

Managing Organizational Performance, PubPol512B - Winter 2019
University of Washington
Daniel J. Evans School of Public Policy & Governance

Professor Mary Kay Gugerty

gugerty@uw.edu

Condon 328, 206-221-4599

Office Hours: Tuesday 3:30-5pm & by appointment

TA: Kelly Husted

khusted@uw.edu

Condon 325

Office hours: Wednesdays 2-4pm

Welcome to Managing Organizational Performance (MOP), the second course in the core management sequence. In Managing Politics and the Policy Process (PBAF 511), you examined your position as a manager and leaders focused externally on the authorizing environment and a variety of stakeholders. MOP puts you in the position of a manager focused on improving organizational operations and capacity, while recognizing the external pressures and financial considerations that affect them. The course proceeds in three phases; the themes of leadership and managing organizational change cut across these sections.

- **Leading Organizational Change through Performance Management**

In this part of the course we examine approaches to performance management and accountability, including qualitative and quantitative approaches to assess and catalyze progress toward achieving organizational mission and goals. We examine the promise and pitfalls of using performance measurement to drive organizational performance and service delivery.

- **Managing People for Performance in Organizations**

In this section we examine techniques for managing and working with employees, considering the imperative to create diverse and inclusive workplaces and strategies for achieving these goals.

- **Improving Process to Improve Performance**

Here we focus on improving the delivery of public goods and services through improving operations, including work processes and service-delivery capacities. Innovating and (re)designing services to serve citizens 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 performance. While the course centers on management strategies and techniques, the assigned readings and cases also address public values, ethics, diversity, equity and inclusion. 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.

1. Heath, Chip and Dan Heath, 2010. *Switch: How to Change Things When Change Is Hard*. New York: Broadway Books
2. PUPOL 512B Harvard Course Pack: <https://hbsp.harvard.edu/import/598506>
3. All other cases and materials are on Canvas. This syllabus provides a guideline for the readings for the quarter. **Some changes may be made to the syllabus and you should always consult the study guide and readings posted on the canvas site for each week.**

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADES

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

- Memo 1 (due Week 4 before class) 20%
- Memo 2 (your choice - due week 5, 6, 8 or 9) 25%
- Participation (Reading questions, Class, TA sections) 20%
- Final project 35%

Additional information on the memo assignments and set of grading guidelines will be provided on the Canvas site. Additional detail on memos is provided at the end of this syllabus.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

As a student in this course, you acknowledge that you are a member of a learning community in the Evans School of Public Affairs that is committed to the highest academic standards. As a member of this community, you agree to uphold the fundamental standards of honesty, respect and integrity, and you accept the responsibility to encourage others to adhere to these standards. If you are uncertain about whether a particular action constitutes academic misconduct, please ask me or the teaching assistant for guidance *before* an assignment is due. You must write your own memos, not copy or paraphrase memos others have written. Plagiarized memos will receive a grade of 0. Group projects must also be original work done by the group. Please review the Evans School student handbook pages 28-30 for detailed guidelines on academic integrity.

STATEMENT ON DISABILITIES:

The university will provide reasonable accommodation of academically qualified students with disabilities so those students can participate fully in the university's educational programs and activities. Any student requesting academic accommodation based on a disability is required to register with Disability Resources for Students (DRS). You can apply at this website: depts.washington.edu/uwdrs/ Please inform me of your accommodation so that I can prepare adequate resources for you.

ATTENDANCE POLICY

Attendance in all class sessions is mandatory. If you miss a session, you must inform the instructor and TA via email in advance, and must complete a two-page (single spaced) analytic reflection paper that discusses the case and the readings for that week. This paper does not need to be written in a memo format, but should contain reflection and analysis on the case and readings for the week sufficient to demonstrate that you have done the reading and reflected upon it. The papers for missed classes should be submitted by the end of the day on the Wednesday following class, unless you have made alternative arrangements for us. If you are missing class for illness or emergency and completing this will pose a hardship, please let us know and we can make alternative arrangements.

GRADING POLICY

We will follow the Evans School guidelines for grading students work as outlined in the student handbook. Assignments will be reviewed and graded by both the TA and the instructor. Any questions about assignment grading should be taken up with the instructor.

DISCUSSION SECTIONS

We expect all students to attend their assigned section meetings. You can expect a section meeting every week unless we announce otherwise. Participation in sections forms a component of your participation grade. Final assignment groups will be created based on sections, and time will be given in some weeks

during section to work on these projects. If you need to miss a section, please notify the TA in advance via email.

PARTICIPATION

Effective participation in discussions is an art and a crucial professional skill for public leaders and managers. Many of us may not be comfortable speaking in larger groups; in some cases, our culture or background might not have equipped us with skills or norms for the questioning and dialogue involved in case discussions. We will have many different ways to participation over the quarter, but I would also challenge each of you to challenge yourself. If you are a ‘speaker’ who is comfortable commenting in a large class, think about ways to step back and help others. If you are less comfortable talking in a larger group, let’s think about some ways we can make it easier for you to participate. Part of the reason for having reading questions each week is to help prepare you for class discussions. Forms of participation for the quarter include:

- Small Group Activities and Discussions: We will have many small group activities, some of which will require presentations to the whole class.
- Reading questions – completing reading questions and demonstrating engagement with the material.
- 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 (i.e. ‘no shows’ with no communication) will decrease your participation grade.
- Sharing outside resources, readings, or opportunities with the class.

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.

We will also work to develop our own set of classroom norms for the quarter.

ASSIGNMENTS

Reading Reflections

Experience suggests that class discussions are richer and more informed when students have read and thought carefully about the assigned readings as well as the teaching case. Reading questions will be posted to Canvas by Thursday morning each week for the following week. Reading reflections are due by 11:59 pm on the Monday night before class.

Reading reflections are due each week for weeks 2-9. You have a choice of which week (between weeks 5 – 9) during which you can complete your second memo. You do not need to turn in a reading reflection the week you turn in a memo.

Reading reflections can address the weekly reading questions or you can offer your own reactions or questions about the readings and case. Your Reflections need not be long – a few paragraphs, or roughly half a page, to one page is sufficient – but should demonstrate critical consideration of key concepts in the readings. A strong reflection paper will seek to make connections across the case and/or readings. Missing or late submissions will decrease your participation grade.

We will work to read your submissions before class. Reflections will be assessed as: 0 (missing/incomplete), 1 (satisfactory work – where satisfactory means meeting the criteria above). If work is submitted but is incomplete or very poorly done, students will receive partial credit (0.5). Our experience and expectation are that most students receive a “1” for all reflection papers. We will seek to make short comments on the papers as often as we can, but will not be able to comment extensively each week. In large part, these reflections are intended to contribute to your own learning – and that of others since you will be more prepared to contribute in class. You will be assigned a grade on a 4.0 scale at the end of the quarter that will contribute to your participation grade.

Memos

Memo 1 – 20% of grade

Memo 1 is due Week 4. Everyone will complete the same memo on the Harlem Children’s Zone case. This memo is due to Canvas before class. The memo assignment will be posted to Canvas and additional support will be provided in section.

Memo 2 – 25% of grade

Memo 2 can be completed any week from Week 5 through week 9 and is due via Canvas at 5pm the day prior to class (so that they are turned in before I post slides for the week). Guidance on memo writing in general and for memo 2 is found at the end of the syllabus and will be reviewed in class and in section.

We will grade the memos for both content and style and will review the grading criteria in class and in sections. For memo assignments, we will do blind grading. Rubrics/guidelines will be provided to help you, but we will not assign points using the rubric. The memos must be sole-authored, with a two-page limit (attachments do not count against the two-page limit). We will discuss the memos in class and in the TA Sections prior to the due dates; you are also welcome to ask questions in class or office hours.

Late Assignments

If you are unable to complete Memo 1 before it is due, please let Kelly and me know before class, and do not attend that week’s class. All late assignments will receive a grade penalty,

unless you receive an extension from me in advance in writing. The grade penalty will be .3/day (which means, for example, that an assignment that receives a 4.0 on the merits will be recorded as a 3.7 if one day late, and a 3.4 if two days late). For Memo 2, memos for any given week may not be submitted after the class has met.

Final Assignment – 35% of grade

The final group project consists of an analysis of a management challenge that addresses organizational performance in relation to people, processes, and change. This year the case will focus on Seattle's Race and Social Justice Initiative (RSJI). We will assign a background chapter on the RSJI, which will be discussed in section.

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. As mentioned above, each case analysis will have three major sections: people, processes, and change. 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. However, rather than emphasizing the readings from 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. More detail will be provided in class and via Canvas.

The final assignment will be due at 5pm on Tuesday, March 19th.

Course Outline

Please note that this course outline constitutes a guideline for the course. Specific readings may change for some weeks. The course canvas website constitutes the final guide to readings for each week.

I. Accountability and Performance

Week One

January 8 Creating Organizational Change

Case:

Minicase: The Revival of Foster High

<http://www.seattletimes.com/education-lab/the-revival-of-foster-high-a-school-filled-with-refugees-makes-a-comeback/>

Readings:

Switch, Chapter 1 Available at:

<http://heathbrothers.com/switch-chapter-1/>

Myerson, Debra and Maureen Scully. "Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of Ambivalence and Change." *Organization Science*. 6(5): 1047-7039.

Gooden, Susan. *Race and Equity: A Nervous Area of Government*, Skim Chapters 1 and 2.

Kavanaugh, Shayne, "Defining and Creating Value for the Public" (Book review). *Government Finance Review*, October 2014.

Week Two

January 15 Organizational Design and Structure

Case:

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

Readings:

Heifetz, Ronald and Donald Laurie. "The Work of Leadership." *Harvard Business Review*, 2001.

Lepore, Jill. 2009. "Not So Fast: Scientific Management Started as a Way to Work. How Did it Become a Way of Life?" *The New Yorker*, October 12.

Kotter, "Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail." *Harvard Business Review*, March 1995.

A Note on Organizational Structure, Mary Kay Gugerty.

Peters, Tom. "A Brief History of the 7-S Model" Accessed at <https://tompeters.com/2011/03/a-brief-history-of-the-7-s-mckinsey-7-s-model/>

Switch, Chapters 2-3.

Review from 511:

Rainey, Hal. 2003. "What Makes Public Sector Organizations Distinctive" Chapter 3 Understanding & Managing Public Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Week 3

January 22 Accountability, Motivation & Performance

Case:

Michelle Rhee's IMPACT on the Washington DC Public Schools. Harvard Business School Case 694.

Readings:

Switch, Chapters 4-6.

Nohria, Nitin, Boris Groysberg, and Linda-Eling Lee. 2008. "Employee Motivation: A Powerful New Model." Harvard Business Review (July-August): 78-84.

Behn, Robert. "Why Measure Performance?" Bob Behn's Performance Report, 1(11), July 2004.

Behn, Robert. *The Performance Stat Potential*. Chapter 8, Collecting the Data.

Gooden, Susan, *Race and Social Equity*, Chapter 3. Nervousness within Individual Public Administrators.

Optional:

Daniel Pink, *Drive*. Chapters 1, 2 and 2A.

Week 4

January 29 Memo Due Performance Management as Change Management

Case:

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

Readings:

Behn, Robert. 2004. "Performance Leadership: 11 Better Practices That Can Ratchet Up Performance." IBM Business of Government.

Gugerty, Mary Kay and Dean Karlan, 2018. *The Goldilocks Challenge: Right-Size Monitoring and Evaluation for the Social Sector*, Oxford University Press.

Goldilocks Toolkit: Finding the Right-Fit in Monitoring and Evaluation

Chapter 3: Theory of Change

Chapter 5, Monitoring with the CART Principles.

Bradach, Jeffrey, Thomas Tierney and Nan Stone. 2008. "Delivering on the Promise of Nonprofits." *Harvard Business Review*.

Week 5

February 5 Accountability Pressures and Organizational Responses

Case:

Robichaud, Christopher, and Erin Baumann. 2016. "A Rising Storm: Eric Garner and the Explosive Controversy over Race and Policing." Harvard Kennedy School Case 2057.2.

Readings:

D. Moynihan, "Goal-Based Learning and the Future of Performance Management," Public Administration Review 65:2 (March 2005). (just skim the cases)

Hood, Chris. 2012. "Public Management by Numbers as a Performance-Enhancing Drug: Two Hypotheses." Public Administration Review. [focus on the first hypothesis].

Valenzuela, Matias. 2016. "King County's Journey in Institutionalizing Equity and Social Justice." Public Administration Review 77(6): 818-821.

Gooden, Susan. 2016. "Social Equity and Evidence: Insights from Local Government." Public Administration Review 77(6): 822-828.

Mullainathan, Sendhil. 2015. Racial Bias, Even When We Have Good Intentions." *The New York Times*, January 3.

Gooden, Susan, *Race and Social Equity*. Chapter 4, Nervousness in Public Sector Organizations.

Optional Resources: Broken Windows and Stop and Frisk Policing:

Bergner, Daniel. 2014. "Is Stop and Frisk Worth It?" *The Atlantic*, March.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/12/opinion/the-scars-of-stop-and-frisk.html>

Auletta, Ken, Yorker, August 2015. Fixing Broken Windows.

<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/09/07/fixing-broken-windows>

Graham, David. The War over the War on Crime. *The Atlantic*. December 31, 2015.

<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/12/ray-kelly-bill-bratton-new-york-police-crime-rates/422256/>

Goodman, David and Al Baker, *New York Times*, October 1, 2015. Bratton, Tracking Police Use of Force, Aims to Stay Step Ahead of Watchdogs.

II. Individuals and Teams in Organizations

Week 6

February 12 - Creating & Managing a Diverse Workforce

Case:

Birbrager, Lindsay. 2016. "CIBC: Fostering an Inclusive Culture, Leading with Gender." Richard Ivey School of Business School Case W16569. (available through HBS Casepack).

Readings:

David Thomas and Robin Ely, "Making Differences Matter: A New Paradigm for Managing Diversity," *Harvard Business Review*, September-October 1996.

Dobbin, Frank, and Alexandra Kalev. 2016. "Why Diversity Programs Fail and What Works Better." *Harvard Business Review* (July-August): 52-60.

Dnika Travis and Jennifer Thorpe-Moscon, Day-to-Day Experiences of Emotional Tax Among Men and Women of Color in the Workplace. Catalyst.

Cindy Pace. How Women of Color Get to Senior Management, *Harvard Business Review*. August 2018.

Optional Resources:

Ely, Robin, Pamela Stone, and Colleen Ammerman. "Rethinking What You Know About High-Achieving Women," *Harvard Business Review*. 2014.

Ground Rules for Effective Groups

Adapted from Schwarz, R.M. *The Skilled Facilitator*, 1994.

<http://dsmgt310.faculty.ku.edu/SuppMaterial/GroundRulesforEffectiveGroups.html>

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

Week 7

February 19 Motivation, Power and Influence in Diverse Organizations

Cases:

Hannan and Welsh (Electronic Hallway)

Readings:

Daniel Pink, "Type I and Type X" and "Mastery" Chapters 3 and 5 in *Drive*, Riverhead Books 2009.

Ely, Robin, Debra Meyerson, and Martin Davidson. "Rethinking Political Correctness," *Harvard Business Review*, September 2006.

Nicholson, Nigel, "How to Motivate Your Problem People," *HBR On Point*, 2002

Marcus Buckingham, "What Great Managers Do," *Harvard Business Review*, 2005

Mastracci, Sharon, and Veronica Arreola. 2016. "Gendered Organizations: How Human Resource Management Practices Produce and Reproduce Administrative Man." *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 38: 137-149.

Optional:

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

Cialdini, Robert. 2001. "Harnessing the Science of Persuasion." *Harvard Business Review*. (October): 72-79.

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

Magee, Joe, and Clifford Frasier. 2014. "Status and Power: The Principal Inputs to Influence for Public Managers." *Public Administration Review*.

III. Improving Processes to Improve Performance

Week 8

February 26 Work Processes, “Lean” and Frontline Delivery

Case:

Overcrowded Clinic, Electronic Hallway

Readings:

Ken Miller, *Extreme Government Makeover*: Chapter 6: Better, Faster, Cheaper.

Delisle, Dennis, 2015. *Executing Lean Improvement*. Milwaukee: ASQ Quality Press, Chapters 1-3.

Sandfort and Moulton, “Front Lines,” Chapter 6 in “Effective Implementation in Practice,” Jossey Bass (2015)

Switch, Chapters 8-9

If you didn’t read in 511: Watkins-Hayes, Celeste, 2011. “Race, Respect and Red Tape: Inside the Black Box of Racially Representative Bureaucracies.” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21(S): 1233-1251.

Week 9

March 5 Public Service Delivery Across Boundaries & “Cultural Competence”

Case:

Making Pay Work, Electronic Hallway

Readings:

Benjamin, Lehn and David Campbell. *Nonprofit Performance: Accounting for the Agency of Clients. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 2014.

Calzada, Esther and Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar (2014). *Enhancing Cultural Competence in Social Service Agencies: A Promising Approach to Serving Diverse Children and Families*, OPRE Report #2014-31, Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Lopez, Michael, et al. 2017. “Developing Culturally Responsive Approaches to Serving Diverse Populations: A Resource Guide for Community-Based Organizations.” *National Research Center on Hispanic Children and Families*.

Note this is more of a resource guide than an article – please skim to get a sense of resources, but also look at the key elements of cultural competence as outlined in organization of the report and the table of contents.

Putting it all Together

Week 10

March 12 Decision-Making and Organizational Culture

Case:

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

Readings:

Thaler, Richard, and Cass Sunstein. 2009. *Nudge*. New York: Penguin Books. Pages, Introduction and Following the Herd, pp. 1-14 and 53-73.

Hackman, J. Richard. "What Makes for a Great Team?" *American Psychological Bulletin*, June 2004. Also look at the explanations of the five factors at:

<http://www.free-management-ebooks.com/faqId/development-03.htm>

Shore, Lynn et al. Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups: A Review and Model for Future Research. *Journal of Management*. 37(4): 1262-1289.

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

Switch, Chapter 10- 11.

Optional:

Atul Gawande, The Checklist. *The New Yorker*, December 10, 2007.

<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2007/12/10/the-checklist>