

The General Public Management Of Organizations

Posted on October 9, 2018

Public organizations should be educated about their failures and successes, but perhaps they should also learn from the failures and successes of other public organizations (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). Public organizations should find information that is available by sharing experiences, participating in conferences, and linking with networks that are Internet-based, like the Public's Measurement Performance and Reporting Network, which is a crucial information-sharing tool. This paper describes the general public management of organizations.

Provide an example of how New Public Management (NPM) has worked in your geographical area or public sector organization with which you are familiar.

New public management helps to learn and improve on what is working and what is not working and helps make suitable modifications towards improving an organization. An example of this is Baltimore's CitiStat City program in learning and improving the operations of the organization (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005).

The program was established by the previous Baltimore mayor, Martin O'Malley, who served from 1999 to 2007, and in 2006, he became an elected governor of Maryland. CitiStat is a measurement of a performance-based system of management that uses computer pin mapping. It evolved from the city of New York's program of Compstat, which was commonly used to pinpoint hotspots of crime. This CitiStat keenly worked on the model of CompStat by including all government areas (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). Communication and cooperation made it possible for CitiStat to work. Bureau heads and city agencies made it possible to come up with strategies, help set goals and assist in collecting performance data that go in hand with the goals and strategies, and they present this data after every 2-week meeting of CitiStat. Here, the mayor, deputy mayor, and other crucial officials are always present (Noordegraaf, 2015).

An example of this is the Solid Waste Bureau of Baltimore, which might present data performance that ranges from the number of sick offs taken to the amount of paid overtime in two weeks' time (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). Using this information, both the head of the Solid Waste Bureau and the Mayor can come up with a plan to ensure that the missed pickups of trash take place less frequently or cleaning up in the dirty alleys. CitiStat is a powerful accountability and management tool, giving the

mayor a chance to perceive how different functions of the government's city are performing.

Program evaluation is an important component of New Public Management. Define program evaluation.

To evaluate is to establish the worth of or fix a value on some objects. Program evaluation is known to be a social science action aimed at collecting, analysing, interpreting, and communicating information about the effectiveness and workings of social programs (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). It is done for a number of reasons, which include aiding decisions regarding whether a program should be continued, expanded, curtailed or improved (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). Program evaluation also assesses the value of new initiatives and programs. It also gives room to increase the effectiveness of program administration and management, and also program evaluation satisfies the accountability desires of sponsors of the program.

Provide an example of program evaluation in a public sector organization.

An example of a public sector organization's program evaluation is the CIPA (Citizen-Initiated Performance Assessment) project of Iowa. This was a project that lasted three years and was funded by the Foundation of Alfred P. Sloan in 2001. This program engaged departmental staff, citizens, and members of the city council in the development and usage of performance measures to evaluate public services (Noordegraaf, 2015).

This CIPA Iowa project is different from the measurement of traditional performance in the following major aspects. Firstly, it lays emphasis on collaboration amongst citizens, managers, and elected officials so as to develop measures that certify the receptivity of those measures and politics. It also highlights the perspective of citizens during performance measurement instead of managerial perspectives that always stress input and efficiency of cost (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). Thirdly, it underlines public distribution of measurements performance results in holding the government accountable.

During the CIPA project's first year, every city that participated formed a performance team of citizens where people from various backgrounds made up the team's majority. In the second stage, the sections of the city developed necessary equipment like user surveys to help in collecting performance data (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). Consequently, the population would assist in collecting performance data, reporting the progress of the project to the city council, and coming up with tactics that would be better for engaging the public in the mission. Finally, the results of the performance extent are reported to the performance group, the council of the city and the overall public. The input

from the public is beseeched to improve the performance (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). Departments of the city then incorporate the outcomes in a strategic plan, budgeting, which is performance-based and service operator's management, which is activity-based.

This CIPA project is presently in its second phase. Apart from it being immature to draw conclusions about the project's long-term impacts, quite a lot of lessons have been learnt, which include helping the officials to focus on citizen concerns and outcome measures (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). This will help enhance public accountability and orientation of services to the public result. It also helps to show the benefit of public communications (Noordegraaf, 2015). For instance, departments should not overlook notifying the public about the advancement of actions of the department after filing a service wish. Subsequently, managers ought to make measurements of comparative performance since the people have an interest in knowing how good their city achieves compared to others in neighbouring areas (Ferlie & Pollitt, 2005). In order to enhance citizens' relevance, measures of performance are to be reported at the level of the nearby region.

Lastly, capital should reflect on using technology like the internet to carry out this with effective costs (Noordegraaf, 2015). A number of cities have been gathering performance data for a long time. CIPA changes the perspective of elected officials and managers simply by engaging citizens to help influence the public's basis of evaluating government services.

References

Ferlie, E. (1996). *The new public management in action*. Oxford [u.a.: Oxford Univ. Press.

Ferlie, E., Lynn, L. E., & Pollitt, C. (2005). *The Oxford handbook of public management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Noordegraaf, M. (2015). *Public Management*. Palgrave Macmillan.