

## Leading with Information Literature Survey

It's not how many worms the bird feeds its young, but how well the fledgling flies.  
(United Way of America, 2002)

Campus Crusade for Christ is engaging in a significant initiative in what we call *leading with information*. Lwi is an intentional decision to add objective, outcome-based measures to our use of anecdotal, life stories in measuring effectiveness in accomplishing our mission.

I've been reading a number of papers and articles this weekend. Here are some things I'm learning. These are my main take-aways from these documents.

***Putting the Balanced Scorecard to Work*** (Kaplan and Norton; Harvard Business Review, 1993; Reprint #93505)

- There are four areas in the balanced scorecard:
  - Financial
  - Customer
  - Internal processes
  - Innovation and Learning
- According to this paper, the balanced scorecard is:
  - A top-down reflection of the organization's mission and strategy
  - Is forward-looking, focusing on current and future success rather than historical activity
  - Focuses on those measures that are most critical to the success of the organization's strategy
- The balanced scorecard is most successful when it is used to drive the process of change.
- The scorecard is not just a measurement system; it is a management system to motivate breakthrough competitive performance.
- It should be the core of the management system, not the measurement system.

***The Performance Prism in Practice*** (Neely, Adams and Crowe; Measuring Business Excellence; 2001)

- Although the balanced scorecard was undeniably pioneering when it first appeared nearly a decade ago, particularly because it addressed the need for a balance between financial and non-financial measures, the world has moved on and priorities are changing in the so-called "new economy". A 2nd generation tool is needed.
- 5 facets of the prism
  - Stakeholder satisfaction: Who are the stakeholders and what do they want and need?

- Strategies: What are the strategies we require to ensure the wants and needs of our stakeholders are satisfied?
- Processes: What are the processes we have to put in place in order to allow our strategies to be delivered?
- Capabilities: What are the capabilities we require to operate our processes?
- Stakeholder contribution: How do we involve stakeholders in contributing to the organization?

***Coming Up Short on Nonfinancial Performance Measurement*** (Ittner and Larcker; Harvard Business Review, 2003; Reprint #R0311F)

- Few companies realize the benefits of nonfinancial performance measures because they fail to identify, analyze, and act on the right nonfinancial measures.
- Nearly half of all balanced scorecard users said they had difficulty quantifying qualitative results.
- Develop a causal model of the strategic plan. Many companies' strategic plans are more like mission or vision statements than road maps.

***The 7 Deadly Sins of Performance Measurement and How to Avoid Them*** (Hammer; MIT Sloan Management Review, 2007; Reprint #48302)

- Emphasize end-to-end business processes, the cross-organizational sequences of activities that create all customer value.
- Determine the drivers of enterprise results in terms of these end-to-end processes.
- Choose *outcome* metrics: desirable goals, but cannot be achieved directly. Determine the *drivers* of these outcomes.
- Every metric must have one or more individuals who are personally responsible and accountable for it.

***Using Imperfect Metrics Well: Tracking Progress and Driving Change*** (Talley and Fram; Leader to Leader, 2010)

- *Imperfect* measurements are metrics that are anecdotal, subjective, interpretive, or qualitative.
- Focus on outcomes, not organizational efforts.
- There is usually a tension between what we *should* measure, and what we *can* measure.
- Without some way of measuring impact, nonprofits can easily degenerate into monitoring staff activities, mistaking efforts for outcomes. This danger is much greater than the danger of using imperfect metrics.

**Measuring what Matters in Nonprofits** (Sawhill and Williamson; The McKinsey Quarterly, 2001)

- Three kinds of performance measures
  - Measure success in mobilizing resources
  - Measure staff effectiveness on the job
  - Measure progress in fulfilling its mission
- Nonprofits can measure their success in achieving their mission in one of three ways:
  - Defining the mission to make it quantifiable
  - Investing in research to show that specific methods work
  - Developing concrete microlevel goals that imply success on a larger scale.

**Outcome Measurement: What and Why?** (United Way of America powerpoint, 2002)

- Four categories of measures
  - Inputs: Resources dedicated to or consumed by the program
  - Activities: What the program does with inputs to fulfill its mission
  - Outputs: The direct products of program activities
  - Outcomes: The differences the organization makes
- Outcome: Not how many worms the bird feeds its young, but how well the fledgling flies

**The NISO Model: Communication Impact with Donors** (Triaxia Partners and Maclellan Foundation, 2010)

[In a previous post](#), I outlined Campus Crusade for Christ's 7 basic ministry measures.

Reading these papers have sparked several questions in my mind:

- Have CCC's traditional measures helped us accomplish the Great Commission? In what ways?
- Have CCC's traditional measures motivated breakthrough improvements in critical areas? In what ways?
- Who is CCC's *customer*?
- Have CCC's traditional measures tended to produce short-term performance in terms of exposures to the gospel and indicated decisions for Christ?
- Who are the *stakeholders* in CCC and what do they need and want?
- Do senior, experienced staff have a greater impact?
- Do CCC's traditional 7 ministry measurements measure *process performance* or only *personal performance*?
- Can CCC create a *process flow chart* of how to create a multiplying disciple? How to build a ministry? How to build a movement? Can we identify *trigger points* in the process flow?