

MIT OpenCourseWare  
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

11.958 Getting Things Implemented: Strategy, People, Performance, and Leadership  
IAP 2009

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.

Reading Tips and Study Questions:  
DAY TWO—JANUARY 6TH

Required reading

1. *(Case: Discussion A)* The Mikhukhu People of South Africa: A Question of Survival
2. Mark Moore, *Creating Public Value*, pp. 63-76.
3. James Collins and Jerry Porras, *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*, New York: HarperBusiness, 1994, ch. 2.
4. Letts et al., *High Performance Nonprofit Organizations: Managing Upstream for Greater Impact*, pp. 1-5, 15-28.
5. *(Case: Discussion B)* Managing Change or Running to Catch Up?: CARE USA and its Mission in Thailand
6. Collins and Porras, *Built to Last*, interlude and ch. 4.

Overview

Yesterday, we looked mainly at ends rather than means, i.e. definitions of value or “value propositions”—and the need to sustain a mandate to act on them. Now we turn to what it means to develop ideas about the means for producing outcomes effectively. We begin with the development of *organizational strategy*. A number of the core concepts also apply to developing strategy for an initiative or project.

In a sense, “developing” includes *changing* a strategy if and when necessary. And both cases address this: shifting strategy for an organization, not just developing its initial strategy (which was the heart of the Upwardly Global case). Nevertheless, our first case today will center on how to think about a strategy for creating public value and why it might be successful, the second case on the implications of a dramatic *change* in strategy.

Questions + tips for preparing Case “A”:

This is a very short case. I suggest reading it through quickly, then doing readings 2 through 4, then re-reading the case to address these questions as you prepare for class discussion:

1. Why exactly does the organization in this case (MIPESA) *need* a strategy? It seems to have made a difference in the world so far, under enormous adversity, without any formal recipe of the kind implied in the Mark Moore reading.
2. Using the Moore reading to conduct a strategic analysis: How has MIPESA’s *external environment* changed in recent years? What new, public-serving



*mission(s)* are suggested? How well aligned is MIPESA's existing *capacity* to pursue such missions? Think about the Letts et al. discussion of capacity, in particular.

3. Defining options and recommending: What are MIPESA's strategic options, and what would you recommend that the organization do?
4. Compare Letts et al.'s arguments to what Collins and Porras term "clock building" in the private sector. In what ways is a nonprofit or nongovernmental organization's interaction with its external environment similar to or different from that of a government agency entity or for-profit company with their respective environments?

### Questions + tips for preparing Case "B":

Life in and around many organizations, especially those doing challenging public-interest work, is often bewildering and distracting: attention is scattered, problems are many, supporters too few, the impacts of your work can be something of a mystery, and inboxes are filled to overflowing. (As an aside, when I worked in the Clinton Administration, I had four overflowing physical inboxes on my desk, a deluged email inbox and my staff's notion of the "ultimate" inbox – my desk chair!)

While many decision-makers are hungry for good analysis—which implies persuasion via evidence, not just rhetoric or good salesmanship—they don't want to wade through excess verbiage or listen to long presentations to find the most important evidence *or* the insights that follow on it. So here's an exercise in clear analysis and concise communication of the results:

You've been recruited to a team consulting to CARE USA on the major challenges and opportunities the organization faces (discussed in the case) as it tries hard to serve a changing world. Read the case and accompanying reading, then outline your answers to these questions (and be prepared to discuss them in class), addressing your team leader, who wrote this note:

Thanks for taking this on. Your analysis will give us the running start we really need. I want to meet with CARE next week, and to prepare for that, we need to give the entire team a concise overview of this organization—where it has come from and where it may need to go. For now, pitch your thoughts to me and the team as analytic background. No need to "sell" your ideas with the client's ears in mind (not yet), though by all means pay attention to feasibility in writing up your recommendations. My questions are below ...

1. What was the CARE strategy that emerged in the founding years of the organization? That is, how did CARE act on its mission and get resources from its external environment in the early years? During this period, what kinds of operating capacity did CARE need to action this strategy?)



2. In the 1980's and 90s, what key features of CARE USA's external environment changed, and why are those changes important for the organization's strategy?
3. Should CARE USA have added "development assistance" to its overall strategy or not? Provide a few pros and cons along with your bottom-line preliminary assessment on this question. And how, if at all, would such move "preserve the core [yet] stimulate progress" in the terms Collins and Porras use in *Built to Last*?
4. If CARE USA is to change its overall strategy to include the goals of "development assistance", what changes to operating capacity and to the organization's relationship to its external environment might be important to "align" the organization with the new strategy? As you consider needed changes, think about CARE USA's handling of the challenges and opportunities posed by the CARE Thailand situation. You clearly cannot provide a detailed blueprint or list of operational specifics, but try to identify the big elements that you think CARE USA would have to put together to align the parts with the new strategy