

APPENDIX: DETAILED EXPLANATION OF EVALUATION AND SCORING

THE PURPOSE OF this assessment is not to evaluate or make judgments about the quality of actual results the agencies produced. Rather, our goal is simply to ascertain *how well the agencies' reports disclose to the public* the outcomes the agencies produce so that policy makers and citizens may make informed judgments about the agencies' results. We review the reports solely from this perspective and not as accountants, government insiders, or experts on the functions of particular agencies.

TARGET AUDIENCE: THE GENERAL PUBLIC

A PERFORMANCE REPORT necessarily addresses different audiences. Some are “stakeholders” with expertise in the agency’s work, who seek an extensive level of understanding about the agency’s performance and may be willing to plow through a lengthy, detailed, and technical report to get it. Others may be government insiders who know how to ferret out information that may be tucked away in congressional budget justifications or other esoteric documents.

From our perspective, though, the most important stakeholders are the ordinary citizens who pay the bills and deserve to know what the agency accomplished. A report will not do well in our evaluation if it does not do a good job of informing the average citizen, even if it is informative for experts, insiders, or others who have more specialized knowledge. Of course, we do not expect tens of millions of fellow citizens to rush to agency Web pages to read these reports. Journalists, bloggers, and other writers can also play an important role in making agency results more widely accessible to the public. But like the general public, these readers are not agency insiders. The information should be accessible and understandable for those who wish to examine it.

Reports that score high on our evaluation effectively communicate important performance results in a way that lay readers—ordinary citizens and taxpayers—can understand. This key trait is relevant to most categories in our Scorecard, and the best reports tend to score well across the board. Reports that consistently score low do little to inform ordinary members of the public about important outcomes. Reports ranking in the middle may serve some audiences well but could do a better job of demonstrating the agency’s value to ordinary citizens.

Specifically, in order to rank highly in this Scorecard, a report must do the following:

- use clear, concise presentation formats and language throughout that a lay person can follow and understand
- present a set of performance metrics that capture important public outcomes that a lay reader can relate to and appreciate
- reinforce these performance metrics with clear narratives illustrating public benefits that flow from the agency’s work
- enable the lay reader to readily grasp and assess progress toward outcomes
- match outcomes with costs, so decision makers and stakeholders can assess tradeoffs
- provide confidence that the agency has adopted challenging measures, forthrightly acknowledge performance shortfalls, and take steps to correct them
- provide confidence that the agency serves as a good steward of taxpayer resources by taking effective steps to resolve major management challenges

Our research team used 12 evaluation factors grouped under three general categories of transparency, public benefits, and leadership:

1. Does the agency disclose its accomplishments in a *transparent* (easily understood) fashion?
2. Does the report focus on disclosing the tangible *public benefits* (valued results) the agency produced?
3. Does the report show evidence of forward-looking leadership (guidance) that uses performance information to devise strategies for improvement?

TRANSPARENCY

REPORTS SHOULD BE accessible, readable, and useable by a wide variety of audiences, including Congress, the administration, the public, news media, and other stakeholders. If a report fails to disclose significant achievements and problems to stakeholders, benefits or failures arising from agency activities will remain secret to all but a few insiders, and citizens will have no real opportunity to indicate their approval or disapproval.

PUBLIC BENEFITS

AN AGENCY'S VALUE to the public becomes clear only when its goals and measures are expressed in terms of the benefit produced or harm avoided for a particular set of clients or the public at large. To demonstrate openly how agency activities produce meaningful results for the community, reports should focus on "outcomes" (i.e., tangible benefits that matter in the lives of citizens) rather than on programs or activities as such. The reports should also clearly present the costs of achieving those results. These costs include both the agency's expenditures and other costs borne by the public at large. For regulatory agencies, much of this information should come from rigorous retrospective analysis of the actual effects of regulation, analogous to the information they are supposed to produce when conducting a Regulatory Impact Analysis prior to issuing a regulation. The ultimate objective of such reporting is to match outcomes with costs so that policy makers and the public understand what citizens are paying to achieve various outcomes. Goals and measures that merely document agency activities, such as counts of checks processed or number of people enrolled in a program, assume that such activities automatically provide public benefits. Such an assumption can be incorrect for a wide variety of reasons. An agency report must highlight achievement of results; otherwise, it will not inform the public of the success or failure of its programs. Budget decisions that rely on flawed information will fail to reflect realistic assessments of what agencies can accomplish with appropriations.

FORWARD-LOOKING LEADERSHIP

AGENCIES SHOULD USE the performance information produced by their organizations to identify solutions to problems and to change future plans accordingly. The report should inspire confidence in an agency's ability to enhance citizens' quality of life commensurate with the resources they have entrusted to the agency. Among the factors that give such confidence is tangible evidence that the agency is using performance and financial data to improve management of its programs.

EVALUATING REPORTS UNDER THE PILOT FORMAT

AGAIN IN FISCAL year 2008, OMB allowed agencies to use an alternative reporting format under a pilot program. Instead of producing a performance and accountability report that combines performance and financial information, agencies had the option of publishing detailed performance information along with their congressional budget justifications, producing a separate financial report, and producing a shorter “citizens’ report” intended to summarize both the performance and financial results. Nine agencies opted for the pilot approach. Agencies producing traditional performance and accountability reports were also urged to produce a summary citizens’ report; 11 did so.

The research team evaluated the pilot reports for fiscal year 2008 the same way it evaluated them for fiscal year 2007. We started with the premise that our evaluation is intended to gauge the usefulness of these reports to the general public. The pilot format does not in any way absolve agencies of the responsibility to produce meaningful information for the public.

For agencies participating in the pilot program, the citizens’ report is the primary document available and accessible to the public that explains performance and financial information. We recognized, however, that the citizens’ report might not contain as much detailed information as a traditional performance and accountability report. Therefore, for pilot agencies, we included information from other documents if the citizens’ report clearly indicated where and how the reader could find this information and presented it in an accessible and understandable form.

We treated the citizens’ report differently for agencies that produced traditional performance and accountability reports. For those agencies, the performance and accountability report should still be the primary means of communication with the public. After evaluating this report, we then examined the agency’s citizens’ report to see if anything in that document merited a higher score. The principal way a citizens’ report might supplement a traditional performance and accountability report would be by improving readability. In fact, several agencies did receive extra points on our readability criterion due to the quality of their citizens’ reports.

WHAT DID THE AGENCIES KNOW, AND WHEN DID THEY KNOW IT?

AS IN PAST years, the Mercatus Center notified federal agencies of the deadlines we would follow in evaluating the reports and the evaluation criteria we would employ.

For fiscal year 2008, the Office of Management and Budget required agencies (except those participating in the pilot for alternative performance reporting) to submit their reports to the president and Congress by November 17—approximately six weeks after the fiscal year ended. OMB required those agencies participating in the pilot program to release their citizens’ report (the primary document the Mercatus research team evaluated for agencies opting into the pilot) by January 15, 2009.²⁸

In early October, the Mercatus Center notified each agency’s chief financial officer via letter (and other individuals listed as agency contacts by e-mail) that the Mercatus research team would regard a report as timely

28. See OMB Circular A-11, part 6, section 200, for these deadlines.

if it was posted on the Web by December 1 (for PAR agencies) or January 19 (for pilot agencies).

The October letter included an explanation of our evaluation process and criteria. It also referred agencies to a May 22, 2007 memo, detailing what the Mercatus research team would be looking for when reviewing citizens' reports. Finally, the letter invited agency personnel to contact Mercatus Center staff with questions or comments about the criteria and the project, and many did so. Thus, agencies had ample notice about the criteria and deadlines.

SCORING STANDARDS

EACH REPORT HAD the opportunity to earn up to 20 points in each of the three categories, for a maximum score of 60 points. Each category included four equally weighted evaluation factors, and scores of 1 through 5 (from poor to excellent) were awarded on each evaluation factor. Thus, an agency could achieve a minimum score of 12 merely by producing a report.

THE 5-POINT SCALE

THE 5-POINT rating scale for individual factors is intended to identify distinct levels of quality. The research team used the accompanying table to guide its scoring. A report that adequately meets all requirements would receive the middle score of 3 on each factor, resulting in a total score of 36. A 2 indicates that the report accomplishes some but not all of the objectives under a given criterion. A 1 indicates failure to provide much relevant information. A 4 indicates unusually good practices that are better than most, and a 5 indicates an especially superior presentation.

Even when a report receives a 5 on a particular criterion, that does not mean there is no room for improvement. A 5 indicates a potential best practice, but best practices should not be confused with perfection. We expect agency reporting practices to improve continually over time, and one of the goals of this Scorecard is to aid in the diffusion of best prac-

WHAT DO THE SCORES MEAN?

5—OUTSTANDING

- Greatly exceeds expectations
- Opens a new field of information
- Sets a standard for a best practice

4—VERY GOOD

- Exceeds expectations
- Has the potential to become a best practice
- Shows innovation and creativity
- Better than most

3—SATISFACTORY

- Meets expectations in all aspects
- Adequate, but does not exceed expectations

2—UNSATISFACTORY

- Fails to meet expectations
- May be adequate in some respects, but not all
- Produces partial information
- Does not fully disclose

1—INADEQUATE

- Fails to meet expectations
- Does not meet standards for adequate disclosure
- Shows no process or plans to overcome problems
- Omits critical information

tices across agencies. Therefore, a practice that earned a 5 this year may only deserve a 4 or 3 in future years as it becomes standard for most agencies and new best practices emerge.

WEIGHTING THE EVALUATION FACTORS

TO REPORT THE results of this study as transparently as possible, the researchers weighted the evaluation factors equally in calculating each agency's total score and rankings. Since the summary table reports scores for all three evaluation categories separately (transparency, public benefits, and forward-looking leadership), readers who believe that one factor is more important than another can apply whatever weights they wish to the separate scores and recalculate rankings accordingly.

In addition, in the interest of transparency, all reports were evaluated against a common scale even though different agency missions may make it inherently more difficult to develop results-oriented goals and measures or collect appropriate data. For example, agencies that provide directly measurable services, such as the General Services Administration and the Department of Veterans Affairs, might find it easier to identify and quantify their contributions than an agency like the State Department or the National Science Foundation, whose results are less tangible. In reality, some agencies that seem to provide few services directly to members of the public have often produced highly ranked reports, and some that arguably have a more direct effect on citizens' well-being have produced poorly ranked reports.

INTERPRETING OUR FINDINGS

IT IS IMPORTANT to emphasize that our research team evaluated only *the quality of reporting, not the quality of results*. Therefore, it would be a mistake to conclude that the agencies with the highest-scoring reports necessarily produced the most or best results for the country. In fact, an agency can score well if it is performing poorly but reporting transparently. A high-scoring report reflects an agency's ability to explain its results in understandable and meaningful terms Americans can appreciate.

Similarly, it would also be inappropriate to draw policy conclusions from our analysis. We offer no recommendations on whether the federal government should or should not be engaged in its current menu of activities.

So what do the findings in this study really mean? By assessing the quality of agency reports, we are trying to evaluate whether the agencies are supplying the cost and performance information that the public needs to understand the agencies' work.

An additional word on information quality is also in order. Our researchers assessed the quality of each report's disclosure of data verification and validation procedures. However, in the interest of producing a timely study, we did not independently verify the performance information cited in each agency's report. The reports themselves should inspire confidence by indicating how data are verified and validated.

OUR CONSISTENCY CHECK

THE MERCATUS RESEARCH team employed the same criteria to assess the fiscal 2008 agency reports that we used to evaluate prior-year reports. However, generally in each succeeding year, we have tightened our evaluation standards for two reasons. One, the highest possible quality that can be achieved is unlimited because creative innovators can always find ways to improve reporting practices and set new standards. Two, each

year gives agencies an opportunity to learn from each other's best practices. If we did not continually raise our expectations, most reports could eventually receive mostly 5s. This Scorecard would then convey little information about the quality of different agencies' reports, and it would give little recognition or credit to those agencies that continue to raise the bar for quality reporting.

For these reasons, an agency had to improve the absolute quality of its fiscal year 2008 report in order to receive the same numeric score it received for its fiscal year 2007 report. That said, there were few new best practices in fiscal year 2008, so the standards did not change a great deal. Nevertheless, if an agency receives a higher score, that score is a reliable indicator that the quality of its report has indeed improved.

Several factors help ensure that the scoring criteria are applied consistently from year to year. Two members of the Mercatus Center research team that evaluated the reports—Henry Wray and Valerie Richardson—have done so for the past six years. Patricia Kelley, who joined the research team in fiscal year 2007, has been on the advisory panel to the Scorecard project since 2002. Next, the team cross-checked the 2008 evaluations against the previous year's in several ways. For each report, the research team generated an extensive set of notes documenting the reasons for each preliminary score on each criterion. The head of the research team then reviewed this documentation for both the fiscal year 2008 and fiscal year 2007 reports to ensure that any scoring differences across years were justified by differences in the actual content of the reports. The team then discussed instances in which proposed scores differed substantially from the previous year's scores.

Finally, for each report, a member of our outside advisory panel with extensive experience in performance reporting reviewed the report, scoring, and documentation. Some scores were modified when the advisor reached different conclusions from the research team and offered persuasive reasons for the difference. Final scores thus reflect a careful review to ensure that the results of the scoring process are consistent with the goal of raising standards.

RESEARCH TEAM AND PROJECT DESIGN

THE SCORECARD PROJECT is headed by the Honorable Maurice McTigue, QSO, director of the Government Accountability Project and a distinguished visiting scholar at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, and Dr. Jerry Ellig, a senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center.

Dr. Tyler Cowen, the Mercatus Center's general director, served as advisory director for the study. A three-member professional research team with extensive government experience completed all report review and analysis. An 11-member advisory panel made up of experts in public management, former federal performance managers, corporate strategists, and communications experts reviewed our evaluations and analysis.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Heather Hambleton

*Program Associate, Government Accountability Project
Mercatus Center at George Mason University*

RESEARCH TEAM

Patricia Kelley

*Hodges University
Naples, Florida*

AFTER SERVING ON our advisory panel since 2002, Dr. Patricia Kelley joined the research team for the 9th Annual Performance Report Scorecard. She has extensive strategic planning, program evaluation, and operational management experience. In 2000 she co-founded a private consulting firm, Denali Associates, which provided a full range of management and IT consulting services to over 30 federal agencies, including support for the implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act and the Clinger Cohen Act. Prior to establishing Denali Associates, Dr. Kelley held senior management positions with the Federal Reserve Board, advising the governors on policy issues regarding efficiency and effectiveness of the board's operations. She also held various positions with the U.S. Government Accountability Office and evaluated the effectiveness of programs in the departments of Defense, Treasury, Agriculture, the Government Printing Office, and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

She recently co-authored the book *The Business of Government: Strategy, Implementation, and Results* with Dr. Thomas Kessler and currently serves on the faculty of Hodges University teaching graduate course in public administration.

Dr. Kelley has a doctorate in public administration from the University of Baltimore, an MA in computer systems management from the University of Maryland University College, and a BS in accounting from the University of Maryland at College Park. She is also a graduate of the Stonier School of Banking.

Valerie J. Richardson

*TreWyn, Inc.
Germantown, Maryland*

VALERIE RICHARDSON IS president and chief executive officer of TreWyn, a financial and strategic management practice based in Germantown, Maryland.

Formerly, she was associate director of the Center for Improving Government Performance at the National Academy of Public Administration. Ms. Richardson has been a practitioner of public-sector performance management for well over a decade; she managed the Results Act of 1993 pilot and implementation efforts at the Patent and Trademark Office.

Ms. Richardson is widely published in public administration and accounting journals and proceedings and is the author of the book *Annual Performance Planning—A Manual for Public Agencies*. She was awarded the Best Paper Award—Highest Quality Rating at the Co-operation & Competition Conference in Vaxjö, Sweden, in 2002 and is a contributing chapter author to the book *Co-Operation & Competition “Co-opetition”—The Organization of the Future*.

She is a graduate of the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University’s Senior Executive Fellows Program. Ms. Richardson holds an MA in financial management from the University of Maryland and undergraduate degrees from Trenton State College in public administration and political science. She is currently pursuing her doctorate in public administration from the University of Baltimore.

Christina Forsberg

*Mercatus Graduate Fellow
George Mason University
Arlington, Virginia*

CHRISTINA FORSBERG IS a graduate student fellow at the Mercatus Center working with the Government Accountability Project and the Regulatory Studies Program. She is working toward her master’s degree in economics at George Mason University.

Stefanie Haeffele-Balch

*Mercatus Graduate Fellow
George Mason University
Arlington, Virginia*

STEFANIE HAEFFELE-BALCH IS a graduate student fellow at the Mercatus Center working with the Government Accountability Project and the Regulatory Studies Program. She is working toward her master’s degree in economics at George Mason University.

ADVISORY PANEL

Jonathan D. Breul

*IBM Global Business Services
Washington, DC*

JONATHAN D. BREUL is executive director of IBM's Center for the Business of Government and a partner in IBM Global Business Services. He is a widely recognized expert on the policy and practice of improving government management and performance.

Formerly senior advisor to the deputy director for management in the White House Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Breul was OMB's senior career executive with primary responsibility for government-wide general management policies. He helped develop the President's Management Agenda, was instrumental in establishing the President's Management Council, and championed efforts to integrate performance information with the budget process. He led the overall implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act. In addition to his OMB activities, he helped Senator John Glenn (D-Ohio) launch the Chief Financial Officers Act. Mr. Breul also served as the U.S. delegate and vice chair of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Public Management Committee.

Mr. Breul is a fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration and an adjunct professor at Georgetown University's Public Policy Institute. He holds an MPA from Northeastern University and a BA from Colby College.

Veronica Campbell

*Independent Consultant
Falls Church, Virginia*

VERONICA CAMPBELL IS currently consulting on performance, financial management, and general management issues after retiring in 2003 from a 30-year career in the federal service, where she contributed to the effectiveness of programs operated by the departments of Labor, Interior, and Agriculture. As the director of the Center for Program Planning and Results, she managed the Department of Labor's strategic planning and performance-based initiatives from 2000 to 2003, working with the department's top executives and a dedicated inter agency committee to foster a results-driven organizational culture. Ms. Campbell joined the planning office after participating on the department's Year 2000 Project Management Team, where she served from 1998 to 2000.

Prior to her administrative experience, Ms. Campbell managed and performed program evaluations and audits for 25 years in the offices of the inspectors general of three federal agencies. She served as the first director of the Office of Evaluations and Inspections at the Department of Labor, OIG, from 1992 to 1998, where she offered departmental clients a range of new consultative services with an emphasis on collaborative program evaluation. From 1987 to 1992, Ms. Campbell was the regional inspector general for audit for the Labor Department's New York and Boston regions. Her early audit career at the Department of Agriculture, from 1973 to 1982, developed Ms. Campbell's analytical skills as she recommended improvements to the USDA's international programs in 20 countries and evaluated a wide array of domestic programs.

Ms. Campbell holds a BA in history from Barat College.

John Kamensky

*IBM Global Business Services
Washington, DC*

MR. KAMENSKY IS a senior research fellow for the IBM Center for the Business of Government and an associate partner with IBM Global Business Services. During 24 years of public service, he had a significant role in helping pioneer the federal government's performance and results orientation. He is passionate about creating a government that is results oriented, performance based, customer focused, and collaborative in nature.

Mr. Kamensky served eight years as deputy director of Vice President Al Gore's National Partnership for Reinventing Government. Previous to his White House position, he worked at the U.S. Government Accountability Office for 16 years where, as an assistant director, he played a key role in the development and passage of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

Mr. Kamensky is a fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration. He earned an MPA from the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas.

Thomas Kessler

Central Michigan University

FROM 1983 THROUGH 1996, Dr. Kessler was a manager at the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. He frequently advised senior officials and provided recommendations for enhancing mission-critical business processes. Prior to joining the Federal Reserve, Dr. Kessler was employed at Westinghouse Electric Corporation's Manufacturing Systems and Technology Center and served as assistant director for systems and programming at the Maryland State Government's Judicial Information Systems.

Over the past several years, Dr. Kessler has trained and facilitated outcome-based performance measurement and planning sessions for many federal agencies, including the departments of Labor, Treasury, Justice, Veterans Affairs, and Agriculture; the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; and the Federal Aviation Administration. In 2008 he co-authored *The Business of Government: Strategy, Implementation, and Results* with Patricia Kelley and is a frequent speaker at professional conferences throughout the United States.

Dr. Kessler earned his doctor of business administration degree from Nova Southeastern University, an MBA from the University of Baltimore, and is a certified information systems auditor.

Sarah E. Nutter

*George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia*

SARAH NUTTER IS an associate professor of accounting in George Mason University's School of Management. Prior to joining the GMU faculty in 1995, she worked as an economist at the Internal Revenue Service. Dr. Nutter teaches a variety of courses in accounting and taxation in undergraduate, MBA, and executive MBA programs and has received a teaching award for Outstanding Faculty Member from George Mason's executive MBA program. Professor Nutter's research interests include investigating the impact of changing decision rules on individual

and business behavior. Her research focuses primarily on the impact of taxes and tax structures on individuals and businesses. She has written extensively and has published in the *Journal of the American Taxation Association*, *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, *Statistics of Income Bulletin*, and *Advances in Taxation*. One of her articles was granted the 1998–99 American Taxation Association’s Outstanding Manuscript Award.

Dr. Nutter earned a BS from Ferris State University and an MBA and PhD from Michigan State University.

John M. Palguta

*Partnership for Public Service
Washington, DC*

AS VICE PRESIDENT for policy at the Partnership for Public Service, John Palguta has responsibility for the development and implementation of a comprehensive program of review and analysis on human capital issues in the federal government.

Prior to joining the Partnership in December 2001, Mr. Palguta was a career member of the federal senior executive service as director of policy and evaluation for the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB), the culmination of a federal career spanning almost 34 years of progressively responsible experience in federal human resources management and public policy issues.

Mr. Palguta earned a BA in sociology from California State University at Northridge and an MPA degree from the University of Southern California. He is active in a number of professional associations and is a fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration, vice chair of the Coalition for Effective Change, and a past president of the Federal Section of the International Public Management Association for Human Resources (IPMA-HR). He has published a number of articles on federal human resources management issues and is a frequent speaker at professional conferences and other forums. He is also an affiliated professor at Georgetown University’s Public Policy Institute. He is a recipient of MSPB’s highest honor, the Theodore Roosevelt Award, and the 2006 Warner W. Stockberger award, which is the highest honor presented annually by IPMA-HR to recognize an individual who has made outstanding contributions in the field of public-sector HR management.

Paul L. Posner

*George Mason University
Arlington, Virginia*

PAUL L. POSNER is the director of the public administration program at George Mason University. He has completed a career with the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) where he served as managing director for Federal Budget and Intergovernmental Issues. He led GAO’s work on the long-term outlook for the federal budget and emerging challenges for public sector finances at the federal, state, and local levels.

Dr. Posner has published articles on public budgeting and federalism issues in various academic journals and books and is the author of *The Politics of Unfunded Federal Mandates* (Georgetown University Press, 1998). He received his PhD in political science from Columbia University and was elected a fellow in the National Academy of Public Administration in 1996 where he chairs their Federal Systems Panel. Prior to his current position with George Mason University, Dr. Posner was a senior adjunct lecturer at Johns Hopkins, Georgetown,

and George Washington universities. He has received the James Blum Award for outstanding budget practitioner from the Association of Budget and Program Analysts. He is president of the American Society for Public Administration.

Michael Rosenbaum

*Rosenbaum Advisors, Inc.
Arlington Heights, Illinois*

MICHAEL ROSENBAUM IS currently president of Rosenbaum Advisors, an independent consulting firm specializing in investor relations and strategic communications.

During the past 20 years, he has counseled more than 150 public and private firms—including both start-ups and Fortune 500 companies—on issues from initial public offerings to mergers, acquisitions, bankruptcy, proxy, earnings restatements, and crises. He has written two books on investor relations—*Board Perspectives: Building Value through Investor Relations* (CCH, 2004) and *Selling Your Story to Wall Street: The Art and Science of Investor Relations* (McGraw-Hill, 1994)—and is co-author of *The Governance Game* (Aspatore, 2003). He is also widely published on investor relations, corporate governance, and management issues, and is a frequent speaker on a wide range of business topics. Mr. Rosenbaum holds an MBA from Roosevelt University and a BA in communications from the University of Illinois.

John Sacco

*George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia*

JOHN SACCO IS currently an associate professor at George Mason University's Department of Public and International Affairs. Prior to joining GMU, he was a program analyst for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Dr. Sacco is currently working on a government and nonprofit accounting and financial reporting textbook that will be accessible to students on the Internet. In 1999, along with several scholars, he published a policy paper about the major government reforms undertaken by New Zealand during the 1980s and 1990s. The paper compared New Zealand's integrated, business-like financial management system with the emerging attempts by the U.S. federal and state governments to use accounting and performance measures similar to those in private business. In 2000, Dr. Sacco published work in the *Association of Governmental Accountants' Journal* analyzing the most dramatic changes in state and local governmental accounting and finance practices that have taken place in the 20th century. He has forthcoming work on the evolution of end-user computing. In addition to his writing, Dr. Sacco has consulted for several state and local governments and Certified Public Accountant (CPA) firms, including contact work with CPA firms on finance and accounting for the Chinese government.

John Sacco holds a PhD in political science, an MS in accounting, and a BS in data processing.

Michael D. Serlin

*Independent Consultant
Alexandria, Virginia*

MICHAEL D. SERLIN, previously a member of the Scorecard research team, is currently writing, speaking, and consulting on public service change and participating in a number of volunteer activities after a 36-year federal career. He retired in 1994 from the U.S. Department of the Treasury's Financial Management Service. As an assistant commissioner, he directed innovations in electronic funds transfer and financial operations for the U.S. government and initiated entrepreneurial administrative support across agencies.

Mr. Serlin led the financial management team for the National Performance Review (Reinventing Government) Task Force, most of whose recommendations were incorporated in the Government Management Reform Act of 1994. The law included requiring audited financial statements for all major agencies and introduced franchising—competitive cross-servicing of agency administrative support.

A former senior executive service presidential rank award winner, Mr. Serlin is a principal with The Council for Excellence in Government and has participated in their reviews of agency strategic performance draft plans. He has contributed frequent articles and research papers on entrepreneurial government, executive mobility, and other government-change efforts to magazines and professional journals.

Mr. Serlin received his BA in political science from Stanford University.

Robert Shea

*Grant Thornton LLP
Alexandria, VA*

ROBERT SHEA IS a director in Grant Thornton's Global Public Sector. He was most recently at the Office of Management and Budget as associate director for administration and government performance. In addition to managing OMB's internal operations, Mr. Shea led the President's Performance Improvement Initiative, administered the Program Assessment Rating Tool, advised on government human capital policy, and led inter-agency collaborations in the areas of food safety and implementation of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act.

Before joining OMB, Mr. Shea served as counsel to the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs where, in addition to general oversight of executive branch management, he advised committee leadership on the status of implementation of the statutory framework for performance-based government, including the Government Performance and Results Act and the Chief Financial Officers Act. He was legislative director for Rep. Pete Sessions (R-TX) from 1997 to 1999, where he organized the Results Caucus, a group of members of Congress dedicated to results-based management and solving many of the government's major management problems. Mr. Shea was a professional staff member with the House Committee on Government Reform from 1995 through 1996. There he examined the economy and efficiency of government programs and acted as liaison with the government's inspectors general.

About the Authors

Dr. Jerry Ellig (jellig@gmu.edu) has been a senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University since 1996. Between August 2001 and August 2003, he served as deputy director and acting director of the Office of Policy Planning at the Federal Trade Commission. Dr. Ellig has also served as a senior economist for the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress and as an assistant professor of economics at George Mason University.

Dr. Ellig co-authored several previous editions of the Mercatus Center's Performance Report Scorecard. He has also published numerous articles on government regulation and business management in both scholarly and popular periodicals, including *The Public Manager*, *Journal of Politics*, *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, *Federal Communications Law Journal*, *Business & Politics*, *CommLaw Conspectus*, *Managerial and Decision Economics*, *Antitrust Bulletin*, *Competitive Intelligence Review*, *Journal of Private Enterprise*, *Texas Review of Law & Politics*, *Wall Street Journal*, *New York Times*, *Barron's*, and the *Washington Post*. He has edited and co-authored several books, including *Dynamic Competition and Public Policy* (Cambridge, 2001), *New Horizons in Natural Gas Deregulation* (Praeger, 1996), and *Municipal Entrepreneurship and Energy Policy* (Gordon & Breach, 1994).

Dr. Ellig received his PhD and MA in economics from George Mason University in Fairfax, VA, and his BA in economics from Xavier University in Cincinnati, OH.

The Honorable Maurice P. McTigue, QSO (mmctigue@gmu.edu) is the director of the Mercatus Center's Government Accountability Project. In 1997, after completing his term as New Zealand's ambassador to Canada, he joined George Mason University as a distinguished visiting scholar. Previously, as a cabinet minister and a member of Parliament, he led an ambitious and successful effort during the 1980s and 1990s to restructure New Zealand's public sector and to revitalize its stagnant economy. In 1999, in recognition of his public service, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II bestowed upon Mr. McTigue the prestigious Queen's Service Order during a ceremony at Buckingham Palace.

At the Mercatus Center, Mr. McTigue shares with U.S. policy makers his practical experience. Since 1997, he has worked with senior administration officials, members of Congress, and scores of senior agency executives on applying the principles of economics, transparency, and accountability in the public sector. He frequently speaks at conferences on performance issues, testifies before congressional committees on issues of government reform, and writes on the importance of transparency in reforming government.

Henry Wray (henrywray@verizon.net) is a visiting fellow with the Mercatus Center's Government Accountability Project. He recently completed a distinguished career in Washington, D.C., where he served for over 30 years on the staffs of the U.S. Government Accountability Office and the United States Congress. At GAO, he started in the Office of the General Counsel, where he served for many years as an associate general counsel, overseeing a group of attorneys who provided legal support to one of GAO's auditing divisions. He also served for four years as GAO's ethics counselor. In addition, for two years he headed the GAO audit group responsible for evaluations of the U.S. Department of Justice, the law enforcement components of the U.S. Department of Treasury, and the Federal Judiciary. He completed his GAO career while serving several years as a detailee to the U.S. Congress, during which time he was on the professional staff of the House Budget Committee, the House Committee on Government Reform, and the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. After retiring from GAO, he served as counsel for the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee and then in 2001 became senior counsel to the House Subcommittee on Government Efficiency, Financial Management, and Intergovernmental Relations.

Prior to coming to Washington, Mr. Wray served as deputy attorney general in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Department of Justice.

Mr. Wray earned his BA in political science from Washington & Jefferson College and a JD with honors from the National Law Center at George Washington University. He remains an active member of the Bar of the District of Columbia.