

**University of Washington
Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs**

Managing Organizational Performance – PbAf 512C, Winter 2014

Class meets Thursday, 6:00-8:50 PM, ALC 141 (Odegaard)

Quiz Section A meets Fridays, 9:30-10:20 AM, Parrington 106

Quiz Section B meets Tuesdays, 4:30-5:20 PM, Parrington 106

Professor David Suarez
203B Parrington
(206) 221-1058 (office)
dsuarez@uw.edu
Office hours: Thursday, 2-4 PM

Teaching Assistant: Ryan Bodanyi

rbodanyi@u.washington.edu
Office hours: TBD in first section

Welcome to Managing Organizational Performance, the second course in the core management sequence. The first course, Managing Politics and the Policy Process (PbAf 511), positioned you as a leader looking primarily outwards to the authorizing environment and a variety of stakeholders. This course puts you in the position of a manager looking inward, to improving organizational operations and capacity, while recognizing the external pressures and financial considerations that affect them. The course is structured into three modules, with the theme of change cross-cutting the modules:

- **Module 1 (“Performance”)** examines mechanisms for performance management and accountability, including qualitative and quantitative approaches to assess and catalyze progress toward the goals that inhere in an organization’s mission. How performance measurement and management can improve service delivery is a key topic.
- **Module 2 (“People”)** presents techniques for managing and improving relations with staff and labor unions to enhance organizational capacity. How to sharpen skills for hiring, managing, and holding staff and contractors accountable is a key topic.
- **Module 3 (“Processes”)** focuses on managing operations, including work processes and service-delivery capacities, in order to assess and improve customer service. How to analyze and (re)design services and delivery systems to serve customers better is a key topic.

We build on Managing Politics and the Policy Process by addressing leadership and strategy, but focus more directly on operational processes and effectiveness. While the course centers on management strategies and techniques, the assigned readings and cases also address public values, ethics, and diversity. In keeping with the approach in Managing Politics and the Policy Process, we will make extensive use of teaching cases, supplemented by readings, to improve your knowledge and application of relevant analytic frameworks.

READINGS

The required readings include one book, a course pack, and materials on our Canvas website. You also are required to purchase a CD-ROM for our final case on the Space Shuttle Disaster (Columbia).

1. Book (purchase at University Bookstore or elsewhere): Heath, Chip and Dan Heath, 2010. Switch: How to Change Things When Change Is Hard.
2. PbAf 512 Course Pack – purchase at University Bookstore:
3. Additional cases and materials are on Canvas
4. Space Shuttle Columbia CD-ROM

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADES

Your final grade for this course depends on your performance in five domains of class activity. Your performance in each domain determines a specific percentage of your final grade:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • Memo 1 (due by Week 5 - February 6): | 15% |
| • Memo 2 (due by Week 9 - March 6): | 15% |
| • Take-Home Midterm (due February 23, by 11:59 PM): | 15% |
| • Participation (Class and TA sections): | 15% |
| • Final Group Project (due March 15, by 12:00 PM (lunch)): | 40% |

Memos: There are two required memos for this course. One memo must be written by week 5 (February 6), but other than that you have discretion as to which topic interests you enough to be the focus of a memo. Your memos must be posted to Canvas before the relevant class meeting. We will not accept late memos. Please put your name, date, and page numbers on all of your work. If you are not satisfied with your grade on one of your memos, you have the option to write a third memo.

We will grade the memos for content and style, and review the grading criteria in class. The memos must be solo-authored, with a two-page limit (attachments do not count against the two-page limit). We will discuss the memos more in class and in the TA Sections. All good memos will analyze a case and incorporate/address the following issues:

- Management Challenge: What kind of problem does the decision-maker face (structural, relational/motivational, or both)? What is the primary issue you are addressing in the memo?
- Organizational (Adaptive) Challenge: What is the organizational context? How will the decision-maker gain support, and who are the relevant players?
- Substantive Proposal: What specifically should be done? What are the technical details of your proposal?
- Risks and Benefits: Why do you recommend your course of action, and what are the potential drawbacks?

Memo Grading – Substance:

Stronger memos contain:

- A thesis statement (a clear argument stated in the first paragraph)
- Arguments systematically derived from frameworks
- Justifications for recommendations

- Relevant references to the readings / theory
- Frameworks applied in a clear, coherent, and logical manner

Weaker memos contain:

- Unjustified recommendations (e.g., “do this, do that”)
- Arguments that float free of frameworks
- Excessive space devoted to summarizing the case or defining frameworks
- Inconsistent or inappropriate use of frameworks
- No mention of the course articles

Memo Grading – Style:

Stronger memos contain:

- Text written with audience in mind
- Subheadings, bullet points, and/or other formatting devices to help readers follow the argument and see key points
- Simple, clear, straightforward sentences
- Logical structure

Weaker memos contain:

- Typos (e.g., misspellings, inconsistent punctuation, grammatical errors)
- Passive phrasing (avoiding making strong, clear recommendations)
- Undefined academic or bureaucratic jargon

Take-Home Midterm: The take-home midterm will give you an opportunity to pull together key skills and tools from the first two sections of the course (performance and people). We will distribute the midterm at the end of class on February 20, and midterms are due by the end of February 23 (11:59 PM). The midterm will consist of two questions. Responses to each question must not exceed two single-spaced pages. Your complete exam must not exceed four single-spaced pages, excluding a bibliography and other attachments (like tables, figures, and exhibits).

Participation: Effective participation in discussions is an art and a crucial professional skill for public leaders and managers. You can participate in this class in several different ways. Please practice and make an effort to participate in each of the following ways.

- **Small Group Activities and Discussions:** We will have many small group activities, some of which will require presentations to the whole class.
- **In-Class or Online (Canvas) Responses Instructor Questions:** Some weeks I will pose a question to the class and give you 5 minutes to write your answer on a 3x5 card. Questions will require a reflective response rather than test specific factual knowledge. Cards will be collected each week, but they will not be graded formally. For some weeks I might pose a question on Canvas instead of using a 3x5 card.
- **Full Class Activities and Discussions.**
- **Class and TA Section Attendance.** You are required to attend all class and section meetings. If you must miss a class or a section, please let the TA know in advance. ‘Unapproved’ absences will decrease your participation grade.

In and outside of class, we expect and encourage you to practice the Evans School's Community Conversation Norms:

At the Evans School, we value the richness of our differences and how they can greatly enhance our conversations and learning. As a professional school, we also have a responsibility to communicate with each other—inside and outside of the classroom—in a manner consistent with conduct in today's increasingly diverse places of work. We hold ourselves individually and collectively responsible for our communication by:

- Listening carefully and respectfully
- Sharing and teaching each other generously
- Clarifying the intent and impact of our comments
- Giving and receiving feedback in a "relationship building" manner
- Working together to expand our knowledge by using high standards for evidence and analysis.

Final Group Project and TA Sections: As noted above, attendance is required at the weekly TA sections. Students will have some opportunities to work on their group project in TA sections, based on the schedule below.

- Week 1 (Jan. 9): No section meetings
- Week 2 (Jan. 16): Memo writing discussion; Review course materials
- Week 3 (Jan. 23): Pick case for group project; Review course materials
- Week 4 (Jan. 30): Analyze your case in the context of "Performance" module
- Week 5 (Feb. 6): Discuss team strengths and weaknesses; Review course materials
- Week 6 (Feb. 13): Review materials from class and prepare for midterm
- Week 7: (Feb. 20): Analyze your case in the context of "People" module
- Week 8: (Feb. 27): Applied activity (TBA in Sections)
- Week 9: (Mar. 6): Analyze your case in the context of "Processes" module
- Week 10 (Mar. 13): Open "office hours" to finalize group projects

As the schedule demonstrates, students will work on specific sections of their group project in weeks 4, 7 and 9. The final project is due by lunch on Saturday, March 15. Group teams will be assigned randomly, although they will be structured around section membership. Each team will have between 5-7 students, preferably teams of 6 students. Each case analysis will have three major sections in addition to the introduction and conclusion: people, processes, performance. In this respect the group project is supposed to be a summative assignment that builds on all three modules of the course. You are expected to draw on the readings, and many aspects of the memos could be useful for the project. For instance, the strategic challenge, the political challenge, the technical proposal, and the costs and benefits of the recommended course of action remain quite relevant. However, rather than looking at these four issues in the context of a given week, here you are thinking about the whole course and a comprehensive organizational analysis. Cases should not be longer than 7 single-spaced pages, not including figures, tables, exhibits, and a bibliography.

Schedule

Week 1 (January 9): Introduction

Case:

Bridges, Gail, and Gwendolyn Campbell. 2001. "Implementing a New Drug and Alcohol Treatment Model in Sacramento County (A)." *Evans School of Public Affairs Case*.

Theory:

Scott, Richard, and Gerald Davis. 2007. "The Subject is Organizations; the Verb is Organizing." Pp. 19-34 in *Organizations and Organizing*, by W. Richard Scott and G. Davis. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Talbot, Colin. 2007. "Performance Management." Pp. 491-517 in *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, edited by Ewan Ferlie et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Switch, Chapter 1.

MODULE 1 – Managing Performance

Week 2 (January 16): Building Organizational Capacity

Case:

Buntin, John. 1999. "Assertive Policing, Plummeting Crime: The NYPD Takes on Crime in New York City." *Kennedy School of Government Case C26-99-1530.0*

Theory:

Ingraham, Patricia, and Amy Kneedler Donahue. 2000. "Dissecting the Black Box Revisited: Characterizing Government Management Capacity." Pp. 292-312 in *Governance and Performance*, edited by Carolyn Heinrich and Laurence Lynn. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Venture Philanthropy Partners. 2001. *Effective Capacity Building in Nonprofit Organizations*. New York: McKinsey & Company. Read pages 33-67.

Switch, Chapters 2-4.

Week 3 (January 23): Performance Measurement

Case:

Grossman, Allen, and Daniel Curran. 2004. "Harlem Children's Zone: Driving Performance with Measurement and Evaluation." *Harvard Business School Case 303-109*.

Theory:

Poister, Theodore. 2003. "Identifying Real Outcomes and Other Performance Measures" Pp. 35-57 in *Measuring Performance in Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kaplan, Robert. 2001. "Strategic Performance Measurement and Management in Nonprofit Organizations." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* (Spring): 353-70

Behn, Robert. 2004. "Performance Leadership: 11 Better Practices That Can Ratchet Up Performance." *IBM Business of Government*:
http://www.businessofgovernment.org/pdfs/Behn_Report.pdf

Optional: Kellogg Foundation, W. K. 2004. *Logic Model Development Guide*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Week 4 (January 30): Accountability

Case:

Edmondson, Amy C., and Frances X. Frei. 2002. "Transformation at the IRS." *Harvard Business School Case 9-603-010*.

Theory:

Bovens, Mark. 2007. "Public Accountability." Pp 182-208 in *The Oxford Handbook of Public Management*, edited by Ewan Ferlie et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hood, Chris. 2012. "Public Management by Numbers as a Performance-Enhancing Drug," *Public Administration Review* 72(s1): 85-92.

Carman, Joanne G. 2010. "The Accountability Movement: What's Wrong With This Theory of Change?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 39(2): 256-274.

Gawande, Atul. 2004. "The Bell Curve." *New Yorker* (December 6): 1-16.

MODULE 2 – Managing People

Week 5 (February 6): Motivation

Case:

Snook, Scott, and Jeffrey Polzer. 2003. "The Army Crew Team." *Harvard Business School Case 9-403-131*.

Theory:

Miller, Ken. 2011. "A Mold Epidemic." Pp. 33-62 in *Extreme Government Makeover*. Washington, D.C.: Governing Books.

Pink, Daniel. 2009. Pp. 13-67 in *Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us*. New York: Penguin.

Switch, Chapters 5-7.

Week 6 (February 13): Diversity, Gender and Groups

Case:

Thomas, David A. and Stephanie J. Creary. 2009. "Meeting the Diversity Challenge at PepsiCo: The Steve Reinemund Era." *Harvard Business School Case 9-410-024*.

Theory

Herring, Cedric. 2009. "Does Diversity Pay? Race, Gender, and the Business of Diversity." *American Sociological Review* 74: 208-224

Auletta, Ken. 2011. "A Woman's Place: Can Sheryl Sandberg upend Silicon Valley's Male-Dominated Culture?" *New Yorker* (July 11 & 18): 55-63.

Thomas, David A. 2004. "Diversity as Strategy." *Harvard Business Review* (September): 98-108.

Optional: Hewlett, Sylvia, et al. 2010. *The Sponsor Effect: Breaking Through the Last Glass Ceiling*. Harvard Business Review Research Report, pages 1-42.

Week 7 (February 20): Professionalization and Leadership

****Take-Home Midterm Distributed at the End of Class****

Case:

Bartlett, Christopher, and Andrew McLean. "GE's Talent Machine: The Making of a CEO." *Harvard Business School Case 9-304-049*.

Theory:

Letts, Christine, et al. 2006. "Human Resources: Developing Employees to Advance Organizational Goals." Pp. 107-128 in *High Performance Nonprofit Organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Spreitzer, Gretchen, and Christine Porath. 2012. "Creating Sustainable Performance." *Harvard Business Review* (January): 3-9.

Collingwood, Harris. 2009. "Do CEOs Matter?" *The Atlantic* (June): 54-60.

Gladwell, Malcolm. 2008. "Most Likely to Succeed." *New Yorker* (December 15): 36-42.

MODULE 3 – Managing Processes

Week 8 (February 27): Contracting

Case:

Varley, Pamela. 1994. "High Stakes & Frightening Lapses: DSS, La Alianza Hispana and the Public-Private Question in Child Protection Work." *Kennedy School of Government Case C16-94-1265.0*

Theory:

Linden, Russell. 1994. "Principles of Re-Engineering." Pp.75-120 in *Seamless Government*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

DeHoog, Ruth, and Lester Salamon. 2002. "Purchase-of-Service Contracting." Pp. 319-339 in *The Tools of Government*, edited by Lester Salamon. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kelman, Steve. 2002. "Strategic Contract Management." Pp. 88-102 in *Market-Based Governance*, edited by John Donahue and Joseph Nye. Washington, D.C.: Brookings.

Week 9 (March 6): Innovation and Learning

Case:

Strachan, Deirdre. 2001. "The Overcrowded Clinic." *Evans School Electronic Hallway Case*.

Theory:

Moynihan, Donald. 2005. "Goal-Based Learning and the Future of Performance Management." *Public Administration Review* 65(2): 203-216.

Sahni, Nikhil, et al. 2013. "Unleashing Breakthrough Innovation in Government." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Summer): 26-31.

Behn, Richard. 1995. "Creating an Innovative Organization: Ten Hints for Involving Frontline Workers," *State and Local Government Review* 27(3): 221-234.

Switch, Chapters 8-9.

Week 10 (March 13): Organizational Culture

Case:

Roberto, Michael et al. 2005. "Columbia's Final Mission." *Harvard Business School Multimedia Case 305032-HTM-ENG*. [CD-ROM]

Theory:

Schein, Edgar. 2004. "The Concept of Organizational Culture" and "The Learning Culture." Pp. 3-24 and 393-418 in *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ostroff, Frank. 2006. "Change Management in Government." *Harvard Business Review* (May): 1-8.

Kotter, John. 2007. "Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail." *Harvard Business Review* (January): 96-103.

Switch, Chapters 10-11.