

T06P04 / Implementing Innovation: Theory, Praxis, Policies

Topic : T06 / Policy Implementation

Chair : Evangelia Petridou (NTNU Social Research and Mid Sweden University)

Second Chair : Inga Narbutaite Aflaki (Karlstad University)

Third Chair : Lee Miles (Bournemouth University Disaster Management Centre)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

The lines between public private management in the field of the provision of services of general interest have been blurred increasingly for at least the past couple of decades. And yet, most associate innovative practices with the private sector, whereas change in bureaucracies is thought of in terms of change (not necessarily for the best) or simply reforms. However, the public sector does, indeed, innovate and in fact many innovations were developed as a means of addressing a new kind of wicked problems involving arduous political environments and fragmented jurisdictions and often inadequate resources (Harris and Kinney, 2003; Steelman, 2010; Windrum, 2008). Furthermore, for innovation to flourish that is, to be implemented successfully, Steelman argues that structural foundations have to be created in order to compete with the ones that the innovation seek to change or replace and create conditions that may foster innovation over time (2010). Here we refer to 'innovation' as the degree that adoption of programs departs from tradition. The implementation of these means or ends is inherent to the concept of innovation.

In light of serious global issues (such as climate change or the refugee crisis) as well as everyday challenges (such as the effective provision of public goods) affecting local political structures, we seek to open the black box of implementing public sector innovation. This means that our focus is not on the diffusion of innovation, but rather on the implementation of innovative practices. Our departure point is the taxonomy of public sector innovation outlined by Windrum (2008) comprising six types of innovation. The first three have been researched extensively in the private sector and it would be fruitful to be examined further in the public sector. These are (i) service innovation; (ii) service delivery innovation, and (iii) administrative and organizational innovation. The remaining three are: (iv) conceptual innovation, involving the development of new ways of thinking challenging old assumptions; (v) policy innovation as the result of learning resulting in the development of new policy concepts, and (vi) systemic innovation underpinning new ways of interacting with other stakeholders. Researching the implementation of innovation based on this taxonomy allows for the interrogation of actors, institutions and the interactions between them in a variety of substantive policy sectors and country settings, thus having a clear theoretical and empirical added value. The object of this panel is to unpack the drivers and mechanisms fostering different kinds of innovation according the taxonomy above in a variety of policies and institutional contexts.

References

Harris, M., & Kinney, R. (2003). Introduction. In M. Harris & R. Kinney (Eds.), *Innovation and Entrepreneurship in State and Local Governments* (pp. 1-32). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Steelman, T. A. (2010). *Implementing Innovation: Fostering Enduring Change in Environmental and Natural Resource Governance*. Washington, D:C.: Georgetown University Press.

Windrum, P. (2008). *Innovation and Entrepreneurshi in Public Services*. In P. Windrum & P. Koch (Eds.), *Innovation in Public Sector Services: Entrepreneurship, Creativity and Management* (pp. 3-10). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Under what conditions does the public sector innovate and which factors foster the implementation of innovation? Most associate innovative practices with the private sector, whereas change in bureaucracies is thought of in terms of change or reforms. However, the public sector does innovate and many innovations were developed as a means of addressing a new kind of wicked problems involving arduous political environments, fragmented jurisdictions and often inadequate resources (Harris and Kinney, 2003; Steelman, 2010; Windrum, 2008). Furthermore, for innovation to flourish that is, to be implemented successfully, Steelman argues that structural foundations have to be created in order to compete with the ones that the innovation seek to change or replace and create conditions that may foster innovation over time (2010).

In this panel we focus on the puzzle of implementation of innovative practices, policies and institutional

arrangements as a response to increasingly complex policy problems. We seek a selection of papers representing the breadth of policy implementation scholarship. We aim at bringing together a diverse group of theoretical, methodological, and empirical orientations with a view to expanding the horizons of methodology and praxis in implementation research.

We invite scholars to examine, among other themes:

- What institutional factors foster innovation?
- What constitutes innovative practices?
- What strategies to actors use to implement innovation?

References

Harris, M., & Kinney, R. (2003). Introduction. In M. Harris & R. Kinney (Eds.), *Innovation and Entrepreneurship in State and Local Governments* (pp. 1-32). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Steelman, T. A. (2010). *Implementing Innovation: Fostering Enduring Change in Environmental and Natural Resource Governance*. Washington, D:C.: Georgetown University Press.

Windrum, P. (2008). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Public Services*. In P. Windrum & P. Koch (Eds.), *Innovation in Public Sector Services: Entrepreneurship, Creativity and Management* (pp. 3-10). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

T06P04 / Implementing Innovation: Theory, Praxis, Policies

Chair : Evangelia Petridou (NTNU Social Research and Mid Sweden University)

Second Chair : Inga Narbutaite Aflaki (Karlstad University)

Third Chair : Lee Miles (Bournemouth University Disaster Management Centre)

Session 1

Wednesday, June 28th 14:00 to 16:00 (Block B 2 - 1)

Discussants

Inga Narbutaite Aflaki (Karlstad University)

Collaboration in Routine Emergency Management: Lessons from Sweden

Jorgen Sparf

Evangelia Petridou (NTNU Social Research and Mid Sweden University)

Effective collaborations in emergency management is the Holy Grail for practitioners in Sweden and elsewhere. More than mere coordination, interorganizational collaboration is deemed by many as the most optimal arrangement to share resources and respond to emergencies more quickly and efficiently. It is also considered to be the source of a broadly and rather vaguely defined concept of greater good. Such collaborations tend to be uncritically accepted as innovative, especially in instances of large-scale disasters or planned events while routine emergency management arrangements tend to be under researched. This research in an in-depth case study of an interorganizational collaboration in the greater Stockholm region in Sweden concerning routine emergency management. The collaboration comprises the physical relocation of one operator each from seven organizations in the area and the establishment of the "Collaboration Cluster". Rather than attempt to define the concept of "greater good" we set out to evaluate the quality of collaboration from the perspective of each member organization. We build a multi-dimensional model to assess the expectations of each organization at the political, managerial, and operative level. What is more, we view the Collaboration Cluster as a network at the operative level and for this reason we employ formal Social Network Analysis (SNA) to tease out network variables that have an effect on the quality of collaboration.

Payment by Results and Social Impact Bonds: theory and evidence

Chris Fox (Manchester Metropolitan University)

Kevin Albertson (Manchester Metropolitan University Business School)

Chris O'Leary (Manchester Metropolitan University)

Over recent years there has been increasing interest in 'Payment by Results' (Pay for Success in the US) as a model for commissioning innovative services in the public sector. A Social Impact Bond (SIB) (Pay for Success Bonds in the US) is a class of PbR contract where the finance needed to make the contract work is provided by private investment, usually social investors, rather than the service provider. These models blur the boundaries between public and private sector delivery of services. A stated aim of most PbR and SIB schemes as been to encourage innovation in service design and delivery and find new ways to address 'wicked issues' in social policy.

This paper asks whether PbR and Social Impact Bonds are an effective way to encourage innovation in the design and delivery of services and, in a UK context, what future they have in the new government's thinking. The paper includes three main sections. First, we set out a brief history of PbR and SIB and chart its recent growth, particularly in the UK. Secondly, we report on the results of a Rapid Evidence Review of the literature on PbR and SIB. Although formal evaluations of both PbR and SIB are still limited some evaluation findings are starting to be published and some tentative conclusions on the potential for

innovation are drawn from the REA. Finally we consider key theoretical issues raised by the growth in PbR and SIB, again with a particular focus on the UK. A key question is the extent to which PbR and SIBs are part of re-alignment of the role of the state the provision of welfare services. The UK Cabinet Office (undated, unnumbered) is clear that they expect that "SIBs shift financial risk of new interventions away from the public sector, towards investors, resulting in innovation and diversification of service provision" and most PbR contracts have been won by private sector organisations or private sector-led consortiums. But does this amount to a fundamental shift in state responsibilities? The limited academic discourse to date tends to argue that it does. So, for example, McHugh et al (2013: 253) argue that SIBs are "the latest stage in an ideological shift which favours removing delivery of social and welfare services from conventional public or third sector providers", Dowling and Harvie (2014: 869) see social investment as a "deepening of capitalist disciplinary logics into the social fabric" and Lowe and Wilson (2016) apply the New Public Management (NPM) paradigm and see the rise of PbR as representing an extension of market power extended by commissioners towards private providers of social services (Lowe and Wilson, 2016). However, In the UK there has always been a mixed economy in the provision of 'public services' in terms of the balance between public and private provision, finance and control (Hills 2011). Recent pronouncements by the new government led by the prime minister of the UK, Theresa May, suggest a possible re-calibration of government policy with a retreat from laissez-faire liberalism and more emphasis on government regulation and a 'shared society' (May 2017). If this is more than a rhetorical shift what are the implications for PbR and SIB and their role in promoting innovation?

Renegotiating governance via civil society public partnerships? An example from reception of asylum seeking minors in Gothenburg city

Inga Narbutaite Aflaki (Karlstad University)

Abstract

The recent challenges of major immigration flows and other wicked social issues in Sweden have contributed to reinventing forms of local governance – collaborative partnerships between civil society and public actors ("Idéburna offentliga partnerskap" or IOP) as a third-way alternative to commissioning services and traditional state grants. Being both a conceptual and organisational innovation this form of governance faces numerous challenges in providing more qualitative and targeted service delivery. The aim of the article is to explore how this new type of governance copes with a major puzzle – sustaining a fruitful partnership, more specifically, through balancing the different roles and value basis ascribed to public and civil society realms. The article questions whether and how IOP may enable civil society a more active role in welfare policies and services without undermining their distinctiveness. The arguments of the article are based on a case study of currently the largest IOP in Sweden involving ten organisations in the work with unaccompanied minors in Gothenburg city. The Gothenburg partnership is explored against the collaboration norms in the Swedish compact and the norms of balanced relations suggested by previous research and is found to live up to their major expectations. We conclude, based on Gothenburg experiences, that there is a potential of a new evolving pattern of post-contractual relations to address wicked social issues and social investment especially in local contexts.

Community-Based Elderly Service Innovation in Shanghai

Wei Li (Huazhong University of Science and Technology)

A network model of service delivery has been considered to be a major innovation in public sector management in the last decades (Goldsmith and Eggers 2004). Based upon comparison of two street-office networks of community-based elderly care service delivery in Shanghai, China, we propose a causal path analysis which clarifies and illustrates how resource availability mediates the impact of network structure on network performance, with a particular focus on its ability to innovate.

Key words: network structure, government resource availability, public service innovation, community-based elderly services

Learning and innovation in the design of rules for the implementation of public policies: The Brazilian experience with rainwater harvesting systems

Vitor Santana (Ministry of Social Development of Brazil)

The utilization of rainwater has become an increasingly frequent solution in the water supply strategy,

especially in a context of increasing water scarcity from surface and underground sources. Since 2003, the Brazilian government has been supporting the implementation of social technologies for access to water, whether for human consumption or for food production, as part of the strategy to guarantee the food and nutritional security of low-income families residing in the rural areas of regions with water shortages.

However, more recently it was identified that the rules that were being used were embedded in a set of obstacles that caused a huge slowness in the implementation process of this policy. It was from the diagnosis of the main bottlenecks, associated mainly with the paralyzing bureaucratic rites to be followed by the actors involved, that the proposal of a new regulation of the execution process appeared.

The aim of the paper is to present the context from which they were introduced mechanisms to simplify the implementation of social technologies of access to water for poor rural populations in regions of water scarcity situation in Brazil. From the presentation of the implementation logic hitherto used in the government action, is presented so that learning about the institutional design of policy contributed to the formulation of a new legal framework, with the prospect give more speed to its implementation process, eliminating bureaucratic bottlenecks that resulted in significant delays in the delivery of expected results. The challenge was to create mechanisms adapted to the institutional arrangement hitherto considered most effective by adjusting other and / or creating new mechanisms to overcome obstacles during implementation.

The first results show that the execution model introduced from this new legal framework has been able to give the expected answers, considering that the first implementation phase has been carried out substantially more quickly than from the instruments used previously. Currently, the pace of technology deployment is twice as fast, which means a more effective response from the state to a demand that is essential, access to water. In this way, it is understood that the process that led to the design of new rules of implementation of this policy can be used with positive results in similar contexts.