

Index

- Australia, community engagement practices in, 6
- Balanced scorecard (BSC), 23
- Bias, 60
- Community engagement practices, 6
- Confirmation of VoC and TR, 73–76
- Consolidation of VoC lists, 68–70
- Critical decision, 35–40
 - PIHoQ in, 41
- Cultural precincts
 - importance and satisfaction ratings of, 35
 - performance indicators, 83
 - PIHoQ, 42, 45–46
 - sample TRs for, 28, 30
 - stakeholder comments related to performance indicators, 85–86
 - VoCs placement in PIHoQ, 24
- Customer-related TRs, sample performance indicators for, 33
- Customers, 2, 21–22
- Demographic analysis, 52
- External stakeholders, 2
 - development of VoC outputs, 64–67
 - focus groups, 57
 - images of facilities and services, 61
 - open discussion on services and facilities, 61
 - participants drawing/writing expression of service/facility, 61
 - prioritisation of VoCs, 63
 - room layout, 58
 - sessions, 60
 - VoCs of service/facility, 62–63
- House of Quality (HoQ), 2, 6–7, 10, 13, 15–18, 21, 110 (*see also* Performance Indicator House of Quality (PIHoQ))
- Imagery used in cultural precinct VoC focus group session, 58–59
- Importance-performance analysis, 35
- Institute of Public Administration of Canada (IPAC), 5
- Intangible performance indicators (IPIs), 32, 84
 - utilisation, 47–48, 104–105
- Internal stakeholders, 53–54 (*see also* External stakeholders)
 - focus groups, 67–68
- Mapping
 - exercise, 77–78
 - of VoC and TR relationship matrix, 78–81
- Participative action research process (PAR process), 7–8, 108
- Performance assessment, 6
- Performance indicator development assemblage (PIDA), 7, 107
 - key messages, 112–113
 - potential benefits, 107–110
 - potential challenges and opportunities, 111–112
 - questions, 113–114
- Performance Indicator House of Quality (PIHoQ), 7, 10, 13, 18–21, 49
 - areas of deployment, 39–47
 - confirmation of PIHoQ and components and deciding areas of deployment, 99–104
 - confirmation of VoC and TR, 73–76

- critical decision, 35–39
- framework, 22
- importance and satisfaction ratings, 34–35
- learning from, 44, 47
- mapping exercise and TR
 - relationship matrix, 77–78
- mapping of VoC and TR
 - relationship matrix, 78–81
- outputs and outcomes, 82–86
- plotting of critical decision, 95–98
- sample TRs for cultural precinct, 28, 30
- stakeholder selection and VoC
 - development, 50–70
- surveying importance and satisfaction ratings, 87–94
- TR, 24–27
- TR relationship matrix, 27–29
- TRs development, 71–72
- VoC, 21–24
- VoC and TR relationship matrix, 29–31
- Performance indicators
 - for cultural precincts, 84
 - customer approach to performance indicator development, 6–8
 - customers collaboration in development of, 3–4
 - and measuring performance in PA, 4–6
 - outputs and outcomes, 32–34
- Performance measurement, 5
- Performance measures, 4
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), 9
- Prioritisation of VoCs, 63
- Public administration (PA), 1, 13
 - customer approach to performance indicator development, 6–8
 - customers collaboration in development of performance indicators, 3–4
 - performance indicators and measuring performance in, 4–6
 - quality-oriented perspective to performance indicator development in, 1–3
- Public organisations, 1–2
- Quadrant graph, 37–39
- Quadruple bottom line (QBL), 23
- Quality function deployment (QFD), 2–3, 13–15
- Quality management, 2, 13
- Quality perspective
 - HoQ, 15–18
 - and performance indicators in PA, 13–14
 - PIHoQ, 18–20
 - QFD, 14–15
- Stakeholder
 - and analysis of participants, 51–56
 - analysis rainbow, 54–56
 - expectations, 22
 - participation, 5
 - selection, 50
- Tangible performance indicators (TPIs), 32, 84
 - utilisation, 47–48, 104–105
- Technical requirements (TRs), 2, 16–17, 21, 24, 49
 - confirmation of VoC and TR, 73–76
 - for cultural precincts, 72
 - development, 71–72
 - example, 26–27
 - implementing VoCs in administering authority, 24–27
 - refining, 30–31
 - relationship matrix, 27–29, 77–78
 - representative TRs for NSW local government authority, 26
- Total Quality Management, 2, 14
- Voice of the customer (VoC), 2, 15, 21–24, 49, 110
 - alignment of VoCs with categories, 68
 - average rating, 92–93
 - confirmation of VoC and TR, 73–76
 - development, 50–70
 - for importance rating, 89–90, 92–93
 - prioritisation of, 63, 88
 - and TR relationship matrix, 29–31