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DAY 3 NOTES
Outline

- **Collaborative Strategy (1 church, 1 child)**
  - Rationales for collaboration (collaboration as rational win-win)
  - Lead implementers: Varied roles
  - Enabling the partnership: Legal reform, process improvement, restructuring, new norms, etc.
  - The multiple meanings of race in the case

- **Performance Management (DC)**
  - Choosing good measures
  - Aligning with strategy
  - Beyond a paper exercise: Political management to get it done
Rationales for collaborating

- Partnering or collaborating as an alternative to other strategies for “producing”: “Make” (do it in house) or “Buy” (contract for it).
- Is it the best way to produce an outcome? What are the risks/rewards?
- Two broad rationales
  - Enhance legitimacy and support (“soft power”), the genius of multi-lateralism
  - Enhance operating capacity
What’s in it for us?

For the state agency

- Legitimacy: Changing the face of the agency and the adoption process, making adoption a community mission.
- Logistical and other assets: spatially distributed workforce and facilities, well-placed “ambassadors” (volunteers).

For the churches

- Access to decisionmakers, an opportunity to strengthen families, chance to “practice religious community” around a new objective.
1 Church: Lead Implementers

Remarkably varied roles:

- **Strategy-maker**: Develop and update a well-informed gameplan (anticipate barriers, know their stakeholders and patterns of influence, identify what they need to know but don’t, etc.)
- **Mobilizer of resources**: from participation to money and other kinds of contributions.
- **Policy advocate**: Identifying and persuasively arguing for changes in policy and practice.
- **Operations chief**: Fine-tuning the “gears” (thinking through nitty-gritty)
- **Civic or social “entrepreneur”**: encompasses several of these.
Enabling the partnership

Thinking through and securing *changes* in practice, not just “teaming up” to do what each “side” already did:

- Legal reform, pitched on the merits plus potential savings to taxpayer
- Moving activities to new sites/times
- Reforms to screening process, to be less biased against prospective black adoptive parents.
- Re-structuring state agency
- Staffing changes, training, and more
- Creating the new nonprofit to help institutionalize the innovation, “outlast the founders.”
Multiple meanings of RACE

- A fault line between public agency and one of its key publics, a proxy for mistrust (legitimacy and support missing)
- A category of data collection and performance tracking (spotlights a racial disparity in wait times for adoption)
- A source of shared history, identity, and thus solidarity (helping “our own”)—a social resource for mobilizing other resources.

But class cultures important as well (e.g. middle-class staff judgments about what a “good” adoptive family looks like, how it functions).
Summary: Lessons

- Collaboration is one way—not necessarily the best way—to produce change. It poses risks and potential rewards (that may not be realized).
- Effective collaboration often demands that implementers play a wide variety of roles well (strategic, operational, mobilization-focused, etc.)
- Collaboratives evolve through stages, navigated jointly: agreeing on a problem, developing strategy, implementing (“co-producing” change)
- Collaboratives can have wider ripple effects (political participation, policy reform, etc).
Performance management

- Systems of performance measures and rules and incentives coupled with them ("management") should align with broader strategies.
- PM can promote good behavior as well as bad behavior, also distract (is time consuming, imposes an opportunity cost).
- So beyond alignment, we care about selecting best-possible measures.
The quality of a measure depends in part on its purpose (list 1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Traits of measures to help achieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>Outcomes, combined with outputs and effects of exogenous factors (&quot;everything else that affects the outcome significantly&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Inputs and outputs that can be regulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Efficiency measures, e.g. productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn</td>
<td>Deviations from the expected, discoveries about cause and effect, barriers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Robert Behn (various works)
## Purposes cont’d (2 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Traits of measures to help achieve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Links between specific operational processes and outputs or outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate</td>
<td>Almost real-time outputs/comes compared with production targets (e.g. monitoring wait times in the DMV, instant reporting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote</td>
<td>Easily understood measures that citizens/customers really care about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate</td>
<td>Periodic, significant performance targets, achievement of which generates a sense of individual and collective accomplishment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing DC’s scorecard measures

- Note: The “goals” are really targets (specific values of measures)
- The quality is uneven, from DMV measures that meet the “promote” purpose (clear signal to public) to activity and output measures not clearly linked to public value.
- Some link more clearly to citywide strategy than others.
- Was there “lowballing”? (setting targets you know you can easily achieve)
- Wider stakes: managing city government’s human resources, credibility of the Mayor, restoring the public’s trust in government, securing and sustaining “home rule.”
“Good” measures

- Should induce more of something good.
- Should include, or be coupled with, controls to prevent a “bad,” such as: loss of quality, abusive behavior, only serving the most able/easiest to serve (“creaming”). NYC assertive policing example (police deployed more aggressively, complaints of abuse went up fast).
- Should convince the people that need to respond to them, not just a detached observer.
Mitigating the risks of reporting outcome-measure targets

- **Rethink your impact and value proposition:** Can you gain more control over the “confounders” (factors outside your current intervention). There will always be limits to what you can control. *Example:* Building family assets by promoting savings versus fighting predatory lending and other “asset stripping.”

- **Explain how the world works:** Tell a simple story about trends beyond your control (demographic shifts, market downturns, etc.) important for the outcome.

- **Consider targeting “intermediate outcomes”** (see Hatry) if “end outcomes” are too hard or risky.
Political management considerations

- Experts can help pick technically sound measures, but constituencies “power” change. What are their interests? How to build a coalition that backs real changes in practice, response to performance management systems, from line staff level to political bosses, outside influentials (Media strategy? Civic leaders?).

- Risk of embarrassment, potential for cost savings, opportunities to gain political capital—can all be resources for building such a coalition.