Building Capability for Government Transformation

A Visioning Workshop for Government Leaders
Achieving your vision:
A Capability Based View
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Vision, Action and Capability

• With a vision to guide action, governments must then ensure they have the infrastructure and capability necessary to achieve transformation.
Our world (s)

Technology
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Organization & management
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Public policies
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Interconnectedness

Systems thinking is . . . seeing wholes . . . seeing interrelationships rather than things, seeing patterns of change rather than static “snapshots.”

. . . systems thinking is a sensibility — for the subtle interconnectedness that gives living systems their unique character.

-Peter Senge
Critical Elements

• Critical elements must be in place, including information policies, governance frameworks, interoperability standards, public value projections, and organizational capability assessments
A New Perspective
Publically available tools

Crowdsourcing
Blogging
Wikis
Micro-blogging
Management Challenges

- Understanding & managing complexity
- Assumptions that simplify but are wrong
- Contrary incentives
- Competing values
- Unrealistic goals, time frames, & funding
Complexity challenges

• Embeddedness
• Risk
• Differences among professions and roles
• Centralized vs. decentralized vs. distributed ways of working
Governance
New York State
New York State Environment

- State CIO
- Agency CIOs who were appointed by their commissioners
- Governor’s Cabinet
- Department of Budget
- Office for Technology
Some challenges in the current environment

• The inherent conflict between policy and operations.
  – CIO/OFT
  – Agency CIOs and their roles as members of the CIO Council as a policy advisory body.

• CIO Council – What is its role?
  – Information push versus discussion versus decision making.
  – Agenda setting? Policy forum? Task completion?
  – Action Teams – Where do they fit?
Primary areas of decision making

• The new enterprise IT governance framework deals with three primary areas of decision making:
  – Decisions about investments
  – Ensuring alignment of IT investments with the overall strategic plan of the state
  – Setting policies and standards.
Intertwining processes

• These processes are intertwined on several levels and therefore a certain degree of overlap of membership and information exchange is required to ensure transparency as well as checks and balances in the system.
Some challenges in the current environment

• Transparency
  – Policy setting
  – Investment priorities – enterprise and otherwise

• The concept of enterprise versus enterprise as an implementation option

• Relative roles and responsibilities of key actors in the NYS IT community
  – Lack of clarity impacting communication, consultation, and engagement efforts
IT Governance

• ...is about ensuring that state government is effectively using information technology in all lines of business and leveraging capabilities across state government appropriately, to not only avoid unnecessary or redundant investments, but to enhance appropriate cross boundary interoperability.
Governance

Answers the questions:

– What decisions must be made?
– Who should make these decisions?
– How will decisions be made?
– What is the process for monitoring results?

(Weill & Ross, 1999)
Value Propositions

1. Reduce redundancy and establish prioritization mechanism
2. Reduce political directions and swings
3. Reduce costs
4. Align IT with business of the state
5. Establish standards
6. Foster sharing of services and information through agency collaboration
7. Reduce product cycle time
8. Improve quality of service
CAPABILITY
What is Capability

• How is it defined?
• How is it defined in the context of transformation?
• How is it assessed?
Approaches to Assessment

• Self-Assessment and Accreditation
• Maturity and Developmental Models
• Multidimensional Models
• Achievement Testing
Capability Assessment Issues

• Capability Models: maturity, uni-dimensional, multi-dimensional
• Assessment Models: formative v. summative, self- v. external, qualitative v. quantitative
• Validity - workshops, field tests, current practices research
• Reliability - field testing, use testing
• Feasibility - workshop reviews, field tests
A Framework for Capability Assessment

- Based on broad best practices research
- Combined Capability/Self Assessment approaches
- Adaptable to wide range of projects and situations
- Based on a social-technical approach
The nature of capability

- Multidimensional
  - made up of several dimensions that all contribute to overall information sharing capability.

- Complementary
  - high or low overall levels of capability result from different combinations of factors, high levels in some can often compensate for lower levels in others.

- Dynamic
  - can increase or diminish due to changes within an initiative or in its external environment.

- Specific to its setting
  - some elements of capability apply to all settings, but capability for any particular project must be assessed relative to its own specific objectives and environment.
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Dimensions of Capability

- Business model and architecture
- Collaboration ready
- Data assets and requirements
- Governance
- Information policies
- Leaders and champions
- Organizational compatibility
- Performance evaluation
- Project Management
- Resources
- Secure environment
- Stakeholder identification
- Strategic planning
- Technology acceptance
- Technology compatibility
- Technology knowledge
Dimension Examples ...

**Governance**
- Limited or no governance mechanism
- Clearly defined, organized, empowered, and active governance mechanism

**Leaders & Champions**
- No one acting effectively to lead & champion the initiative
- Strong, effective leadership & championing
This dimension deals with the mechanisms to set policy and direct and oversee the information-sharing initiatives planned or underway.

Evidence of the effectiveness of governance mechanisms will be found in the scope and clarity of policies and other sources of authority as well as in the procedures and organizational arrangements for making decisions and allocating resources.

There will also be evidence of the means to ensure that policies are implemented and decisions are carried out.
High Capability

• Governance mechanisms that have a clear, ample, and viable charter or other sources of authority to move the initiatives forward.
• Operate smoothly and purposely
• Governance policies and procedures are clearly defined and agreed upon
• Appropriate authority to make decisions across disciplines, levels of government, and agencies
• Methods for conflict resolution and consensus are well established.
Low Capability

- Settings with low capability on this dimension lack a clear or authoritative charter to operate and have poor policy making and control mechanisms.
- Decisions and actions are delayed or inhibited by slow decision making, uncertainty, and unresolved conflicts.
Cycle of Assessment Activities

- Identify intended outcomes
- Current situation
- Capability Assessment
- Invest in the initiative
- Tactical & action planning
- Invest in enhanced capability
Basic Assumptions About Capability Assessment

- Should be Formative
- Should be Collective
- Should be Self-administered
Step 1 - For each statement below, please circle the letters to the right that best represent how much you agree or disagree. As you think about each statement, please use the space on the following page next to that statement to describe the evidence or experience your response is based on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example: This statement is short.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (SA)</th>
<th>Agree (A)</th>
<th>Not Sure (NS)</th>
<th>Disagree (D)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (SD)</th>
<th>Don't Know (DK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We actively seek opportunities for collaboration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a substantial record of successful collaboration across organizational boundaries.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have policies that effectively support collaboration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have management practices that effectively support collaboration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaboration Ready

Threatened by collaboration; lack of resources and support; policies that discourage collaboration; no experience

Actively seek collaboration; readily available resources; supportive policies
We actively seek opportunities for collaboration.

We have a substantial record of successful collaboration across organizational boundaries.

We have policies that effectively support collaboration.

We have management practices that effectively support collaboration.

We have standard operating procedures that effectively support collaboration.

We are willing to commit resources (staff, finances, technology, etc.) across boundaries.

We have effective mechanisms to commit resources across boundaries.

We have an executive-level champion of collaborative activities.

We have high levels of stakeholder support for collaboration.
Step 1 - For each statement below, please circle the letters to the right that best represent how much you agree or disagree. As you think about each statement, please use the space on the following page next to that statement to describe the evidence or experience your response is based on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: This statement is short.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We actively seek opportunities for collaboration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a substantial record of successful collaboration across organizational boundaries.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have policies that effectively support collaboration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have management practices that effectively support collaboration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have standard operating procedures that effectively support collaboration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are willing to commit resources (staff, finances, technology, etc.) across boundaries.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have effective mechanisms to commit resources across boundaries.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have an executive-level champion of collaborative activities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have high levels of stakeholder support for collaboration.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpreting the patterns and mark the dimensions

Threatened by collaboration; lack of resources and support; policies that discourage collaboration; no experience

Actively seek collaboration; readily available resources; supportive policies
Project Management Ratings

Average Rating

- Formal PM Responsibility
- Tech Training
- PM Methods
- PM Technology
- Link PM & Objectives
- Use PM Reports
- Shared PM Responsibility
- Risk Assess & Conting
- Ample PM Resources

Legend:
- Executive
- Steering
- Technology
- Total
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What is METER?

METER is an online, interactive tool to assist governments and decision makers at any level throughout the world in developing, monitoring, refining and improving the context within which information and communication technologies are used to transform government, in a sense in creating the context for e-government.

Transforming government through an e-government strategy is not an easy endeavor. Realizing this transformation requires a fundamental change in how a government delivers public services and in how the public interacts with the government. E-Government plays a central role in this transformation. E-Government, however, cannot materialize by simply imposing new technologies onto existing operations of government. New capability must be created through commitment, legal, policy-related, organizational and technological changes. E-Government requires policy shifts as well as operational changes. If governments are to be effective in creating an enabling environment for e-government, leaders must commit to the changes regardless of the level or complexity of these changes.

METER consists of five main pillars, or building blocks, considered as key to the establishment of a supportive enabling environment for e-government. The pillars are: commitment, legal, vision and policy, organization, and technology. Within each pillar, there are a number of sub-themes and related statements identifying essential factors, choices, and challenges likely to influence a government's capability to effectively harness technology as an enabling force for government transformation.

Conceived to serve as an advisory tool, METER is designed to assist governments to identify the issues affecting e-government development that need to be addressed. Thus, METER helps to determine and monitor a country's current state of affairs with regard to the establishment of an environment that enables e-government development. In this way, it guides policy makers and government officials in their e-government development initiatives by raising their awareness and by drawing their attention to key issues that need to be tackled and properly addressed.

It is essential that a government takes stock of and assesses its national enabling environment before embarking on the preparation and realization of its e-government strategy and development plan and before deciding to invest in new e-government programs so as to ensure the success of these initiatives.

Use your mouse to click on each of the METER categories to assess your government in a chosen category.
Need to gather the current evaluation / survey for the baseline aligned to objectives.
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