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"The picture’s pretty bleak, gentlemen. ... The world’s climates are changing, the mammals are taking over, and we all have a brain about the size of a walnut."
On one hand….

The “picture’s pretty bleak” –

Many people and communities plagued by daunting problems

Community-based organizations under severe funding pressures

Governments facing unprecedented fiscal constraints
On the other….

**Reasons for optimism and resolve –**

**Significant resources**

**Innovative people** with a **long tradition of solving our biggest problems**

**Many effective solutions** already being deployed in communities
Many inspiring examples
An amazing decade

CIS: 1,250,000
YV: 18,465
TFA: 750,000
NFP: 26,000
CEO: 3,722
BELL: 15,436
KIPP: 41,000
Year Up: 1,900
The problem

- High School Dropouts
- Teen Pregnancy Rate
- Reduced Recidivism
- High School and College Completion

**PERCENT OF NEED SERVED**

- CIS
- YV
- TFA
- NFP
- CEO
- BELL
- KIPP
- Year Up
Pathways to closing the gap

Org. strategies: scale impact
Field strategies: affect all
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The big idea

“The bottom line is clear: solutions to America’s challenges are being developed every day at the grass roots – and government shouldn’t be supplanting those efforts, it should be supporting those efforts.

“Instead of wasting taxpayer money on programs that are obsolete or ineffective, government should be seeking out creative, results-oriented programs ... and helping them replicate their efforts across America.”

- President Obama, June 30, 2009
“Tiered-evidence initiatives”

By 2011, the Obama Administration supported six initiatives to drive scaling of innovative, evidence-based programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invest in Innovation (i3)</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>DoED</td>
<td>$650 million in FY10+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Innovation Fund</td>
<td>Econ. opportunity, youth dev., health</td>
<td>CNCS</td>
<td>$50 million in FY10,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Innovation Fund</td>
<td>Job training</td>
<td>DOL</td>
<td>$125 million in FY11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Pregnancy Prevention</td>
<td>Teen pregnancy prevention</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>$100 million in FY10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Visiting</td>
<td>Maternal health, child, family</td>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>$1.5 billion over 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. College Challenge Fund</td>
<td>Job training</td>
<td>DOL, DoED</td>
<td>$2 billion over 4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prerequisites to scaling

Bridgespan’s experience suggests four key conditions must be in place:

1. **Evidence** that the program/intervention actually generates **strong results**

2. **Program model** whose **key elements** can be **standardized** and **reproduced**

3. **Organizational** and **financial capability** to execute effective scaling plan

4. **Determination** to drive **potential impact**
Who is the “best that ever was?”

What does the evidence say?
Critical issues to address

**Effective scaling of impact requires answers to these questions:**

- What is the **ultimate purpose** of your scaling?
- What **pathway** in which **locations** will you use?
- How will you deliver **key “central” functions**?
  - High fidelity implementation
  - On-going quality control (services, brand)
  - Training, knowledge management
  - Performance measurement
- How will you **fund** the **center and sites**?
Alternative pathways for scaling

**Branching**
- Spread through local sites managed by one large org.
- Grow in new locations
- Grow in existing locations
- Partnership/joint-venture

**Affiliation**
- Spread through formal relationships with other organizations
- Distribute via existing network
- Provide certification/TA+QC to partners

**Dissemination**
- Spread through provision of information and/or technical assistance to others
- Set up and hand-off to partners
- Provide training and/or TA (but no QC)
- Provide open-source info (eg website)

**Economies of scale**
- Low
- High

**Control over implementation, quality**
- High
- Low

Source: TBG analysis
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=High potential options for BELL
Distribute via existing networks
Enable others
Leverage technology
Each pathway has tradeoffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What must you believe?</th>
<th>What are the pros?</th>
<th>What are the cons?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branching</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong outcomes require high operational control</td>
<td>• Partners offer significant relevant capability</td>
<td>• Parties are able to generate sufficient outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High demand from funders and customers</td>
<td>• Partners can implement with high fidelity</td>
<td>• Economics are sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scale goals can be reached</td>
<td>• High demand from partners to embrace the model</td>
<td>• Other pathways are not desirable or practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No piloting / experimenting costs and time required</td>
<td>• Partners could take on some of the program costs</td>
<td>• High potential for rapid scale, assuming customer demand, capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Highest likelihood of consistent outcomes</td>
<td>• Partners with large networks may support rapid scale</td>
<td>• Lowest cost pathway per unit of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must relinquish control over some/many aspects of model</td>
<td>• May risk quality outcomes and less clear attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must relinquish control over some/many aspects of model</td>
<td>• Requires new skills and capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must relinquish control over some/many aspects of model</td>
<td>• Must adapt program model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Must relinquish control over some/many aspects of model</td>
<td>• Must relinquish control over some/many aspects of model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact
Execution
Sustainability
Collaborating to accelerate social impact
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