

MANAGING FOR RESULTS

At all program levels

Presented by

Barry White

Accountability for results

- The principle of accountability for results is the same at all levels of federal, state and local government; for leaders, managers and staff; and for non-profits and contractors. It is accepting responsibility for your part in producing cost-effective results in accord with law and policy.

Why does managing for results have to apply to grantees?

- Service delivery by intermediaries is growing.
Grants to state and local government:
 - 1955: \$3 billion
 - 2005: \$426 billion
- Federal relationship to grantees is changing:
 - The “captain and the private”
 - Partners

The view from the top

**“This administration is asking you to perform
an unnatural act: We are asking you to be
managers.”**

Mitch Daniels, Director, OMB

An advocate's perspective

“Damn it, we are the only college-access program funded by the federal government. There is no doubt in anyone’s mind, here or in the Congress, that we are going to save this program.”

National Journal 2/12/05 p. 465

What's missing here:

- This program is effective; here's how I know.
- It is cost-effective; here's how I know.
- It fills a need; here's how I know.
- It should be a priority because ...

Results matter because ...

1. Responsibility to the public and the laws
2. Responding to change
3. Resources are finite; demand is infinite .. And the money is not the government's
4. Professional standards

Hallmarks of Managing for Results

1. Systematic specification and measurement of end goals and objectives
2. Interim measures of cost and outcomes that have a proven link to achieving the end goals and that meet managers' and decision-maker's needs on a timely basis
3. Using rigorously defined and gathered timely data, plus objective evaluation of program net impact.
4. Decisions based on careful blending of results with policy, preference, and politics
5. Accountability: incentives and sanctions based on results.

Slide 7

Executive Branch Initiatives

“It must be remembered that the Act is not in itself a magic wand that will wave out all the faulty procedures and beckon in the financial [and management] millennium. Habits, customs, regulations, laws that the passage of more than a hundred years has built into the very machinery of government cannot be eradicated overnight. It must be a continuing process that will require years of patient, persistent and courageous behavior.”

H.M. Lord, Director, Office of Management and Budget, in 1922, The Budget and Accounting Act, 1921.

“This program … will help us find new ways to do jobs faster, to do jobs better, and to do jobs less expensively. It will identify our national goals with precision and will do it on a continuing basis. It will enable us to fulfill the need of the American people with a minimum amount of waste.”

President Lyndon Johnson, The Planning-Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS), 1965

“I am now asking each department and agency head to seek a sharper focus on the results which the various activities under his or her direction are aimed at achieving. This conscious emphasis on setting goals and then achieving results will substantially enhance federal program performance.”

President Richard Nixon, Management By Objectives (MBO), 1973

Executive Branch Initiatives (cont.)

“This approach will] reform federal budgeting, which is inefficient, chaotic, and virtually uncontrollable by either the President or the Congress.”

President Jimmy Carter, speaking of Zero-Based Budgeting (ZBB) system, 1977

“Our goal is to make the entire federal government less expensive and more efficient, and to change the culture of our national bureaucracy away from complacency and entitlement toward initiative and empowerment.”

President William J. Clinton, the National Performance Review, 1993

“Government should be results-oriented – guided not by process but guided by performance. There comes a time when every program must be judged either a success or failure. Where we find success, we should repeat it, share it, and make it the standard. And where we find failure we must call it by its name. Government action that fails in its purpose must be reformed or ended.”

President George W. Bush, the President's Management Agenda, 2001

Common Features

- Institutionalize processes for goal and objective setting and for basing more of each decision on performance vs. emotion, intuition, and anecdote
- Make government more effective and efficient
- Improve and systematize analytical processes and use of high quality evaluations
- Improve employee capability and institutional capacity to achieve results

Why haven't these goals taken sufficient hold -- Yet?

1. Lack of persistence – inadequate foundation in law, no continuity across administrations, inadequate efforts to change political and career cultures.
2. Too much process, not enough content.
3. Inadequate connection to high stakes decisions.
4. Little effective congressional, media, or public pressure to persevere

Managing for Results: Time for pessimism or cautious optimism?

- *In politics, there are no right answers, only a continuing flow of compromises between groups, resulting in a changing, cloudy and ambiguous series of public decisions, where appetite and ambition compete openly with knowledge and wisdom.*
Senator Alan Simpson
- *Habits, customs, regulations, laws that the passage of more than a hundred years has built into the very machinery of government cannot be eradicated overnight. It must be a continuing process that will require years of patient, persistent and courageous behavior.”*
H.M. Lord, Director, Office of Management and Budget