback from public and media</td>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Periodic progress reports</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation by Elected and Appointed Officials</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Comparison with other agencies</td>
<td>Statistical comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Interviews or other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation by Publics</td>
<td>Intermediary Effectiveness</td>
<td>Program comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Quality of products and activities</td>
<td>Scoring sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Impact Effectiveness</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Interviews or other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Statistical change</td>
<td>Statistical indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Cost benefit analysis</td>
<td>Cost benefit analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Outcomes in absence of planning</td>
<td>Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Feedback from public and media</td>
<td>Brainstorming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Institutional Adaptiveness</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Interviews or other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation by Publics</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Comparison with other agencies</td>
<td>Statistical comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10 — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements and Arenas</th>
<th>Effectiveness Levels</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation by Publics (continued)</td>
<td>Efficiency (continued)</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Locus of Agency in Government, and Citizen Commission Evaluation by Officials and Publics</td>
<td>Effectiveness and Efficiency</td>
<td>To be devised by team of experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cases this could be many millions of dollars. But there are many other requirements besides a general development plan for sewerage funding.

What share does the planning agency play? What is the cost of producing the planning agency's plan, especially if planning is a continuing process and the plan is updated every few years? How much of the cost of plan preparation should be charged to winning the sewerage grant, and how much to the plan's many other applications? Would it have been less costly to have developed the plan as part of the sewerage planning contract rather than as a separate planning function? If so, how would it apply to other uses of a general development plan? What would its cost be if there were no planning agency to provide the basic data inputs to the plan? This is only a sample of the difficulties of cost/benefit analysis.

Yet management seeks to make such studies as a reasonable way of allocating scarce financial resources. Perhaps techniques for doing this will be developed. If such techniques were available, how would cost benefit analysis fare on the twelve criteria for selection of evaluation methods?

If all the problems could be worked out, the method might be objective, valid, and reliable. Mathematical models today are not free of built-in biases. It would probably have a high potential for generating anxiety and political criticism. It would be rather costly in time and resources. It would have high educational value, it would indicate deficiencies for correction, it might have some value for indicating whether statutory obligations were being met, it would be useful for evaluating the annual budget but not necessarily for defending it. It should have high value for assessing the agency’s impact potential, and in very circumscribed areas, it would be useful for determining actual impact.
Feedback from the public and the media is often the decision maker's only source of information. Depending upon who provides the input and what his biases are, this method of evaluation may or may not be objective, valid, or reliable. It may or may not have high potential for generating staff anxiety and political criticism. It costs nothing in planning agency time or effort but its value for educating clients and bosses may be good or bad. It may indicate deficiencies for correction but is unlikely to indicate whether or not statutory obligations are being fulfilled. It may have strong impact on the annual budget, but its impact may not necessarily be favorable. It may indicate the agency's potential impact on the community, and in some cases may indicate actual impact.

Element 2. Staff Evaluation by Elected and Appointed Officials -- Efficiency

All tests listed for this element in Table 10 have been discussed.

Element 3. Staff Evaluation by Publics -- Effectiveness

All of the tests listed in Table 10 have been reviewed except institutional adaptiveness.

Institutional adaptiveness. This goal is discussed in the review of "new" planning theories. It refers to the changing of existing institutions or the creation of new institutions to deal with new problems or existing problems which are not being dealt with adequately under existing institutional arrangements. An example of a new institutional arrangement needed is a way of relieving the effects of hard-core poverty without perpetuating its causes. Planning may or may not make an attributable contribution to institutional adaptivity. If it does, or

has, evidence is most likely to be obtained through the knowledge or perceptions of community leaders or clients. The information may be elicited through interviews, Delphi technique, or other interaction techniques. Such information may or may not be reliable, valid, or objective. It is not likely to cause anxiety or political criticism unless the institution in question is controversial, or the planners' role is controversial. The method is not very costly to use, and any information produced will be educational for publics and bosses. It will not indicate deficiencies for correction, it will not indicate whether statutory obligations are being met, and it will probably not have impact on the budget making process. It may be an indicator of the agency's impact potential, and in one area at least, will indicate actual impact on the community.

Element 4. Staff Evaluation by Publics -- Efficiency

Both tests for this element have been reviewed.

Element 5. Focus in Government and Citizen Commission Evaluation by Officials and Publics

This complex issue, if investigated at all, should probably be approached by ASPO's team of experts. Outside specialists are more likely than any other group or individual to be objective and to reach valid and reliable conclusions. No matter how it is done, such a study has a very high potential for generating staff anxiety and political criticism. The consultant services may be expensive, and there may be added costs in planning staff assistance. The information provided should be very useful in educating publics and bosses and indicating deficiencies for correction. The findings may indicate a need for altering statutory obligations. The
effect on the annual budget will depend on the findings. An integral part of such a study should be assessment of the agency's potential and actual impact.

Feedback in the media and from other sources is an unreliable, subjective, and invalid method of evaluating this complex political and administrative issue. It is likely to obscure more than it illuminates, and to create more problems than it solves.

Two other methods -- perceptions of the quality of agency activities and of the impact effectiveness and potential impact of the agency program can be a part of any assessment of agency locus in the local governmental structure, and the role of the citizen commission. If all is going well there should be no impetus for change. If change appears to be needed, then this political and administrative issue may have to be addressed by a team of experts.

Selecting Elements of the External Assessment

1. Staff evaluation by elected and appointed officials -- effectiveness.
The objectivity of officials, the validity of their findings and the reliability of outcomes are variable. Staff review by officials has a very high potential for creating staff anxiety and political criticism of the agency. It may be a costly process, depending upon how many people are involved and what their offices are. The process should have good potential for educating and for indicating deficiencies for correction, at least within the value systems of those doing the reviewing. These values may have short-term validity. The findings are not likely to speak to statutory obligations but may have considerable effect on the annual budget. The process should indicate the agency's short-term potential for impact on the community, but is not likely to disclose long-term impacts, unless guided.

2. Staff evaluation by elected and appointed officials -- efficiency.
The efficiency of the planning agency should be outside the province of officials, as it is an administrative matter under normal conditions. With assistance and information provided by the agency, however, objective, valid, and reliable conclusions might be reached. If this occurs, it will be at the cost of staff anxiety and possible political criticism of the agency. The process will be less costly in time than officials' assessment of agency effectiveness. It will have limited educational value but may be useful for indicating deficiencies for correction. Some of these deficiencies may lie in the budgetary area. Statutory obligations might be highlighted in this process, which might also provide clues to potential for agency impact on the community.

3. Staff evaluation by publics -- effectiveness. The diversity of publics is likely to produce a wide variation in objectivity, validity, and reliability of information obtained. Throwing agency effectiveness and the quality of work into the public arena will generate a high level of staff anxiety, and will undoubtedly stir up political criticism of the agency, no matter how favorable some of the findings may be. Such an investigation will be costly to set up and administer. It will probably have a high educational value for publics and bosses, and may indicate deficiencies for correction. It will probably not address statutory obligations unless guided to do so. It may affect the annual budget either favorably or unfavorably, and will have considerable value in indicating the agency's impact potential. It may not disclose actual impacts.
4. Staff evaluation by publics -- efficiency. Although it may appear that the public is not qualified to judge agency efficiency, it has the right to do so on two counts. First, it pays the bills, and second, it has an outcome interest in the agency's efficiency. Its determinations, however, will have to be informed and guided, as impressionistic findings have value only for guiding the agency's educational and PR program. Whether objective, valid, and reliable or not, the public's opinions are needed. They may generate staff anxiety and political criticism. They will be costly to obtain, but can be combined with investigation of effectiveness and quality of work (above) to spread the costs. The process should be educational to bosses and clients and may indicate deficiencies for correction. The investigation will probably not address statutory obligations but it may impact the annual budget. Public opinion provides a clue to the agency's impact potential.

5. Locus in government and the citizen commission -- evaluation by officials and publics. As previously indicated, these areas are best not explored unless it appears to be a major stumbling block to agency effectiveness. Unless accomplished by a team of experts, the findings will be subjective and unreliable, valid only within the value systems of disparate observers. The assessment will have a very high potential for generating staff anxiety and political criticism of the agency. It will be costly to perform. It should educate bosses and clients if conducted by a team of experts, and should indicate deficiencies for correction. It should address statutory obligations and deficiencies in enabling and implementing legislation. It should impact the annual budget, indicate the agency's potential for making an impact on the community, and assess actual impacts on the community. Findings should be directed toward achieving optimum impact effectiveness through adaptation to the local governmental structure and alignments of power and authority while protecting professional integrity.
XII. ELEMENTS OF ONGOING ASSESSMENT

Ongoing assessment may include four internal elements and three external elements. Most of the elements listed for ongoing assessment in Table 11 and their several tests are evaluated in Chapters X and XI. Those not already treated are discussed in this chapter, applying the twelve criteria listed in Chapter X.

Internal Elements

Element 1. Staff Self-Evaluation -- Effectiveness. Of the five tests listed in Table 11 for intermediary effectiveness, only one, program budget comprehensiveness, has not previously been discussed. This item differs in two respects from general program comprehensiveness. First, the annual program cannot include everything the agency does over a period of years. It must include those program elements not previously done, those previously done but out of date, and any new elements or responsibilities required by law or local circumstances. The second distinction is that the annual program budget must include some things not included in the comprehensiveness program, such as time for ad hoc projects, service on and to committees, and many daily and ongoing responsibilities for which time must be allocated. For these reasons, assessment of program budget comprehensiveness is somewhat subjective. For example, who judges whether a study is out of date, and if so, when its updating should be scheduled? If the agency is new, the first program budget can achieve comprehensiveness only at the expense of thoroughness or high initial cost in consultant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements and Arenas</th>
<th>Internal Elements</th>
<th>Effectiveness Levels</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. staff self-evaluation</td>
<td>Intermediary effectiveness</td>
<td>Program budget comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Simple Units&quot;</td>
<td>Tally sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Milestones&quot; toward program budget fulfillment</td>
<td>Record sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program budget fulfillment</td>
<td>Records check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of products and activities</td>
<td>Scoring sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11
ORDERING THE ELEMENTS OF ONGOING ASSESSMENT

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Effectiveness Levels</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Self-Evaluation (continued)</td>
<td>Efficiency (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Periodic progress reports</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Comparison with other agencies</td>
<td>Statistical comparisons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Evaluation by Citizen Commission</td>
<td>Intermediary Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Quality of products and activities</td>
<td>Scoring sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Program budget fulfillment</td>
<td>Records check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Impact Effectiveness: Prospective Estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Evaluation by Citizen Commission</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Program budget fulfilled</td>
<td>Records check</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Periodic progress reports</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Comparison with other agencies</td>
<td>Statistical comparisons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11 -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Effectiveness Levels</th>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3. Staff Evaluation by Publics</td>
<td>Impact Effectiveness</td>
<td>Measured progress toward specific community goals and objectives from baseline data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Staff Evaluation by Publics**

a. Impact Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff plan review and update process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This test, then, is somewhat limited in its objectivity, validity, and reliability. It has limited potential for generating staff anxiety or political criticism, it costs almost nothing to apply and has moderate usefulness in educating publics and bosses on the subject of priorities. It may indicate deficiencies of underprogramming or overprogramming for correction. If it is a multi-year rather than a single-year program budget, it has value for testing whether statutory obligations are being met. The timeliness of studies programmed will have a significant effect in determining the agency's impact potential.

Impact effectiveness evaluated prospectively in an ongoing assessment program has a single test: **measured progress toward specific community goals and objectives from baseline data**. This is the key test of the planning agency's (and the community's) effectiveness. How meaningful it is will depend on how the agency predetermines its goals and objectives. As stated elsewhere, there is considerable range between initial and ultimate (sometimes unintended) impacts. The example given earlier in this paper identifies several goals of increasing difficulty to achieve and measure for the program of slum eradication. The first goal addresses only the visual environment which is improved by eliminating slums. The second goal addresses the health of slum dwellers who are relocated to standard housing. The third goal is increased revenue from property taxes in the redeveloped area. An ultimate goal is the total rehabilitation of the people who are relocated. The planning agency, by identifying all possible goals and objectives of a program or project, can measure progress toward the attainment of each, thereby achieving some satisfaction from the attainment of easier or earlier goals, and postponing satisfaction for the attainment of more difficult or more
long-range goals.

Application of the criteria in Chapter X to the test of "measured progress . . . toward goals" will rate it as capable of being made objective, valid, and reliable; very limited in its potential for generating staff anxiety or political criticism because of the lapse of time; and possibly costly in time and funds for gathering and analyzing data. Offsetting the cost, however, are the value of this approach for educating publics and bosses, indicating deficiencies (not necessarily those of the planning agency) for correction, indicating whether statutory obligations are being met, defending the budget, and determining the agency's (and other governments') impact potential and actual impact on the community.

This is the ultimate assessment test toward which every local public planning agency should strive, regardless of the problem of attribution of credit for results.

Element 2. Staff Self-Evaluation -- Efficiency. All four of the tests listed in Table 11 for this element are discussed in Chapter X.

Element 3. Staff Evaluation by Citizen Commission -- Effectiveness. All three tests listed in Table 11 have been discussed.

Element 4. Staff Evaluation by Citizen Commission -- Efficiency. The three tests in Table 11 have been discussed.

External Elements

Element 1. Staff Evaluation by Elected and Appointed Officials -- Effectiveness. The three tests in Table 11 have been discussed.

Element 2. Staff Evaluation by Elected and Appointed Officials -- Efficiency. Three of the tests in Table 11 have been discussed. The fourth test, responsiveness to requests, has two parts: responsiveness to officials and to publics. The first of these is a crucial test in the value system of the chief executive and members of council. It is also important to the many operating agencies with which the planning agency must interact, both in planning facilities and systems and in day-to-day business. It is important, therefore, that the planning agency maintain its own records (simple and complex units) so that it can defend itself against any perceptions of non-feasance. It is also important that any requests requiring substantial investment of time or other resources be made in writing. Responsiveness to publics is also important. This is one of the ways that the agency builds its constituency and weather's political changes. It is also valued by officials until a public group takes an adversary position on a public project or program.

In terms of the criteria for test selection, "responsiveness to requests" ought to be objective, valid, and reliable, but in fact, perceptions and recollections will differ. Whether this test has potential for arousing staff anxiety or generating political criticism will depend on the agency's record. This test costs relatively little to use, and pays off in educating publics and bosses, indicating deficiencies for correction, evaluating or defending the annual budget, and determining the agency's impact potential. It may have very little to do with statutory obligations or actual impact on the community, depending on the nature of the requests made.
Selecting Elements of Ongoing Assessment

The four elements of internal assessment listed in Table II are discussed in Chapter X; the three elements of external assessment listed in Table II are discussed in Chapter XI.

Based on the evaluation of elements and tests of planning agency assessment in this chapter and the two preceding it, planning agencies should be able to select those elements and tests which meet their needs within time and budgetary constraints. For illustration, an assessment program is selected for a hypothetical agency in the concluding chapter, which follows.

XIII. CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Recommendations

This paper recommends an ongoing assessment program in preference to initial assessment principally on the basis of cost in time and funds. Internal assessment is preferred to external assessment to avoid generating unnecessary staff anxiety and the potential for political criticism. Nonetheless, specific needs are met by an initial assessment and by external assessment elements, as described in the three preceding chapters. From the extensive analysis of assessment elements and tests for each element in those chapters, an assessment plan can be designed which will meet an agency's needs within the time and other resources available. In selecting elements for the agency's assessment program, decision is based on elements which meet a maximum number of the thirteen criteria in Chapter X and which employ the same tests to the extent possible, for further economy of time and effort. To illustrate this, an assessment plan for a hypothetical agency is provided in Table 12. In this example, only the staff and not the citizen commission is evaluated. However, the citizen commission is evaluated implicitly by all tests of the outcome of planning, as its partial instrumentality is assumed in agency successes and failures.

It is important to note that the sample plan assumes an established agency of medium size. New agencies, small agencies, and very large agencies would have somewhat different assessment requirements. A planning agency contemplating consolidation with other land use agencies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arenas for Staff Assessment</th>
<th>Intermediary Effectiveness</th>
<th>Impact Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Units</td>
<td>Simple Units</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestones</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
<td>Specific Community</td>
<td>Specific Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Goals and Objectives from Base-line Data</td>
<td>Changes in T.O., etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Periodic Progress Reports</td>
<td>Periodic Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Comparison with Other Agencies</td>
<td>Comparison with Other Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment by Citizen Commission</td>
<td>Program Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment by Officials</td>
<td>Program Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
<td>Program Budget Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment by Publics</td>
<td>Program Comprehensiveness</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Past Statistical Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would need to assess its internal structure, its locus within the local
governmental organization, and its citizen commission. Other variations
in local needs and conditions will also affect overall assessment design.

Table 12 illustrates the economy involved in multiple use of tests.
The matrix covers initial and ongoing assessment of the staff for
intermediary and impact effectiveness and for efficiency in four arenas --
a total of twenty-four cells -- utilizing a total of thirteen tests. Three
cells contain no tests, nine cells contain only one test, and twelve
cells contain two or more tests. The emphasis is on ongoing internal
assessment through program budgeting and record keeping.

**Contributions to the State of the Art of Local Public Planning Agency Assessment**

This paper represents a plateau in the progress toward design of
a comprehensive evaluation program for local public planning agencies.
It assembles and synthesizes, from management and planning literature,
concepts of effectiveness and efficiency, criteria for their assessment,
tests to determine whether criteria have been met, and instruments for
test application. These means of planning agency evaluation are subjected
to analysis of their weaknesses and strengths and are integrated into a
systematic view of local public planning agency assessment. This assembly,
synthesis, systematization, and analysis comprise the first contribution
of this paper to the state of the art of planning agency assessment.

The second contribution of this paper is the comprehensive view
of planning agency assessment from two perspectives: 1) the operational
view of mandatory and permissive legislative provisions and professional
substantive and procedural requirements for planning, the quality of
work, and organizational efficiency; and 2) the outcome view of intermediary
and impact effectiveness of agency activities, and the perceptions
of planning by bosses and publics.

The third contribution comes from the author's professional
experiences which help flesh out the concepts, criteria, and tests, which
contribute to the preliminary design of several instruments (see Appendices)
for recording, eliciting, or analyzing information to be used in the process
of agency assessment, in both initial and ongoing phases.

**Research Projects Needed**

This paper, despite its pretensions to comprehensiveness, is
neither exhaustive nor definitive. Undoubtedly there are missing elements
which will be identified by others.

The concept of comprehensiveness itself is open to challenge.
As substitutes for the costly and time-consuming comprehensive approach,
selected indicators may be identified and tested which can be easily and
quickly applied and which will provide the necessary information for the
maintenance of organizational vitality and program effectiveness.

The instruments for testing effectiveness and efficiency themselves
require testing. Only the questionnaire has been field tested, and only
once, in a preliminary form. Along with the quality scoring sheet and
other instruments, it needs to be applied many times in planning agencies
of various characteristics to determine its validity and reliability.

Considerable refinement and adaptation are probably needed.
Interview formats need considerable attention, both by planners and
professional survey designers. The information provided in the interview
appendices is sketchy and illustrative, with details provided only for
single elements of each interview arena. Fleshing out and casting in
appropriate language are two major tasks if interviews are to be used. Evaluating responses to interviews, questionnaires, quality scoring forms, and other instruments and techniques for eliciting information requires study. The possibility of introducing bias by weighting some factors more heavily than others, or by asking more questions about some issues than others, or by not weighting responses at all, is an obstacle to equitable assessment and appropriate choice of actions.

Major lacks indicated in this paper are an adequate conceptual basis and data base for describing baseline conditions and measuring progress toward improvement in the areas addressed by planning. This problem is addressed sporadically by agencies of the federal government, departments of sociology and other disciplines in various universities, by planning consultants, and by many planning agencies. If environmental standards do not change more rapidly than the techniques for their measurement and evaluation, progress will be made.

Another lack indicated here is a technique for attributing to planning agencies their proper share of credit for the long-range outcomes of programs in which many actors participate. Perhaps it appears excessively parochial to require this, yet planning periodically falls on hard political times, and it must be ready to assert and defend the value of its role in the progress of the community.

Finally, if a comprehensive guide to agency assessment is to be applicable to all local public planning agencies without expenditure of excessive time in modifying and adapting a prototype design, there is still much work to be done. The first task might be to analyze and classify planning agencies according to their assessment needs, which will vary with their age, maturity, size, statutory mandates, and the political, social, and economic environment in which they operate. By way of illustration, various combinations and permutations of the following four circumstances in which planning agencies find themselves would call for different approaches to their assessment: 1) new agencies lacking a sense of direction, 2) established agencies doing reasonably well, but with a few weaknesses in effectiveness or efficiency, 3) established agencies whose influence appears to be diminishing, and 4) established agencies with tight budgets requiring program cutbacks. After establishing classifications for various assessment levels, designs would have to be tailored to each class. Perhaps this is an impossible task. In the long run, however, it should not consume more time and energy than creating an assessment plan and design de novo for each agency which needs it.
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APPENDIX A

PROGRAM COMPREHENSIVENESS CHECKLIST
(Including Plans, Resources, Systems and Activities of the Planning Staff, Operating Agencies, Community Consultants, and Other Levels of Government)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aerial photography</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agricultural production planning</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Annexation studies</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Annual reports</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Archaeological areas identification and protection</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Area design plans</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Capital improvements programs, long range</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Capital improvements programs, short range</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Citizen participation in planning</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Central business district plans</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Code update and enforcement studies</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Community development plans</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Community renewal plan</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Community shelter plan</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Community amenities plan</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Consolidation plans</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
APPENDIX A, Continued

17. Cultural facilities plan
18. Development coordination planning (public/private; interagency)
19. Development plans, alternatives
20. Drainage plans
21. Economic analysis and economic development planning
22. Elderly and infirm needs
23. Erosion control
24. Fire stations
25. Fiscal and taxation policy
26. Flood plain ordinance
27. General development guide (land use plan)
28. Grants and applications; federal/state requirements monitoring
29. Growth needs, future
30. Health services planning
31. Historic areas identification and conservation planning
32. Housing studies and plans
33. Housing statistics
34. Impact review ordinance
35. Income statistics
36. Influence on developers
37. Industrial site studies; assistance to industrial recruiters
38. Information management system, interagency
39. Internal evaluation of effectiveness and efficiency

(continued)

APPENDIX A, Continued

40. Labor force data
41. Land classification plan
42. Land use maps
43. Land use statistics
44. Legislation monitoring and influence, federal/state
45. Library plan
46. Management system
47. Man-made resources study
48. Manpower planning
49. Map cataloguing and filing system
50. Membership in or technical assistance to special interest groups
51. Monthly reports
52. Natural resources study
53. Neighborhood development plans
54. Open space/recreation plans
55. Participation of officials in planning
56. Participation of operating agencies in planning
57. Participation of special interest groups in planning
58. Physiographic studies; soils mapping
59. Plan implementation strategies
60. Population statistics and projections: totals; small areas; demographic analysis
61. Professional society meetings; attendance, participation
62. Program planning coordinated with budgeting and management

(continued)
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Project designs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Public information and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Public relations and public education program, comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Quality of life studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Regional base mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Regional planning context; regional projects and programs review (A-95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Research and analysis function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Resources conservation planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Scenic route plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Schools plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Sewage disposal plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Site plan review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Sites for public purposes selection and protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Social services policy planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Solid waste management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Staff development program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Staff evaluation program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Staff services to other agencies, committees, commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Staff services to chief executive and council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Subdivision regulations; updating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Subdivision review and approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Topographic and planimetric mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Transportation, transit, and terminal plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Urban design planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Urban development studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Urbanization planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Water supply and distribution plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Zoning ordinance; updating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Zoning petition review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
APPENDIX B
"SIMPLE UNITS" OF INTERMEDIARY EFFECTIVENESS

TALLY OF SERVICES RENDERED BY ALL STAFF MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitors Assisted</th>
<th>Outside Visits Made</th>
<th>Phone Calls Received</th>
<th>Phone Calls Made*</th>
<th>Memoranda and Correspondence</th>
<th>Reports Distributed**</th>
<th>Press Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LocalGovt.</td>
<td>Fed./State Other</td>
<td>Local Govt.</td>
<td>Fed./State Other</td>
<td>Local Govt.</td>
<td>Fed./State Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To avoid referring questions outside, or to exchange information
** Includes minutes of meetings, copies of legislation, anything produced in this office

PLEASE POST THIS ON THE WALL NEAR YOUR PHONE AND MAKE A TALLY MARK (////////) IN THE RIGHT BOX AS SOON AS YOU HANG UP THE PHONE, OR A VISITOR LEAVES, OR YOU RETURN FROM A VISIT, OR YOU SIGN A LETTER

APPENDIX C
"MILESTONES" FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT OF COMPLEX UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Information gathered, systematized, analyzed, presented for problem identification and goal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Problems identified and analyzed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Goals, objectives, and standards identified and agreed upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Alternative solutions developed, implications explained, evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Other agencies involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Public involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Chief executive and council involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Other agencies involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Public involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Chief executive and council involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C, Continued

Dates

b. Public involved

c. Chief executive involved

d. Council involved

5. Planners' preferred alternative identified, documented, and explained
   a. To other agencies
   b. To chief executive
   c. To public
   d. To council

6. Policies developed for implementing selected solution
   a. Other agencies involved
   b. Chief executive involved
   c. Public involved
   d. Council involved

7. Strategy developed for implementation of selected solution
   a. Other agencies involved
   b. Chief executive involved
   c. Public involved
   d. Council involved

8. Proposal adopted by council, with support of
   a. Other agencies
   b. Chief executive

   (continued)

APPENDIX C, Continued

Dates

c. Public

d. Citizen Commission (if there is one)

9. Proposal(s) implemented
   a. Council approves capital improvements program
   b. Council funds project(s)
   c. Operating agency instructed to proceed
   d. Operating agency constructs project and/or commences service

NOTES

1. If there is a citizen commission, its actions should be provided for under most of the items above.

2. If there is a citizen commission, a separate item for citizen commission approval and recommendation to council should be inserted above, before item 8.

3. This schedule is over-simplified and will need to be adapted to individual projects. It will be especially necessary to provide for many dates rather than a single date of action under each item and sub-item.

4. Some items and sub-items may generate separate projects for "milestones" tracking. For example, if item 7, Strategy, includes the drafting and adoption of new regulations, a new tax policy, a capital improvements program, etc., each one would require a separate "Milestones" sheet for recording activities and progress toward the objective(s).
### APPENDIX D

#### QUALITY OF PRODUCTS AND ACTIVITIES

#### SCORING SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Report, study, or other project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification #</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**0 = poor, 1 = fair, 2 = good, 3 = excellent, X = not applicable**

1. Is imaginative, innovative, pushing toward new frontiers
   - [ ]

2. Problem solution is not too far advanced for public acceptance
   - [ ]

3. Full exposition of alternatives is given for solution of problem(s) or achievement of agreed-upon goals and objectives
   - [ ]

4. Full exposition is given of the consequences to the social, economic, aesthetic, natural and man-made systems for each alternative
   - [ ]

5. Planners' preferred alternative is stated fully without compromise
   - [ ]

6. A strategy or strategies for achieving the agreed-upon goal(s) or objective(s) is described
   - [ ]

7. Data, proposals, and ideas are described and illustrated clearly and understandably; arguments are simple, brief and direct
   - [ ]

8. Sufficient, timely, accurate information is used
   - [ ]

9. Conclusions reached are fully supported by the data provided
   - [ ]

10. The proposal reflects a clear understanding of how the private market works, and encourages private as well as public investment
    - [ ]

(continued)

### APPENDIX D, Continued

11. The assumptions made are clearly stated and soundly based
    - [ ]

12. Relations among functions and systems in the problem analysis and solutions are clearly shown
    - [ ]

13. The strategy for achieving the goals and objectives emphasizes cost-effective incentives and provides sanctions where incentives are inadequate
    - [ ]

14. The proposal(s) reflect the values, wishes, tastes, and needs of the groups it will affect
    - [ ]

15. Adequate mechanisms for full citizen participation were followed in problem and issues identification and analysis, goals formulation, and development of solutions
    - [ ]

16. Public officials and the citizen commission were involved in the planning process as appropriate
    - [ ]

17. Heads of appropriate operating departments and agencies were involved in the planning process
    - [ ]

18. Experts in the community were consulted on technical problems; an interdisciplinary approach was taken, if appropriate
    - [ ]

19. Hot or tough issues are dealt with in seeking solutions
    - [ ]

20. Studies and analysis are relevant to the decisions which must be made
    - [ ]

21. The solution proposed fits the analysis of the problem
    - [ ]

22. Short-range project proposals are made in the context of long-range, coordinated, comprehensive plans
    - [ ]

23. Priorities are recommended among a number of actions which must be taken, based on established criteria
    - [ ]

24. Staff positions and background studies support the director, the citizen commission, the chief executive, and/or council, as appropriate
    - [ ]

25. The work was completed in time to be useful in decision making
    - [ ]

26. Update criteria, standards, and schedules are included in long-range proposals and plans
    - [ ]

(continued)
27. Criteria and standards for monitoring and evaluation of the outcome of the proposals are included.
28. Planners adequately publicized and explained the completed plan or proposal.
29. Planners worked with community groups for support of proposals.
30. Planners bargained in the political arena for support of proposals.
31. The strategy for dealing with hot or tough issues provided opportunities for dissent, but avoided polarisation.
### APPENDIX F

**PERCEPTIONS OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY**

**QUESTIONNAIRE OR INTERVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification #</th>
<th>Job Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**A. Organization, Management, and Workload**

Please indicate below your opinions of our efficiency and the effectiveness of our organization and management:

- **0** = not at all
- **1** = slight(ly) or sometimes
- **2** = moderate(ly) or frequent(ly)
- **3** = for the most part or very much
- **DK** = don't know
- **NA** = not applicable

1. Do you think that our table of organization accurately reflects our responsibilities now and our probable activities over the next few years?  
2. Do you believe that our team planning and problem solving is a valuable organizational alternative to a rigid hierarchical structure?  
3. Do you feel that the administration has the program under control?  
4. Do you feel that our job descriptions are accurate and complete?  
5. Do you feel that it is desirable for our job descriptions to be specific?  
6. Do you feel that our organization and management are sufficiently flexible to meet changing program demands?  
7. Do you think we have enough staff meetings, memoranda, and other structured methods of communication?  
8. Do you think we have too much structured communication?  

(continued)
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9. Do you think “bad luck” and “firefighting” are managed as efficiently as possible under prevailing political conditions? [ ]

10. Does administration provide comprehensive guidelines for the orientation of new personnel and those who are transferred? [ ]

11. Do you believe that the professional staff is large enough to fulfill program responsibilities? [ ]

12. Do you believe that everyone on this staff is competent to do what he or she is assigned to do? [ ]

13. Do you believe that program and assignments represent a sound professional planning climate in this agency? [ ]

14. Are our mapping, information, and other resources adequate for the demands of your work? [ ]

15. Do you believe that our budget is reasonably adequate to provide the resources we need to fulfill our work program? [ ]

16. Is your work area adequate in space, arrangement, and equipment? [ ]

17. Is there adequate provision for private consultations in the office? [ ]

18. Does the appearance of the office project an image of competence, efficiency, and pride in the planning profession and in the community? [ ]

19. Were you involved in setting goals for this year’s work program? [ ]

20. Were you involved in developing the work program and determining your work load? [ ]

21. Do you think the agency work load is equitably distributed? [ ]

22. Do you think the agency work load is appropriately prioritized? [ ]

23. Is the support staff large enough to meet the needs of the professional staff? [ ]

24. Is the support staff adequately administered? [ ]

B. Supervisory Behavior

Does your supervisor, for the most part, behave as you think a supervisor should? Indicate your approval of your supervisor's behavior by placing an X in the square beside each item. A blank square means that you disapprove of your supervisor's behavior on that item.

1. Gives clear and complete instructions when making an assignment; tells me how my assignment fits into the agency’s goals and work program [ ]

2. Is available, receptive, and helpful when I have questions, suggestions, problems, or complaints [ ]

3. Checks on my progress and concepts regularly [ ]

4. Is fair and honest in dealing with subordinates and others [ ]

5. Delegates authority adequately [ ]

6. Takes at least part of the responsibility for my mistakes [ ]

7. Represents the agency in a dignified manner and in a favorable light [ ]

8. Doesn't insult my intelligence [ ]

9. Has reasonably neat work habits [ ]

10. Works well with others [ ]

11. Resolves complaints, problems, and conflicts promptly and privately, through proper channels [ ]

12. Refrains from destructive criticism [ ]

13. Refrains from spreading harmful rumors or gossip [ ]

14. Is courteous and helpful to the public, other government employees, and media representatives [ ]

15. Enjoys the work and communicates enthusiasm [ ]

16. Makes me stretch my mind [ ]

17. Makes me work to my full capacity [ ]

18. Does not expect me to be superhuman [ ]

(continued)
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19. Takes an interest in my professional development

20. Encourages and assists me in developing managerial skills so that I can fulfill my present role well or become qualified for advancement

21. Evaluates me on my output: quantity, quality, and promptness

22. Provides new members with adequate orientation

23. Respects the administration, works well with them, and keeps them informed of what we are doing

24. Applies his/her analytical skills to understanding everyday issues and occurrences as well as to the work itself

25. Takes pride in the work of his/her section, team, and the agency

26. Demonstrates a continuing effort to improve his/her technical and management skills

27. Consults me before making decisions that affect my work

28. Handles record keeping and accounting problems competently

29. Encourages innovative thinking and styles

30. Is good at cross-fertilization of ideas

31. Encourages me to participate in setting goals, prescribing my roles, and setting my objectives

32. Keeps me informed of what is going on, to the extent reasonable, so that I don't have to depend on the grapevine

33. Demonstrates skill in strategic dealings with public officials and other interests

C. Bosses, Clients, Roles and Goals

Our effectiveness may be influenced by agreement or disagreement over whom we serve and what our functions are in serving them. To help determine the fit between our beliefs and those of others, please indicate below the importance you ascribe to each item by placing a number in the box beside it:

0 = not important
1 = slightly important
2 = important
3 = very important

1. In my opinion, the following people and groups are the planning staff's bosses:

   a. The chief executive
   b. Council
   c. The general public
   d. The citizen commission
   e. State and federal funding agencies
   f. State and federal regulatory agencies

2. In my opinion, the following people and groups are the planning staff's clients:

   a. The chief executive
   b. Local government agencies
   c. Non-local government agencies
   d. Private service providers
   e. Council
   f. The citizen commission
   g. Individuals and groups in the community who need or request assistance of government to improve their lives
   h. Neighborhood planning councils
   i. Special interests such as taxpayer groups and environmental groups

(continued)
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Bosses, Clients, Roles and Goals, Continued

j. Special interests such as realtors, homebuilders, financial institutions, the Chamber of Commerce

k. Anyone who asks for information or assistance

3. This staff's roles are to:

a. Satisfy the demands of all our bosses (as defined by me above)

b. Satisfy the demands of all our clients (as defined by me above)

c. Balance the goals and values of bosses and clients

d. Educate bosses and clients to the values, goals, objectives, methods and resources of planning

e. Achieve consensus among bosses, clients, and ourselves on values, goals, objectives and roles

f. Take the lead in planning the programs and projects of operating agencies

g. Play a supporting role in planning performed by operating agencies

h. Develop and adhere to a comprehensive multi-year program

i. Give high priority to ad hoc demands on our time by the chief executive, council, other departments and agencies, and interest groups

j. Promote our programs and recommendations in the political arena

k. Bargain openly for our recommendations in the political arena

l. Work behind the scenes to build a power base for our program and recommendations

m. Do high quality technical work and leave bargaining, compromising, and politicking to the citizen commission

(continued)
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Bosses, Clients, Roles and Goals, Continued

4. The roles of the citizen commission are to:

a. Interpret public opinion to the staff

b. Provide a forum for public opinion and hearings on agency proposals

c. Fulfill statutory requirements

d. Develop and direct a program for the staff

e. Promote the plans and proposals of the agency in the political arena

f. Serve as a buffer between the staff and contending political factions

g. Develop plans and recommendations which balance conflicting values in the community

h. Prevent polarization on conflicting issues

i. Exert its influence in relationships with state and federal government

j. Exert its influence in relationships with private agencies

k. Protect and foster the independent professional judgment of the staff

l. Provide continuity of policy during changing administrations

m. Bring major development problems to the attention of council

n. Keep plans practical

o. Intercede with key decision influencers who cannot be reached by staff

5. I agree with this agency's goals as summarized below, from state planning enabling legislation:

a. Contribute to the protection of the public health, safety, welfare, convenience, order, economy, and prosperity

(continued)
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Bosses, Clients, Roles and Goals, Continued

b. Facilitate the community's economic development.

c. Protect business and industrial areas from blight and/or devaluation.

d. Protect the natural environment in the process of development.

e. Protect development from hazards in the natural environment.

f. Optimize existing public and private investments in the process of new development.

g. Increase the range and variety of community amenities such as schools, parks, public open space, cultural activities, etc., and access to them for all residents.

h. Protect existing residential neighborhoods from blight and/or devaluation.

i. Facilitate the provision of new housing in all appropriate locations and price ranges.

j. Facilitate the conservation of the existing housing stock.

k. Improve and maintain the appearance of the community.

l. Influence an energy-efficient urban form.

m. Influence the cost-effectiveness of public services.

n. Preserve the character of rural areas.

o. Protect non-urban development.

p. Prevent overcrowding and scatteration.

q. Plan for adequate provision of public utilities and other public requirements.

r. Protect the historical heritage.

(continued)
D. Planning Agency Effectiveness

How do you define effective planning? Is this agency's program effective in terms of your definition? Please indicate below the value you place on various activities and outcomes of planning by putting the appropriate number in the box beside each item:

0 = not important
1 = slightly important
2 = important
3 = very important

1. My definition of planning effectiveness includes:
   a. Citizen commission adopts/recommends all or most of our reports and proposals to council .... [ ]
   b. Council adopts all or most of our recommendations .... [ ]
   c. Council implements all or most of our recommendations .... [ ]
   d. The chief executive frequently requests information, advice, or special studies in our areas of competence .... [ ]
   e. The chief executive usually acts favorably on our advice .... [ ]
   f. The public frequently seeks information and advice from us .... [ ]
   g. More often than not, the public acts favorably on our advice .... [ ]
   h. Other departments and public and private agencies seek information and advice from us .... [ ]
   i. Departments and private agencies usually act favorably on our advice .... [ ]
   j. Large amounts of federal/state funds have come to the community partly as a result of our program .... [ ]
   k. Visible or measurable improvement in the community results from implementation of our recommendations .... [ ]
   l. Taxpayer and environmental groups support our proposals in council meetings .... [ ]
   m. Diverse and conflicting interests support our proposals in council meetings .... [ ]

(continued)
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n. If council sought citizen input to the prescription of our goals, objectives, and roles ........ [ ]

o. If we were more careful to ensure that our tasks were designed to realize our goals and objectives ........ [ ]

p. If we were more careful to undertake a program which we can realistically hope to fulfill in the available time and with the available resources ........ [ ]

q. If we found resources to undertake a broader program ........ [ ]

r. If we found resources to undertake studies in greater depth ........ [ ]

APPENDIX G

AGENCY EVALUATION BY PUBLICS AND CLIENTS

-- INTERVIEW SCOPE

1. Opinions of agency mission, goals, roles (see Appendix F)

2. Awareness of agency products, programs, resources, and activities (see Appendix A)

3. Perceptions of effectiveness of agency (see Appendix F)

4. Opinions of agency's public relations program

5. Perceptions of agency's understanding of the private market

6. Perceptions of agency's contribution to the community's economic development

Sample Questions

a. How do you define community economic development?

b. Do you believe the community should have quality goals as well as quantity goals?

c. Do you believe that the planning agency has a role to play in the economic development of the community?

d. If so, what do you think that role should be?

e. Do you believe that the planning agency is carrying out that role, fully or in part? What else should it do?

f. Do you believe that the planning agency places legal impediments in the way of community economic development as you have defined it in terms of quality and/or quantity goals?

g. Do you believe that unregulated and unguided development is better for the community's economy than regulated and guided development? Please list all the pros and cons you can think of.

h. Should the planning agency have a role in industry recruitment?

(continued)
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i. Is it carrying out that role, fully or in part? What else should it do?

j. Should the planning agency provide guidance to new or expanding businesses and industries in location, design, and other environmental considerations?

k. Do you believe that economic opportunities should be built into neighborhood plans? Do you feel this is being done?

l. Do you believe the planning agency should contribute economic considerations to the health services, educational services, and social services planning processes? Is the planning agency doing this? If not, what are the reasons?

m. What are the factors in housing costs, expressed in percentages? What absolute and percentage contributions does planning make to the increase and/or reduction of any of these cost factors?

n. Should the planning agency weigh the costs of public service provision to new developments against the economic and social benefits of specific new developments?

o. Should the environmental costs of new developments be weighed against the net benefits, economic and social, of specific new developments?

p. Do you believe that community amenities, including appearance, historic preservation, recreation, education, cultural resources, a strong central business district, a strong transit system, an easily accessible rural open area, etc., aid in recruitment of quality industries and businesses?

q. In your opinion, has the planning agency made a contribution to the community in the above respects?

r. What should be the contribution of regional planning to local economies?

s. What should be the contributions of educational institutions to the local economy?

7. Perceptions of the agency's involvement in important issues

8. Perceptions of the agency as a mediator in important issues

9. Causes of any perceptions of insufficient effectiveness

Sample Questions

a. Should more time be spent on maintenance tasks such as public relations, record-keeping, fence-mending, etc.?

b. Is the agency performing its maintenance tasks effectively?

c. Has the agency defined its roles appropriately?

d. Has the agency defined its goals appropriately?

e. Are the agency's objectives appropriate to meet its goals?

f. Is the agency's location in the local governmental structure an advantage or a disadvantage on balance?

g. Is the existence of the citizen commission an advantage or a handicap, on balance?

h. Are effects of the agency's program negative, not visible, or visible and favorable? What is your opinion of the following:

1) strip commercial zoning and strip development

2) redevelopment projects (specifically)

3) neighborhood conservation projects (specifically)

4) design projects; landscaping, plantings, etc.

5) new and improved highways

6) design of subdivisions

7) general appearance of the community

8) general quality of life in the community

9) level of public services

10) appearance of public buildings and grounds

11) traffic congestion

12) slum clearance

13) other (specifically)

i. What do you think has been the planning agency's contribution to each of the above?
APPENDIX H

AGENCY EVALUATION BY CHIEF EXECUTIVE, COUNCIL, DEPARTMENT HEADS, CHAIRMEN OF SELECTED BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS, AND SELECTED LOCAL REPRESENTATIVES OF REGIONAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

-- INTERVIEW SCOPE

1. Prescriptions of agency mission, goals, roles and activities in total government context (see Appendix F)
2. Awareness of agency programs, products, activities, and resources (see Appendix A)
3. Perceptions of effectiveness of agency, individual staff members, in terms of mission, goals, and roles
4. Perceptions of quality and effectiveness of agency products (see Appendix D)
5. Usefulness of staff products for decision-making
6. Information shared between planning agency and other government departments
7. Assistance in formulating decisions and recommendations
8. Opinions on interaction with governing bodies, chief executive, operating departments; responsiveness to requests
9. Perceptions of efficiency of agency
10. Perceptions of causes and correctability of any ineffectiveness or inefficiency
    a. Locus in government organization
    b. Scope of authority and responsibility
    c. Integration of related responsibilities
    (continued)
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11. Opinions of roles of director, citizen commission, and chairman
12. Suggestions for change: organizing and managing for achievement of mission, goals, and objectives
    a. Agency
        1) Scope of authority, responsibility
        2) T.O., staffing
        3) Roles, titles
        4) Administration
        5) Location in local government structure
    b. Board
        1) Scope of authority, responsibility
        2) Size, composition
        3) Operations
APPENDIX I

CITIZEN COMMISSION SELF-EVALUATION

-- INTERVIEW SCOPE

1. Opinions of community and agency goals and objectives
2. Opinions of agency, section, and individual roles
3. Perceptions of effectiveness of agency, sections, and individual staff members in terms of agency mission, goals, objectives, and roles
4. Awareness of agency resources, products, and activities
5. Perceptions of quality and effectiveness of agency products and activities
6. Projections of long-range effectiveness of agency program
7. Perceptions of efficiency of agency, sections, and individuals
8. Perceptions of ratio of input to output
9. Perceptions of causes of any ineffectiveness or inefficiency
   a. Locus in government organization
   b. Scope of authority and responsibility
10. Perceptions of correctibility of causes of any ineffectiveness or inefficiency
11. Estimates of influence of the citizen commission and its chairman
    a. Recommendations accepted by governing bodies
    b. Requests for services channeled or encouraged
    c. Successful missions to mold opinions, policies of decision-makers
    d. Committee memberships
    e. Fruitful citizen participation
(continued)

12. Estimates of impact of the citizen commission and its chairman:
changes in outside world as result of planning
   a. Improved appearance of community (subdivisions, public buildings, parks, private developments, redevelopment, conservation)
   b. Improved level of services (transportation, sewerage, recreation, other)
   c. Wise allocation of resources
   d. Comments received on public's attitude toward planning
   e. Does agency receive credit when due?
   f. Are the public and private sectors coordinated in community growth and improvement?
   g. Is community more convenient, efficient, prosperous as a result of planning?
   h. Have property values been protected?
   i. Has public safety been enhanced?
   j. Has money been saved in the public or private sectors?
   k. Have increased costs in the public or private sectors paid off in better living conditions?
   l. Has the board acted as a change agent?
13. Suggestions for change: organizing and managing for achievement of goals, objectives
   a. Agency
      1) Location in local government structure
      2) T.O.; roles, positions, titles, etc.
      3) Goals/objectives; program development
      4) Performance, etc.
      5) Administration
   b. Citizen commission
      1) Roles
(continued)
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a) Occupational viewpoints
b) Citizen/taxpayer viewpoints
c) Maximizing achievements
d) Minimizing public conflict
e) Working with special interest groups
f) Working with the public in general
g) Working around and through the political processes

2) Composition and characteristics

3) Operations, procedures, and scope of responsibility and authority

a) Membership involved in identifying needs of governing bodies, setting priorities and deadlines
b) Membership input in preparation of agency program budget
c) Membership cooperation with chief executive and council in preparation of program budget
d) Site plan review
e) Community impact review
f) Ordinance updating
g) Rezoning petitions
h) Subdivision regulations
i) Development guidance
j) Citizen participation
k) Neighborhood planning
l) Public sites and facilities
m) Broadening scope

n) Quality, timeliness and volume of output and activities:
   Program budget products reviewed and recommendations made promptly on completion of staff work
   (continued)
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Outside requests channeled and monitored to completion as needed
Number of projects discussed in meetings
Number of projects recommended to governing bodies

o) Procedures for all of above

4) Other interactions

a) With staff
b) With council
c) With the chief executive
d) With the community

c. Roles of the chairman

1) In relation to staff
2) In relation to the chief executive
3) In relation to council
4) In relation to special publics and the general public
5) In relation to the citizen commission
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