

# Improving the Local Landscape for Innovation (Part 3): Assessment and Implementation: ASSESSMENT TOOL

Gigi Georges, Tim Glynn-Burke and Andrea McGrath 01  
November 2013

*The following was originally published by the Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government as part of its Occasional Papers Series.*

City officials engaged in efforts to improve their local landscapes for innovation in public problem solving should consider three questions:

- 1) What strategies are we pursuing and how do we know if they are actually working?
- 2) How do we communicate the value of our efforts to the public and other stakeholders—creating demand for innovation?
- 3) How can we institutionalize our work to ensure that future administrations will sustain these efforts?

The goal of the assessment tool is to help cities develop a

sophisticated approach to supporting and promoting innovation by assessing their current efforts through the lens of the strategies in the framework for an innovative jurisdiction (discussed in the miniseries), adapting the framework to their local contexts and communities and capturing metrics in a manner that responds to the three questions above.

The assessment tool reflects a framework comprising three main strategies, each of which has three components.

- For each component, the assessment tool guides cities to identify a set of desired objectives to guide their innovation efforts.
- For each objective, the assessment tool presents a set of key questions to help actors evaluate whether, or to what degree, they are meeting stated objectives.
- For each question, in turn, the assessment tool lists sample indicators that a city could employ to formulate an answer.

The components, objectives, questions and indicators that a city chooses to utilize should take into consideration the local context including mayoral priorities, political feasibility and operational capacity including availability of data and other resources.



The assessment tool is designed from the perspective of those whose portfolios include responsibility for driving innovation, which could include a mayor's office, city agency or innovation team. It aims to help cities identify their priorities and assess their progress in developing a more innovative jurisdiction. Because most cities are deploying some type of performance measurement system, they might incorporate this assessment tool into their existing measurement systems. The tool could also serve as a stand-alone system. No matter the approach, pulling data from as many sources as available across the city is important because the tool addresses a broad array of issues.

Some cities might choose to utilize the assessment tool as a rating or grading mechanism. Publishing results from the assessment tool internally or publicly might prove useful to building legitimacy and support for local innovation offices and teams.

Occasional Papers Series from the Ash Center for  
Democratic Governance and Innovation  
John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard  
University

# Assessment Tool p1

STRATEGY I: BUILD COLLECTIVE CAPACITY FOR INNOVATION		
Component I: Facilitate or Encourage Efforts to Improve Collaboration across Agencies or Sectors		
OBJECTIVES	KEY QUESTIONS	SAMPLE INDICATORS
1. Lay the groundwork for more effective partnering and collaboration	To what extent do you provide city employees opportunities to increase their skills, tools or knowledge to work in collaborations or partnerships? Through what mechanisms?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # workshops, online courses, retreats, other # opportunities offered # people/agencies participating
	To what extent do you provide nonprofits and community groups opportunities to increase their skills, tools or knowledge to work in collaborations or partnerships? Through what mechanisms?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # workshops, online courses, retreats, other # opportunities offered # people/agencies participating
	To what extent have you facilitated opportunities for potential collaborators to meet or interact? Through what mechanisms?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) networking and match-making events # opportunities # people/agencies participating
2. Increase the number of formal collaborations	To what extent do you create formal collaborations or partnerships with other city agencies?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # collaborations or partnerships # or % of city agencies involved
	To what extent do you create formal collaborations with outside partners, e.g., community organizations, universities, businesses?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # collaborations or partnerships # outside partners involved
	To what extent do you integrate collaboration or partnership objectives into strategic planning?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
3. Leverage collaborative networks to identify and disseminate new models	Are measures in place to track results from collaborations? If yes, to what extent does participation in collaborative networks help to identify new innovations or programs?	Yes/No Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # of new programs developed or identified through collaborations
	To what extent are innovations or best practices disseminated among network partners?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) Indicate top dissemination mechanisms

# Assessment Tool p2

STRATEGY I: BUILD COLLECTIVE CAPACITY FOR INNOVATION

Component II: Provide Platforms that Encourage New Innovators and Ideas, New Funding and More Volunteer Service

OBJECTIVES	KEY QUESTIONS	SAMPLE INDICATORS
1. Host or support platforms to attract new innovators <sup>1</sup>	To what extent do you host or support local platforms to attract new innovators from government? From the community?	# and type of platforms # participants from city government # participants from community
	To what extent do you track whether these platforms help increase the number of innovators in local government? In the community?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # new government innovators # new community innovators (nonprofits or other)
2. Host or support platforms to attract new ideas <sup>2</sup>	To what extent do you host or support local platforms to attract new ideas from local government? From the community?	# and type of 'new idea' platforms # ideas from government platforms # ideas from community platforms
	To what extent do you track whether these platforms help increase the number of new ideas from local government? From the community?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # ideas from local government # ideas suggested by the community # of sources suggesting ideas
	To what extent do you scan for new ideas or best practices outside of your local community?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # outside ideas replicated or adapted locally # and type of efforts to identify outside innovations
3. Host or support platforms to attract private funding <sup>3</sup>	To what extent do you host or support platforms to attract private funding to support local innovation?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # and type of platforms \$ amount raised
	To what extent do you track whether these platforms increase the amount of private funding raised?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) Level of local participation in platforms (# or %) Amount of funds raised # groups/ideas supported
4. Host or support platforms to attract volunteer service <sup>4</sup>	To what extent do you host or support local platforms to attract volunteer service?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # and type of 'new idea' platforms
	To what extent do public leaders support or champion volunteerism through public endorsement, participation, or funding?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you track whether these platforms help increase the amount of volunteer service in the community?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # volunteers or volunteer hours % residents who have volunteered

1 Examples of platforms for new innovators might include incubators, hubs, fellowships, recruitment, alternative certification programs and partnerships with human capital agencies.

2 Examples of platforms for new ideas might include crowdsourcing, "innovation hubs," incubators, competitions or challenges and hackathons.

3 Examples of platforms for private funding might include crowdsourcing, new funds, innovation hubs, incubators or accelerators, competitions or challenges and fellowships.

4 Examples of platforms for volunteers might include volunteer campaigns, events, websites or social media, recruitment drives and trainings.

## Assessment Tool p3

## STRATEGY I: BUILD COLLECTIVE CAPACITY FOR INNOVATION

## Component III: Support the Operational Capacity of Innovators and the Development and Adoption of Their Promising Ideas

OBJECTIVES	KEY QUESTIONS	SAMPLE INDICATORS
1. Support the operational capacity of innovators with key skills training, networking and other resources; <sup>5</sup>	To what extent do you provide direct support to help increase the skills, capacity or resources of innovators within local government? Within the community?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or frequency and type of supports # people receiving resources/supports \$ amount of spending on supports
	To what extent do you support local intermediaries or incubators that increase the skills and capacity of innovators or organizations? <sup>6</sup>	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # hubs or incubators supported # and types of assistance
	To what extent do you track the results of the support that you provide innovators and their organizations?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # new innovations or organizations launched; Evaluation from participants on skills learned and retained, capacity improved, or other
2. Establish systems and supports to develop, test and refine the most promising ideas	To what extent do you develop, test and refine new programmatic or operational ideas?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # pilot programs \$ amount of spending
	To what extent is there a system in place in your office to track the development, testing and refinement of innovations?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you apply consistent evaluation criteria at each stage of innovation development? <sup>8</sup>	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
3. Aid in the adoption or incorporation of innovations with proven impact	To what extent do you champion the successful adoption or incorporation of proven innovations across city government? Across the community?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # innovations deemed successful and adopted or incorporated by # of agencies # innovations deemed successful and adopted or incorporated by community
	To what extent do you assist innovators in navigating opposition to their efforts? <sup>9</sup>	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)

<sup>5</sup> Examples of support might include skills training and workshops, leadership training, mentoring, networking and shared workspace.

<sup>6</sup> Examples of support might include funding, direct participation, public support like PSAs and shared workspace.

<sup>7</sup> Additional sample indicators for nonprofit providers include # of innovators hitting funding targets, # providers improving results, # or % of local nonprofits actively innovating (defined as whether developed new service within past three years) and # of local organizations or innovations that receive national or noteworthy recognition.

<sup>8</sup> Stages might include prompting, developing, testing, sustaining and scaling or replicating ideas.

<sup>9</sup> Examples of assistance might include messaging or media strategies, communicating their value, finding advocates and participating in or helping coordinate coalition efforts

## Assessment Tool p4

STRATEGY II: RETHINK POLICY TO OPEN SPACE FOR INNOVATION		
Component I: Utilize Data to Better Understand Problems, Track Results and Direct Funds to Proven Policies and Programs		
OBJECTIVES	KEY QUESTIONS	SAMPLE INDICATORS
1. Establish a performance measurement system that quantifies outputs and outcomes	To what extent are performance measurement systems in place to evaluate your programs and operations?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of agencies utilizing performance measurement systems
	To what extent does the performance measurement system track/report on outputs? On outcomes?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of programs tracking/reporting
2. Use data and tools to understand problems, prompt insights, make decisions and design solutions	To what extent do you utilize data to better understand the details of the problems your programs address?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of city agencies
	To what extent do you analyze data to prompt new insights?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of city agencies
	To what extent do you utilize data in your planning, decision-making and implementation of programs and services?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of city agencies
3. Align data and evaluation tools to strategic goals	To what extent do staff in your office report progress regularly against strategic goals?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do current evaluation tools capture the metrics you are trying to quantify?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) % key metrics currently captured
	To what extent is there a common evaluation framework or close coordination of systems across programs?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
4. Use performance data to hold programs or providers accountable for results	To what extent are you utilizing accountability tools with the programs you fund and support?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of programs utilizing accountability tools
	To what extent do current evaluation tools capture the metrics you are trying to quantify?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of programs sanctioned or defunded
	To what extent are programs or providers continued or scaled when their performance meets or exceeds threshold standards?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of programs benefiting from incentives/rewards?
5. Make data transparent and accessible	To what extent are you providing a transparent window into key data?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # data sets that are being provided to public (as percentage of overall programmatic data)
	To what extent is the data format accessible and usable to an average citizen?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) Level of usage by residents (e.g., page views)

## Assessment Tool p5

STRATEGY II: RETHINK POLICY TO OPEN SPACE FOR INNOVATION		
Component II: Create Funding Mechanisms to Address Risk Such As an Innovation Fund, Leveraging Private Funding When Possible		
OBJECTIVES	KEY QUESTIONS	SAMPLE INDICATORS
1. Establish R&D fund that allows for creation, implementation and evaluation of innovations	To what extent do you make funding available for R&D or innovation?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	What are the funding sources? How flexible is the funding?	\$ amount of public funds \$ amount of private funds % or \$ amount of unrestricted funding
	To what extent are any private matching funds required for public funds distributed?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	What is the total size (\$) of the fund (annual/endowed)?	\$ amount/year (or for current fiscal year) % of overall budget?
	How much of this fund is spent directly on development versus implementation versus evaluation of innovative models? Other uses?	\$ amount or % of fund for development \$ amount or % of fund for implementation \$ amount or % of fund for evaluation
2. Establish measures to continue or scale innovations that show success and to discontinue innovations that do not	To what extent do you use measurable criteria to decide whether to continue or scale fund-based innovations that show success?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you employ outside evaluators to assist with or make determinations on fund-supported innovations from phase to phase?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you track a promising innovation after it moves out of the pilot phase?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
3. Track the number of innovations that are continued, scaled, or discontinued	To what extent do you track how many innovations supported by the fund are continued or scaled up?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of innovations continued # or % of innovations scaled up
	How many innovations supported by the fund are discontinued?	# or % of innovations discontinued

# Assessment Tool p6

STRATEGY II: RETHINK POLICY TO OPEN SPACE FOR INNOVATION		
Component III: Level Playing Field for New Ideas and Providers by Addressing Rules and Administrative Hurdles in Spending		
OBJECTIVES	KEY QUESTIONS	SAMPLE INDICATORS
1. Remove barriers for new providers or new program models	Approximately what share of public services is delivered through procurement or grants to outside providers?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of agencies utilizing performance measurement systems
	To what extent do you track and analyze the local supply of service providers?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of programs tracking/reporting
	To what extent do you address barriers to entry in the contracting process for new (non-legacy) providers and program models? <sup>10</sup>	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # and type of efforts
	To what extent is innovation written into RFPs as a condition or requirement of a successful proposal?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
2. Increase transparency to enlarge the competitor pool for potential providers	To what extent are procurement opportunities and processes transparent and easily accessible by new (non-legacy) providers?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) \$ value of public procurement openly advertised as % of overall city budget Providers' evaluation of the openness of process and accessibility of bidding
	To what extent are you attracting new potential providers through outreach and advertising?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # potential providers reached (e.g. page views)
4. Use performance data to hold programs or providers accountable for results	To what extent are your grants or contract dollars open to new, non-legacy providers (i.e., smaller nonprofits, start-ups, providers who have not contracted with you before, providers from others sectors)?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % total funded providers that are non-legacy organizations # or % of government funding sources to which non-legacy providers are entitled to apply (competitive bid)
	To what extent are your grants or contract dollars open to new ideas or program models, whether from an existing or new provider?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or % of funded ideas or programs that are non-legacy organizations \$ value of competitive contracts/grants directed toward novel ideas or programs # or % government funding sources directed towards new ideas or programs

<sup>10</sup> Examples of efforts to remove barriers to entry include sunset provisions, budget reclassifications, elimination of regulations, transparency rules and charter schools.

# Assessment Tool p7

STRATEGY III: DEVELOP A CULTURE OF INNOVATION		
Component I: Reward and Protect Risk-Taking Activities as well as Recruiting Risk-Takers or Innovators		
OBJECTIVES	KEY QUESTIONS	SAMPLE INDICATORS
1. Encourage and promote innovation and considered risk taking	To what extent does the mayor or agency head publicly champion innovation?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	How much/what type of public communication has come from city officials championing innovation?	# and type of communications
2. Establish systems and supports to develop, test and refine the most promising ideas	Do you have an innovation team or office? Is there an executive order or legislative action authorizing it?	Yes/No
	To what extent are you pursuing a comprehensive innovation agenda or strategy?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	Which policy or operational areas does your innovation initiative focus on?	# and description of policy or operational areas
	To what extent do agency staff (middle/line) work towards your innovation agenda or strategy?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
3. Reward efforts at innovation and risk taking; protect those who take considered risks	To what extent are incentives in place for generating or championing new ideas?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # and description of incentives in place
	To what extent is generating, testing or implementing new ideas reflected in performance reviews?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you (or HR departments) track/measure your ability to attract and retain innovators and risk takers?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) Retention rate for innovative employees Feedback from employee interviews (current and exiting) on role of innovation in their decisions to join, stay or leave organization
4. Increase potential for innovation through recruiting and human resources strategy	To what extent do you look to utilize expertise from outside government?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you (or HR departments) look to hire new talent from outside government?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you (or HR departments) track/measure employee feedback on your organization's innovativeness?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) Feedback on culture from exit interview

## Assessment Tool p8

STRATEGY III: DEVELOP A CULTURE OF INNOVATION		
Component II: Mobilize Community Awareness and the Public Will for Change and Innovation		
OBJECTIVES	KEY QUESTIONS	SAMPLE INDICATORS
1. Inform the public on major innovation or reform initiatives	To what extent are you sharing information on your innovation agenda or strategy with the general public?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) Measures of the extent of your reach to the public # and type of media hits (traditional or digital)
	To what extent are you sharing information on your innovation agenda or strategy with key influencers?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) Measures of the extent of your reach to key influencers
	To what extent do you incorporate your innovation work into a comprehensive communication strategy?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
2. Engage the public in major innovation or reform initiatives	To what extent are there mechanisms in place for all residents, businesses, community groups, etc. to provide input on major innovation or reform initiatives?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or frequency of mechanisms
	To what extent are residents, businesses, community groups, etc. included as advisors or partners in major innovation or reform initiatives?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent is there an intentional strategy to engage and include residents, businesses, community groups, etc. in support of major innovation or reform initiatives?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
3. Anticipate and plan for opposition to major innovation or reform initiatives	To what extent does the mayor, agency head or innovation team actively work to win support from opponents?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent are there mechanisms in place to mobilize residents to actively advocate for major innovation or reform initiatives?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always) # or frequency of mechanisms

## Assessment Tool p9

STRATEGY III: DEVELOP A CULTURE OF INNOVATION		
Component III: Empower Clients to Participate in Their Own Progress, Including Choice and Feedback on Programs and Services		
OBJECTIVES	KEY QUESTIONS	SAMPLE INDICATORS
1. Measure data at the individual or household level	To what extent do you gather evidence of individual- or household-level outcomes?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you gather evidence of increased self-sufficiency at an individual or family level?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
2. Solicit feedback from citizens ('clients' and others) on public services	To what extent are mechanisms in place to gather client feedback on public services?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you require service providers (nonprofit and other) to gather and report measures on client feedback?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent is client feedback incorporated into current and future funding decisions on a program or service provider?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
3. Anticipate and plan for opposition to major innovation or reform initiatives	To what extent do city agencies offer choices in service providers or programs to its clients?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)
	To what extent do you engage clients as potential partners or co-creators of public services?	Rate from 1 (never) to 5 (always)

## Selected Resources on Innovation Landscape Assessment

Australian Government Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research. "Public Sector Innovation Toolkit."

<http://innovation.govspace.gov.au/>

Australian National Audit Office. "Innovation in the Public Sector: Enabling Better Performance, Driving New Directions (Better Practice Guide)." December 2009.

<http://www.anao.gov.au/bpg-innovation/index.html>

Bloch, Carter, Lydia Lassen Jørgensen, Maria Theresa Norn, and Torben Bundgaard Vad. "Public Sector Innovation Index: A diagnostic tool for measuring innovative performance and capability in public sector organizations." CFA-DAMVAD, October 2009.

<http://nestainnovation.ning.com/forum/topics/measuring-innovation-within>

The Center for American Progress, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and Frederick M. Hess. "Leaders and Laggards: A State-by-State Report Card on Educational Innovation." November 2009.

<http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2009/11/09/6915/leaders-and-laggards/>

Special Report: The Government Dashboard." February 2012.

[http://www.govtech.com/pcio/special\\_reports/special-report-dashboards.html](http://www.govtech.com/pcio/special_reports/special-report-dashboards.html)

Corporation for National and Community Service and National Conference on Citizenship. "Volunteering and Civic Life in America 2012."

<http://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/>. [City-level data on volunteerism and other civic engagement.]

Cortright, Joe. "City Vitals 2.0: Benchmarking City Performance." CEOs for Cities, 2012.

<http://www.ceosforcities.org/>

<http://www.cfa.au.dk/>

Deloitte. "Driving Innovation in the Public Sector: Developing an Innovation Index." October 2009.

<http://nestainnovation.ning.com/forum/topics/measuring-innovation-within>

<http://www.cfa.au.dk/>

Gillett, Stacey. Presentation for Webinar "

Building a Culture of Innovation in Government: An Example from New York City Public Schools," August 15, 2011. Recording and related resources available at <http://www.innovations.harvard.edu>

The GreeningUSA.

12 Traits of Sustainable Communities. May 2010.

<http://www.greeningusa.org/>

Hartman, Kat. "D3 + UX : INSIGHT - The Skills Required for Innovation." Urban Innovation Exchange. April 12, 2013.

<http://www.uixdetroit.com/features/uixd3oneyear.aspx>

Hughes, Alastair, Matt Farren-Hanford, and Craig Baker.

"Public Sector Innovation Index: Exploratory Project."

Ernst & Young. October 2009.

<http://nestainnovation.ning.com/forum/topics/measuring-innovation-within>

Hughes, Alastair, Kyla Moore, and Nimesh Kataria.

"Innovation in Public Sector Organisations: A pilot survey for measuring innovation across the public sector." Nesta. March 2011.

<http://www.nesta.org.uk/publications>

The Innovation Unit.

"An Innovation Index for the Public Sector: Final Draft Report." Nesta. October 2009.

<http://nestainnovation.ning.com/forum/topics/measuring-innovation-within>

John S. and James L. Knight Foundation and Gallup. "Soul of the Community."

<http://www.soulofthecommunity.org/>

Jong In Yoon. "Government Innovation Index (GII): Concept, Development & Application."

Headquarters for Government Innovation, Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs, Republic of Korea. June 2006.

<http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan023428.pdf>

The Massachusetts Technology Collaborative and John Adams Innovation Institute. "Index of the Massachusetts Innovation Economy." 2010.

<http://www.masstech.org/research-and-analysis/innovation-index>

Metis Associates. "Evidence of Organizational Change: Qualitative Assessment of the NYC CEO's Impact on NYC Agencies and Provider Organizations." October 2009.

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/ceo/html/home/home.shtml>

Mulgan, Geoff, Julie Simon, and Louise Pulford. "Study on Social Innovation for the Bureau of European Policy Advisors." The Young Foundation. March 2011.

<http://youngfoundation.org/publications/study-on-social-innovation-for-the-bureau-of-european-policy-advisors/>

Nesta. "Annual Innovation Report 2010." January 2011.

[http://www.nesta.org.uk/areas\\_of\\_work/economic\\_growth/](http://www.nesta.org.uk/areas_of_work/economic_growth/)

[the\\_innovation\\_index/assets/features/annual\\_innovation\\_report](#)

OECD and EuroStat. "The Oslo Manual: Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data." 2005.

<http://www.oecd.org/innovation/inno/oslomanualguidelinesforcollectingandinterpretinginnovationdata3rdedition.htm>

Partnership for Public Service. "Best Places to Work in the Federal Government Analysis: Most Innovative Agencies." May 2013.

<http://bestplacestowork.org/BPTW/index.php>

Preskill, Hallie and Tanya Beer. "Evaluating Social Innovation." FSG Center for Evaluation Innovation. 2012.

<http://www.fsg.org/tabid/191/ArticleId/708/Default.aspx?srpush=true>

Pro Inno Europe. "Paper No. 15: European Innovation Scoreboard 2009: Comparative Analysis of Innovation Performance." 2009.

<http://www.slideshare.net/victori98pt/european-innovation-scoreboard-eis-2009>

USA.gov. "Performance Dashboards."

<http://www.usa.gov/Contact/Engagement/Dashboards.shtml>