


AD-A146 934



DETERMINING MANAGERIAL METHODS OF
PRODUCTIVITY MEASUREMENT WITHIN
CIVIL ENGINEERING DESIGN UNITS

THESIS

Jared A. Astin Christopher D. Ruff
Captain, USAF Captain, USAF

AFIT/GEM/LSM/84S-1

DTIC
ELECTE
NOV 01 1984
S
E
D

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR UNIVERSITY

AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

This document has been approved
for public release and distribution is unlimited.

84 10 30 007

DTIC FILE COPY

AFIT/GEM/LSM/84


DETERMINING MANAGERIAL METHODS OF
PRODUCTIVITY MEASUREMENT WITHIN
CIVIL ENGINEERING DESIGN UNITS

THESIS

Jared A. Astin Christopher D. Ruff
Captain, USAF Captain, USAF

AFIT/GEM/LSM/84S-1

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited



The contents of the document are technically accurate, and no sensitive items, detrimental ideas, or deleterious information are contained therein. Furthermore, the views expressed in the document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the School of Systems and Logistics, the Air University, the United States Air Force, or the Department of Defense.

Accession For	
1. Original	☒
2. Copy	☐
3. Microfilm	☐
4. Other	
5. Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
6. Distribution and/or	
Distribution Special	
A-1	



UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) AFIT/GEM/LSM/84S-1			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION School of Systems and Logistics		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AFIT/LS		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Air Force Institute of Technology Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433			7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.		PROJECT NO.
			TASK NO.		WORK UNIT NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) See Box 19					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Jared A. Astin, B.S., Capt. USAF Christopher D. Ruff, B.S., Capt. USAF					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT MS Thesis		13b. TIME COVERED FROM TO		14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) 1984 September	
				15. PAGE COUNT 111	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Approved for public release; LHW, AFIT 150-17. Lynn E. Wolaver 14 Sept 84 Dean for Research and Professional Development Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.	Productivity Civil Engineering		
14	01		Efficiency Operational Effectiveness		
05	01		Measurement		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Title: DETERMINING MANAGERIAL METHODS OF PRODUCTIVITY MEASUREMENT WITHIN CIVIL ENGINEERING DESIGN UNITS Thesis Chairman: Rodney C. Byler, Major, USAF					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS ☐			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Rodney C. Byler, Major, USAF			22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) 513 257-2000		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL AFIT/LSM

DD FORM 1473, 83 APR

EDITION OF 1 JAN 73 IS OBSOLETE.

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

12005

Productivity in the United States is declining. We have slipped from the leader of the world to eighth among nations. Recognizing this, Department of Defense (DOD) leaders directed the implementation of a DOD Productivity Program. The key to any productivity program is the development of a productivity measurement system. The purpose of this study is to determine a managerial method for productivity measurement within a base level Civil Engineering Design Section. Current methods of productivity measurement were reviewed and found to be deficient. A relatively new method, Constrained Facet Analysis, was chosen. Design section inputs and outputs were determined. A data set was generated to a predetermined efficiency result. The Constrained Facet Analysis model was run using the generated data, and its computer output was compared to the predetermined efficiency result. The comparison showed identical results for the computer model and the predetermined efficiencies. The authors concluded that the computerized Constrained Facet Analysis model is an accurate and valid method of determining productivity within a base level Civil Engineering Design Section. The limitations of this method of productivity measurement are discussed. Further research, using data from real design sections, is recommended before implementation of the model. The model should be used as a managerial aid to improve organizational performance. It should not be used to evaluate manager's performance.

AFIT/GEM/LSM/84S-1

DETERMINING MANAGERIAL METHODS
OF PRODUCTIVITY MEASUREMENT
WITHIN CIVIL ENGINEERING DESIGN UNITS

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the School of Systems and Logistics
of the Air Force Institute of Technology
Air University
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science in Engineering Management

Jared A. Astin, B.S.
Captain, USAF

Christopher D. Ruff, B.S.
Captain, USAF

September 1984

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank our advisor, Major Rodney Byler, for his support and assistance in the preparation of this thesis. The work done by Captain Jeffrey R. Charles of the School of Civil Engineering, in providing Civil Engineering expertise, is greatly appreciated also.

We cannot adequately thank our wives, Donna Astin and Sharyn Ruff, for their support and patience. Their words of encouragement (and some typing) helped us over the top. Finally, a special thanks to Lindsey Ruff (age:4) for her typing assistance.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
List of Figures	v
Abstract	vi
I. Introduction	1
Background	1
Justification for Study	6
Problem Statement	9
Research Objectives	11
Research Questions	12
Scope and Limitations	13
Assumptions	13
Definitions	15
Summary	16
II. Review of the Literature.....	17
DOD Productivity Program	17
Hanley and Smith	18
Baumgartel and Johnson	19
Tuttle	20
Kaneda and Wallett	22
Summary	23
III. Methodology	25
Overview	25
Analysis Techniques	26
Ratio Analysis	27
Regression Analysis	28
Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA).....	29
Summary of Analysis Techniques	34
Input and Output Determination	34
Data Generation and Preparation for Analysis...	43
Data Generation	44
Preparation of Data for Analysis	46
IV. Findings and Results	48
Inputs and Outputs Used	49
Model Execution	51
Limitations of the CFA Code	53

	Page
V. Conclusions and Recommendations	55
Conclusions	55
Research Questions Answered	55
Recommendations	56
Appendix A: CFA Model	59
Appendix B: Panel Members	65
Appendix C: List of Inputs and Outputs Analyzed	66
Appendix D: Inputs and Outputs Further Defined	70
Appendix E: Data	76
Appendix F: Organizational Efficiencies	82
Appendix G: Computer Printout of Results	84
Appendix H: Sample Organizational Reports	92
Bibliography	97
VITA	101

List of Figures

Figure	Page
1. Farrell's Efficiency Isoquant.....	31
2. Input and Output Determination Diagram.....	37

Abstract

Productivity in the United States is declining. We have slipped from the leader of the world to eighth among nations. Recognizing this, Department of Defense (DOD) leaders directed the implementation of a DOD Productivity Program. The key to any productivity program is the development of a productivity measurement system. The purpose of this study is to determine a managerial method for productivity measurement within a base level Civil Engineering Design Section. Current methods of productivity measurement were reviewed and found to be deficient. A relatively new method, Constrained Facet Analysis, was chosen. Design section inputs and outputs were determined. A data set was generated to a predetermined efficiency result. The Constrained Facet Analysis model was run using the generated data, and its computer output was compared to the predetermined efficiency result. The comparison showed identical results for the computer model and the predetermined efficiencies. The authors concluded that the computerized Constrained Facet Analysis model is an accurate and valid method of determining productivity within a base level Civil Engineering Design Section. The limitations of this method of productivity measurement are discussed. Further research, using data from real design sections, is recommended before implementation of the model. The model should be used as a managerial aid to improve organizational performance. It should not be used to evaluate manager's performance.

DETERMINING MANAGERIAL METHODS OF
PRODUCTIVITY MEASUREMENT WITHIN
CIVIL ENGINEERING DESIGN UNITS

I. Introduction

Background

The last few years have brought the issue of productivity in American economy to the point that it is a national concern (3:1). United States after World War II was the leader in the economic world and first in productivity. That trend, however, has reversed and productivity is now in a downward trend. At present, the United States is eighth in productivity among nations (12). American industry is no longer concerned about increased productivity or creating innovative ways to manufacture products more efficiently and less expensively. This is the cause for the decline in the American economy over the last decade. Nine countries now have a greater Gross National Product per capita than does the United States (34). For many years, the United States was consistently number one. General Alton Slay recognized the problem that was facing the United States when he said,

My conviction is now very strong that we do indeed have a national problem.... a national industrial productivity disease which must be addressed if we are to maintain our status as the focus of the free world's industrial, economic, and military strength. [16:2]

The American economy is not the leader it once was fifteen years ago. This decline in productivity has had a significant impact on

Air Force and its operations. General Louis L. Wilson, Jr., summed up this impact when he stated,

The Air Force is facing one of the most austere times in its history. In spite of increased defense budgets, our buying power has eroded with the net result that we have to do more with less. To meet this challenge, we need to fully utilize our most costly and important resource...people...by instilling in them a sense of urgency about their important role in the conduct of the Nation's critical enterprise...national security...and in doing so we must increase their productivity. [3:3]

The key to turning the declining American economy around is to increase productivity in America (34). The importance of productivity improvement can not be overstated. Without a productivity increase, the United States' standard of living will decline (16:7). General James P. Mullins, in an address to the students and faculty at the Air Force Institute of Technology, concluded, "We can not afford not to be productive; we can no longer let productivity wane (28)." Rising costs have squeezed the public's resources between public demands for service and the cost of supplying those services. There is growing resistance on the part of the public to pay for these services through higher taxes. This creates a problem. The answer to this problem is to improve productivity of the public service (18:9). Major General Robert C. Thompson, former director of USAF Civil Engineering, stated that a look into the future indicates that the Civil Engineer must do more with less through increased productivity (3:4). The key to the future of America was summed up by Thomas Edison when he said, " There is a way to do it better...find it (12)."

On October 23, 1978, a memo from President Carter was sent to the head of all Federal departments and agencies. The memo announced the

establishment of the National Productivity Council. The council is to be the focal point for productivity improvement efforts in the United States (36:1). President Carter wrote the following in the memo:

I have established this council in recognition of the vital role productivity plays in the nation's economy by helping control inflation, making the U.S. goods more competitive in world markets, and increasing the real income of the American worker..improved productivity is vital to the social and economic well-being of our nation. The Federal Government can make a major contribution to improving productivity. I expect all agencies to cooperated and assist the council in meeting its responsibilities so we realize maximum benefit from the Federal effort to improve productivity growth. [36:1]

This memo was followed in 1981 by the Government Cost Reduction Act (16:19). This act was an attempt by the federal government at productivity enhancement.

The Secretary of Defense, realizing the need for productivity, made increased productivity one of the highest priorities of the Department of Defense (18:3) The Department of Defense (DOD), the largest and most costly of all public organizations, issued directive 5010.31 that requires each military department to establish a productivity improvement program (36:1). This directive was followed by DOD Instruction 5010.34. Howell and Van Sickle, in a master's thesis, explained the meaning of the Productivity Program:

DoD Directive 5010.31 establishes the policy of focusing management attention on the achievement of maximum defense output within available resource levels by ... seeking and exploiting opportunities for improved methods of operations in consonance with the defense preparedness mission. The directive further states that, productivity measurement, enhancement and evaluation will be an integral element of resource management...The Directive prescribes a labor-oriented mode, but allows for total product or unit cost measures if available. [18:6]

In response to the White House and the DOD, the Air Force created a comprehensive productivity improvement plan. This plan directed all major command agencies to develop individual productivity plans, to appoint "productivity principals" as points of contact for productivity matters, and to report all productivity accomplishments annually to Air Force headquarters (37:1). In issuing the plan, General James A. Hill, Vice Chief of Staff, said:

Productivity has received increased emphasis at all levels of government, and had consistently surfaced a key factor during congressional debates on Military Appropriations. If we are to continue obtaining the necessary funding for vital Air Force Programs everyone at all organizational levels must actively seek more productive means of accomplishing their jobs. We therefore urge your full support for this plan. [36:1]

Air Force Civil Engineering has long felt that productivity improvement was important.. The Base Civil Engineering organization is generally the largest service organization on base and usually spends 40 to 60 percent of the total operations and maintenance budget of the base (10:1). Any improvements within Civil Engineering would have a significant impact on the Air Force and DOD in general. The inefficient use of resources by USAF Base Civil Engineering organizations has a substantial impact on the overall DOD productivity level (3:3). Brigadier General Archie S. Mayes, former Deputy Chief of Staff for Civil Engineering, Strategic Air Command, presented a plan involving six points designed to improve productivity of the work force and overall efficiency of Base Civil Engineering operations (3:4). Major General Guy H. Goddard, also a former Director of Civil Engineering, stressed that the key to productivity within Air Force Civil Engineering was at the base level (3:4).

The Air Force Civil Engineering community, in an effort to increase productivity instituted an automated management information system called the Base Engineer Automated Management System (BEAMS) and a Management Review Program (MRP). This system included a list of objectives to be used as aids to increasing efficiency (2:1-2). The programs are intended to help manage the civil engineering organization more efficiently. Presently, the civil engineering organizations rely on information provided by the BEAMS system to monitor performance. The system has been found to have numerous shortcomings. In a move to increase productivity, the civil engineering community is attempting to implement a new automated management information system called Work Information Management System (WIMS). Major General Clifton D. Wright, current Director of Engineering and Services, feels so strongly about productivity that increasing productivity is one of his six strategic goals. Changes to AFR 85-1, the Civil Engineering Resources and Work Force Management Regulation, have come about as management efforts aimed at reducing impediments to productivity within civil engineering organizations (3:5).

Programs have been implemented on a national, Air Force, and Civil Engineering level all designed toward increasing productivity. By increasing productivity, we can stop rising costs that are squeezing the public's resources. This turn can only be achieved if all levels of industry and public service are involved.

Justification For Study

With the problem of declining productivity, the manager of today is faced with the problem of what to do. The major problem is that a manager can not improve productivity if he does not know his present productivity. The development of meaningful productivity measures will ultimately lead to better management in the areas of present and future operations (20:13). One way of enhancing and improving effective management is the development and use of productivity measures (20:3). A manager is given a certain amount of input, or resources which he uses to produce output. After these outputs are produced, performance feedback information and measurement is needed to indicate how well he utilized his resources to produce the output (32:2).

John Mee broke the management process down into seven sub-processes (15:2). Mee's sixth sub-process deals with productivity measurement. Not only are measurements of productivity beneficial to managers but they are a portion of managerial responsibility. Through the use of Productivity Measurement, managers can be helped in the following areas:

1. Current Operations
 - a. To objectively identify efficient management
 - b. To identify and take effective timely remedial action in potential trouble areas
 - c. To compare the relative production efficiency of similar functions performed in different major commands, and
 - d. To improve productivity and the methods and standards of operation.
2. Aid in Future Planning
 - a. To improve the planned allocation of resources

- b. To improve the evaluation of effects of policy constraints by:
 - 1) Evaluating feasibility
 - 2) Making more effective adjustment to comply with externally imposed constraint
 - 3) Measuring advantages/disadvantages (costs) of externally imposed constraints
- c. To improve the integration of present policies with contingency and mobilization requirements. [26:24]

Kaneda and Walleth, in a thesis on productivity, concluded that productivity measurements are powerful tools for any manager. But these tools are more difficult to develop within military organizations because of substantive goals and policy constraints. However, some type of productivity measurement is essential to assist management (20:13). This is contrary to the military belief that rank automatically makes an Air Force Officer an instant leader and a superior manager (16:32). In public service and government organizations, regular feedback to managers is slower and less specific. This makes it all the more important that we have the information available to make good productivity choices (18:40). The following conclusion came out in a study for the Navy done by Litton System, Inc.:

Accurate productivity measurements are powerful tools for any military or civilian manager; however, these tools are more difficult to develop within the military context for there is no profit-and-loss statement; also, a wide variety of policy constraints make an overall profit-and-loss type of productivity measurement difficult. Some type of productivity measure, however, is essential to assist management. [26:2-1]

With the current Department of Defense productivity programs, the obvious question that arises is, "How will agencies within the Defense Department know if they are or are not improving productivity?" The

answer is, of course, they will not without the initiation of some measurement system (18:3). The development of meaningful productivity measurement systems is the key issue in the Defense Department productivity programs. Without the measures, the agencies of DOD have no hope of defining the present level of productivity, nor can any estimates of improvement or regression be made. With no measurements, the success or failure of new management productivity improvement efforts cannot be assessed (18:7). Combine productivity measurement with some old-fashioned belt-tightening, and significant savings in defense programs can be achieved (18:4).

The Base Civil Engineering Squadron never seems to have sufficient resources to accomplish everything called for in the mission statement (10:4). This limitation makes productivity measurement within Civil Engineering a necessity. Lieutenant Colonel Norwood J. King, in his article "How to Increase Work Force Productivity," stressed the importance of being able to understand, measure, and increase productivity in USAF Civil Engineering (21:8). The importance to a Civil Engineering manager was summed up in a thesis completed by Baumgartel and Johnson:

Base level civil engineering managers must be able to assess an increase or decrease in productivity in order to identify the degree of attainment of this directorate goal. Therefore, a method of measuring the productivity of a base level civil engineering organization is definitely needed. [3:21]

Given, then, the importance of productivity measurement to managers, the development of a productivity measurement model would be of significant value to the Department of Defense and the Air Force productivity programs.

Problem Statement

In the private sector, a productivity measurement system has been developed based on profit and economic standing in the market. However, federal organizations do not produce for profit, nor do they compete in the private sector markets. A new or different method is needed as it is not feasible to measure federal productivity in the same manner as the private sector (18:3). If a simple ratio of work output to input could be established, the problem would be solved. Unfortunately, that ratio is hard to apply in service organizations, and the simplicity soon disappears. The mission of the Base Civil Engineering Squadron is, "...to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate real property facilities, and provide related management, engineering, and other support work and services (10:1)." In other words, the mission is service. Simon, in his book, Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations, wrote that for public service organizations, the efficiency is measured by a statement of objectives for that activity (33:175). In service organizations, objectives are stated social or appropriate substantive results (20:1). In government, this means managers must attempt to substitute the profit measures with intangible goals such as "national defense (20:1)." A study by H.G. Rainey, comparing government organizations to private industry, showed the following differences in government organizations:

1. Greater multiplicity and diversity of objectives
 2. Greater vagueness and intangibility of objectives
 3. Greater tendency of goals to be conflicting
 4. Greater caution and rigidity, less innovativeness
- [30:233-244]

These differences make the objectives hard to define and even harder to measure.

The correct selection of objectives and appropriate criteria is a critical step in trying to determine productivity. The accuracy and the meaningfulness of any productivity measure depends on the accuracy of the measurement of the respective inputs and outputs and on the appropriateness of the measurement units (26:3-2).

The main problem is determining the proper input and output measures for productivity. Inputs are usually more easily determined than outputs in service organizations. The measures of performance and productivity must be consistent and meaningful if they are to be any benefit to managers. Productivity should not be measured just for the sake of measuring (16:31). Only if the productivity measure is used by managers to improve the organization is the effort worthwhile.

Not all people feel productivity should be measured. Major Donald Fowler, in a report on white collar productivity measurement, felt that productivity in government offices should not be measured. Rather, he said productivity should be "assessed" at the macro level (16:31). While not widely accepted, Major Fowler's assessment idea does not seem so far-fetched since performance measurement techniques in use in AF Civil Engineering are almost entirely subjective (10:111). This is because, presently, there is no acceptable objective measurement technique. The Engineering Design Section of Civil Engineering offers some special problems. The section is dominated by professionals, and professionals tend to resent having their productivity measured (9:21). It is difficult to evaluate efficiency and effectiveness of an

organization whose work deals with such factors as design safety and economy (9:21).

It is obvious that some organizations are more effective than others. The problem is how to measure this against different groups or the same group, taken at different times (24:1). Accurate productivity measurements are powerful tools for all managers. The military and service context of Base Level Air Force Civil Engineering makes productivity measurement difficult. The problem is compounded by the unique nature of the engineering section within civil engineering. Presently, there is no productivity measurement method in use within the Air Force Civil Engineering Design Section. Therein lies the problem encountered by this thesis, to develop a managerial measurement method for productivity in Base Level Civil Engineering Design Section.

Research Objectives

The objectives of this research are to: 1) determine Air Force Civil Engineering Design Section outputs and inputs for productivity measures, 2) determine an appropriate objective productivity measurement technique, and 3) develop a productivity measurement model for a Base Level USAF Civil Engineering Design Section. The specific model and actual measurement of productivity for every study on productivity varies according to the study desired, the measurement approach taken, and the type of organization being studied (3:14-15). All studies, like this one, have in common an attempt to improve organizational productivity through measurement. There has been considerable research by various U.S. Air Force agencies on productivity, including:

- 1) The Air Force Academy Behavioral Science and Leadership Department's motivation studies.
- 2) The Air Force Institute of Technology.
- 3) The Air Force Military Personnel Center's development of officer evaluation reports.
- 4) The Air Force Directorate of Personnel Plans Human Resources Development laboratories.
- 5) The Leadership Management Development Center's (LMDC) problem solving support.
- 6) The Logistics Management Center's (LMC) efforts to improve Air Force policies. [19:1]

The area of productivity and its relationships are constantly changing and growing. The efforts of this research will help future researchers and managers better understand productivity and its relationships. If a model is developed, it will help the design responsibility center/cost center fully accomplish the objectives of the Resources Management System (RMS), by enabling the manager to equate resources consumed to output realized (15:1).

Research Questions

In order to develop a meaningful measure of productivity for the Base Civil Engineering Design Section, the following research questions must be answered:

- 1) What are inputs and outputs for a base level USAF Civil Engineering Design Section?
- 2) What is the appropriate productivity measurement technique?
- 3) Can a model of productivity be developed using appropriate inputs and outputs?

Scope and Limitations

This research effort is focusing on the design section of Air Force Civil Engineering in the development of a productivity measurement model. If the model or its development method can be applied to other responsibility centers/cost centers within or outside of civil engineering, so much the better. The goal of this research however, is not to develop a universal model but one that is tailored and specifically able to meet the unique requirements of the design section.

A measurement model is only as good as the measurement of its inputs and outputs (26:3-2). Also, all measurement is subjective to a certain degree (10:iii). It is not the desire to arrive at a perfect or ideal measurement model. If such a model were possible to develop, it would be prohibitively expensive to run. The achievement of such a model could mean many managers would be replaced by computers (26:3-1). The desirability of this occurrence is questionable.

Assumptions

We will assume that the organizational goals or objectives for the Civil Engineering Design Section have not changed significantly since Baumgartel and Johnson identified them as the following:

1. Facility Life Cycle Cost
 - A. Identify and program Military Construction Projects (MCP) projects, and monitor approval, design and construction phases to ensure maximum durability and maintainability of accepted facilities.
 - B. Ensure in-house design complies with AFM 88-15 and applicable building codes.

2. Facility Function
 - A. Ensure new construction projects are identified, programmed and designed in a timely manner, and are designed and located in accordance with the user's requirements.
 - B. Identify, program, and design contract corrections to facilities which are functionally inadequate for mission requirements.
3. Facility Protection
 - A. Ensure corrective contract actions for identified facility, fire, safety, and security deficiencies are programmed, designed, and completed in a timely manner.
 - B. Ensure new contract work complies with regional requirements for structural protection against weather and earthquake-related forces.
4. Facility Occupant/User Requirements
 - A. Complete architectural studies of facilities to identify inadequate aesthetic conditions and facility deficiencies contributing to occupant discomfort.
 - B. Ensure designed projects comply with applicable life safety and public health code requirements.
 - C. Ensure identified facility life safety and health code deficiencies requiring contract corrective actions are programmed, designed, and completed in a timely manner.
 - D. Identify, program, and specify custodial contracts required for base facilities and ensure contractor compliance with the contractual requirements.
5. Other Non-Facility Requirements
 - A. Provide professional architectural and engineering assistance to operations branch and to other organizations as required.

[3:82-83]

These objectives will be used as the organizations goals in this research effort.

Definitions

The definitions and terminology used in the field of productivity vary according to the author. To eliminate any conflicts or confusion that may arise, the following definitions will be used for this research effort. These definitions are a compilation of those currently in use in productivity literature (3;35) and are compatible with those definitions used by Kaneda and Walleth (20), whose research helped form the basis of this study.

INPUT -- the quantity of resources used by an organization during a specified period of time. Inputs can include personnel, facilities, energy, dollars, raw materials, supplies, and information.

OUTPUT -- the quantity of goods, products, and services produced or provided during a specified period of time.

EFFICIENCY -- the ratio of output to input; implies minimizing resource consumption or maximizing output for given resources. This term does not imply the appropriateness of the output to goal attainment.

OBJECTIVES -- the desired future conditions that are subgoals of organizational goals which an organization or section wants to achieve through its activities.

GOALS -- the organizational goals that relate the activities of an organization to its environment.

SURROGATE MEASURES -- measures that do not directly measure an aspect of efficiency, effectiveness, or productivity, but research has shown are indicators of actual performance.

PRODUCTIVITY -- efficiency of an organization in a goal related direction. Given that an organization is meeting its mission, productivity can be measured as a ratio of output to input.

Summary

Productivity in the United States is declining. We have slipped from the leader of the world to eighth among nations. The decline will continue unless we do something about it. The economy of the United States and our standard of living will drop without an increase in productivity. Recognizing this, DOD leaders have directed the implementation of a DOD Productivity Program. The key to any productivity program is the development of a productivity measurement system. How will we know when the highest level of performance has been reached with the least expenditure of resources? Obviously, a measurement technique is needed.

Productivity measures can be a powerful tool for managers in a military organization. However, outputs for a service-oriented, military organization such as civil engineering are vague or difficult to define. It is obvious some organizations are more productive than others. The key is developing a productivity measurement model with which to evaluate an organization's productivity. Presently, there is no productivity measurement model for the design section of Air Force Civil Engineering.

Productivity will ultimately lead to better management in current and future operations. However, before this can be realized an appropriate productivity measurement model must be developed.

II. Review of the Literature

A review of the literature concerning productivity revealed a plethora of views on productivity. Each article has a slightly different definition of productivity. Rather than review and comment on the extensive amount of literature concerning productivity in general, the authors chose to limit this presentation to those works thought to be most applicable to this research effort. That decision was based on two factors: 1) An exhaustive review of productivity in general would not contribute substantially to this report, and 2) Such exhaustive reviews have been accomplished by others (we recommend the technical report by Tuttle (35)). Therefore, this literature review will concentrate on the five articles the authors felt were most relevant to the task at hand.

DOD Productivity Program

The DOD established this program in 1975, with the instruction that each DOD Component implement a Department/Agency-wide Productivity Program (required by DOD Directive 5010.31) (13). The objective of the program is to obtain maximum productivity growth (i.e. increase goods produced or services rendered relative to the resources used) to help offset personnel cuts, reduce costs, and free funds for other requirements.

DOD first defined productivity as a combination of efficiency and effectiveness, saying that organizations must be efficient (accomplish the right things at the lowest expense) and effective (accomplish the

right things at the right times). Thus, "The efficiency with which organizations utilize all types of fund resources to accomplish their mission represents total resource productivity (13:1)." Later in the same instruction documents, DOD states that a productivity index is "the percentage ratio of goods produced or services rendered (outputs) to resources expended (inputs) during a current period in relation to a base period (13:11)." This second definition of productivity is the same as our definition of efficiency; thus, the official DOD definition of productivity is unclear.

The instruction goes on to list the minimum department functions that must provide productivity indicator data. The instruction also suggests possible indicators for each department function. The Air Force Civil Engineering Design Section is not specified in the instruction (13:Encl 3:4-8).

Hanley and Smith

A 1976 AFIT thesis by the research team of Hanley and Smith analyzed the effect of labor manhour requirement estimates on the measurement of Air Force Civil Engineering (AFCE) productivity (17:7). Their findings indicated that significant variation existed in the standard manhour requirements estimates being computed by Air Force planners for any given project (17:58). Those estimates were the standards against which actual labor manhours were compared to compute a productivity index. Since the existence of variation would result in different standard estimates for the same project at different bases, Hanley and Smith concluded that, "Comparisons of standard

estimates with actual labor manhour expenditures result in unreliable productivity ratios (17:73)."

Baumgartel and Johnson

In 1979, the AFIT research team of Baumgartel and Johnson attempted to develop productivity measures for a USAF base level civil engineering organization (3). They defined productivity as "the measure of effective and efficient use of resources to attain results which are directed towards the strategic level organizational goals, through the branch level objectives (3:24)." In their model, they proposed to measure productivity by taking the average value of the performance indicators for each branch objective, divided by the total resources used to attain the level of output (3:24). The resulting ratio of performance achieved to resources consumed represented that branch's effort to support a specific objective during that specified time period; a series of measurements taken over time would be an indicator of any change in the branch's productivity (3:71-72).

It should be noted that their measurements would require a length of time before any interpretation of the ratio would be possible. Additionally, each organization would be measured against itself; no mention is made of the ability to compare one organization to another based on the ratios.

Baumgartel and Johnson concluded that while the input data was available in great quantity and detail, the output data needed for their index calculations was limited. Using their defined objectives, they found it difficult to classify the output information. They

could not measure readiness or response output, and they questioned the inclusion of any training or exercise evaluation results (3:108).

Tuttle

In Thomas Tuttle's extensive review of productivity implications for the Air Force, he offers five different definitions of productivity, three of which bear mention. The economist defines productivity as the ratio of output to input when both output and input are measured in real (physical volume) terms (35:7). The engineer, on the other hand, defines productivity from the idea of mechanical efficiency (35:8):

$$\text{Productivity (efficiency)} = \frac{\text{Useful Work}}{\text{Energy}}$$

or

$$\text{stated another way: Productivity} = \frac{\text{Useful Output}}{\text{Input}}$$

In comparing the engineer's definition of productivity to the economist's, three important distinctions should be made. First, the upper limit of efficiency for the engineering definition is unity (one), while in the financial definition, the ratio can and should exceed 1. Second, the engineering definition distinguishes between "total" output and "useful" output (i.e. goal directed, quality output) (35:9). Finally, the purpose of the engineering definition is to measure individual or small unit operations, while the economist's approach is to develop statistics for comparing total industries (35:9).

The manager appears to have a broader interpretation of productivity. Based on a nationwide survey of Chief Executive Officers (CEO) and Industrial Relations Officers on their definitions of productivity, "Virtually 9 out of 10 managers would include quality, effectiveness and efficiency in their definition; 7 out of 10 would add the idea of work stoppages, waste, shrinkage, sabotage, absenteeism and turnover; and 6 out of 10 managers would include measures of customer or client satisfaction (35:11)." From that, one can conclude that there is a wide difference of opinion as to the manager's definition of productivity.

Tuttle concludes that an Air Force organization's definition of productivity should incorporate the concepts of both efficiency and effectiveness. Also, any productivity measurement scheme for an organization should include multiple measures of both efficiency and effectiveness (35:76). Finally, Tuttle identifies seven desirable characteristics of a set of productivity measures:

1. Completeness - the set of measures adequately covers the significant facets of the organization's mission.
2. Comparability - the measures should be applicable over time to permit longitudinal measurements of productivity within the organization.
3. Input coverage - outputs used in measurement represent all the relevant inputs.
4. Compatibility with existing data sources - attempt to use data already available.
5. Cost effectiveness - the benefits derived should exceed the costs incurred in making the measurements.
6. Consistent across organizations - the most useful measures would be relatively invariate across organizations performing the same function.

7. Acceptable to organization members - the managers and workers being measured accept and support the measures.
[35:77-78]

Kaneda and Walleth

In 1980, the AFIT research team of Kaneda and Walleth set out to develop productivity measures for the design section of a base civil engineering organization. Using a questionnaire survey instrument, they collected data on proposed productivity measures from base civil engineers, chiefs of design, and chiefs of industrial engineering throughout the United States. Statistical analyses then yielded six measurements acceptable to the majority of survey respondents. The six productivity measures are:

1. Total estimated dollar amount of contract projects and in-house work orders designed divided by total design manhours.
2. Total number of projects designed (complete and ready for acquisition action) divided by total design manhours.
3. Total number of facility inspections and utility systems surveys completed divided by total manhours to complete surveys and inspections.
4. Total estimated dollar amount of architect-engineer (A-E) design acquisition packages prepared divided by total manhours to prepare.
5. Total estimated dollar amount of contract projects and in-house work orders designed divided by total design labor cost.
6. Total number of projects designed (complete and ready for acquisition action) divided by total design labor cost.
[20:76]

Two additional measures were identified by two prominent partial samples (the Base Civil Engineers and the managers with over 10 years

experience in a base civil engineering organization), and may be considered useful to the managers of the design section:

1. Total contract funds obligated (i.e. Military Construction Program and Operations and Maintenance) divided by total design manhours associated with the contract funds obligated.

2. Number of work orders reviewed and/or evaluated divided by total manhours required for review and or evaluation. [20:77]

Kaneda and Walleit concluded that those productivity measurements should be useful as a starting point to measure productivity trends. They also stated, though, that every measurement may not be applicable to every design organization, and advised against comparing dissimilar design sections (i.e. design sections with dissimilar projects, level of engineer experience, etc. (20:79-80).

Summary

The preceding literature review has been a chronological review of productivity in general, and a narrowing of the scope of productivity measurements from DOD to Air Force to base level Civil Engineering to the Civil Engineering Design Section. Hanley and Smith showed that productivity should not be measured as a ratio of actual manhours to standard manhours required, as the estimates for standard manhours required were too varied. Baumgartel and Johnson then proposed a model for measuring productivity of a total base level Civil Engineering organization by using performance indicators for branch objectives, divided by total resources used to attain those objectives. Baumgartel and Johnson could not classify their outputs

by inputs consumed, though. Kaneda and Wallett then looked at a portion of a Civil Engineering organization--the design section--and identified at least six productivity measures that would be useful to managers of design sections in determining the section's productivity.

III. Methodology

Given that productivity measurement is important and necessary, we now will attempt to provide a means for measuring productivity in a Civil Engineering Design Section. The desired end result will be some form of a productivity model that will permit the design chief to analyze his section and then make managerial decisions that will improve the performance of his section based on that analysis.

Four steps must be taken to obtain the desired result of a productivity measurement for a design section. First, we must determine what the actual inputs and outputs of a design section are. That is, we must know all of the resources that a design section receives, and we must know what products, services, and activities result from the consumption of those resources. Second, we must have some method for measuring those inputs and outputs. The inputs and outputs themselves can be measured, or they can be measured indirectly by using a surrogate. Third, the input and output measures must be gathered. Finally, some form of mathematical analysis of the data must be performed to determine the unit's productivity rating or measurement, either with respect to other design units or with respect to the unit itself over a period of time.

Overview

A review of the various resources (inputs) and products and services (outputs) of a design section yielded a list of over thirty factors to be considered in the measurement of a design section's productivity. The list was then analyzed and subsequently reduced to

a total of twenty-six inputs and outputs representing the work of a design section. Simultaneously, various analytical techniques were examined for use in analysis of the input and output data. One technique, Constrained Facet Analysis (CFA), appeared to be exactly the type of model needed to analyze a complex organization with multiple inputs and outputs. Accordingly, it was selected as the analysis technique.

Due to the selection of the CFA model and its short history, the authors felt that a demonstration of the model was appropriate. Data was generated for fifty-two organizations. The data was constructed so that four organizations were definitely efficient with respect to the other organizations, and four units were definitely the least efficient. A successful demonstration of the model would occur if the CFA technique verified the four efficient organizations and the four most inefficient organizations.

Analysis Techniques

First of all, it must be recognized that the problem being confronted is one of multiple inputs and multiple outputs. That is, a design section does not simply take manhours and turn them directly into design drawings. Other inputs (eg., number of personnel, supplies) and outputs (eg., site inspections, design reviews, etc) are involved. Therefore, any analysis technique must be capable of handling both multiple inputs and multiple outputs simultaneously, permitting interdependence of factors to be included as part of the examination.

The next step is to research those techniques currently in use or thought to be applicable to the problem at hand. Three different techniques were found to be available. The three analysis techniques chosen were those felt by the authors to be the most appropriate for this problem, though certainly not exclusive of all others. The techniques examined were: 1) ratio analysis; 2) regression analysis; and 3) Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA).

Upon examination, the Constrained Facet Analysis (CFA) technique--an adaptation of DEA--was selected as the appropriate method. The three techniques will be examined in the following section to present the reasons why CFA was chosen over the other methods. Each method will be explained along with its relative strengths and weaknesses as revealed by the research.

Ratio Analysis. Ratio analysis is a one-to-one comparison of outputs to inputs used frequently today as measures of productivity or efficiency. Ratio analysis is popular because it is easy to use and familiar to managers (18). Managers are comfortable with a measurement that conveys some tangibility (eg., number of widgets produced per hour). It can be used without knowing the production process or when the production process is difficult to model (5:23).

The problem with ratio analysis lies in its inability to consider the full range of inputs and outputs and their interactions simultaneously (5:23). Ratios typically consider one input and one output at a time. Thus, any one ratio is only a partial measurement at best of an organization's activity (18). A number of ratios are needed to completely cover the range of the organizational activity, and yet they still do not portray any of the interactions between outputs

competing for the same resources or inputs dependent on one another.

Comparisons between organizations are difficult when using the ratio method, particularly when one organization ranks higher in some measurements while the other organization ranks higher in other measurements. The ratios must then be given some order of importance to permit comparison between the organizations. As the number of ratios grows (ie., the number of inputs and outputs to be compared increases), the task of weighting and assimilation grows multiplicatively (5:23).

Regression Analysis. Regression analysis attempts to find a relationship between some response variable (productivity) and some set of secondary variables (productivity indicators). The objective is to find a linear equation for the relationship so that the secondary variables can be used to better predict or estimate the response variable (productivity) (25:523).

Least squares regression is defined as that curve (line) which minimizes the sum of squares of the lengths of vertical line segments drawn from the observed data points on the scatter diagram to the fitted curve (22:45). It is important to note that a least squares regression of a single output, multiple input case having both positive and negative error terms will produce a curve (line) of average relationship (5:18). The curves are not frontier or extremal relationships, as actual outputs can lie above or below the curve.

In the multiple output case, regression analysis must be performed on each output separately. As in the ratio analysis, this prevents consideration of the impact of interdependencies or competition for resources among the variables. In their paper "Managerial Efficiency

Measurement, Theory and Applications," Bessent, Bessent, and Cla
explain the impact of this deficiency as follows:

Each regression equation might be able to predict adequately an expected level of a single output for an organization, assuming this organization could experience any of the random fluctuations or inefficiencies of the industry (all firms) and recognizing that the influence of other outputs are implicitly taken into account by the deviations from the regression line (residuals). But these equations cannot predict the expected output of an organization whose variations and/or inefficiencies are significantly affected by the given technology and policies of the firm which are not random. Magnitudes of actual outputs of an organization are influenced by both local and corporate policy which may prevent the true expected output values of the organization from conforming to the corresponding regression estimates.
[5:19]

If it is accepted that a linear regression model is appropriate, then the regression estimates must reflect an efficient input/output relationship (5:20). Therefore, the rate of technical substitution is assumed to be constant and the rate at which an input is converted into an output is the same for all of the organizations in the model (5:20). That means that an organization cannot decrease one input without increasing another input, or total output must decrease. Also, an organization cannot increase output without some increase in inputs. While those statements are true of the efficient organizations, inefficient organizations should be able to increase output without increasing inputs or decrease inputs while holding output constant to increase efficiency.

Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA). Data Envelopment Analysis is a relatively new method of evaluating productivity in not-for-profit organizations. After researching the other available analysis methods, we concluded that DEA offered the best possibility of being able to measure productivity in a Civil Engineering Design Section. A memb

of the AFIT faculty, Lt Col Charles T. Clark, has been very active in pioneer work with the DEA model as part of his Doctoral effort, and has been of great assistance to this research team in explaining the procedures and results of DEA. His assistance was particularly valuable because of the extremely small body of literature available on DEA. Therefore, the following discussion of DEA and its offspring, Constrained Facet Analysis (CFA), is drawn from class lectures from Lt Col Clark and two papers which he contributed to.

Data Envelopment Analysis is a fractional programming model for measuring the efficiency of similar management units (5:1). The model is capable of taking into account both multiple inputs and multiple outputs; it then calculates an efficiency rating for each unit relative to other similar units that have produced greater outputs with their inputs.

The approach to DEA was conceptualized by M. J. Farrell in 1957, in a paper entitled, "The Measurement of Productive Efficiency (8:3)." His work provided a major breakthrough in specifying a frontier of relative efficiency while not assuming any particular form for the industry production function (5:4). Subsequently, work done in 1978 by Charnes, Cooper, and Rhodes solved some mathematical computational problems in Farrell's work, and it was their operational linear programming model which they named "Data Envelopment Analysis (8:3)." Computer software for solution of the model was provided by the team of Ali, Bessent, Bessent, and Kennington, and field applications began in 1980 (8:3).




Figure 1. Farrell's Efficiency Isoquant

Figure 1 represents Farrell's concept of an efficiency frontier--an isoquant along which various combinations of inputs x_1 and x_2 are all equally efficient in producing one unit of output. Again, this isoquant is established with observed units operating at maximum relative efficiency. Any inefficient unit must use more of one or both of the inputs. Therefore, no observations can fall between the isoquant and the origin. Inefficient units will appear somewhere above the isoquant, as illustrated by point p. Efficient units appear on the isoquant, as represented by point q. The distances from the origin to point p and q, respectively, can be represented by the line segments op and oq . Farrell defined the technical efficiency of unit p as the ratio oq/op (5:4). That is, unit p must decrease its inputs x_1 and x_2 by the ratio oq/op to be equally efficient as unit q.

One of the most important points to be made concerning DEA is the idea that each management unit is evaluated against all other similar units ("similar" meaning having roughly equal mixes of inputs and outputs). Those determined to be most efficient are assigned a rating of 1.0 and are placed on a frontier which the inefficient units are compared to. Thus there is no artificial standard being used as a yardstick; management units are measured against the other similar management units (called a "neighborhood") in the group with the most efficient units becoming the basis for comparison. Observed standards are used as opposed to the usual theoretical standards. Farrell, as quoted in Bessent, Bessent, and Clark, noted that, "...it is far better to compare performances with the best actually achieved than with some unattainable ideal (5:4)."

Some requirements must be met by the organizations being measured before DEA can be used. First of all, organizations must be using varying amounts of the same resources (5:14). The authors believe CE design sections meet that criterion. All design sections are composed of some mix of military and civilian personnel and receive various amounts of funding from a central authority. Every design section is responsible for the same tasks, although their actual output varies from base to base. Thus, the design sections are sufficiently similar to satisfy the first requirement. Second, it is important to select as many inputs and outputs as possible depending on how many organizations are being measured (5:14). Input and output selection is discussed later in this chapter; we will use at least twice as many organizations as the total of inputs and outputs chosen.

It is also important to observe the following rules, as outlined in Bessent, Bessent, and Clark (5):

1. All measures should be total quantities or ratios which have a common denominator.
2. All units must use some amount of each input to produce some amount of each output.
3. Input measures should be selected that have a positive relation to output--that is, an increase in the input should cause an increase in output.
4. Regardless of how a resource is acquired, it should be included in the analysis if it has some affect on the production of outputs.

While the Data Envelopment Analysis technique is effective in identifying efficient and inefficient organizations, it is limited in its ability to provide planning information (8:2-3). Work by Clark at the University of Texas resulted in a new method of computing efficiency called Constrained Facet Analysis (CFA), which was then successfully tested in field work by Bessent and Bessent (8:3). The extensions of efficiency analysis developed in CFA allow the managers to identify those organizations which had similar inputs but higher outputs (ie., those that were more efficient) (8:4). They are then rank ordered in terms of similarity and available to the manager of the less efficient organization for review. That manager can then talk to or visit the more efficient organizations to determine what it is that makes them more efficient.

Constrained Facet Analysis is a normative type model, meaning that it performs optimization calculations. As such, it is an abstract mathematical model that is very difficult to understand and validate (4). CFA has been used successfully in three areas: 1) the Texas Public School system; 2) aircraft maintenance, and 3) a mental

hospital (4). Its limited use to this point is explained by its short existence.

The CFA model, as presented in the paper by Bessent, Bessent, Clark, and Elam, is shown in Appendix A (8:16-19).

Summary of Analysis Techniques. The Constrained Facet Analysis (CFA) model has been chosen over ratio analysis and regression analysis. CFA is an offspring of Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) that improves the management information provided by DEA.

The CFA model exhibits the following desirable characteristics:

1. The model simultaneously considers multiple inputs and multiple outputs.
2. Results in aggregate measures of efficiency for each organization.
3. Units are evaluated as efficient or inefficient relative to a neighborhood frontier region of actual achievement.
4. The maximum achievable efficiency value is one (1.0).
5. The inputs and outputs do not require common scales or units of measurement
6. Indicates input overages
7. Indicates output shortages
8. The information provided is a major improvement over those models currently used (i.e., ratio and regression) in the measurement of public service productivity.

Input and Output Determination

The approach in determining inputs and outputs for the Constrained Facet Analysis model is outlined in a paper by Bessent, Bessent, and Clark entitled "Specification of Inputs and Outputs (6)." As a prerequisite for the CFA model, both the necessary data and the

model itself should be able to interface with the existing management information system. The data should be available from the information currently compiled or recorded in the base level Civil Engineering organization to avoid any additional administrative workload.

The current management information system in use in the Civil Engineering community is the Base Engineer Automated Management System (BEAMS). This system has been described as probably the most comprehensive performance reporting system in use in the Air Force today (20:33). BEAMS has a huge historical data base. One of the purposes of BEAMS, as outlined in Air Force Manual 171-20, is to allow more efficient and effective management of resources by the base Civil Engineering organizations (31:1).

BEAMS has an outline subsystem interface that causes the data from a single update transaction to be fed into other files that require the same information (31:2). Two of these subsystems that are important to the base level Civil Engineering Design Section are the Labor and Prime BEEF Subsystem and the Civil Engineering Contract Reporting System (CECORS). The Labor and Prime BEEF Subsystem provides for the accounting of authorized and assigned personnel, the reporting of labor expended against specific work orders, and the accounting for time other than direct labor expended against specific work orders. The Civil Engineering Contract Reporting System maintains the status of all service contracts and all active and programmed projects regardless of fund source. Additionally, CECORS produces a monthly report for submission to the responsible MAJCOM, and includes two optional engineering design backlog management capabilities (31:3-4). The importance of these subsystems will be

seen when the inputs and outputs are developed. Additional data that is not maintained on these subsystems can be obtained using an Air Force On Line Data System (AFOLDS) retrieval that allows the user to specify exactly what data he wants (31:8).

One criticism of BEAMS has been that the data is not current. Some have questioned the integrity of the data. The time lapse in data permits examination of the data prior to entry or manipulation to make the situation reflect a more favorable situation (31:9). This would not be a problem on a productivity measurement model since productivity is rarely figured on a daily basis.

The future of BEAMS is uncertain with the new proposed Work Information Management System (WIMS). However, the proposal is for WIMS to be implemented in addition to BEAMS. One thing that is certain in BEAMS'S future is that it will be around for awhile with or without WIMS. This is important in the implementation of the productivity measurement model since the data must be available on a management information system for the model to be useful. It would be fruitless to develop a model that would be rendered obsolete by the abolition or replacement of the management information system on which the data is maintained. This does not appear to be the case with the Base Engineer Automated Management System. It will continue to be in existence in the future with or without a base level Civil Engineering Design Section productivity measurement.

The first step in the determination of inputs and outputs (the process is outlined in Figure 2) is to determine the decision making unit (DMU). The decision making unit in this research project is the base level Civil Engineering Design Section.




Figure 2. Input and Output Determination Diagram [6:2]

Once the decision making unit has been selected, the next step is to develop a formal statement of the DMU goals and services. These goals and services will be those organizational objectives determined by Baumgartel and Johnson (3) and stated in Chapter I.

The next step is to review all pertinent studies and reports. This review was done as part of the literature review conducted in Chapter II of this research effort. The most applicable was a research effort conducted by Kaneda and Walleth (20) in a master's thesis at the Air Force Institute of Technology, School of System and Logistics. As part of the research they developed a suggested productivity measurement system for the base level Design Section. This leads to step three which is determining available measures or current systems (6:2). The system developed by Kaneda and Walleth was never adopted by the Air Force and is not in use today.

The next step is to describe the managerial context. In developing this managerial context, the organizational goals, operational requirements, and managerial system must be evaluated (6:1). The views of key managers, analysts, and technicians should be sought while determining the managerial context (6:1). This was done in several ways by Kaneda and Walleth. The first way was using a panel of fellow Facilities Management students at the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) School of System and Logistics. This panel consisted of five members with 5 to 12 years experience in the Air Force Civil Engineering career field (20:84). Each member of the panel had also been associated with or managed a base level Civil Engineering Design Section (20:84). The second way Kaneda and Walleth collected the views of experts was using a panel made up of faculty

members from the Air Force Institute of Technology School of Civil Engineering (20:85). This panel of experts provided a forum for criticism and recommendations for improvement.

This method was selected for use in this research effort also. Two panels were selected and used as a sounding board to provide criticism and recommendations. The first panel consisted of AFIT Engineering Management students with at least 6 years civil engineering experience and some design experience. The second panel was comprised of AFIT School of Civil Engineering faculty. The members of the panels are shown in Appendix B.

The next step in the determination of inputs and outputs was to generate a comprehensive set of input and output measures. First we will discuss identifying relevant input measures. Kaneda and Walleit used only direct labor cost and manhours (20:54). This research effort analyzed a number of possible input measures. In generating a comprehensive list of inputs, a total of six inputs were considered. This list was submitted to the two panels for screening for relevancy and completeness. From this list, all six inputs were selected for inclusion in the model. These inputs are as follows:

1. Labor manhours
2. Labor costs
3. Years experience
4. Personnel skill level aggregate
5. Number of professional educational courses completed
6. One over the number of additional duties performed

The amount of equipment available, facilities available, and overhead were not included in the analysis. These were analyzed by Kaneda and Wallelt, and they concluded that these did not vary significantly in various design sections. The reason given for this small variance is that all the design sections are controlled by the same organizational structure. Additionally, the amount of equipment, materials and overhead allocated for the exclusive use of the Civil Engineering Design Section is not maintained in the records of the Base Engineer Automated Management System. Thus, including these inputs would not be keeping with the restraint to avoid an additional administrative workload.

Output measures are difficult to develop. The Civil Engineering Design Section has different outputs every day of the year, and one design unit has different outputs from the next. Output measures must be used which enable these organizations to be compared to one another. Kaneda and Wallelt came up with twenty-six possible output measures.

The twenty-six measures of Kaneda and Wallelt were used as the starting point in developing the comprehensive list of outputs. The two panels were used to help revalidate the output measures developed and add to or delete other measures. They reviewed the inputs and outputs to ensure that the list was complete (ie. all resources, products, and services were represented) based on their experience. A total of thirty-three output measures were considered and analyzed. From these, twenty measures were selected for use in the model. These outputs are:

1. Total contract funds obligated
2. Estimated dollar amount of all projects designed (complete and ready for contracting action)
3. Total O&M maintenance and repair project funds obligated
4. Total O&M minor construction funds obligated
5. Total number of projects designed (complete and ready for contracting action)
6. Total number of facility inspections and utility system surveys completed
7. Total number of special technical studies and reports completed
8. One over total funds expensed on contract change orders
9. One over number of contract change orders
10. Total estimated dollar amount of in-house work orders designed
11. Total estimated dollar amount of architect-engineer packages prepared
12. Total A-E design funds obligated
13. Estimated dollar amount of MCP Project Books
14. Number of work orders reviewed and/or evaluated
15. Number of technical reviews accomplished on designed projects
16. Pages of project specifications
17. Total number of oral presentations made
18. Number of facility surveys conducted
19. Total hours of surveys completed
20. Number of pages of engineering drawings completed

The complete list of inputs and outputs analyzed, along with the reason for the rejection of some of the measures, is presented in

Appendix C. The selected inputs and outputs are also further explained in Appendix D.

Several inputs and outputs have the form of "one over" a measure. This is necessary to maintain the relationship that an increase in inputs will result in an increase in output. This is the positive relation referred to by Bessent, Bessent, and Clark (5).

Each input and output measure, while being analyzed, was evaluated against several different sets of criteria. This step was necessary due to the unique nature of the data (as explained in the following section, the data was generated by the authors). Inspection or statistical analysis of the data would not reveal faulty measurements, due to its special development. One of the sets of criteria used was developed in a thesis by Armstrong and Dougherty, A Study of the Development of Output Measures. The criteria are:

1. Based on determined mission
2. Measure permits direct evaluation
3. Measure is based on objectives
4. Causative relationship exists
5. Measure is needed
6. Measurement is not a restatement of resources
7. Data for measurement is quantifiable-programable
8. Measurement is meaningful to management
9. Data for measure is available
10. Structure agreement exists
11. Measurement is homogeneous with like measures
12. Measure is matchable to expense
13. Measure provides for continuity and compatability

14. Measure is not a composite if other alternative exists [1:98]

The final list of selected inputs and outputs were then evaluated against the seven characteristics of productivity measures recommended by Tuttle (35:77-78) and discussed in Chapter II of this research. The outputs and inputs satisfy five of the seven characteristics. The characteristics satisfied are those of completeness, comparability, input coverage, compatability with existing data sources, and consistency across organizations. The two characteristics not satisfied are cost effectiveness, and acceptable to organization members. These characteristics can not be appropriately determined until the measurement model is implemented and in use. Only at this time can the final two characteristics be determined. With five of Tuttle's seven characteristics satisfied, and Bessent, Bessent, and Clark's (5) rules for inputs and outputs complied with, the selected inputs and outputs were used for data generation.

Data Generation and Preparation for Analysis

The data used in the development of the productivity measurement model was generated by the researchers. Actual data from real Civil Engineering Design Sections was not gathered.

The decision to simulate real data is based primarily on the choice of the statistical analysis method. Recent research has produced a new method for measuring the relative efficiency of an organization with respect to other similar organizations performing similar operations with similar resources. That method is called

Constrained Facet Analysis (CFA) and is explained in detail in this chapter in the discussion of analysis methods.

The authors believe that Constrained Facet Analysis will prove to be a powerful management tool when knowledge of its existence spreads and more applications of the model are made. The authors have no reason to believe that the model cannot successfully be implemented in an Air Force Civil Engineering Design Section. However, it is recognized that CFA has not yet been applied to a civil engineering problem. Any application of the model to Civil Engineering using actual data could not be reliably shown to reflect the true state of nature, unless the true state of nature was already known. Therefore, the use of CFA in a civil engineering application, such as a design section, is needed to demonstrate its capability, but it must be applied so that the output of the model verifies a previously known state of nature. One reliable way of knowing the true state of nature is to manufacture it.

Data Generation. Identification of inputs and outputs revealed 26 candidate measures. As stated in the analysis section, data from twice as many organizations, or 52 units, will be used in the analysis.

The data will reflect the following situations:

- 1) Efficient large units with a concentration of in-house design work
- 2) Inefficient large units with a concentration of in-house design work.
- 3) Efficient small units with a concentration of in-house design work.
- 4) Inefficient small units with a concentration of in-house design work.

- 5) Efficient large units with design work contracted out to A-E firms.
- 6) Inefficient large units with design work contracted out to A-E firms.
- 7) Efficient small units with design work contracted out to A-E firms.
- 8) Inefficient small units with design work contracted out to A-E firms.

Based on the authors' experience, some typical values for each input and output were determined. Using that group of values, two ranges were developed--one for small organizations and one for large organizations. Within each of those two ranges, values were then adjusted to reflect either an in-house design concentration or an A-E contract design concentration. Thus, four major divisions were developed within the organizations. These divisions are 1) large units with in-house design work, 2) large units with A-E contracted design, 3) small units with in-house design work, 4) small units with A-E contracted design. One organization in each division was chosen to be the efficient organization and one organization selected to be the least efficient organization. The most efficient organization was then assigned the lowest input values within its division and the highest output values for that division. The organization selected to be least efficient was given the highest inputs and the lowest output values for its division. By maintaining the values of inputs and outputs within the prescribed divisions, it was hoped that the particular "neighborhood" of organizations could be fixed. The data was generated for the following conditions to exist:

- 1) Organization 1, the efficient large unit with a concentration of in-house design work.
- 2) Organization 10, the least efficient large unit with a concentration of in-house design work.
- 3) Organization 12, the efficient small unit with a concentration of in-house design work.
- 4) Organization 23, the least efficient small unit with a concentration of in-house design work.
- 5) Organization 24, the efficient large unit with design work contracted out to A-E firms.
- 6) Organization 32, the least efficient large unit with design work contracted out to A-E firms.
- 7) Organization 35, the efficient small unit with design work contracted out to A-E firms.
- 8) Organization 46, the least efficient small unit with design work contracted out to A-E firms.

Preparation of Data for Analysis. The computer code for CFA was developed and tested at the University of Texas at Austin, and is maintained on that school's CDC Dual Cyber 170/750. The code is written in Fortran and employs a revised primal simplex code (7:1). The authors traveled to the University of Texas at Austin and were permitted to use the Cyber and the CFA Code in the analysis of their data.

Use of the CFA code required preparation of the data in the proper format, as outlined in the paper by Bessent, Bessent, Clark, and Elam describing the code (7:6). The data from each of the fifty-two units was entered in the Aeronautical Systems Division (ASD) Cyber computer at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. A hard-copy of the data file was printed and all data entries were checked for accuracy against the original data list. The data file was then

routed to a card printer, where the data was punched onto computer cards (four cards per organization). The cards were then entered into a card reader to verify that the data items had been punched accurately.

Upon arrival at the University of Texas at Austin, the researchers were given a briefing on the use of the school's Cyber computer and the CFA code. The data card deck and appropriate control cards were entered into the computer to establish a local data file. Some data cards could not be read properly by the school's card reader, requiring some additional manual data input. A copy of the data file is contained in Appendix E.

IV. Findings and Results

The data file in Appendix E was analyzed using the CFA code contained in the University of Texas at Austin's Dual Cyber computer. The analysis runs were made the week of 25-28 June, 1984.

After entry of the execution command for the CFA code, the code instructs the user to specify requirements of the analysis from five options. First, the code asks which organizational units are to be included in the reference set to be analyzed. The authors requested all organizations be included in each run. Second, the code asks which organizations of the reference set are to be processed. Again, we specified all organizations be processed. The next two options ask which outputs and which inputs, respectively, are to be included in the analysis. Finally, the code asks which of the managerial reports, if any, are to be produced in the analysis. After the five options are specified, the program executes.

Initial runs on the data set were unsuccessful. Consultations with Dr. A. Bessent and Dr. W. Bessent, Co-Directors of the Educational Productivity Council (which supports the research and maintenance of the CFA code), revealed that the CFA code was dimensioned such that a combination of only twenty (20) inputs and outputs could be used. Dr. A. Bessent attempted to redimension the code so that up to 100 inputs and outputs could be analyzed, but her efforts were unsuccessful.

Since one of the options of the code is to select which inputs and outputs are to be considered, the authors then selected a total

of twenty of the inputs and outputs for analysis. Again, the computer computation was aborted. Subsequent tests with succeedinglly smaller combinations of inputs and outputs resulted in a successful run when a total of fifteen factors were considered.

Inputs and Outputs Used

Originally both the productivity of design engineers and the site development personnel were to be included in the measurement model. However, limitations of the computerized model required a reduction in the inputs and outputs. The site development personnel were eliminated from both the inputs and outputs. This resulted in total elimination of the following outputs:

- Number of surveys conducted.
- Total hours of surveys completed.

The list of inputs and outputs were still too numerous for the computerized version of CFA at the University of Texas. To eliminate inputs and outputs further it was determined to begin with those that have the smallest percentage of manhours devoted to them. To determine this the authors used data obtained from the AFIT School of Civil Engineering and presented in the School's Engineering and Environmental Planning Management Applications Course. This method resulted in the elimination of the following inputs:

- Number of professional education courses completed.
- One over the number of additional duties performed.

and the following outputs:

- Total O&M minor construction funds obligated.
- Total number of facility inspections and utility system surveys completed.
- Total number of special technical studies and reports completed.
- Pages of project specifications.
- Total number of oral presentations made.
- Number of pages of engineering drawings completed.

The final output eliminated was "Total A-E design funds obligated." It was eliminated because of indecision on the part of the authors whether it was truly an output or an input. Rather than jeopardize the analysis by including it as an output, it was eliminated entirely. This was possible since the A-E contract output portion is captured in the output, "Total estimated dollar amount of architect-engineer packages prepared."

That reduction left a total of four inputs and eleven outputs. The CFA model was able to accommodate that number of factors. These inputs and outputs, then, were used in the final analysis:

Inputs

1. Labor manhours
2. Labor costs
3. Years experience
4. Personnel skill level

Outputs

1. Total contract funds obligated

2. Estimated dollar amount of all projects designed (complete and ready for contracting action)
3. Total O&M maintenance and repair project funds obligated
4. Total number of projects designed (complete and ready for contracting action)
5. One over total funds expensed on contract change orders
6. One over number of contract change orders
7. Total estimated dollar amount of in-house work orders designed
8. Total estimated dollar amount of architect-engineer packages prepared
9. Estimated dollar amount of MCP Project Books
10. Number of work orders reviewed and/or evaluated
11. Number of technical reviews accomplished on designed projects

Model Execution

The computerized model was run with all 52 organizations and the 4 inputs and 11 outputs. The following results were obtained:

1. Organization 1, the efficient large unit with a concentration of in-house design work.
2. Organization 10, the least efficient large unit with a concentration of in-house design work.
3. Organization 12, the efficient small unit with a concentration of in-house design work.
4. Organization 23, the least efficient small unit with a concentration of in-house design work.
5. Organization 24, the efficient large unit with design work contracted out to A-E firms.

6. Organization 32, the least efficient large unit with design work contracted out to A-E firms.
7. Organization 35, the efficient small unit with design work contracted out to A-E firms.
8. Organization 46, the least efficient small unit with design work contracted out to A-E firms.

This coincides with the results anticipated in the methodology chapter of this research. The efficiencies of all 52 organizations are listed in Appendix F. The actual computer printout results are included in Appendix G.

The model gives two efficiencies. These are termed as the upper and lower bound efficiencies. The upper bound is the largest relative efficiency possible for that organization and the lower bound is the smallest possible relative efficiency for that organization. The actual efficiency may lay anywhere within these two bounds.

The indication of only four efficient organizations would lead us to believe that in fact four "neighborhoods" or divisions were used by the model as was desired. This means that small in-house design organizations were only evaluated against small in-house design organizations, etc.

The model also gives reports for each inefficient organization showing what inputs would be necessary for that organization to be efficient if it maintained the same output. The model also determines what output increases are necessary for an organization to become efficient if its present inputs remain the same. A sample of each report is included in Appendix H.

Limitations of the CFA Code

Use of the CFA code as it presently exists revealed some limitations which anyone interested in application of the code or further research in this area should take note of. Improvements to the CFA code are being made continuously, so some of the following problems may not be of concern in the near future.

In the development of the code, the case of a set of inputs and outputs exceeding twenty in number was unforeseen. The CFA code will not work for a case with more than twenty inputs and outputs. Depending on the data and its range, the code may not work with more than fifteen factors involved. Work is underway to expand the capability of the code in this regard. Until the problem is resolved, researchers are forced to minimize the number of inputs and outputs used. Pearson's correlation can be used on actual data to discard those factors having a high positive correlation (meaning one of the factors is sufficient to measure the activity) or those having a negative correlation (meaning additional amounts of that factor detract from productivity). Pearson's correlation was not used in this research effort to reduce the set of inputs and outputs because the data was generated by the researchers. Any highly positive or negative correlations would be suspect.

Related to the above problem, it may be advantageous in the description of an organization's productivity to first focus on a few main inputs and outputs in the analysis. After successful analyses have been made of those few factors, the researcher can expand and

become more descriptive with each input and output. Additionally, select only those inputs and outputs having a positive correlation. While factors negatively correlated with productivity can be converted by using reciprocals or inverses, these manipulations tend to cause computation problems during program execution by generating extremely small numbers.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The measurement of productivity in an Air Force Civil Engineering Design Section is desirable from a management perspective. Until now, inadequate measurement techniques prevented managers from knowing how well their units were performing over time or with respect to other units. The use of the Constrained Facet Analysis technique can provide that information. CFA is a valid method of determining the relative efficiency of a base level Civil Engineering Design Section.

This research effort is a step forward in the DOD and Air Force Productivity Programs. Further research is needed to develop CFA's full potential of helping managers better understand productivity and improve organizational performance.

Research Questions Answered

Three research questions were presented in Chapter I of this thesis. In this section, each of the three questions are reiterated along with a brief summation of their respective answers.

The first research question posed in this thesis was, "What are the inputs and outputs for a base level Civil Engineering Design Section?" The total list of twenty outputs and six inputs described in the Methodology chapter of this research are the inputs and outputs for a Design Section. The complete list could not be used in the Constrained Facet Analysis technique used by the researchers for the development of the model, however, due to computer limitations. A

reduction of relatively insignificant and/or redundant measures was made to meet the computer requirements.

The second research question asked, "What is the appropriate productivity measurement technique?" Three different analysis methods were examined, after which Constrained Facet Analysis was chosen. CFA is the only technique capable of handling multiple inputs and outputs and producing a single aggregate measure relative to a frontier of actual achievement.

The final research question asked, "Can a model of productivity be developed using appropriate inputs and outputs?" A model was developed, using the framework of the CFA model adapted to a Civil Engineering design context through the use of the Design Section inputs and outputs. Based on the results of the data analysis (presented in Chapter IV), the adaptation yielded a valid productivity measurement model.

Recommendations

The authors recommend that further research be done before any attempt is made to implement CFA into design sections. Actual data should be collected from the Continental United States (CONUS) Air Force bases. Pearson's correlations should be conducted for each input and output to screen out those factors that are redundant measurements or negatively correlated. The data should then be analyzed using CFA. Assuming that further research supports the notion that valid productivity measurement within design sections is possible, then we recommend implementation of the model.

We recommend that, should this analysis technique be implemented, design section managers be trained in its use and application, and in its limitations. The managers should be shown how it can help them improve their organization's performance, rather than becoming another mandated program that impedes their progress.

We recommend that any application of the CFA technique be done initially as an aid to the base level managers, rather than as an organizational assessment tool used at the Major Command level. Results of the analysis should be given to the base level managers for their use in effecting change to improve their organization. The analysis results would include the overall efficiency rating of the particular organization, summary reports of which inputs to decrease or outputs to increase to become efficient, and a list of the organizations against which they were compared. Armed with that information, the manager could then change those factors over which he has control to move his organization closer to the efficiency frontier. He can contact those units within the frontier "neighborhood" to see what those organizations are doing that makes them efficient. Additionally, he can identify those factors beyond his control which are contributing to his inefficiency rating, and possibly use the ratings to induce upper management to change those inputs and outputs in his favor.

As with any computer-generated product, the results are only as good as the information used. As numbers cannot totally describe a situation, managerial common sense must enter into the evaluation. Each inefficiency rating requires investigation into the circumstances

surrounding that organization's poor score. An inefficient rating can identify an organization needing improvement, but that rating may not be a valid assessment of the manager's efforts or problems. A poor manager can inherit an efficient organization, just as an excellent manager can find himself in an extremely inefficient unit. While measurements over time could yield information on a given manager's performance, a single evaluation cannot. Therefore, we would not recommend that the results of the model be used as an evaluation technique for managers.

Appendix A: CFA Model

Model Used in Constrained Facet Analysis of Not-Fully-Enveloped Units [8:16-19]

The model used in the iterative method called Constrained Facet Analysis is presented in this appendix, a model which can be used in evaluating the range of inefficiency in organizational units and in determining marginal rates of substitution and productivity in frontier facets.

Suppose one wishes to evaluate the relative efficiency of n decision making units (DMUs), each of which uses varying amounts of m inputs and produces varying amount of s outputs. Using notation conventions similar to those used by Clark (see references at the end of this appendix), let:

x_{ij} = the amounts of input type i used by DMU j
during the period of observation, $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$
and $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

y_{rj} = the amount of output type r produced by DMU j
during the period of observation, $r = 1, 2, \dots, s$
and $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

x_{ik} = the amount of input type i used by the unit k
where $k = \{1, 2, \dots, k, \dots, n\}$ and unit k is
the DMU being evaluated. Each DMU in turn will
be evaluated.

y_{rk} = the amount of output type r used by DMU _{k} .

N = $1, 2, 3, \dots, M$ is the sequence of iterations
of the Constrained Facet Analysis model which
ends at iteration M .

$h_k^{(1)}$ = the upper bound efficiency value sought for DMU_k which is determined from the solution of the first iteration of the Constrained Facet Analysis.¹

$h_k^{(M)}$ = the lower bound efficiency value sought for DMU_k which is determined from the solution of the final iteration (M) of the Constrained Facet Analysis.

$v_{ik}^{(N)}$ = the multipliers for each input type i which will be determined by solution of the Nth iterative model.

$u_{rk}^{(N)}$ = the multipliers for each output type r which will be determined by solution of the Nth iterative model.

$s_{rk}^{(N-1)*}$ = the dual surplus values associated with outputs $r = 1, 2, \dots, s$ of DMU_k at optimality of the previous iteration. For the initial iteration, these surplus values are

$$s_{rk}^{(N-1)*} = s_{rk}^{(0)*} = y_{rk}.$$

$s_{ik}^{(N-1)*}$ = the dual surplus values associated with inputs $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ at optimality of the previous iteration. Initial values at iteration one are

$$s_{ik}^{(N-1)*} = s_{ik}^{(0)*} = x_{ik}.$$

¹The form of the CFA model used in the first iteration is similar to the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) model of Charnes, Cooper and Rhodes [1], however, the non-Archimedean infinitesimal quantities are not required.

The following linear programming model is used in constrained facet analysis for each iteration

$N = 1, 2, \dots, M:$

Primal

$$\text{Max } f_k^{(N)} = \sum_{r=1}^s \mu_{rk}^{(N)} s_{rk}^{(N-1)*} + \sum_{i=1}^m v_{ik}^{(N)} s_{ik}^{(N-1)*} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{r=1}^s \mu_{rk}^{(N)} y_{rj} - \sum_{i=1}^m v_{ik}^{(N)} x_{ij} = 0 \quad \text{for } j \in E_k^{(N)}$$

$$\sum_{r=1}^s \mu_{rk}^{(N)} y_{rj} - \sum_{i=1}^m v_{ik}^{(N)} x_{ij} \leq 0 \quad \text{for } j \in \bar{E}_k^{(N)}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m v_{ik}^{(N)} x_{ik} = 1$$

$$\mu_{rk}^{(N)}, v_{ik}^{(N)} > 0$$

where

$E_k^{(N)} \equiv \{j/j\text{th constraint holds with equality at optimality at iteration } N-1\}$

$\bar{E}_k^{(N)} \equiv \{j/j\text{th constraint is } < 0 \text{ at optimality of iteration } N-1\}$

$E_k^{(1)} \equiv \emptyset$ (empty), $\bar{E}_k^{(1)} \equiv \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

The upper and lower bound efficiency measures are obtained from solution of the first and last iterative models as shown below:

$$h_k^{(1)} = f_k^{(1)} - 1 = \sum_{r=1}^S \mu_{rk}^{(1)*} y_{rk}$$

$$h_k^{(M)} = \sum_{r=1}^S \mu_{rk}^{(M)*} y_{rk}$$

The dual of model (1) above is:

Dual

$$\text{Min } \omega_k^{(N)} \quad (2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in E(N)} \lambda_j^{(N)} y_{rj} + \sum_{j \in \bar{E}(N)} \gamma_j^{(N)} y_{rj} - s_{rk}^{(N)} \\ & = s_{rk}^{(N-1)*} \quad r = 1, 2, \dots, S \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} x_{ik} \omega_k^{(N)} - \sum_{j \in E(N)} \lambda_j^{(N)} x_{ij} - \sum_{j \in \bar{E}(N)} \gamma_j^{(N)} x_{ij} - s_{ik}^{(N)} \\ = s_{ik}^{(N-1)*} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m \end{aligned}$$

$$\omega_k^{(N)}, \lambda_j^{(N)} \text{ unrestricted; } \gamma_j^{(N)}, s_{rk}^{(N)}, s_{ik}^{(N)} \geq 0$$

The mathematical theory and proofs related to the development of this model can be found in Clark [2] and will not be repeated in this appendix. But there are a few model characteristics which are worth noting here.

First, the efficiency measures $h_k^{(1)}$ and $h_k^{(M)}$ are scalar ratio measures. Secondly, the constraints of the primal problem insure that the maximum achievable value of these efficiency measures is 1. Furthermore, Constrained Facet Analysis does not require that outputs or inputs have common scales or units of measurement, an important attribute when dealing with difficulties such as nonmonetary objectives and nonpurchased resources. However, all measured input and output values are required to be strictly positive. Finally, each unit is compared to others in the set which have similar input/output mixes, i.e., those units in its "neighborhood."

In short, the Constrained Facet Analysis model can identify units which are efficient or inefficient relative to a neighborhood frontier region of actual achievement; it can provide a limited number of clues on possible causes from analysis of surplus variables and multipliers; and it is helpful in evaluating the impact of alternative mixes of inputs and outputs.

Furthermore, the information provided by the CFA model is a major improvement over the inadequate, partial

(and sometimes inaccurate) measures of performance which are now typically in use in many public service organizations. In addition to its usefulness as a performance monitoring device, this efficiency analysis tool opens the door for further development and growth in other areas of planning, resource allocation and decision support.

Appendix References

1. Charnes, A., W.W. Cooper and E. Rhodes. "Measuring the Efficiency of Decision Making Units," European Journal of Operational Research: 429-444 (1978).
2. Clark, C. Terry. Data Envelopment Analysis and Extensions for Decision Support and Management Planning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Graduate School of Business, University of Texas at Austin, Austin TX, May 1983.

Appendix B: Panel Members

Panel of AFIT School of Systems and Logistics

Engineering Management Students

NAME/RANK	CUM YEARS IN BCE
James T. Ryburn, Captain	9
Frederick Nightengale, Captain	6
Charles Howell, Captain	8

Panel of AFIT School of Civil Engineering

Faculty

NAME/RANK	POSITION
Jeffery R. Charles, Captain	Course Director, Dept of Management Applications
Thomas H. Gross, Major	Course Director, Dept of Management Applications

Appendix C: List of Inputs and Outputs Analyzed

OUTPUT MEASURES	REASON FOR ELIMINATION
1. Total estimated dollar amount of contract projects and in-house work orders designed	This is the addition of output measures 2 and 12
2. Total contract funds obligated	
3. Total O&M contract funds obligated	
4. Total O&M maintenance and repair funds obligated	
5. Total O&M minor construction funds obligated	
6. Total estimated dollar amount of project document (DD 1391/1391C) completed	DD 1391/1391C are the responsibility of DEEV
7. Total number of projects designed (complete and ready for acquisition action)	
8. Total number of facility inspections and utility system surveys completed	
9. Total number of special technical studies and reports completed	
10. One over total funds expensed on contract change orders	
11. One over number of contract change orders	
12. Total estimated dollar amount of in-house work orders designed	
13. Total service contract funds obligated	Service contracts are handled by DEEC

- | | |
|--|--|
| 14. Number of environmental assessments (EA's) and environmental impact statements (EIS's) completed | While assistance may be given, EA's and EIS's are accomplished by DEEV |
| 15. Total estimated dollar amount of architect-engineer packages prepared | |
| 16. Total A-E design funds obligated | |
| 17. Number of work orders reviewed and/or evaluated | |
| 18. Number of technical reviews accomplished on designed projects | |
| 19. Number of military family housing (MFH) inspections completed | To avoid counting the inspections accomplished by the Housing Office, those completed by DEEE will be added in output 8. |
| 20. Pages of project specifications | |
| 21. Total hours of supplemental training completed | Evaluated as both an input and an output and not considered to be a significant amount at a base level organization |
| 22. Number of professional educational courses completed | Was originally evaluated as an output, but in the opinion of the researchers should be included as an input instead |
| 23. Total hours construction inspections completed | Construction inspections are handled by DEEC. Those that are completed by DEEE will be included in output 8 |
| 24. Total number of oral presentations made | |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 25. Total number of journal articles written | Not part of military job. If accomplished, should be completed on individual time |
| 26. Hours of training sessions taught/conducted | Not considered to be a significant amount in a base level organization |
| 27. Number of surveys conducted | |
| 28. Total hours of surveys completed | |
| 29. Number of pages of engineering drawings (blueprints) completed | |
| 30. Customer satisfaction index | Time lag between facility design and customer use is too long |
| 31. Number of buildings demolished | Engineers are not always involved. Could be performed on a service contract handled strictly by DEEC |
| 32. Estimated dollar amount of all projects designed (completed and ready for acquisition action) | |
| 33. Estimated dollar amount of MCP Project Books | |

INPUT MEASURES

REASON FOR ELIMINATION

1. Labor manhours
2. Labor costs
3. Years experience
4. Personnel skill level
aggregate
5. Number of professional
education courses completed
6. One over additional duties
performed

Appendix D: Inputs and Outputs Further Defined

All outputs and inputs are cumulative values for all personnel in design (those figured into the manhours calculation) for the fiscal year. Data could be broken down into quarterly figures and used in the productivity model, if desired.

OUTPUTS FURTHER DEFINED

1. Total contract funds obligated- The total amount of design contract funds obligated. Outputs 3, 4, and 10 are subsets of output 1. Should also include Military Construction Program (MCP) and Military Family Housing.
2. Estimated dollar amount of all projects designed- All projects designed during the year that are complete and ready for contracting action. This output should also measure the "on the shelf" effort during the year.
3. Total O&M maintenance/repair project funds obligated- Total maintenance and repair project funds. This should be the majority of work and funds.
4. Total O&M minor construction funds obligated- Should be a small percentage of output 1.

5. Total number of projects designed (complete and ready for contracting action)- This should be the number of those projects included in output 2. This measure of quantity will prevent one large project from dominating as could be the case in output 2.

6. Total number of facility inspections, utility system surveys and construction site inspections completed- This should include the yearly facility inspections where the engineer accompanies a planner, utility system surveys that the engineers may be involved with and also construction site inspections. The construction site inspections should be in support of or along with construction management.

7. Total number of special technical studies and reports completed- This should include any cost savings studies, replacement vs repair studies etc. There is a trend in the Air Force toward increased emphasis in this area.

8. One over total funds expensed on contract change orders- By taking the reciprocal value, we are preventing an increase in change order funds to also increase productivity. This output is attempting to measure quality of the designs accomplished.

9. One over the number of contract change orders- This reciprocal is to prevent one large change order from dominating as can be done in output 8.

10. Total estimated dollar amount of in-house work orders designed- This is the estimated dollar amount of projects designed to be completed by the in-house work force. Those projects are accomplished by Civil Engineering Operations Branch personnel (DEM).

11. Total estimated dollar amount of architect-engineer packages prepared- The estimated dollar amount of projects that the engineer must prepare prior to submission to an architect-engineer firm.

12. Total Architect-Engineer design funds obligated- The amount of Title I-B design funds obligated to an Architect-Engineer firm.

13. Estimated dollar amount of MCP Project Books- The estimated dollar amount of those Military Construction Program Project Books prepared by the design section. This value may be zero if MCP PB's are prepared by Environmental Planning Section.

14. Number of work orders reviewed and/or evaluated- The number of work orders that the engineers render assistance on, advise or review for the DEM personnel

15. Number of technical reviews accomplished on designed projects- Should include the 35% review, the 60-65% review and the 95% review. Include only those reviews actually accomplished.

16. Pages of project specification- The number of pages of specifications written by the design section personnel. Should not include the pages added by Base Contracting.

17. Total number of oral presentations made- Should include presentations such as paintplan, special command interest projects and presentations to MAJCOM personnel. Should not include daily or weekly standups.

18. Number of surveys conducted- The number of site surveys conducted by the site development personnel. Should also include plane crash surveys.

19. Total hours of surveys completed- The manhours expended in performing the surveys listed in output 18. This measure is to help take into account a large plane crash survey that might be accomplished.

20. Number of pages engineering drawings completed- Those drawings done by the site development personnel and engineers in project design. To include updating of as-built drawings if performed by the engineers or site development personnel.

INPUTS FURTHER DEFINED

1. Labor manhours- The gross manhours available during the year assuming an eight hour day, five day week work week. The figure is 2080 hours a year per person. Supervisory personnel are included in the figure.
2. Labor costs- Figured using the base shop rate times the gross manhours.
3. Years experience- The cumulative total years of engineering experience of personnel in design. A scale weighting the type of experience could be used, but would be extremely hard to administer. If all organizations use the same criteria, a weighted scale would not be necessary.
4. Personnel skill level aggregate- A numeric total of points assessed for the personnel skill level according to the following point values:

GS-7	3	AB-A1C	1	LT	4
GS-9	4	SRA-SSGT	2	CAPT	5
GS-11	5	TSG-MSG	3	MAJOR	6
GS-12	5.5	SMSG-CMSG	4		
GS-13	6				

One additional point will be added if the individual is a licensed professional engineer. An additional .5 will be added if the individual possesses an advanced degree.

5. Number of professional education courses completed- Courses sponsored by AFIT, civilian university or professional organization. Conventions and seminars should also be included.

6. One over the number of additional duties- This is to account for the decrease in resources available to perform work when personnel are involved in additional duties.

Appendix E: Data

This appendix contains the printout of the data file used by the Constrained Facet Analysis model in determining the efficiencies for the organizations. At the top of the printout is the title assigned to the model (for computer file identification purposes) by the authors. This is followed by a line that contains three numbers. The first number is the number of organizations in the data file. The second number is the number of outputs and the last number is the number of inputs. The output and input titles are then printed out. This order is important, as it is in the same order that the data is listed within each organization. Each organization's data requires four lines on the printout. The organization numbers are printed on the left hand side of the page. This data is supplied for any future researchers that may attempt to replicate the model and result.

BASE CIVIL ENGR DESIGN SECTION PROD

52 20 6
 OUTPUT 01 OUTPUT 02 OUTPUT 03 OUTPUT 04 OUTPUT 05 OUTPUT 06 OUTPUT 07
 OUTPUT 08 OUTPUT 09 OUTPUT 10 OUTPUT 11 OUTPUT 12 OUTPUT 13 OUTPUT 14
 OUTPUT 15 OUTPUT 16 OUTPUT 17 OUTPUT 18 OUTPUT 19 OUTPUT 20 INPUT 01
 INPUT 02 INPUT 03 INPUT 04 INPUT 05 INPUT 06

01							
01	5.6	7.8	3.8	1.	128.	300.	12.
01	5.	.05	1.2	1.	0.9	2.8	232.
01	300.	2500.	17.	36.	900.	650.	100.
01	1500.	300.	250.	10.	8.		
02							
02	5.2	7.7	3.6	0.9	126.	240.	11.
02	2.5	.04	1.1	0.9	0.9	2.7	220.
02	250.	2000.	16.	27.	700.	625.	115.
02	2000.	380.	330.	11.	9.		
03							
03	5.0	6.8	3.4	0.8	122.	251.	11.
03	3.33	.033	1.1	1.	0.8	2.5	150.
03	240.	1600.	17.	35.	600.	575.	117.
03	1600.	390.	260.	12.	10.		
04							
04	4.8	7.5	3.7	0.85	119.	298.	10.
04	1.428	.0286	0.95	1.0	0.8	2.4	160.
04	280.	2000.	16.	24.	500.	550.	110.
04	1500.	400.	250.	11.	8.		
05							
05	4.6	7.6	2.9	0.75	112.	278.	12.
05	1.67	.025	1.0	0.9	0.9	2.8	210.
05	290.	1800.	13.	36.	900.	525.	112.
05	1700.	370.	270.	10.	11.		
06							
06	4.7	7.7	3.5	0.88	127.	274.	9.
06	1.428	.0238	0.9	1.0	0.8	2.3	230.
06	300.	1700.	15.	28.	700.	650.	122.
06	1800.	420.	280.	12.	10.		
07							
07	4.9	7.8	3.7	0.9	128.	298.	10.
07	1.053	.037	0.9	0.9	0.9	2.8	210.
07	220.	2200.	14.	35.	900.	600.	124.
07	1900.	320.	290.	13.	9.		
08							
08	5.1	7.6	3.6	0.94	98.	264.	9.
08	1.111	.0263	0.8	0.8	0.7	2.7	170.
08	240.	2300.	12.	29.	800.	500.	114.
08	2100.	340.	320.	14.	8.		
09							
09	4.4	7.4	3.5	0.97	124.	222.	8.
09	1.0	.0238	0.85	0.8	0.8	2.2	180.
09	200.	1700.	11.	31.	600.	475.	120.
09	2200.	410.	310.	15.	9.		
10							
10	4.3	6.8	2.7	0.7	110.	220.	8.
10	0.853	.0222	0.8	0.8	0.7	2.0	150.
10	200.	1500.	10.	25.	500.	450.	125.
10	2240.	420.	330.	17.	12.		
11							
11	4.7	7.4	3.5	0.8	122.	250.	8.
11	0.909	.0244	1.0	0.9	0.7	2.1	200.
11	290.	2400.	15.	34.	800.	500.	100.

ORG 11	2200.	400.	300.	16.	11.		
ORG 12							
ORG 12	3.	4.	1.3	0.45	70.	100.	5.
ORG 12	100.	0.125	0.8	3.	2.7	1.5	100.
ORG 12	100.	1000.	9.	20.	220.	240.	40.
ORG 12	500.	80.	80.	3.	2.		
ORG 13							
ORG 13	1.2	3.9	1.2	0.14	32.	90.	3.
ORG 13	50.	.0714	0.7	2.7	2.5	1.3	
ORG 13	90.	900.	8.	8.	160.	140.	
ORG 13	900.	180.	100.	7.	5.		
ORG 14							
ORG 14	1.8	2.4	1.1	0.18	50.	29.	5.
ORG 14	33.33	0.111	0.6	2.8	2.6	1.5	52.
ORG 14	95.	600.	9.	5.	100.	150.	40.
ORG 14	800.	170.	110.	6.	3.		
ORG 15							
ORG 15	1.6	2.	1.	.22	37.	80.	4.
ORG 15	25.	.0833	.8	2.9	2.7	1.3	60.
ORG 15	100.	500.	6.	7.	80.	160.	42.
ORG 15	700.	160.	120.	5.	2.		
ORG 16							
ORG 16	2.	3.8	.9	.25	40.	30.	2.
ORG 16	20.	.125	.7	3.	2.6	1.	90.
ORG 16	95.	1000.	7.	9.	70.	170.	44.
ORG 16	600.	150.	130.	4.	3.		
ORG 17							
ORG 17	2.2	1.5	.8	.29	42.	40.	3.
ORG 17	16.67	.0714	.5	2.9	2.5	1.2	80.
ORG 17	85.	600.	8.	11.	90.	180.	46.
ORG 17	500.	140.	140.	3.	4.		
ORG 18							
ORG 18	2.4	2.5	1.3	.31	29.	100.	2.
ORG 18	14.286	.0769	.8	2.5	2.7	1.1	92.
ORG 18	90.	900.	9.	13.	110.	140.	48.
ORG 18	550.	130.	150.	4.	5.		
ORG 19							
ORG 19	2.6	2.8	1.2	.35	30.	90.	5.
ORG 19	12.5	.0833	.6	2.4	2.6	1.5	70.
ORG 19	85.	700.	6.	15.	130.	200.	50.
ORG 19	650.	120.	160.	5.	4.		
ORG 20							
ORG 20	2.8	2.9	1.1	.37	45.	50.	4.
ORG 20	14.286	.0909	.7	2.6	2.5	1.4	80.
ORG 20	80.	800.	7.	16.	150.	210.	52.
ORG 20	750.	110.	170.	6.	3.		
ORG 21							
ORG 21	3.	3.	1.	.39	70.	60.	5.
ORG 21	10.	.1	.8	2.3	2.3	1.1	60.
ORG 21	90.	700.	8.	17.	170.	220.	54.
ORG 21	850.	100.	110.	7.	2.		
ORG 22							
ORG 22	2.8	1.8	.7	.41	55.	80.	4.
ORG 22	100.	.111	.4	2.4	2.4	1.2	70.
ORG 22	75.	800.	7.	18.	180.	230.	56.
ORG 22	900.	90.	100.	5.	4.		
ORG 23							
ORG 23	1.2	1.5	.3	.1	27.	29.	2.
ORG 23	10.	.0667	.3	2.3	2.2	1.	52.
ORG 23	75.	450.	6.	4.	50.	125.	60.
ORG 23	900.	200.	120.	7.	5.		
ORG 24							

ORG 24	5.6	7.8	2.9	1.	128.	300.	12.
ORG 24	5.	.05	1.2	3.	2.7	2.8	232.
ORG 24	300.	2500.	17.	36.	900.	650.	100.
ORG 24	1500.	300.	250.	10.	8.		
ORG 25							
ORG 25	5.2	7.7	2.6	.9	126.	240.	11.
ORG 25	2.5	.04	1.1	2.7	2.5	2.7	220.
ORG 25	250.	2400.	16.	27.	700.	625.	115.
ORG 25	2000.	380.	330.	11.	9.		
ORG 26							
ORG 26	5.	6.8	2.4	.8	122.	251.	11.
ORG 26	3.333	.0333	1.1	2.8	2.6	2.5	150.
ORG 26	240.	1600.	17.	35.	600.	575.	117.
ORG 26	1600.	390.	260.	12.	10.		
ORG 27							
ORG 27	4.8	7.5	2.7	0.85	119.	298.	11.
ORG 27	1.428	.0286	0.95	2.9	2.7	2.4	160.
ORG 27	290.	2000.	16.	24.	500.	550.	110.
ORG 27	1500.	400.	250.	11.	8.		
ORG 28							
ORG 28	4.6	7.6	1.9	0.75	112.	270.	12.
ORG 28	1.667	.025	1.0	3.0	2.7	2.8	210.
ORG 28	290.	1800.	13.	36.	900.	525.	112.
ORG 28	1700.	370.	270.	10.	11.		
ORG 29							
ORG 29	4.7	7.7	2.5	0.88	127.	274.	10.
ORG 29	1.428	.0238	0.9	2.9	2.6	2.3	230.
ORG 29	300.	1700.	15.	28.	700.	650.	122.
ORG 29	1800.	420.	280.	12.	10.		
ORG 30							
ORG 30	4.9	7.8	2.7	0.9	128.	288.	9.
ORG 30	1.053	.037	0.9	2.5	2.5	2.0	210.
ORG 30	220.	2200.	14.	33.	900.	600.	124.
ORG 30	1900.	320.	280.	13.	9.		
ORG 31							
ORG 31	5.1	7.6	2.6	0.97	124.	264.	9.
ORG 31	1.	.0263	0.8	2.6	2.4	2.7	170.
ORG 31	240.	2300.	12.	29.	800.	500.	114.
ORG 31	2100.	340.	320.	14.	8.		
ORG 32							
ORG 32	4.3	6.8	1.7	0.7	110.	220.	8.
ORG 32	0.833	.0222	0.8	2.5	2.3	2.0	150.
ORG 32	200.	1500.	10.	25.	500.	450.	125.
ORG 32	2240.	420.	330.	17.	12.		
ORG 33							
ORG 33	4.7	7.4	2.5	0.94	122.	250.	8.
ORG 33	0.909	.0244	0.85	2.7	2.3	2.2	190.
ORG 33	200.	1700.	11.	31.	600.	475.	120.
ORG 33	2200.	410.	310.	15.	9.		
ORG 34							
ORG 34	4.4	7.4	2.5	0.8	126.	222.	12.
ORG 34	1.111	.0238	1.	2.8	2.7	2.1	200.
ORG 34	280.	2400.	15.	34.	800.	500.	100.
ORG 34	2200.	400.	300.	16.	11.		
ORG 35							
ORG 35	3.	4.	7.3	0.45	70.	100.	5.
ORG 35	100.	0.125	0.8	2.	1.5	1.5	100.
ORG 35	100.	1000.	9.	20.	200.	240.	40.
ORG 35	500.	80.	90.	3.	2.		
ORG 36							
ORG 36	1.2	3.2	1.2	0.14	32.	90.	3.
ORG 36	50.	3.11	0.7	1.1	0.8	1.3	90.

ORG 36	90.	900.	8.	8.	160.	140.	60.
ORG 36	900.	180.	130.	7.	5.		
ORG 37							
ORG 37	1.8	2.4	1.1	0.18	50.	28.	5.
ORG 37	33.33	2.1	0.6	1.2	0.9	1.5	52.
ORG 37	95.	600.	9.	5.	100.	150.	40.
ORG 37	800.	170.	110.	6.	3.		
ORG 38							
ORG 38	1.6	2.	1.	0.22	37.	80.	4.
ORG 38	25.	.091	0.8	1.3	1.5	1.3	60.
ORG 38	100.	500.	6.	7.	80.	160.	42.
ORG 38	700.	160.	120.	5.	2.		
ORG 39							
ORG 39	2.	3.8	0.9	0.25	40.	30.	2.
ORG 39	20.	.0833	0.7	1.4	1.2	1.	90.
ORG 39	95.	1000.	7.	9.	70.	170.	49.
ORG 39	600.	150.	130.	4.	3.		
ORG 40							
ORG 40	2.2	1.5	0.8	0.29	42.	40.	3.
ORG 40	16.67	.0769	.5	1.5	.7	1.2	80.
ORG 40	85.	600.	8.	11.	90.	180.	46.
ORG 40	500.	140.	140.	3.	4.		
ORG 41							
ORG 41	2.4	2.5	1.3	.31	29.	100.	2.
ORG 41	14.28	.0714	.8	1.6	1.1	1.1	92.
ORG 41	90.	900.	9.	13.	110.	190.	48.
ORG 41	550.	130.	150.	4.	5.		
ORG 42							
ORG 42	2.6	2.8	1.2	.35	30.	90.	5.
ORG 42	12.5	.0667	0.6	1.7	1.0	1.5	70.
ORG 42	85.	700.	6.	15.	130.	200.	50.
ORG 42	650.	120.	160.	5.	4.		
ORG 43							
ORG 43	2.8	2.9	1.1	.37	45.	50.	4.
ORG 43	11.11	.125	.7	1.8	1.3	1.4	80.
ORG 43	80.	800.	7.	16.	150.	210.	52.
ORG 43	750.	110.	170.	6.	3.		
ORG 44							
ORG 44	3.	3.	1.	.39	70.	60.	5.
ORG 44	10.	.0833	.8	1.9	1.4	1.1	60.
ORG 44	90.	700.	8.	17.	170.	220.	54.
ORG 44	850.	100.	110.	7.	2.		
ORG 45							
ORG 45	2.8	1.8	.9	.41	55.	80.	4.
ORG 45	100.	.111	.4	1.	1.3	1.2	70.
ORG 45	75.	800.	7.	18.	180.	230.	56.
ORG 45	800.	90.	100.	5.	4.		
ORG 46							
ORG 46	1.2	1.5	.8	.1	27.	28.	2.
ORG 46	10.	.0667	.3	.8	.7	1.	52.
ORG 46	75.	450.	6.	4.	50.	125.	60.
ORG 46	900.	200.	180.	7.	5.		
ORG 47							
ORG 47	1.4	3.5	1.2	.43	65.	70.	3.
ORG 47	20.	.0714	.5	.9	1.1	1.4	130.
ORG 47	80.	900.	9.	19.	190.	130.	54.
ORG 47	500.	190.	90.	6.	4.		
ORG 48							
ORG 48	2.11	2.5	1.3	.31	29.	120.	2.
ORG 48	14.28	.0769	.9	2.5	2.7	1.1	92.
ORG 48	90.	900.	9.	13.	110.	190.	48.
ORG 48	550.	130.	150.	4.	5.		

ORG 49							
ORG 49	4.7	7.7	3.5	.88	127.	274.	9.
ORG 49	1.428	.0238	.8	1.	.8	2.3	230.
ORG 49	300.	1700.	15.	28.	700.	650.	122.
ORG 49	1800.	420.	290.	12.	10.		
ORG 50							
ORG 50	1.8	2.4	1.1	.18	50.	28.	5.
ORG 50	33.33	.111	.6	2.8	2.6	1.5	52.
ORG 50	95.	600.	9.	5.	100.	150.	40.
ORG 50	800.	170.	110.	6.	3.		
ORG 51							
ORG 51	4.4	7.4	2.5	.8	126.	222.	12.
ORG 51	1.11	.0238	1.	2.8	2.7	2.1	200.
ORG 51	290.	2400.	15.	34.	800.	500.	100.
ORG 51	2200.	400.	300.	16.	11.		
ORG52							
ORG52	2.2	1.5	.8	.29	42.	40.	3.
ORG52	16.67	.0714	.5	2.9	2.5	1.2	80.
ORG52	85.	600.	8.	11.	90.	180.	46.
ORG52	500.	140.	140.	3.	4.		

Appendix F: Organizational Efficiencies

Organization	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	1.000	1.000
2	.79136	.79136
3	.59427	.75203
4	.69733	.93149
5	.88892	.88892
6	.76336	.87833
7	.68393	.68393
8	.57143	.75729
9	.64095	.64095
10	.59284	.59284
11	.65909	.96655
12	1.000	1.000
13	.77934	.77934
14	.99906	.99906
15	.95138	.95138
16	.10667	.90812
17	.96564	.96564
18	.90801	.90801
19	.79891	.79891
20	.71702	.71702
21	.79896	.79896
22	.88870	.88870
23	.00000	.51027
24	1.000	1.000
25	.62500	.79137
26	.59427	.75204
27	.69733	.93150
28	.82038	.88893
29	.76336	.87834
30	.57895	.68394
31	.57143	.75732
32	.44643	.59285
33	.45455	.64096
34	.63636	.94871
35	1.000	1.000
36	.77929	.77929
37	.99901	.99901
38	.67227	.95132
39	.62500	.86267
40	.52147	.84910
41	.0000	.90798
42	.79888	.79888
43	.05228	.76813
44	.0000	.79893
45	.88867	.88867

Organization	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
46	.35714	.47489
47	.99893	.99893
48	.90801	.90801
49	.76336	.87833
50	.99906	.99906
51	.30706	.97160
52	.96564	.96564

Appendix G: Computer Printout of Results

This appendix contains a portion of the printout that is received as the result of a successful run of the Constrained Facet Analysis (CFA) model.¹ By itself, this printout is of marginal value to the manager. The manager should refer to the input and output reports. This printout permits the individual running the model to check for errors and consistency.

At the top of the printout is the title of the specific CFA model (i.e. the name of the data file) being run. This is followed by a line that contains three numbers. The first number is the number of organizations being evaluated, the second number is the number of inputs evaluated, and the third number is the number of inputs evaluated. The output and inputs titles are then printed out. This order is important as this is the same order the inputs and outputs are listed in the organizational data (the organization number is listed in the far left hand column) that follows. The first line of the organizational data is blank, except for two numbers on the far right hand side. The first number is the lower bound efficiency and the second number is the upper bound efficiency. These values are listed separately in Appendix F.

¹Results from the first 32 organizations are included. The printouts from organizations 33 to 52 were unsuitable for reproduction.

The output and input data follows on the next lines in the same order as listed in the header. Each output and input datum requires three lines. The top line repeats the actual observed value of that particular output or input, as found in the data file. The second line is the multiplier the model used in determining the relative importance of that output or input. The third line is the value of slack (output) or surplus (input) that is available in that organization for the observed values. An efficient organization has zero slack or surplus.

```

1 BASE CIVIL ENGR DESIGN SECTION 0000
2 52 11 4
3 OUTPUT 01 OUTPUT 02 OUTPUT 03 OUTPUT 05 OUTPUT 06 OUTPUT 09 OUTPUT 10
4 OUTPUT 11 OUTPUT 13 OUTPUT 14 OUTPUT 15 INPUT 01 INPUT 02 INPUT 03
5 INPUT 04
6 ORG 01 1.000000 1.000000
7 ORG 01 5.000 7.000 3.000 120.000 5.000 0 1.2000
8 ORG 01 .000010 .046709 .000020 .000001 .000010 .000010 .000010
9 ORG 01 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
10 ORG 01 1.000 2.000 232.000 300.000 100.000 1500.000 3000.000
11 ORG 01 .000010 .000010 .000001 .002117 .009993 .000000 .000001
12 ORG 01 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
13 ORG 01 250.000
14 ORG 01 .000001
15 ORG 01 0
16 ORG 02 .79130 .79130
17 ORG 02 5.200 7.700 3.000 120.000 2.500 0 1.100
18 ORG 02 0 0 -.000000 0 0 0 0
19 ORG 02 .800 .447 0 12.824 117.353 .141 .571
20 ORG 02 .900 2.700 220.000 250.000 115.000 2000.000 3000.000
21 ORG 02 .000000 0 .002550 .000921 .008090 0 0
22 ORG 02 0 .300 0 0 0 0 0
23 ORG 02 330.000
24 ORG 02 57.225
25 ORG 03 .59427 .75203
26 ORG 03 5.000 6.000 3.400 122.000 3.330 0 1.100
27 ORG 03 0 0 .000000 0 0 0 0
28 ORG 03 2.300 2.759 0 62.529 153.771 .193 .700
29 ORG 03 1.000 2.500 150.000 240.000 117.000 1600.000 3000.000
30 ORG 03 -.000000 0 .002514 .000905 .008547 0 0
31 ORG 03 0 1.150 0 0 0 0 0
32 ORG 03 260.000
33 ORG 03 0
34 ORG 03 50.725
35 ORG 04 .69733 .93149
36 ORG 04 4.000 7.500 3.700 119.000 1.420 0 .450
37 ORG 04 0 0 .000000 0 0 0 0
38 ORG 04 2.400 3.712 0 67.706 242.010 .304 .820
39 ORG 04 1.000 2.400 160.000 280.000 110.000 1500.000 3000.000
40 ORG 04 .000000 0 .002674 .000963 .009091 0 0
41 ORG 04 0 1.200 0 0 0 0 0
42 ORG 04 250.000
43 ORG 04 67.316
44 ORG 05 .00042 .00042
45 ORG 05 4.000 7.000 2.900 112.000 1.070 0 1.000
46 ORG 05 0 0 .000000 0 0 0 0
47 ORG 05 1.317 .563 0 23.891 46.901 .054 .330
48 ORG 05 .900 2.000 210.000 290.000 112.000 1700.000 3000.000
49 ORG 05 -.000000 0 0 .003067 .001534 0 0
50 ORG 05 0 .159 24.340 0 0 0 0
51 ORG 05 270.000
52 ORG 05 .003067
53 ORG 05 0
54 ORG 06 .70330 .91333
55 ORG 06 4.700 7.700 3.500 127.000 1.420 0 .450
56 ORG 06 0 0 .000000 0 0 0 0
57 ORG 06 .200 1.343 0 27.100 97.704 .125 .110
58 ORG 06 1.000 2.300 230.000 300.000 120.000 1500.000 3000.000
59 ORG 06 .000000 0 .002545 .003017 .003017 0 .001272

```

6	ORG 10		.254	21.359			125.444	
7	ORG 10	288.228						
8	ORG 10							
9	ORG 10	39.095						
0	ORG 17						.50343	.00343
1	ORG 17	4.988	7.888	3.748	124.888	1.253		
2	ORG 17							
3	ORG 17	1.288	.382		13.941	175.505	.211	.044
4	ORG 17	.988	2.888	218.888	228.888	124.888	198.888	328.888
5	ORG 17			.882372	.888854	.888885		
6	ORG 17		1.854				283.321	34.885
7	ORG 17	298.888						
8	ORG 17							
9	ORG 17	4.457						
0	ORG 18						.57143	.75723
1	ORG 18	5.188	7.888	3.888	98.888	1.111		.818
2	ORG 18			.888888				
3	ORG 18	1.488	2.324		14.412	64.787	.888	.115
4	ORG 18	.888	2.788	178.888	248.888	114.888	2188.888	348.888
5	ORG 18	.888888		.888888	.882381		.888870	
6	ORG 18		.858			18.289		54.474
7	ORG 18	328.888						
8	ORG 18							
9	ORG 18	19.437						
0	ORG 19						.84845	.84845
1	ORG 19	4.488	7.488	3.588	124.888	1.888		.858
2	ORG 19		.839883					
3	ORG 19	1.114			4.288	158.857	.138	.574
4	ORG 19	.888	2.288	188.888	288.888	128.888	2288.888	418.888
5	ORG 19	.888888			.881748	.888333		
6	ORG 19		.557	18.288			414.288	95.888
7	ORG 19	318.888						
8	ORG 19							
9	ORG 19	37.857						
0	ORG 10						.59284	.59284
1	ORG 10	4.388	6.888	2.788	118.888	.853		.888
2	ORG 10		.838895	.888888				
3	ORG 10	.729			6.571	114.881	.138	.457
4	ORG 10	.888	2.888	158.888	288.888	125.888	2248.888	428.888
5	ORG 10	.888888			.881078	.888888		
6	ORG 10		.514	38.571			331.288	72.457
7	ORG 10	338.888						
8	ORG 10							
9	ORG 10	33.257						
0	ORG 11						.85989	.78885
1	ORG 11	4.788	7.488	3.588	122.888	.989		1.888
2	ORG 11							
3	ORG 11	.588	1.359		27.529	181.358	.131	.248
4	ORG 11	.988	2.188	288.888	298.888	188.888	2288.888	428.888
5	ORG 11	.888888	.888888		.882273		.888455	
6	ORG 11					23.828		47.775
7	ORG 11	388.888						
8	ORG 11							
9	ORG 11	47.588						
0	ORG 12						1.888888	1.888888
1	ORG 12	3.888	4.888	1.388	78.888	148.888	.125	.888
2	ORG 12	.888818	.888818	.888818	.888881	.889994	.888818	.888818
3	ORG 12							
4	ORG 12	3.888	1.588	188.888	188.888	48.888	588.888	588.888
5	ORG 12	.888888	.888818	.888881	.888881	.888881	.888888	.888881
6	ORG 12							
7	ORG 12	88.888						

8 ORG 12	.012498						
9 ORG 12	0						
0 ORG 13						.77434	.77434
1 ORG 13	1.200	3.900	1.200	32.400	50.000	0	.700
2 ORG 13	.000010	.199594	.000010	.000001	.000010	.000100	.000010
3 ORG 13	1.725	0	1.417	36.250	47.500	.112	.000
4 ORG 13	2.700	1.300	90.000	90.000	00.000	900.000	100.000
5 ORG 13	.000000	.000010	.000001	.000001	.000001	.000000	.000001
6 ORG 13	0	.163	7.500	7.500	7.000	214.500	02.000
7 ORG 13	100.000						
8 ORG 13	.009997						
9 ORG 13	0						
0 ORG 14						.94900	.94900
1 ORG 14	1.800	2.400	1.100	50.000	33.330	.111	.000
2 ORG 14	.000010	.000010	.000010	.000001	.000010	.000100	.000010
3 ORG 14	1.200	1.000	1.400	20.000	60.070	.014	.200
4 ORG 14	2.800	1.500	52.000	95.000	40.000	800.000	170.000
5 ORG 14	.000000	.005531	.000001	.000001	.024991	.000000	.000001
6 ORG 14	0	0	48.000	5.000	0	300.000	90.000
7 ORG 14	110.000						
8 ORG 14	.000001						
9 ORG 14	30.000						
0 ORG 15						.95138	.95138
1 ORG 15	1.600	2.000	1.000	37.000	25.000	0	.000
2 ORG 15	.000010	.000010	.000010	.000001	.000010	.000100	1.100371
3 ORG 15	1.400	2.000	.900	33.000	75.000	.115	0
4 ORG 15	2.900	1.300	60.000	100.000	42.000	700.000	100.000
5 ORG 15	.000000	.000010	.000001	.000001	.023001	.000000	.000001
6 ORG 15	0	.200	40.000	0	0	160.007	72.301
7 ORG 15	120.000						
8 ORG 15	.000001						
9 ORG 15	34.200						
0 ORG 16						.10007	.90012
1 ORG 16	2.000	3.000	.900	40.000	20.000	.125	.700
2 ORG 16	0	0	0	0	.005333	0	0
3 ORG 16	1.400	3.000	5.400	20.000	0	.100	.540
4 ORG 16	3.000	1.000	90.000	95.000	40.000	000.000	150.000
5 ORG 16	0	0	0	0	0	0	.000007
6 ORG 16	1.600	.700	70.000	75.000	3.307	30.000	0
7 ORG 16	130.000						
8 ORG 16	0						
9 ORG 16	2.133						
0 ORG 17						.90504	.90504
1 ORG 17	2.200	1.500	.800	42.000	10.070	0	.500
2 ORG 17	.000010	.000010	.000010	.000001	.000010	.000100	.000010
3 ORG 17	.700	2.367	.457	25.007	79.997	.111	.273
4 ORG 17	2.900	1.200	80.000	85.000	40.000	500.000	140.000
5 ORG 17	.332028	.000010	.000001	.000001	.000001	.001999	.000001
6 ORG 17	0	.250	10.007	11.007	5.000	0	50.000
7 ORG 17	140.000						
8 ORG 17	.000001						
9 ORG 17	50.000						
0 ORG 18						.90001	.90001
1 ORG 18	2.400	2.500	1.300	29.000	14.200	0	.000
2 ORG 18	.000010	.000010	.000010	.000001	.000010	.000100	1.134290
3 ORG 18	.000	1.500	3.000	41.000	85.714	.115	0
4 ORG 18	2.500	1.100	92.000	90.000	40.000	550.000	130.000
5 ORG 18	.000000	.000010	.000001	.000001	.000001	.001010	.000001
6 ORG 18	0	.400	8.000	10.000	3.030	0	30.142
7 ORG 18	150.000						
8 ORG 18	.000001						
9 ORG 18	50.304						

0 ORG 19						.74491	.74491
1 ORG 19	2.6000	2.5000	1.2000	30.0000	12.5000	0	0
2 ORG 19	.000010	.000010	.000010	.000001	.000010	.000010	.000010
3 ORG 19	.0000	1.2000	3.7000	40.0000	87.5000	.115	.0000
4 ORG 19	2.4000	1.5000	70.0000	85.0000	50.0000	650.0000	120.0000
5 ORG 19	.000000	.532254	.000001	.000001	.019993	.000000	.000001
6 ORG 19	0	0	30.0000	15.0000	0	20.0000	10.0000
7 ORG 19	100.0000						
8 ORG 19	.000001						
9 ORG 19	40.0000						
0 ORG 20						.71742	.71702
1 ORG 20	2.8000	2.9000	1.1000	45.0000	14.2000	0	.7000
2 ORG 20	.000010	.000010	.000010	.000001	.000010	.000010	.000010
3 ORG 20	0	.833	1.313	20.333	79.047	.107	.047
4 ORG 20	2.6000	1.4000	80.0000	80.0000	52.0000	750.0000	110.0000
5 ORG 20	.000000	.511743	.000001	.000001	.014224	.000000	.000001
6 ORG 20	0	0	13.333	13.333	0	71.795	4.3000
7 ORG 20	170.0000						
8 ORG 20	.000001						
9 ORG 20	47.385						
0 ORG 21						.79896	.79896
1 ORG 21	3.0000	3.0000	1.0000	70.0000	10.0000	.100	.0000
2 ORG 21	.000010	.000010	.000010	.011007	.000010	.000010	.000010
3 ORG 21	0	1.0000	4.5000	0	90.0000	.025	0
4 ORG 21	2.3000	1.1000	60.0000	90.0000	54.0000	850.0000	100.0000
5 ORG 21	.000000	.000010	.000001	.000001	.000001	.000000	.000000
6 ORG 21	0	.4000	40.0000	10.0000	3.2000	180.0000	0
7 ORG 21	110.0000						
8 ORG 21	.000001						
9 ORG 21	0.0000						
0 ORG 22						.88870	.88870
1 ORG 22	2.8000	1.8000	.7000	55.0000	100.0000	.111	.4000
2 ORG 22	.000010	.000010	.000010	.000001	.000001	.000010	.000010
3 ORG 22	.2000	2.2000	4.2000	15.0000	0	.014	.4000
4 ORG 22	2.4000	1.2000	70.0000	75.0000	50.0000	900.0000	90.0000
5 ORG 22	.000000	.000010	.000001	.000001	.000001	.000000	.011101
6 ORG 22	0	.3000	30.0000	25.0000	9.770	300.0000	0
7 ORG 22	100.0000						
8 ORG 22	.000001						
9 ORG 22	0.889						
0 ORG 23						0	.51027
1 ORG 23	1.2000	1.5000	.8000	27.0000	10.0000	0	.3000
2 ORG 23	0	0	0	0	0	3.200000	0
3 ORG 23	.9600	1.1000	13.050	21.4000	2.0000	0	.230
4 ORG 23	2.3000	1.0000	52.0000	75.0000	60.0000	900.0000	200.0000
5 ORG 23	0	0	0	0	0	0	.005000
6 ORG 23	0	.8000	44.0000	67.0000	1.2000	11.2000	0
7 ORG 23	180.0000						
8 ORG 23	0						
9 ORG 23	.6400						
0 ORG 24						1.000000	1.000000
1 ORG 24	5.6000	7.8000	2.0000	120.0000	5.0000	0	1.2000
2 ORG 24	.057709	.000010	.000010	.000001	.000010	.000010	.000010
3 ORG 24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 ORG 24	3.0000	2.8000	232.0000	300.0000	100.0000	1500.0000	300.0000
5 ORG 24	.000000	.000010	.000001	.002254	.009993	.000000	.000001
6 ORG 24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7 ORG 24	250.0000						
8 ORG 24	.000001						
9 ORG 24	0						
0 ORG 25						.52500	.79137
1 ORG 25	5.2000	7.7000	2.0000	120.0000	2.5000	0	1.1000

2	ORG	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	ORG	25	.553	1.224	0	19.797	0	0	0
4	ORG	25	2.700	2.700	224.000	250.000	115.000	2000.000	340.000
5	ORG	25	.000000	0	0	.002500	0	.000500	0
6	ORG	25	0	.370	27.051	0	11.345	0	12.534
7	ORG	25	330.000	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	ORG	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	ORG	25	2.140	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	ORG	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	ORG	26	5.000	6.000	2.400	122.000	3.333	.59427	.75204
2	ORG	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.100
3	ORG	26	2.300	2.759	0	62.529	153.774	.193	.700
4	ORG	26	2.800	2.500	150.000	240.000	117.000	1000.000	390.000
5	ORG	26	-.000000	0	.002514	.000905	.008547	0	0
6	ORG	26	0	1.150	0	0	0	249.170	39.047
7	ORG	26	260.000	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	ORG	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	ORG	26	50.725	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	ORG	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	ORG	27	4.800	7.500	2.700	119.000	1.428	.00733	.93151
2	ORG	27	0	0	.000000	0	0	0	.450
3	ORG	27	2.400	3.712	0	67.700	242.010	.304	.820
4	ORG	27	2.900	2.400	100.000	280.000	110.000	1500.000	400.000
5	ORG	27	-.000000	0	.002074	.000963	.009091	0	0
6	ORG	27	0	1.200	0	0	0	354.011	50.452
7	ORG	27	250.000	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	ORG	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	ORG	27	67.310	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	ORG	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	ORG	28	4.600	7.000	1.900	112.000	1.067	.82038	.80093
2	ORG	28	.052521	0	-.000000	0	0	0	1.000
3	ORG	28	0	1.065	0	7.882	67.402	.080	.127
4	ORG	28	3.000	2.000	210.000	290.000	112.000	1700.000	370.000
5	ORG	28	-.000000	0	0	.001990	.008929	0	0
6	ORG	28	0	.500	2.000	0	0	55.357	.013
7	ORG	28	270.000	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	ORG	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	ORG	28	22.557	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	ORG	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	ORG	29	4.700	7.700	2.500	127.000	1.428	.76330	.87834
2	ORG	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	.900
3	ORG	29	.260	1.343	0	27.160	97.764	.125	.112
4	ORG	29	2.900	2.300	230.000	300.000	122.000	1800.000	420.000
5	ORG	29	.000000	0	0	.002545	.003017	0	.001272
6	ORG	29	0	.084	21.359	0	0	125.954	0
7	ORG	29	280.000	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	ORG	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	ORG	29	39.695	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	ORG	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	ORG	30	4.900	7.800	2.700	128.000	1.053	.57895	.00394
2	ORG	30	0	0	.000000	0	0	0	.900
3	ORG	30	1.856	2.404	0	10.463	20.150	.031	.113
4	ORG	30	2.500	2.000	210.000	220.000	124.000	1900.000	320.000
5	ORG	30	0	0	0	.002632	.000000	.000520	0
6	ORG	30	0	.078	45.110	0	0	0	39.300
7	ORG	30	280.000	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	ORG	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	ORG	30	22.000	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	ORG	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	ORG	31	5.100	7.600	2.600	124.000	1.000	.57143	.75732
2	ORG	31	0	0	.000000	0	0	0	.000
3	ORG	31	1.400	2.324	0	40.412	64.670	.000	.115

4 ORG 31	2.000	2.700	170.000	240.000	114.000	21.000.000	340.000
5 ORG 31	- .000000	0	.000000	.002381	0	.000470	0
6 ORG 31	0	.850	0	0	10.209	0	59.479
7 ORG 31	320.000	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 ORG 31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 ORG 31	19.437	0	0	0	0	0	0
0 ORG 32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 ORG 32	4.300	6.800	1.700	110.000	.033	.44043	.59205
2 ORG 32	0	0	- .000000	0	0	0	.000
3 ORG 32	.800	1.800	0	30.294	17.745	.028	0
4 ORG 32	2.500	2.000	150.000	200.000	125.000	2240.000	420.000
5 ORG 32	0	0	.000000	.002232	0	.000440	0
6 ORG 32	0	.250	0	0	9.491	0	10.018
7 ORG 32	330.000	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 ORG 32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 ORG 32	20.032	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix H: Sample Organizational Reports

This appendix contains a sample of the organizational reports that may be obtained from the computerized model. The first organizational report presented tells the manager what changes in outputs would be necessary for that organization to achieve maximum efficiency with no change in inputs. The outputs evaluated are listed along the far left hand side of the report. Next to the outputs is the column titled "Observed Values". This column gives the current output values for that organization. The next column to the right, titled "Efficient Output Levels," shows the output values that would have to be achieved by the organization for it to be 100 percent efficient. The column on the far right gives the weighting of the output to the overall efficiency. An organization desiring to improve its efficiency should concentrate on those outputs with the highest weighting. At the bottom of the outputs report, the inputs are listed in the same format except that the second column is titled "No Input Changes Required." This portion of the outputs report tells the manager the relative importance the model attached to each input.

Following the output report is the inputs report. This report shows the managers what changes in inputs would be necessary to achieve maximum efficiency with no corresponding reduction in outputs. The format is identical to the previous report except inputs and outputs are switched. Under the "outputs" heading the column is titled "No Output Changes Required" while the inputs show the values necessary to achieve 100 percent efficiency.

BASE CIVIL ENGR DESIGN SECTION PROD
 DECISION MAKING UNIT 3 ORG 03

 * SUMMARY OF RESULTS *

EFFICIENCY RANGE = 59.4 TO 75.2 PERCENT
 MULTIPLIER FOR EFFICIENT OUTPUT LEVELS = 1.683

 * OUTPUTS *

	OBSERVED VALUES	EFFICIENT OUTPUT LEVELS	PERCENT CONTRIBUTION TO EFFICIENCY
OUTPUT 01	5.0	10.7	0
OUTPUT 02	6.8	14.2	0
OUTPUT 03	3.4	5.7	.0
OUTPUT 05	122.0	267.8	0
OUTPUT 08	3.3	159.4	0
OUTPUT 09	0	.2	0
OUTPUT 10	1.1	2.6	0
OUTPUT 11	1.0	1.7	.0
OUTPUT 13	2.5	5.4	0
OUTPUT 14	150.0	252.4	37.7
OUTPUT 15	240.0	403.9	21.7
TOTAL :			59.4 PERCENT

* INPUTS *

	OBSERVED VALUES	NO INPUT CHANGES REQUIRED	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INPUTS
INPUT 01	117.0		100.0
INPUT 02	1600.0		0
INPUT 03	390.0		0
INPUT 04	260.0		0
TOTAL :			----- 100.0 PERCENT -----

BASE CIVIL ENGR DESIGN SECTION PROD
DECISION MAKING UNIT 3 ORG 03

* SUMMARY OF RESULTS *

EFFICIENCY RANGE = 59.4 TO 75.2 PERCENT
MULTIPLIER FOR EFFICIENT INPUT LEVELS = .594

* OUTPUTS *

	OBSERVED VALUES	NO OUTPUT CHANGES REQUIRED	PERCENT CONTRIBUTION TO EFFICIENCY
OUTPUT 01	5.0		0
OUTPUT 02	6.8		0
OUTPUT 03	3.4		.0
OUTPUT 05	122.0		0
OUTPUT 08	3.3		0
OUTPUT 09	0		0
OUTPUT 10	1.1		0
OUTPUT 11	1.0		.0
OUTPUT 13	2.5		0
OUTPUT14	150.0		37.7
OUTPUT 15	240.0		21.7
TOTAL :			59.4 PERCENT

 * INPUTS *

	OBSERVED VALUES	EFFICIENT INPUT LEVELS	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INPUTS
INPUT 01	117.0	69.5	100.0
INPUT 02	1600.0	701.7	0
INPUT 03	390.0	192.1	0
INPUT 04	260.0	103.8	0
TOTAL :			100.0 PERCENT

Bibliography

1. Armstrong, Captain Gerald R. and Captain Patrick J. Dougherty. A Study of the Development of Output Measures. MS Thesis, SLSR 24-71A. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 1971 (AD887 487).
2. Arnold, Captain Palmer G. and Captain David F. Fink. Hierarchical Model of Objectives and Performance Indicators For the Base Civil Engineer. MS Thesis SLSR 19-74A. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 1974 (AD777 248).
3. Baumgartel, Captain Gary P. and Captain Thomas D. Johnson. Productivity Measurement in a Base Level USAF Civil Engineering Organization. MS Thesis LSSR 17-79A. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 1979 (AD-A073 017).
4. Bessent, A., and W. Bessent. Lecture on "Optimization Model Decision Support Systems." School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 4 May 1984.
5. Bessent, A., W. Bessent, and C. T. Clark. "Managerial Efficiency Measurement, Theory, and Applications." Unpublished report. Educational Productivity Council, University of Texas, Austin TX, 1983.
6. Bessent, A., W. Bessent, and C. T. Clark. "Specifications of Inputs and Outputs." Working Paper. Educational Productivity Council, University of Texas, Austin TX, June 1982.
7. Bessent, A., W. Bessent, C. T. Clark, and J. Elam. "Constrained Facet Analysis of the Efficiency of Organizational Subunits with the CFA Code (Version 1.0)." Unpublished report. Educational Productivity Council, University of Texas, Austin TX, August 1983.
8. Bessent, A., W. Bessent, C. T. Clark, and J. Elam. "Constrained Facet Analysis, A New Method for Evaluating Local Frontiers of Efficiency and Performance." Unpublished report. Educational Productivity Council, University of Texas, Austin TX, May 1983.
9. Burcher, William. "Development of a Method to Measure the Productivity of USAF Base Civil Engineering Units." Unpublished paper, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, September 1982.

10. Burgess, Lieutenant Colonel Danny N. "Base Civil Engineering Organizational Effectiveness." Unpublished research report. Air War College, Maxwell AFB AL, April 1978.
11. Clark, Lieutenant Colonel C.T. Lecture on "Modeling Forms," Class LM 6.35. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 30 January 1984.
12. Demidovich, John W. Lecture on "Creativity," given to Graduate Engineering Management students, School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 29 November 1983.
13. Department of Defense. Productivity Enhancement, Measurement and Evaluation--Operating Guidelines and Report Instructions. DODI 5010.34. Washington: Government Printing Office, 4 August 1975.
14. Dogramaci, Ali, ed. Productivity Analysis, a Range of Perspectives. Boston: Flower-Nighoff Publishing, 1981.
15. Drummond, Captain John R. and Captain Emory J. Pratt. The Development and Evaluation of Output Measures for the Standard Air Force Base Supply Organization. MS Thesis SLSR 28-72A. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 1972 (AD743 414).
16. Fowler, Major Donald R. "White Collar Productivity Measurement for AFSC and Aerospace Firm Source Selection and Evaluation." Unpublished research report. Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB AL, 2 March 1982.
17. Hanley, Lieutenant Colonel William F. and Captain Frederick C. Smith. USAF Civil Engineering Work Force Productivity: An Analysis of Non-Behavioral Factors Affecting Planning Technician Labor Manhour Estimates for In-House Work Requirements. MS Thesis SLSR 24-76A. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 1976 (AD-A030 244).
18. Howell, Captain R.C. and Lieutenant J.D. Van Sickle. Perceptions of a Methodology for the Development of Productivity Indicators. MS Thesis LSSR 69-82. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, September 1982 (AD-A123 026).

19. Huseman, Richard, William Boulton, Robert Gatewood, and John Harfield. "Strategies for Improving U.S. Air Force Productivity: Developing Methodologies for Assessing the Potential Relationship between Communication Behavior and Productivity." Unpublished research report. University of Georgia, Athens GA, September 1980.
20. Kaneda, Captain Kenneth G. and Captain Robert M. Wallett. Development of Productivity Measures For the Design Section of a Base Level Civil Engineering Organization. MS Thesis LSSR 16-80. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 1980 (AD-A087 496).
21. King, Lieutenant Colonel Norwood J. "How to Increase Work Force Productivity," Air Force Engineering and Services Quarterly, 16: 3 (August 1975).
22. Kleinbaum, David G. and Lawrence L. Kupper. Applied Regression Analysis and Other Multivariable Methods. North Scituate MA: Duxbury Press, 1978.
23. Mali, Paul. Improving Total Productivity: MBO Strategies for Business, Government and Not-for-Profit Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1978.
24. McKnight, Captain Richard D. and Captain Gregory P. Parker. Development of an Organizational Effectiveness Model for Base Level Civil Engineering Organizations. MS Thesis LSSR 13-83. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, September 1983 (AD-A134 950).
25. Meek, Gary E. and Stephen J. Turner. Statistical Analysis for Business Decisions. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1983.
26. Mellonics Systems Development Division (Litton Systems, Inc.). Productivity Measurement Model. Department of the Navy Document PRR-69-5, Monterey CA, 16 May 1969.
27. Moss, Captain Richard N., Captain Donald J Meister, and Captain David F. Ruschmann. A Study of Estimating Project Design Manhours. MS Thesis LSSR 12-78B. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, September 1978 (AD-A061 340).
28. Mullins, General James P., Commander, Air Force Logistics Command. "The Future of the Air Force." Address to students of Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 26 January 1984.

29. Pope, Louis T. and David Meister. "Symposium Proceedings: Productivity Enhancement: Personnel Performance Assessment in Navy Systems." Navy Personal Research and Development Center, San Diego CA, October 1977.
30. Rainey, H.G. "Comparing Public and Private Organizations," Public Administration Review, 15: 233-244 (March/April 1976).
31. Ruff, Captain Christopher D. "Base Engineer Automated Management System: Analysis and Evaluation." Unpublished research report. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 9 March 1984.
32. Schneider, Ralph W. A Model for Measuring Effectiveness in a Security Organization. MS Thesis. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey CA, September 1976.
33. Simon, H.A. Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations. New York: The McMillian Company, 1976.
34. Smith, Howard K., Journalist. "National Concerns." Address to students of Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 5 January 1984.
35. Tuttle, Thomas C. "Productivity, Measurement Methods: Classification, Critique, and Implications for the Air Force." Unpublished report. Maryland Center For Productivity and Quality of Working Life, College Park MD, September 1981.
36. Tuttle Thomas C. "Manager's Guide to Productivity Improvement Resources and Programs." Unpublished research report. Maryland Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life, College Park MD, August 1981.
37. Tuttle, Thomas C., Robert E. Wilkinson, Wallace L. Gatewood, and Lindsay Lucke. "Measuring and Enhancing Organizational Productivity: An Annotated Bibliography." Unpublished report. Maryland Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life, College Park MD., July 1981.

VITA

Captain Jared A. Astin was born 10 August 1958 in Salt Lake City, Utah. He graduated from high school in 1976 and entered the United States Air Force Academy. He graduated from the Air Force Academy in May 1980 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering and was commissioned a second lieutenant. After graduation, he was assigned to the 2849 Civil Engineering Squadron at Hill AFB Utah, where he served as chief of Readiness and Logistics. He served there until entering the School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson AFB OH in June 1983.

Permanent address: 463 W. 3400 S.

Bountiful UT 84010

VITA

Captain Christopher D. Ruff was born on 24 December 1957 in Greeley, Colorado. He graduated from high school in Ault, Colorado, in 1976 and attended the United States Air Force Academy from which he received a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering in May 1980. Upon graduation, he was assigned to the Ballistic Missile Office at Norton AFB as a Civil Engineering Project Manager. He served there until entering the School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson AFB OH in June 1983.

Permanent address: 1208 42nd Ave

Greeley CO 80634