Change and Continuity:

Lessons Learned from the Bush and Obama Administrations' Experiences with Evaluation and Performance Measurement

Nicholas R. Hart

PhD Candidate, Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration

Kathryn E. Newcomer

Director, Trachtenberg School of Public Policy and Public Administration

November 12, 2015 American Evaluation Association Evaluation 2015 in Chicago, IL THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

1

Presentation Overview

- Provide brief survey of Bush and Obama Administration evaluation and performance measurement initiatives
- Highlight select similarities and differences
- Discuss lessons (un)learned

Hart and Newcomer

Change and Continuity

Key Features of Bush Initiatives

- President's Management Agenda (PMA)
 - emphasis on human capital, competitive sourcing, electronic government, integrating budget and performance



- Established Performance Improvement Officer (PIO) and Performance Improvement Council (PIC)
- Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)
 - Questions on performance goals, comparison to similar programs, and effectiveness
 - Questions about independent evaluation

Hart and Newcomer

Change and Continuity



Key Features of Obama Initiatives

- Evaluation Capacity and Barriers
 - Transparency and Tiered Evidence
 - Requests for Funding
 - Chief Evaluation Officers

Management Agenda

- Emphasis on customer service, shared service delivery, open data, IT delivery, strategic sourcing, financial management, real property
- High Priority Goals and Cross Agency Goals
- Quarterly Reviews/Strategic Reviews

Hart and Newcomer

Change and Continuity



Major Similarities

- Espoused support to delivering better results and improving accountability but the audiences for initiatives were not clear
- PMAs for both Administrations targeted management improvements in similar areas (service delivery, IT, contracting, real property, etc.)
- Evaluation focus was more on Randomized Control Trials and Impact
 Evaluation
- OMB took the lead on performance management and served as corridor for implementation guidance
- Both espoused need for Chief Performance Improvement Officers but did not ensure the designated PIOs had time to devote to the function
- · Neither emphasized congressional stakeholder engagement
- Neither effectively stressed linkages between performance measurement and evaluation

Hart and Newcomer

Change and Continuity

7

Major Differences

- More emphasis in Obama initiatives on agency flexibility for management agenda
- Some of the Obama efforts were "institutionalized" in the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010
- Obama voiced support for increasing evaluation funding and reducing barriers –primarily in HHS, ED, and Labor.
- Bush efforts used OMB as police instead of a coach -- relied on OMB to help establish "stretch goals" and coordinate overall implementation
- Obama efforts faced delays in launching, whereas Bush efforts had specified purpose and action relatively quickly

Hart and Newcomer

Change and Continuity

Lessons (un)Learned

- 1. Calibrate OMB role with agency needs
- 2. Establish and maintain audience attention
- 3. **Effectively implement** initiatives, with appropriate cross-agency collaboration
- 4. Generate and highlight success stories
- 5. Build **sufficient evaluation capacity** to support initiatives

Hart and Newcomer

Change and Continuity

q

Lessons (un)Learned

- 6. **Institutionalize relationships** between performance measurement and evaluation staffs and offices
- 7. **Provide training** for senior managers and political appointees about leadership roles in performance measurement and evaluation
- 8. **Consult Congressional staff** and committees on implementation and demand for use

Hart and Newcomer

Change and Continuity

Thank you!

Nicholas Hart

nrhart@gwu.edu

Kathryn Newcomer

newcomer@gwu.edu

Hart and Newcomer

Change and Continuity