

Appendix E: Services Assessment

Based on MacMillan Matrix for Nonprofit agencies from the Alliance for Nonprofit Management. Adapted by GreenPlay LLC, and GP RED for Public Sector Agencies. April 2009.

Public agencies have not traditionally been thought of as organizations needing to be competitively oriented. Unlike private and commercial enterprises which compete for customers and whose very survival depends on satisfying paying customers, many public and non-profit organizations operate in a non-market, or grants economy – one in which services may not be commercially viable. In other words, the marketplace may not supply sufficient and adequate resources.

In the public sector, our customers (taxpayers) do not decide how funding is allocated and which service gets adequate, ongoing funding. (In fact, many public agencies and non-profits can be considered “sole-source,” the only place to get a service, so there is little to no market saturation and therefore, potential for apathetic service enhancement and improvement). Consequently, public and non-profit organizations have not necessarily had an incentive to question the status quo, to assess whether customer needs were being met, or to examine the cost-effectiveness or quality of available services.

The public sector and market environments have changed, funders and customers alike are beginning to demand more accountability; and both traditional (taxes and mandatory fees) and alternative funding (grants and contributions) are getting harder to come by, even as need and demand increase. This increasing demand for a smaller pool of resources requires today's public and non-profit agencies to rethink how they do business, to provide services where appropriate, to avoid duplicating existing comparable services, and to increase collaboration, when possible. In addition, organizations are leveraging all available resources where possible.

An assessment of a **Public Sector Agency Services** is an intensive review of organizational services including activities, facilities, and parklands that leads to the development of an agency's **Service Portfolio**. Additional results indicate whether the service is “**core to the organization's values and vision,**” and provides recommended provision strategies that can include, but are not limited to enhancement of service, reduction of service, collaboration, advancing or affirming market position, etc. This assessment begins to provide a nexus relative to which services are central to the organization's purpose. The process includes an analysis of: each service's relevance to the organization's values and vision; the organization's market position in the community relative to market; other service providers in the service area including quantity and quality of provider; and the economic viability of the service.

Based on the **MacMillan Matrix for Competitive Analysis of Programs**¹⁴, the Public Sector Services Assessment Matrix is an extraordinarily valuable tool that is specifically adapted to help public agencies assess their services. The MacMillan Matrix realized significant success in the non-profit environment and has led to application in the public sector. The **Public Sector Agency Services Assessment Matrix** is based on the assumption that duplication of existing comparable services (unnecessary competition) among public and non-profit organizations can fragment limited resources available, leaving all providers too weak to increase the quality and cost-effectiveness of customer services. This is also true for public agencies.

¹⁴ Alliance for Nonprofit Management

The **Public Sector Agency Service Assessment Matrix** assumes that trying to be all things to all people can result in mediocre or low-quality service. Instead, agencies should focus on delivering higher-quality service in a more focused (and perhaps limited) way. The Matrix helps organizations think about some very pragmatic questions.

- Q: Is the agency the best or most appropriate organization to provide the service?**
- Q: Is market competition good for the citizenry?**
- Q: Is the agency spreading its resources too thin without the capacity to sustain core services and the system in general?**
- Q: Are there opportunities to work with another organization to provide services in a more efficient and responsible manner?**

Services Assessment Matrix <small>© 2009 GreenPlay LLC and GP RED</small>		Financial Capacity Economically Viable		Financial Capacity Not Economically Viable	
		Alternative Coverage High	Alternative Coverage Low	Alternative Coverage High	Alternative Coverage Low
Good Fit	Strong Market Position	Affirm Market Position 1	Advance Market Position 2	Complementary Development 5	“Core Service” 6
	Weak Market Position	Divest 3	Invest, Collaborate or Divest 4	Collaborate or Divest 7	Collaborate or Divest 8
Poor Fit	Divest				9

Note: Based on MacMillan Matrix for Nonprofit agencies from the Alliance for Nonprofit Management. Adapted by GreenPlay, LLC, and GP RED for Public Sector Agencies. April 2009.

Fit

Fit is the degree to which a service aligns with the agency's values and vision, reflecting the community's interests. If a service aligns with the agency's values and vision, and contributes to the overall enhancement of the community, it is classified as "good fit," if not, the service is considered a "poor fit."

- Does the service align with agency values and vision?
- Does the service provide community-wide return on investment (i.e. community, individual, environmental, or economic benefits and outcomes that align with agency values such as crime prevention, improved health and well-being, enhancement of property values)?

Financial Capacity

Financial Capacity is the degree to which a service (including a program, facility or land asset is currently or potentially attractive as an investment of current and future resources to an agency from an economic perspective.

No program should be classified as "highly attractive" unless it is ranked as attractive on a substantial majority of the criteria below.

- Does the service have the capacity to sustain itself (break even) independent of General Fund or taxpayer subsidy/support?
- Can the service reasonably generate at least XXXXX% (TBD) from fees and charges?
- Can the service reasonably generate excess revenues over direct expenditures through the assessment of fees and charges?
- Are there consistent and stable alternative funding sources such as donations, sponsorships, grants and/or volunteer contributions for this service?
- Can the service reasonably generate at least XXXXX% (TBD) of the costs of service from alternative funding sources?
- Is there demand for this service from a significant/large portion of the service's target market?
- Can the user self-direct or operate/maintain the service without agency support?

Market Position

Market Position is the degree to which the organization has a stronger capability and potential to deliver the service than other agencies – a combination of the agency’s effectiveness, quality, credibility, and market share dominance. No service should be classified as being in a “strong market position” unless it has some clear basis for declaring superiority over all providers in that service category, and is ranked as affirmative on a substantial majority of the criteria below.

- Does the agency have the adequate resources necessary to effectively operate and maintain the service?
- Is the service provided at a convenient or good location in relation to the target market?
- Does the agency have a superior track record of quality service delivery?
- Does the agency currently own a large share of the target market currently served?
- Is the agency currently gaining momentum or growing its customer base in relation to other providers? (e.g., "Is there a consistent waiting list for the service?")
- Can you clearly define the community, individual, environmental and/or economic benefits realized as a result of the service
- Does agency staff have superior technical skills needed for quality service delivery?
- Does the agency have the ability to conduct necessary research, pre and post participation assessments, and/or properly monitor and evaluate service performance therefore justifying the agency’s continued provision of the service? (Benchmarking performance or impact to community issues, values, or vision)
- Are marketing efforts and resources effective in reaching and engaging the target market?

Alternative Coverage

Alternative Coverage is the extent to which like or similar services are provided in the service area to meet customer demand and need. If there are no other large (significant), or very few small agencies producing or providing comparable services in the same region or service area, the service should be classified as "low coverage." Otherwise, coverage is "high."

Unfair Competition

It has become somewhat challenging to draw a line of demarcation between those services that are recognized to be the prerogative of the private sector and those thought to be the responsibility of the public sector. Overlap of service production and provision are common. A continuing problem today is the lack of clarification between what sector should be producing or providing which services, therefore, developing boundaries. What is needed is the reshaping of how public and private sector agencies work independent of each other or together in a more effective way, becoming complementary rather than duplicative.

Service lines are blurred due to a variety of factors. Whether it is due to the emergence of new services, not offered before, in response to customer demand, or reduced availability of public funds and therefore greater dependence on revenue generation, these blurred lines sometimes result in charges that the public sector engages in unfair competition practices by offering similar or like services to those of the private sector. These charges result from the resource advantages the public sector has over the private sector including but not limited to immunity from taxation and the ability to charge lower fees for similar or like services due to receipt of subsidy dollars.

Recommended Provision Strategies – Defined (numbers refer to graphic above)

Affirm Market Position (1) – a number (or one significant) *alternative provider(s)* exists yet the service has *financial capacity* and the agency is in a *strong market position* to provide the service to customers or the community. **Affirming market position** includes efforts to capture more of the market and investigating the merits of competitive pricing strategies. This includes investment of resources to realize a financial return on investment. Typically, these services have the ability to generate excess revenue.

Advance Market Position (2) – a smaller number or no *alternative providers* exist to provide the service, the service has *financial capacity* and the agency is in a *strong market position* to provide the service. Due primarily to the fact that there are fewer if any alternative providers, **advancing market position** of the service is a logical operational strategy. This includes efforts to capture more of the market, investigating the merits of market pricing, and various outreach efforts. Also, this service may be an excess revenue generator by increasing volume.

Divestment (3,4,7,8,9) – the agency has determined that the service does not fit with the agency's values and vision, and/or the agency has determined it is in a *weak market position* with little or no opportunity to strengthen its position. Further, the agency deems the service to be contrary to the agency's interest in the responsible use of resources, therefore, the agency is positioned to consider **divestment** of the service.

Investment (4) – **investment** of resources is the agency's best course of action as the service is a *good fit* with values and vision, and an opportunity exists to strengthen the agency's current *weak market position* in the marketplace.

Complementary Development (5)– the service is a *good fit*, a number of or one significant *alternative provider(s)* exists which provide the service, the agency is in a *strong market position* to provide the service, yet it does not have *financially capacity* to the agency. “**Complementary development**” encourages planning efforts that lead to complementary service development rather than duplication, broadening the reach of all providers. Although there may be perceived market saturation for the service due to the number or like services of alternative providers, demand and need exists justifying the service’s continued place in the market.

Collaboration (4,7,8)– the agency determines that the service can be enhanced or improved through the development of a collaborative effort as the agency’s current *market position is weak*. **Collaborations** (e.g., partnerships) with other service providers (internal or external) that minimize or eliminate duplication of services while most responsibly utilizing agency resources are recommended.

Core Service (6) – these services *fit* with the agency’s values and vision, there are few if any *alternative providers*, yet the agency is in a *strong market position* to provide the service. However, the agency does not have the *financial capacity* to sustain the service outside of General Fund support and the service is deemed to not be economically viable. These services are “**core**” to **satisfying the agency’s values and vision** typically benefiting all community members, or are seen as essential to the lives of under-served populations.

Glossary

Ability - the quality or state of being able; power to perform; competence in doing

Adequate - sufficient for a specific requirement; reasonably sufficient

Capacity - the potential or suitability for accommodating; the maximum amount or number that can be contained or accommodated; the facility or power to produce, perform, or deploy; capability

Quality - meeting or exceeding expectations; degree of excellence; superiority in kind

Superior - of higher rank, quality, or importance; excellent of its kind

Target market – the specific market of a service (e.g., age, sex, race/ethnicity, education level, ability level, residence)

*This **Services Assessment Methodology** Outline is provided by:*



211 North Public Road, Suite 225, Lafayette, CO 80026
(303) 439-8369; Toll-free: 1-866-849-9959; Info@GreenPlayLLC.com; www.GreenPlayLLC.com; www.gpred.org
All rights reserved. Please contact GreenPlay or GP RED for more information.