

**USE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING AND
REINVENTION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT**

May 13, 1996

A GPRA CASE STUDY

for the

**DENVER SERVICE CENTER
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

FOREWORD

This case study provides information regarding the reengineering of the Denver Service Center, National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Reengineering the office followed by the development and implementation of a process to implement the Government Performance and Results Act of August 1993 was a logical progression. Strategic planning principles were followed. The strategic planning for the National Park Service is formulated and directed by the NPS Strategic Planning Office.

Large programmatic offices who are downsizing, reengineering, and developing plans to implement the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act may find this case study useful. More specifically, the study may assist agencies or offices that provide planning, design, and construction support services to land management field areas or the design and construction of federal facilities.

The American Society of Public Administration and the Government Accomplishment and Accountability Task Force may be of help in meeting the needs of agencies beginning the strategic planning process and furnish additional information including copies of case study documents.

Questions regarding the process described in this case study may be directed to Director Charles P. Clapper, Denver Service Center, 12795 W. Alameda Parkway, P.O. Box 25287, Denver, CO 80225-0287. Preparation of the case study was completed by Jim LaRock, who may be reached at the same address.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
History and Context	2
Description and Background of the Denver Service Center	2
Case Study Development and Key People	2
Reinvention of the Denver Service Center	4
Phase I — Development Plan	4
The Six Strategic Objectives	4
Employee Workgroups	4
Communication	5
Space Allocation Issues	5
Phase II — Final Reinvention Planning	6
DSC Reinvention Team	6
The DSC Reinvention Laboratory	6
Formulation of the Reinvention Plan	7
Government Performance and Results Act Activities at The Denver Service Center	9
Phase I — New Management Team Identification of Goals And Targets	9
Development of Goals (Missions) and Targets (Long-Term Performance Goals)	9
Handoff to the DSC Special Projects GPRA Leaders	10
Phase II — Task Group Work	10
The Task	10
Selection of the Task Group	10
Goal and Target Refinement Process	11
Validation of Existing Conditions	11
Briefings and L Team Direction	11
Establishing Priorities	12
Results Achieved (Indicators and Performance Measures)	13
Management Briefings (L Team), Task Group Direction, and Communications	13
Developing the Implementation Plan	14
Use and Impact of Strategic Planning for the Denver Service Center	15
Impetus for Strategic Planning in the National Park Service	15

National Performance Review	15
NPS Strategic Planning	16
NPS Restructuring, Streamlining, and Downsizing	16
Integration of DSC Goals and Targets with the NPS Strategic Planning Office	17
Short-Range Impacts	17
Long-Range Implications	18
Costs	18

Lessons Learned 19

- Interaction between Management, Task Group, and Strategic Planning Office 19
- Communications (Barriers, Needs, Timeliness) 19
- Selling the Product to Employees and Establishing Belief 20
- Massive Efforts: Restructuring, Downsizing, Performance Measurement, and Employee Morale 20
- Other Lessons Learned 20
- What Problems Still Seem Intractable 21

Where We Are in the Process 22

- Transforming the Implementation Plan to Action 22
- Customer Review and Feedback 22

The Next Steps 23

- Continuing to Implement the Plan 23
- Goals and Measurement Systems 23
- Dealing with Measurement Results and Making Corrections 23
- Customer Project Surveys 24

Time Line for Case Study Events 25

Exhibits

- A: First Cut at GPRA Goals and Targets (L Team), 1995 31
- B: Second Cut at Goals and Targets, 1995 32
- C: DSC Target Priorities, 1996 33
- D: DSC Employee Package, 1996 34
- E: Target Priority Package, 1996 46
- F: GPRA DSC Implementation Plan, 1996 47
- G: DSC Goals and Targets 48

Bibliography 49

INTRODUCTION

This case study traces the reinvention, reorganization, and introduction of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 principles into the Denver Service Center, National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Denver Service Center (DSC) is the primary planning, design, and construction office and serves 367 field areas within the national park system.

In 1916 Congress created the National Park Service to

Promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations . . . by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations. (1916 NPS organic act, 16 USC 1)

This language provides the central theme of NPS policy and philosophy, which guides the management and operation of all offices and field areas. Simply stated, the National Park Service is responsible for preserving natural and cultural resources for the enjoyment of today's citizens in a manner that leaves them unimpaired for future generations.

To more clearly understand the case study, the reader must understand that strategic planning and implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) is taking place on many levels with the National Park Service. The NPS Strategic Planning Office formulated the core NPS strategic plan in *Creating Our Future: A Strategic Plan for the National Park Service* (NPS 1994c) (referenced in this document as the *Strategic Plan*). It also trains, monitors, and provides oversight for the development and establishment of the GPRA process within the national park system. Currently, there are 30 lead field areas and program offices developing plans for management and operation based on GPRA principles. Each plan, while distinct and suitable for its own purposes, will reflect the mission goals in the *Strategic Plan*.

It may also help the reader to understand the NPS organizational matrix so that a perspective of the Denver Service Center's role and function can be gained. The National Park Service has implemented a new structure as a result of the mandate to streamline, reengineer work processes, and downsize. Field areas (parks, monuments, recreation areas, historical sites, etc.) make up a cluster group. Cluster groups number in size from 10 to 35 field units. Each cluster group is supported from a systems support office that works for the cluster group and reports to one of the seven field directors. Each field director reports to the Washington, D.C., headquarters office. Program offices like the Denver Service Center, also report to the Washington, D.C., headquarters office.

Attachments of several of the key documents referenced in this report are enclosed with this

document.

HISTORY AND CONTEXT

DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND OF THE DENVER SERVICE CENTER

The Denver Service Center (DSC) was created in 1971 to provide planning, design, and construction services for the national park system. Congressional appropriations are received on a program and project line-item basis and are assigned to the Denver Service Center by the seven field offices for designated projects. This system of project funding separates the Denver Service Center from most other offices and field areas within the National Park Service, which are usually base funded.

Before the mid-1950s, planning, design, and construction services were provided by each field area or one of the former regional offices. With the advent of Mission 66 (which was a massive program to improve park infrastructure and visitor facilities during the Eisenhower Administration), those services were moved and consolidated in the Western (San Francisco) and Eastern (Philadelphia) Offices of Design and Construction. The two offices were consolidated in 1971 to form one geographically central office in Denver, Colorado. The intent was to realize substantial travel cost savings and to reduce duplicative support services. Combining offices also brought a large body of professional expertise together to support planning, design, and construction projects — including architects, engineers, landscape architects, natural and cultural resource specialists, historians, sociologists, socioeconomists, contract specialists, and park planners. The core planning, design, and construction functions are supported by administrative services, global information systems, surveys, specifications, contract management, transportation planning, editing, graphics, printing, supply, information storage and retrieval, and library services. Some administrative and computer services are supported by the co-located NPS Intermountain Field Office.

When the National Performance Review initial report was completed in 1993, the Denver Service Center employed more than 700 people. The current target is to reduce that number to 569 by FY99. Reductions to date have been accomplished through agency buyouts, acceptance of reassignments to field areas and system support offices, and attrition. As of April 1, 1996, there are 599 full-time employees in the Denver Service Center.

The combined obligation of net construction funds for FY95 was \$237.6 million, which includes funds obligated by the Federal Highway Administration for reconstruction of park roads. The planning program, used to conduct studies and prepare planning documents, accounted for about \$5.0 million (NPS 1996a).

CASE STUDY DEVELOPMENT AND KEY PEOPLE

The call for case studies from the Office of Management and Budget was relayed to DSC Director Charles Clapper, Jr., by Office of Strategic Planning Director Heather Huyck. Since the Government Performance and Results Act was enacted in August 1993, the Denver Service Center has moved ahead rapidly and is now in the process of implementing actions to produce desired results. Because the Denver Service Center is also well advanced in its reinvention, the implementation of the Government Performance and Results Act has been synthesized into the overall process. To provide a complete picture, this case study includes descriptions of the Denver Service Center's reinvention and strategic planning efforts.

During the major restructuring of the Denver Service Center, the leadership team (L team) noted that many continuing projects from the reinvention process and new issues such as the Government

Performance and Results Act needed a center of responsibility. A special projects group was created to carry this work forward. GPRA responsibility for the Denver Service Center was delegated by the L team to Jim LaRock and Vicki Walker, who work in the Management Services Special Projects Office. Their work to implement GPRA processes is coordinated and directed by the L team. Oversight responsibility is provided by the NPS Strategic Planning Office. Employees within the Denver Service Center are now working in small teams to implement and carry out activities stated in the GPRA implementation plan.

REINVENTION OF THE DENVER SERVICE CENTER

PHASE I — DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Six Strategic Objectives

Developed in January 1994 by the DSC senior management team, the objectives provided an immediate focus for office reinvention. Employee involvement was recognized as a vital part of the reinvention plan. DSC management requested that employees validate these objectives as part of an employee survey. Although employee involvement in reinvention required a great deal more time than a top-down approach, allowing employees to take part in the solutions has greater advantages by developing employee buy-in. Providing for employee participation, input, and communication was carefully planned and executed.

In February 1994 an all-employee meeting was held to discuss DSC downsizing, reengineering, and work processes. An employee survey was passed out that included and expanded DSC objectives and provided opportunity for written comments. During March 1994, 241 employees returned surveys, which was more than a 40% response. Responses were collated and reported so that everyone could see the results. More than 75% of those returning surveys agreed with the objectives for the Denver Service Center.

The objectives were to

- clarify the purpose of the Denver Service Center and its role within the National Park Service
- improve procedures for project priorities and scheduling
- develop and improve employee skills
- decide how to improve customer services, including products and processes
- determine the best organizational structure and optimum staffing level
- implement recommendations from previous studies and explore new technologies

Overall, employees indicated they were deeply frustrated by DSC processes and procedures and felt that management had room for improvement. There was also a strong feeling that the Denver Service Center needed to define its role, become more accountable, support quality, and define the customer(s).

Employee Workgroups

A small group of employees was charged by management to prepare a task directive to describe the work needed and the process to follow. When the task directive was complete, a call went out for volunteers for other workgroups. About 115 DSC employees were selected by management from a large number of volunteers. In May 1994 six workgroups began work, charged with researching and formulating recommendations for each of the six objectives. Workgroups were formed for: purpose and significance; customer service; optimum organizational structure and staffing; scheduling and priorities; implementation of previous studies and technology; and employee skills and development.

Composition of the workgroups reflected a cross section of grades and occupations and represented various responsibilities and knowledge. All workgroups used in-house facilitators to lead discussions and provide the focus necessary to accomplish the work. Facilitators had received training and/or had sufficient experience to ensure that work was accomplished quickly and with few interpersonal problems.

The consensus among representatives from the workgroups was that three driving forces had to be recognized before change could occur. As stated in the *Final Synthesis Report of Recommendations for Improving the Denver Service Center* (NPS 1994a), these forces were as follows:

- commitment to the principle that people are the most critical resource in accomplishing the program effectively, on time, and within budget to the satisfaction of those we serve
- establishment of a new organizational structure that reflects the principles of interdependence and accountability
- commitment to state-of-the-art technology so that the best tools are available to the people who need them

Written reports prepared by each workgroup were made available to all employees for comment. Recommendations were then synthesized into a single report by a group composed of one member from each of the original workgroups. Each DSC employee had access to a copy of the report, as well as the full report from each workgroup and a copy of the employee comments.

Communication

Keeping more than 600 DSC employees informed about the activities of the workgroups as the reinvention process continued was a primary concern; various methods were used to provide information to employees. Informal, drop-in question and answer / discussion groups were held periodically with the DSC director and employees. At times these meetings were recorded and a transcript was circulated via e-mail. Additional reinvention information was also passed via e-mail. Employees were able to submit questions anonymously, which were then answered and put on e-mail. Three all-employee meetings (see "Time Line for Case Study Events" section) were held at major milestone points. (A nearby hotel conference room was rented to accommodate the 600+ employees.) Because of costs, all-employee meetings were limited and held only when necessary to ensure that all employees were provided critical information at the same time. Additional information was occasionally provided by hard copy, but this was infrequent because of cost. A copy of the final *DSC Reinvention Plan* was provided to every employee.

Space Allocation Issues

Reorganization of functional space to match the new organizational structure has not yet been accomplished. Space allocation and the location of employees' personal space is a major issue, and much attention should be given to this subject. One full-time employee has been appointed to deal with all space issues, and there is also an e-mail bulletin board for space issues.

PHASE II — FINAL REINVENTION PLANNING

DSC Reinvention Team

Workgroups completed their recommendations and reports in August 1994 (NPS 1994b). In September, Director Clapper selected 15 employees to take the reinvention process one step closer to implementation. The charter of this group was to

- affirm, refine, and integrate the recommendations of the DSC workgroups
- develop a detailed, dynamic implementation plan
- ensure that the implementation and recommendations reflect coordination and integration with
NPS reinvention efforts
- review, amend, and suggest revision of DSC rules, policies, and procedures to improve
efficiency and effectiveness and to enhance reinvention efforts
- ensure open, honest, and timely communications to foster support throughout the
Denver
Service Center and the National Park Service

Reinvention team members read *Reengineering the Corporation* by Hammer and Champy (1993), which served as a guideline. The team divided responsibilities according to former workgroup categories, formed a number of ad hoc groups, and developed recommendations. This step, validating past workgroup recommendations and finding additional information, was necessary to ensure that all information was available for consideration. Management wanted to be absolutely sure that the findings of the workgroups had been accurately portrayed in the summary report and also wanted to consider any additional information.

For instance, customer service information was validated by a four-person ad hoc group. These four members contacted former workgroup members about different facets of customer service and investigated additional topics. These findings were consolidated and brought back to the reinvention team where they were tested against previous recommendations and provided additional insights.

Other reinvention team ad hoc groups met with functional groups such as architects, landscape architects, engineers, and planners to gather additional information and suggestions about work processes and to consider employee concerns that might have been overlooked. In particular, the work processes necessary to produce plans, designs, construction drawings,

specifications, and other documents were reviewed. At the time of the review, the Denver Service Center worked in a three-team structure, all producing the same type of planning, design, and construction documents but serving a different geographical customer base. Over the years, each team had developed a unique way of doing business that suited their customers and each team's management and value system. These differences, as well as some of the reasons for escalating DSC production costs, became clear while interviewing the functional groups.

The DSC Reinvention Laboratory

In October 1994 the Denver Service Center was selected as a Department of the Interior reinvention laboratory. The basic mission for all labs was to serve as a mechanism to identify new ways to serve customers and accomplish goals. The DSC lab was viewed as a change agent, identifying better ways to perform work more quickly and possibly with fewer resources. The lab and reinvention team were moving forward simultaneously and needed coordination. Two reinvention team members were assigned to exchange information and coordinate with the lab to ensure that there would be no duplication of work and that recommendations would be linked.

The lab was composed of six DSC employees, three customers (park superintendents), an associate regional director, and a facilitator from the Bureau of Reclamation. Two weeks of formal training were provided before the lab began its work. Working from a charter given to all labs, the DSC lab investigated the basic business practices used for planning, design, and construction activities. Based on a great deal of research, project case studies, and file material, the lab validated the existing work processes as sound but criticized the way in which DSC processes were implemented. Review processes resulted in costly delays and frivolous requirements that varied from customer to customer. The DSC lab completed its work and report in January 1995 and was disbanded.

The lab was recognized for their work in March 1996 with a Hammer Award. The Hammer Award is the vice president's answer to the \$600 hammer of yesterday's government, symbolically consisting of a \$6 hammer, ribbon, and a note card from Vice President Gore. The DSC lab was recognized for their efforts to reengineer the DSC review processes for planning, design, and construction and to deliver products to customers in a timely and cost-effective manner that satisfies customer needs.

Basically, the lab recommended changing DSC work processes to eliminate unnecessary reviews, clearly scope and record the desired products, record problems, and place accountability with the responsible party. Additional needs included obtaining exceptions for mandated practices requiring departmental and congressional approvals. Copies may be

obtained on Internet (specific address is <http://WWW.NPS.GOV/DSC/REINV>).

Formulation of the Reinvention Plan

Shortly after the initial organizational meetings in September 1994, the reinvention team was charged with developing a vision statement. Put in draft format, the vision was provided to all employees for input and comment, including the current management team.

National Park Service employees at the Denver Service Center are committed to providing quality planning, design, and construction services for parks and the public that treasures them. We share a commitment with our partners within the National Park Service to protect our natural and cultural heritage, while providing our services in a timely and cost-effective manner.

This vision drives the DSC goals formulated for the Government Performance and Results Act. Goals and targets (outcomes) are crafted around this vision statement. Some employees still find the vision unnecessary, a useless relic from reinvention days. When asked, however, many respond that the Denver Service Center provides quality products in a timely and cost-effective manner to our partners.

At the same time that the Denver Service Center was working on its reinvention plan, the National Park Service was restructuring. The newly formed National Leadership Council, composed of field directors and the Washington, D.C., directorate, was the decision-making nucleus for the entire NPS reorganization. Among this group were staunch DSC supporters as well as those who questioned the value of having centralized planning, design, and construction services. With the recent creation of the system support offices, there was an argument for providing all services to park clusters from those offices. Although the Denver Service Center is still intact and completing restructuring, there are still some who feel that the Denver Service Center will be integrated with the system support offices, similar to pre-Mission 66 days. Maintaining high morale during and after a reorganization is very difficult. It is more difficult when employees believe that they will be absorbed into other offices.

After compiling additional bench-marking data on private businesses and other federal and state agencies and synthesizing that data, it was determined that a charette (design workshop) was needed to discuss and test reinvention team recommendations and make final decisions regarding DSC organization. The charette was held February 6–10, 1995. Participants included the reinvention team, members of the management team, and a few other key people. A professional outside facilitator organized and led the discussions. Strong emphasis was placed on using a skilled facilitator who could expedite and organize the exchange of ideas. The same

facilitator has been consistently used at key meetings and retreats. Using the same person increases his/her knowledge of the organization and its culture, saves time, creates credibility, and provides a high degree of comfort for participants.

The purpose of the week-long session was to build agreement on a structure for the organization that would best support the DSC mission. More specifically, the outcomes of the charette were as follows:

- a definition of criteria against which to evaluate structural options
 - an analysis of four optional structures, including how each option would interact with the proposed new work processes
 - the selection of one preferred structure based on the application of the criteria
 - a discussion of what would be needed to make the preferred structure work — including further definition of the roles and responsibilities of key positions, examination of the weaknesses of the structure, and identification of steps that might be taken to address the weaknesses
- a plan for implementing the new structure

Based on the outcomes of the charette, the DSC *Reinvention Plan* (NPS 1995a) was prepared.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT ACTIVITIES AT THE DENVER SERVICE CENTER

PHASE I — NEW MANAGEMENT TEAM IDENTIFICATION OF GOALS AND TARGETS

Leadership positions within the new organization were filled in June 1995, and second-tier leadership was selected in early August in accordance with the *Reinvention Plan*. Old and new management coexisted within the organization from late June until October 1 when new management was recognized at an all-employee meeting. Most former managers were moved to second-tier management or to project-oriented jobs.

Development of Goals (Missions) and Targets (Long-Term Performance Goals)

The leadership team (L team) began transitional meetings in mid-June, and one of the subjects covered was the Government Performance and Results Act and its implementation in the restructured organization. The NPS GPRA task force, including a park superintendent (customer), met with the L team from July 17–20, 1995, to orient them and begin the process of creating a framework of DSC GPRA goals. The group was able to use the same facilitator as before.

As a GPRA prototype office within the National Park Service, the Denver Service Center was expected to develop and test a performance-based management system. Performance management is defined as a way of doing business that links program activities to goal setting and budgeting before the fact and to performance measurement and evaluation after the fact.

Preliminary discussions involved the DSC vision, the purpose of performance measures, individual aspirations for the workshop, and individual concerns. The DSC vision statement and *Reinvention Plan* provided the focus for the group to explore possible goals. Even though criteria were established for goals, many additional ones were developed, which proved confusing.

Small groups discussed the DSC goals and reported back to the large group. After further discussion and clarification, many goals seemed to have common threads, so they were lumped under various themes. Statements were developed to capture the essence of each set of related goals, which resulted in the establishment of six goals.

Each of the six goals was discussed to determine its specific meaning. Statements describing

each goal were further developed and used as targets under the appropriate goal. Performance measurements were developed for each target, including the activities needed for accomplishment (inputs), existing conditions, and the expected results (results achieved). Activities and results expected were placed within a five-year time frame.

Further development of goals and targets was concluded in a two-day L-team workshop in September 1995 that included two members of the special projects group. These two members were designated to further develop and lead the GPRA effort for the Denver Service Center. They were given eight action items to accomplish directly or through the work of a yet-to-be appointed task group.

In general, the L team adopted goals that were in the *Reinvention Plan*. Because crafting and wordsmithing each goal began to take an inordinate amount of time, this work was delegated to the future task group (see exhibit A).

Handoff to the DSC Special Projects GPRA Leaders

The special projects group was designated to lead the DSC GPRA effort. The special projects GPRA leaders attended the September goal and target-setting workshop. This provided a good opportunity to understand the background, process, and expectations of the L team.

DSC goals were reworked by the GPRA leaders in conjunction with the DSC editing staff, which helped to reorder and present clear and concise wording for each goal. Targets were moved to more appropriate goals and were also reworded. Goals and targets were distributed to all employees in October 1995, via e-mail, with a short explanation of the Government Performance and Results Act and how it would affect the office.

PHASE II — TASK GROUP WORK

The Task

Requirements were stated by the L team through a process led by the facilitator. All points were written and reviewed. Expectations were explored, narrowed, and restated, as were some of the time frames. The task as stated was to

- set up a task group that is representative of the new DSC structure with 8 to 10 people
- critique goals, targets, performance measures, and expected results

- validate, define, or provide measurement data for existing conditions
- devise appropriate monitoring, tracking, and reporting systems
- provide a completed plan to a customer feedback group — a group of 44 superintendents
- coordinate with the NPS Strategic Planning Office
- provide a final version of DSC GPRA goals for all employees by December 1, 1995
- provide feedback and briefings for the L team

Selection of the Task Group

A brief description of the work and a request for volunteers from the newly selected group of quality leaders, technical experts, and project managers was issued by e-mail. About 50 people were contacted. A few stepped forward, but for the most part getting participation was difficult. This was attributed to the Denver Service Center's recent reorganization, people working in very new jobs, many having served on past task groups, and hesitancy to rush into more uncharted territory. The L team furnished additional names, but in most cases project workloads did not permit participation. An active search finally produced a quality group that was approved by the L team. The task group represented a cross section from the design and planning disciplines, former reinvention team members, and some new volunteers. It was a group determined to produce a practical product — DSC GPRA goals and targets.

Goal and Target Refinement Process

The NPS Strategic Planning Office gave the task group an introductory overview to the Government Performance and Results Act. A packet of information was provided to each individual that contained the 1994 NPS goals, a summary of the Government Performance and Results Act that highlighted critical areas, and a copy of a speech given by Dr. Alice M. Rivlin (contained in the summer 1995 issue of *The Public Manager — The New Bureaucrat*).

A spreadsheet/table was distributed that showed each goal, the targets under each goal, the existing condition, and a needs column that indicated actions needed to validate existing conditions. Establishing the existing condition was extremely important as it would become the baseline for all future performance measurements (see exhibit A).

A discussion began regarding the content and merit of each goal and then expanded to the targets. Many task group members were uncomfortable with the goals and targets as stated and felt that wordsmithing and rearrangement was necessary. They explored overlap, placement within goals, and the potential to combine goals and targets. A fine line had to be drawn between the freedom to revise (and in some cases depart from) the original intent and the investment and ownership of the L team.

The same error that the L team had made was being repeated: the task group was taking too much time to reach consensus on the wording of each goal, target associations with goals, and target wording. Assignments were made to bring the preferred wording and target changes back to the group, including individual work on goals.

Validation of Existing Conditions

The Denver Service Center had been organized in a three-team structure with shared office support systems. Specialized ways to conduct business had evolved from that structure, which complicated the establishment of existing conditions because each team's methods had to be researched and compared (sort of like apples and oranges) to come up with an accurate baseline.

Briefings and L Team Direction

The first commitment was to provide each member of the L team with a revised spreadsheet (see exhibit B) containing all goals, targets, performance measurements, existing conditions, activities needed, and expected results by November 1, 1995. This deadline was met with a follow-up briefing on November 8. The L team established a self-imposed deadline to prepare questions and comments that the task group would respond to.

As a result of the briefing on November 8, 1995, the L team asked the task group to work on a phased approach to the Government Performance and Results Act, including recommendations for priorities, a format suitable for presenting the information to all employees, and an improved format showing the detailed data. The L team disagreed with some of the existing conditions that had been established. All questions were personally addressed, consolidated, and sent back to all L team members by the task group. In general, the L team concurred with the task group's work. Two of the original goals were combined, and some targets were moved to better suit the goals. The reasoning and request was presented to the task group by an L team member, which resulted in a good exchange of thoughts. This was a positive interactive management response as opposed to a top-down decree.

A communication problem was encountered between the L team and the task group. The L team preferred to work as a unit, acting with one voice, and answering individual questions in a team forum. Without an individual L team point of contact, answers to rather simple questions had to wait for an L team meeting and subsequent decision. A point of contact was chosen so that work could move at a faster pace and deadlines could be met.

An additional concern of the L team was the numerous measurement systems needed for the targets. A table was prepared by the task group that showed the number and type of new measurement systems required to determine results achieved. There are 24 new measurement systems required in addition to the eight already in place. Some of the targets required two measurement systems. Although some systems need specialized collection systems, others are no more than counting and collating exercises. However, the cost of devising data collection systems and the resources required to implement, maintain, assimilate, and analyze the data remains a concern.

Establishing Priorities

The L team was conscious of the amount of work that would be required to implement the five goals and 28 targets. They asked for three implementation alternatives consisting of a minimum, intermediate, and full action plan.

The first order of business was to establish criteria and break the work down into activities for FY96 through FY2000. The task group applied various filters and screens as criteria. The first effort to set priorities was discarded because it was not definitive. The necessary criteria came from a return to the DSC vision statement and analysis of some additional statements in the *Reinvention Plan*. A determination was made that goals were too broad and that targets should be used to establish the priorities. Using targets would also ensure that progress would be made for each goal, gaining a more integrated effort.

The task group used the following criteria:

Does it help get the work done on time?

Does it reduce cost?

Does it help respond to customer needs?

Will it increase technical quality of the product?

Does it improve communication and teamwork between the customer and the Denver Service Center?

Will it benefit the customer and the resource?

Criteria were ranked in order of importance. These proved to be good criteria. However, in retrospect, one additional criteria should have been added: Does it show progress to our customers?

Targets were ranked against the criteria, and value judgments were made to determine where

the next set of priorities would begin so that three levels of implementation could be shown. There was a great deal of discussion and debate throughout this process, which showed people felt strongly about the priorities.

The next step was to place the priorities in what was termed "bands." The task group wound up with seven priority bands. All bands were displayed on one large wall chart. Color coding was added to associate priorities and targets with their parent goal. This chart illustrated what could be accomplished for each goal even if less than the full number of goals or targets were implemented during FY96 (see exhibit C).

At the same time, graphics were produced showing how DSC goals, targets, and results could be best shown to employees. Several alternatives were produced with a recommended alternative. The objective was to produce a readable product that got the message across without detailed information.

The L team was briefed on January 11, 1996 (following a long period of government shutdown) and accepted the task group recommendation to implement all activities required for all goals and targets during FY96. The graphics proposed were accepted. At this time the task group was released from further responsibilities but was kept informed of progress (see exhibit D).

In most cases, special effort groups would have been monetarily rewarded. However, without an approved budget and with an austere approach to performance awards, thank you letters and personal thanks were provided for all task group members and support people. One of the targets addresses the incentive awards program, and creative ways will be developed to reward outstanding work.

Results Achieved (Indicators and Performance Measures)

The task group segmented activities for five fiscal years as opposed to the original concept of one and five fiscal years. This allowed a better distribution of work and incremental achievement of results. FY96 does have the heaviest workload in terms of getting things in place to carry out the goals and targets (see exhibit E).

Units of measure were, in general, easy to describe and state, although there was some doubt and discussion in the task group about ensuring that the right product was being measured. Other questions frequently asked were (1) does it make a difference? and (2) is it something we can cure? Another perceived problem was: Could 100% perfection in really difficult areas be attained or were we just kidding ourselves? The answer was resolved by the Strategic Planning Office with a question: If you don't shoot for the bull's-eye, how can you ever hit it?

If you shoot lower, then a lower result must be acceptable.

Management Briefings (L team), Task Group Direction, and Communications

Briefings for the L team was provided by the GPRA coleaders from the special projects group. They were responsible for all briefings, direction to the task group, and meeting deadlines. A written copy of the briefing information was always provided to the L team recorder. A recap of what work or products had been requested, what had been accomplished, a list of questions that provided clear direction for the task group, and a list of the remainder of the work required was submitted at each briefing.

L team briefings were made orally, with written documents, and using poster-size graphics to encompass all communication styles. In general these were well accepted. Individual information packages were always prepared for reference for all L team members.

Exception to L team direction was taken in only two instances. When the task group began work on goals and targets there was a feeling that validation meant the freedom to rewrite, reorder targets, add missing pieces, or strike targets. Consensus was reached in a manner acceptable to all. Adding the point of contact between the L team and the task group was extremely helpful in resolving differences.

The second area of disagreement came when the task group was asked to provide cost data for minimal, intermediate, and full implementation plans. While this seemed reasonable, it was the subject of much discussion and debate. It was finally determined by the task group that cost estimates would be meaningless until people were selected to work on the GPRA activities. It was recommended that all target teams be directed to work efficiently and to accurately record their time spent on the activities. This approach was stressed in the presentation to the L team. It was also emphasized that implementing the goals and targets in the GPRA framework was so critical to the success of the Denver Service Center that costs should not be the deciding factor in determining the level of implementation. The L team chose to go ahead with work to implement all goals and targets.

Employees on the task group felt that it was an acceptable risk to disagree with the L team if a better product or more cost-effective approach could be anticipated. Taking a risk proved to be the right choice.

GPRA information and task group work had not been provided on a regular basis for all employees with the exception of some general references and the initial release of the goals and targets. To reach employees in the quickest and most cost-effective way, a two-page description of the Government Performance and Results Act was placed on e-mail. Good employee communication on this process had been somewhat overlooked and should have

received more attention.

Developing the Implementation Plan

Based on the established target priorities, an implementation plan was put together in a table format. Targets with results to be achieved for FY96 were shown. Activities to be accomplished were also shown. Boxes indicated each of the functional areas within the office: project management, landscape architecture, architecture, engineering, management services, contracting, and resource planning. Boxes for each target under each functional heading were marked according to recommended target lead and/or participation. If work had been started through another process, that name was inserted (see exhibit F).

The L team was asked to insert their nominations in appropriate boxes and return them to the special projects GPRA coleaders and work on the activities would be started.

The DSC director added a requirement. Ten of the targets received an additional priority rating and must be completed as soon as possible. These priorities not only demonstrate progress, but also touch areas very important to field areas and DSC employees.

USE AND IMPACT OF STRATEGIC PLANNING FOR THE DENVER SERVICE CENTER

In discussing the strategic planning for this case study, it is necessary to understand that strategic planning is occurring at three levels— one for the National Park Service as an agency, one for the Denver Service Center as a program office, and one for all field areas. Agency strategic planning is the backdrop against which DSC and field area strategic planning plays. It is therefore necessary to discuss the levels so that a clear understanding is gained of how the process affects the Denver Service Center's goals and targets.

IMPETUS FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING IN THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The 75th anniversary of the National Park Service in 1991 served as the impetus for an intense review of NPS responsibilities and prospects. A conference held at Vail, Colorado, in October 1991, brought together nearly 700 NPS and external experts and other interested parties to consider the future of the national park system and its employees. The central focus was "Our National Parks: Challenges and Strategies for the 21st Century." This conference and the resulting recommendations are commonly referred to as "The Vail Symposium" and are contained in *National Parks for the 21st Century: The Vail Agenda* (NPS 1992).

The symposium steering committee developed six strategic objectives, which were

- resource stewardship and projection
- access and enjoyment
- education and interpretation
- proactive leadership
- science and research
- professionalism

These objectives provided the nucleus and direction for needed reforms; they also served as the criteria under which specific actions and strategies could be formulated. A "Statement of Condition" was included in the report, and recommendations were developed for each of the objectives. Many of the recommendations contained in this report indicate actions the Denver Service Center must take to support the needs and objectives of the National Park Service. These objectives and goals were reflected in the *Strategic Plan* (NPS 1994c).

"The Vail Agenda" (NPS 1992) states, "There is no clear baseline or standard of measure to

assess how things are, in fact, different today from the recent past." This statement shows the need for what must be accomplished by the National Park Service under the umbrella of the Government Performance and Results Act.

NATIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Shortly after the conclusion of the Vail Symposium, work on the National Performance Review began. This work and recommendations it created are in *From Red Tape to Results, Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less* (Vice President Gore 1993). The basic mandate to all agencies was to streamline, reengineer work process, and downsize the workforce. This mandate drove NPS and DSC reorganization; strategic planning was also an influence in reorganization.

NPS STRATEGIC PLANNING

The *Strategic Plan* for the National Park Service (NPS 1994c), published in August, set out three vision statements and identified seven broad goals to guide the restructuring plan for the National Park Service. However, the *Strategic Plan* was begun before the enactment of the Government Performance and Results Act and does not contain all the information required by the act. The plan is under review, and a revision is scheduled for completion in September 1996. This plan will also serve as a reference and guideline for the Denver Service Center.

The updated plan envisions the National Park Service as an exemplary steward, as a guide and teacher, and as an advocate and partner in extending the benefits of healthy natural and cultural systems to society. The draft revised plan to date has seven long-term goals that recognize increasing threats to the environment. The goals also recognize that the National Park Service is operating under severe fiscal limitations and with fewer personnel. The roles of steward, teacher, and partner are incorporated in the following goals. The National Park Service will

- establish a scientific/scholarly basis for resource management decisions
- strengthen protection of park resources
- achieve sustainability in all park operations and developments
- help people forge emotional, intellectual, and recreation ties with their natural and cultural heritages
- lead in a national initiative to strengthen the recognition and perpetuation of heritage resources and their public benefits
- become a more responsive, efficient, and accountable organization
- pursue maximum public benefit through contracts, cooperative agreements,

contributions, and other alternative approaches to support park operations

NPS RESTRUCTURING, STREAMLINING, AND DOWNSIZING

The NPS senior management team was recreated and renamed the National Leadership Council (NLC). It operates under a personal code of conduct prepared and agreed to by its members. NLC efforts are directed toward updating the *Strategic Plan*, restructuring to improve performance, and conforming with mandated FTE reductions. The work of this group and many other subgroups was reported in the *Restructuring Plan* for the National Park Service (NPS 1994d).

Before the restructuring effort, 10 regional offices provided policy direction and support services for park units within their regional boundaries. Regional boundaries were defined according to state boundaries.

The 10 former regional offices became seven field offices with boundaries determined by ecological, cultural, and geographic characteristics rather than geopolitical boundaries. Parks were joined into 16 clusters of 10 to 35 parks. All clusters have field unit superintendents and a systems support office of 65 to 80 support people. Each cluster brokers and shares services between its individual parks. For instance, if one park within the cluster has a superior system for handling personnel work, it might serve as a center for that type of work within the cluster. Another park might have outstanding expertise in interpretive services, concessions, or contract management and could assist other parks with those functions. It is a way of sharing rather than constantly duplicating services and personnel.

The headquarters in Washington, D.C., now focuses on providing program direction, policy guidance, and communication with Congress, the Office of Management and Budget, and other agencies. Field directors provide the link in this process with the system support offices, cluster groups, and individual parks.

INTEGRATION OF DSC GOALS AND TARGETS WITH THE NPS STRATEGIC PLANNING OFFICE

Part of the direction from the DSC director and the L team was that work should be coordinated with the Strategic Planning Office and that DSC goals should nest or be integrated with the overall NPS goals. The DSC effort has been coordinated with the Strategic Planning Office, and documents were provided with advice and comment requested as needed. Additionally, the Denver Service Center was invited to participate in a Strategic Planning

Office work session to establish goals and measurement of results for the National Park Service. The Denver Service Center has also participated in a training session for other lead parks and program offices. The Strategic Planning Office has also provided two overview GPRA training and information sessions for target leaders and other interested DSC employees.

The Denver Service Center has maintained a lead position in carrying out the Government Performance and Results Act since July 1995. Copies of formats and working documents have been shared with requesting parks and system support offices and with facilitators working with park groups. Although field areas and other offices may prepare their plans using different terms, the documents provide a process to follow that could be useful in understanding GPRA tenants.

The NPS efforts to conform to GPRA requirements is led by the Strategic Planning Office, which is guiding, assisting, and training a group of 30 lead parks and program offices. The Denver Service Center is one of the lead program offices.

SHORT-RANGE IMPACTS

Development of the goals, targets, and performance measurement systems provides an immediate focus for continuing the reinvention of the Denver Service Center. The DSC goals and targets will be immediately visible to all employees. The goals and targets also provide a fabric that determines what issues will be given attention and Denver Service Center will not do. The L team has already incorporated the five goals as critical results in their performance plans. This emphasizes the fact that management is serious about their commitment to the GPRA process, and the goals and targets will be used in determining the relative importance of budget items and activities within the office.

During DSC budget and priority-setting meetings, the L team has consistently used the GPRA goals and targets as criteria for setting budget priorities. The same criteria have been used to determine how training funds are to be used.

After two years, a baseline will have been established. If adjustments need to be made, this baseline will provide the reasons and the background for the adjustments. The process will provide objective data that cannot be interpreted as a whim of management. Management decisions can be logically supported and defended by using the process.

LONG-RANGE IMPLICATIONS

What Problems Still Seem Intractable

After working with the system for three or four years, there should be a very strong sense of direction. Measurements will provide objective data and be more accurate than in the initial stages. The importance of considering the meaning of the goals and targets within the office would become second nature, an accepted way of doing business. This should also become obvious to our customers in terms of DSC performance. The Denver Service Center has lacked clear vision in the past. The Government Performance and Results Act and reinvention, working in tandem, will correct the problem. The impact is reality for both management and employees.

COSTS

The Denver Service Center has not encountered significant political or bureaucratic costs in its reinvention efforts. The office has not changed location and has not significantly affected the local economy through downsizing. It has received some negative press due to its shifting needs to locate and relocate employees in temporary offices. The physical size of the main DSC building prohibits the location of all NPS employees in one location. The building is shared with a field headquarters office and several Washington, D.C. (WASO) offices located in Denver.

Currently, all employees of the DSC payroll are in the main building, and WASO employees are being relocated to other office space. This has been a difficult transition period, particularly for employees.

Because the Denver Service Center is project funded, it continues to be difficult to allocate personnel to ever-increasing overhead costs to meet the requirements of reinvention and implement GPRA requirements. The expenditure of time and money seem justified. However, the results have yet to be realized.

LESSONS LEARNED

INTERACTION BETWEEN MANAGEMENT, TASK GROUP, AND STRATEGIC PLANNING OFFICE

1. The DSC task group was given clear direction with specific results expected. The Strategic Planning Office provided the task group with a comprehensive overview briefing to explain what the Government Performance and Results Act was all about. A point of contact between management and workgroups is essential to answer the questions that arise. It is helpful to have a point of contact for both management and the task group so that lines of communication are clear and increase the speed and ease of getting things done. Direct access to the Strategic Planning Office and their GPRA knowledge base was also very helpful.

2. To a minor extent there was some pride of ownership associated with the goals and targets with both the L team and the task group. Original goals and targets and their relationships were rewritten, modified, and reordered, which caused some consternation. This was recognized early and resolved in a satisfactory manner. This same problem is occurring as target leaders begin work on implementation activities. People do not want to be given a task and not have some input in the job requirements. The same theme of ownership-input is again visible with some of the target groups.

When the task group gave briefings to the L team, a written copy was provided with a list of questions. This technique got answers quickly and provided clear direction. This more effectively used the time of the task group members who also had project responsibilities.

3. Management must decide whether the task groups can realistically meet imposed deadlines and accomplish all regularly assigned job responsibilities. This was done with the GPRA effort. However, attendance by all people at all meetings was not possible and posed a problem in terms of repetitive communication and completing work assignments on time.

COMMUNICATIONS (BARRIERS, NEEDS, TIMELINESS)

1. The language of the Government Performance and Results Act is difficult to understand because it uses unfamiliar words to describe concepts — such as inputs, outputs, outcomes, and results achieved. This problem was alleviated somewhat when the L team used words more common in the DSC vocabulary. Goals remained as outcomes, while targets were substituted for an additional layer of incremental outcomes that clearly lead to goal accomplishment. Units of measure, existing conditions, and performance measurement were

easily understandable, while inputs was translated to activities required to reach a target.

The problem of relating GPRA language to commonly held concepts was also a sticking point when the Strategic Planning Office worked with park and program office representatives on strategic goals and performance measurements. Matching the thought process to concepts and new vocabulary takes some time, and there should be freedom to substitute more common or appropriate words. Subsequent training and receipt of handout materials has been helpful and is curing that problem.

3. Even with detailed consideration for effective communication, many employees still complain about the lack of information provided. During the height of reinvention work, notes were passed to all employees by e-mail on an almost weekly basis. However, more personal contact was requested so that a two-way dialogue could take place. It has also been noted that there is a resistance to the use of e-mail by some employees.

SELLING THE PRODUCT TO EMPLOYEES AND ESTABLISHING BELIEF

1. A system to communicate on all levels should be carefully planned and executed. Leaders should constantly reinforce their beliefs in the product by word and actions. Second-tier leadership must also believe in the project. They have contact with employees on a daily basis and are the glue in the organization between management and employees. Face-to-face communication should be used to establish belief by testing concepts to get answers.

2. Distribution of the employee copies of the DSC goals and targets (see exhibit D) was delivered to each functional chief with a follow-up e-mail . The plan was for each functional chief to provide and explain the package to each quality leader and technical expert; they in turn would present and provide the package to each employee within their communication network. Feedback indicates that in many cases the information was distributed with little or no communication. As work progresses and the importance of the Government Performance and Results Act becomes apparent, there will be more interest.

MASSIVE EFFORTS: RESTRUCTURING, DOWNSIZING, PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, AND EMPLOYEE MORALE

In the last two years, the Denver Service Center has placed itself under a microscope and is now in a positive process of change that will benefit employees and customers. The change process is difficult and painful to many and exciting and challenging to others. While the management team has changed and many action items have been put in place for change, there is still a long way to go. Much of the change process will depend on partners and customers.

LESSONS LEARNED

The Denver Service Center cannot make all the changes necessary to improve without their help. As progress and successes are shown, attitudes will change and more employees will become advocates. Implementing cultural change within an office is difficult and takes time. Good communication, fair treatment of employees, and strong leadership are keys to success.

OTHER LESSONS LEARNED

1. Time must be allocated for survey design to ensure collection of the desired information. Adequate time is needed for collation and interpretation of the feedback. Additionally, employees expect and deserve feedback as part of an effective communication process.

2. Facilitation skills are extremely important. If the organization does not have skilled facilitators on staff, they should be hired. Work can be accomplished faster and with fewer interpersonal problems.

A few employees felt slightly intimidated and had difficulty expressing their thoughts in the workgroups. Facilitators encouraged members to fully participate, and some of the more outspoken members, usually managers, were cautioned to listen to others and not be too forceful with their own views.

4. All workgroups were given the same format to synthesize their reports, but they had little guidance or direction on what was expected. This proved detrimental by forcing important data out of the feedback process.

5. Some of the appointed workgroup members did not fully represent group thinking and had a tendency to present their personal views. This issue was answered when the reinvention team met with former workgroup members to validate information contained in the *Final Synthesis Report* (NPS 1994a).

6. Physically moving people to new locations to reflect the new organizational structure is a huge undertaking. This work has been complicated by moving people from satellite offices, negotiating and designing space for other groups moving to outside space, computer wiring, telephone number changes, occupational requirements, seating arrangements, employees who do or do not want to sit together in tight working areas, the needs of employees with disabilities and allergies, and a poor heating and ventilating system. Additionally, budget allocations did not match management aspirations to provide employees with better working conditions. Space issues are placed on a DSC bulletin board for all employees. It is used regularly for updates. However, the person dealing with space has reported a tremendous amount of time spent on personal issues, both real and perceived. Working with employee

issues is demanding. It would have been helpful to establish methods for handling employee issues prior to actually working with space planning problems.

WHAT PROBLEMS STILL SEEM INTRACTABLE

1. New roles and functions for other offices within the National Park Service must be reinforced by top management. Oversight for DSC projects is a park function unless policy is involved and higher review and approval authority is necessary. To reduce escalating project costs, the review and oversight process must be shortened.
2. Park infrastructures are in a terrible decline, and more and more visitors are pouring through the gates. Budgets continue to be reduced, which creates a great deal of competition between NPS offices for available project funds. The illusion among many customers is that the Denver Service Center is very expensive compared to base-funded offices, which results in hesitancy to employ the Denver Service Center. Somehow, this playing field must be leveled to reveal true project costs. A customer educational program has been tried without success. The Denver Service Center must, as a GPRA goal and target, increase its workload through both internal and external customers. Good marketing, as in the private sector, may help.
3. A number of items recommended for implementation by the reinvention laboratory require departmental and congressional approval. An effort will be made to take the necessary steps, provide the information, and make the necessary appeal to the appropriate people. It is a crucial step in reducing costs and streamlining processes.

WHERE WE ARE IN THE PROCESS

TRANSFORMING THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN TO ACTION

Target leaders representing functional groups met, were briefed, and received information packages on April 20, 1996. The special projects group divided the 28 targets between four people who will coordinate with target leaders to provide support, facilitate the work, and prevent overlap and duplication of work. A one-page monthly e-mail report has been initiated so that target leaders can keep the coordinators informed, document costs, be aware of problems, and record progress. Coordinators will consolidate the monthly reports and provide summaries and briefings to the L team.

Most of the target leaders have met with their groups, are developing a time line, and have made individual assignments leading to the completion of work identified for FY 96. There are over 100 DSC employees involved in the effort to implement the DSC goals and targets (see exhibit F). This is being accomplished in addition to assigned project planning and design work.

CUSTOMER REVIEW AND FEEDBACK

The Special Projects group prepared an information package that showed the NPS mission, the DSC vision, and the five goals for the Denver Service Center. It provided an introduction to the Government Performance and Results Act and a list of the goals and targets and results to be achieved for FY96 through FY2000. This package went to every DSC employee (see exhibit D). The same package was also sent to the customer review group (44 superintendents of field areas) for review and comments. Two months after release, written feedback has been negligible. However, some very positive feedback has been received from these superintendents by the L team. We will assume that the superintendents like what they saw and had no comments.

THE NEXT STEPS

CONTINUING TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN

Special projects coordinators will receive and collate the first monthly target leaders' reports in June. Coordinators will continue to look for ways that overhead costs can be reduced during the implementation phase. Coordination between groups is extremely important so that no work is duplicated. Additionally, the work to implement recommendations of the DSC reinvention lab is beginning. In some cases these recommendations are closely aligned to the goals and targets (see exhibit G), and again, duplication must be avoided by close coordination. These relationships have been noted so that target leaders are aware.

GOALS AND MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS

There is concern about the large number of measurement systems that must be developed and put in place. There are eight measurement systems in place, and an additional 24 are needed to measure results achieved. Although some systems are no more than simply tracking and counting, others are more complicated and will require the use of spreadsheets, databases, or the possible modification of the Resources Project Management system now in use.

The DSC computer network is supported by the colocated Administrative Program Center that serve the Denver Service Center and other NPS offices. The long-range goal for the measurement systems is for every employee to be able to know how we are doing in the GPRA office process by having computer access to the information.

The special projects GPRA coordinators will serve as the interface between the target leaders and the computer network office to develop, improve, and modify existing and future systems. Cost containment and simplification and the use of currently available software will be important considerations in putting the new measurement systems in place.

DEALING WITH MEASUREMENT RESULTS AND MAKING CORRECTIONS

A process has not been developed at this time for measuring and making corrections. A plan will be developed to collect and analyze information and to provide recommendations to the L team. Establishing an accurate baseline is the case for many of the targets.

TIME LINE FOR CASE STUDY EVENTS

We anticipate that if the target and measurement system resides in one DSC functional area, that functional chief and staff will collect and analyze information and make recommendations for improvement. If the performance measure cuts across functional lines, a group such as special projects may be used to collect and analyze information and provide recommendations to the L team.

Much of this data will provide the nucleus for the *DSC Annual Report*, replacing the existing format. This data may also form the basis for the DSC contribution in the national reporting system and carry over into the NPS report to the Department of the Interior and Congress.

At this time the NPS Washington, D.C. headquarters office is working on a budget and expense system to blend data into one system for the report to Congress. The Denver Service Center will be included in reporting within this system.

CUSTOMER PROJECT SURVEYS

As stated in several of the targets, the Denver Service Center will ask for customer feedback on accomplishing our work. Many of our customers and all of our employees have received copies of the DSC vision, goals, and targets ((see exhibit D). The Denver Service Center has received some very favorable feedback. However, the proof will be in the customer reviews of our project work.

TIME LINE FOR CASE STUDY EVENTS

1991 — 75th anniversary of the National Park Service — Intense review of NPS responsibilities and objectives.

October 1991 — Symposium held at Vail, Colorado, culminating in setting six strategic objectives for the National Park Service. Seven hundred NPS employees and external delegates attend the symposium.

1992–1993 — Work begins on the National Performance Review mandating agencies to streamline, reengineer work processes, and downsize the workforce.

August 1993 — Government Performance and Results Act legislation passed.

January 1994 — New director for the Denver Service Center appointed. There were retreats with management staff and six strategic DSC objectives were identified.

February 1994 — DSC all-employee meeting held to discuss FTE reduction and changing how to do business. Employee survey distributed to validate objectives and gain consensus on what to focus on.

March–April 1994 — DSC employee scoping group produces a task directive outlining work required and results to be achieved. Recommendations will be made concerning the six strategic objectives.

May 1994 — DSC employee workgroups are established and begin work to provide recommendations on achieving the objectives.

June–July 1994 — Final synthesis for all workgroup products is completed and submitted to DSC director.

August 1994 — NPS *Strategic Plan* (NPS 1994c) was completed, setting out three vision statements and identifying seven broad goals to guide restructuring.

August 1994 — All DSC employees receive *Final Synthesis Document* for review and comment. Employee responses assembled.

August 1994 — Denver Service Center is selected as a Department of the Interior reinvention

TIME LINE FOR CASE STUDY EVENTS

laboratory. A team of eight people assembled from the Denver Service Center, the parks, and regional office to participate. (Three are DSC customers.) Focus is improvement of DSC work processes.

September 1994 — All comments are reviewed by DSC management. A reinvention team is selected from past workgroup members and management. The focus is to develop the implementation strategy and a more comprehensive plan to meet the six objectives.

October 1994 — DSC reinvention team begins work. Reengineering lab receives training and begins work. All-employee meeting is held to discuss the next steps in the process. Another survey is completed to assess employee opinions regarding the processes.

December 1994 — A DSC vision statement is proposed. Draft is reviewed by 44 parks (customers), other central offices, and DSC employees.

November–April 1995 — DSC reinvention team and lab collect and analyze data and make recommendations. Progress is presented to other NPS offices and park groups. Reengineering lab also presents recommendations to similar groups.

February 1995 — DSC management, reinvention team and reengineering lab retreat for a week-long contractor facilitated charette (workshop) to determine optimal structure for the Denver Service Center. All-employee meeting held to deliver the charette finding.

March 1995 — DSC director presents reengineering lab findings to NPS National Leadership Council, which endorses the work and recommendations. Forty-four superintendents are sent a briefing statement containing a summary of the lab's work, proposed DSC structure, basic criteria and philosophy for proposed changes, and a number of questions and answers. DSC management team retreats for two days to prepare for implementation of the reinvention team and reengineering lab recommendations.

April 1995 — All-employee meeting is held following completion of work by the reinvention team and reengineering lab. Employees preview the work completed and register questions and concerns in a large group as well as later in smaller groups. Expectations for next six months are outlined. Communications group selects additional employee representatives to work with employees during this accelerated implementation phase.

May 1995 — The final DSC *Reinvention Plan* is completed and distributed to 44 superintendents, field directorates, and Washington, D.C. directorate. An implementation team (I team) is established and assists the organizational transition. This group monitors and ensures attention to all details for smooth transition. A communications network is established with representatives from all offices.

Time Line

June 1995 — Top management positions are filled through competitive process. The new leadership team retreats with professional facilitator and emerges with goals, operating principles, refined roles, and responsibilities.

July 1995 — The DSC leadership team meets with the NPS Strategic Planning Office staff to develop DSC goals and performance measures in conformance with the Government Performance and Results Act.

August 1995 — Second-tier management selections are made. "Change, and Coping with Change" training has been completed with customer service training scheduled.

September 1995 — Employees other than those selected for leadership roles receive new assignments. L team meets to complete GPRA goals, targets and performance measurements. Special projects coordinators also attend to take on the detailed phases of the Government Performance and Results Act.

October 1995 — An all-employee ceremony is held to commemorate DSC changes in management, philosophy, and operating principles. Implementation team work is concluded with remaining work taken on by the L team.

October 1995 — Employee task group is selected and begins work on DSC GPRA plan.

November 1995 — GPRA DSC coordinators brief L team to gain consensus on goals, target organization, refinement and editing, collection of existing condition data, and direction.

December 1995 — Work halted due to government shutdown.

January 1996 — Task group work continues, developing formats, a phased implementation plan, and a simplified all-employee format.

February 1996 — Implementation plan and employee document accepted and produced with full distribution to 600 DSC employees and 44 superintendents.

March 1996 — DSC GPRA target leaders and groups named by L team. Organizational materials are prepared for each target team.

April 1996 — FY96 target leaders are briefed. Work begins on activities listed in the implementation plan leading to accomplishment of desired results. Target leaders call initial

TIME LINE FOR CASE STUDY EVENTS

meetings with designated group to plan work, prepare a schedule and assign individual responsibilities.

May 1996 — All target groups are briefed, assigned activities, and begin work on implementing DSC targets.

Time Line

EXHIBIT A: FIRST CUT AT GPRA GOALS AND TARGETS (L TEAM), 1995

TIME LINE FOR CASE STUDY EVENTS

EXHIBIT B: SECOND CUT AT GOALS AND TARGETS, 1995

Exhibit D: DSC Employee Package, 1996

EXHIBIT C: DSC TARGET PRIORITIES, 1996

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT D: DSC EMPLOYEE PACKAGE, 1996

Exhibit D: DSC Employee Package, 1996

EXHIBIT E: TARGET PRIORITY PACKAGE, 1996

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT F: GPRA DSC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, 1996

Exhibit D: DSC Employee Package, 1996

EXHIBIT G: DSC GOALS AND TARGETS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hammer, Michael and James Champy

1993 *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution*. NY, New York: HarperBusiness, a division of HarperCollins Publishers.

National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior

1992 *National Parks for the 21st Century: The Vail Agenda — Report and Recommendations to the Director of the National Park Service*. The Steering Committee of the 75th Anniversary Symposium. Reprinted by Capital City Press, Montpelier, Vermont.

1994a *A Final Synthesis Report of Recommendations for Improving the Denver Service Center*. Denver Service Center, Denver, CO.

1994b *Compilation of Final Reports from Six Priority Workgroups*. Denver Service Center, Denver, CO.

1994c *Creating Our Future: A Strategic Plan for the National Park Service*. On file at the Denver Service Center, Denver, CO.

1994d *Restructuring Plan for the National Park Service*. On file at the Denver Service Center, Denver, CO.

1995a *Reinvention Laboratory, Denver Service Center*. Denver Service Center, Denver, CO.

1995b *Reinvention Plan, Meeting Today's Challenges and Tomorrow's Needs*. Denver Service Center, Denver, CO.

1996a *Denver Service Center Annual Report Fiscal Year 1995*. Denver Service Center, Denver, CO.

1996b "Key NPS Measures." A handout prepared by the Strategic Planning Office for a GPRA training course.

Rivlin, Alice B.

Exhibit D: DSC Employee Package, 1996

1995” Linking Resources to Results.” *The Public Manager — The New Bureaucrat* 24:2.

Vice President Al Gore

1993 *From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less — Report for the National Performance Review*. Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C.