

Can government play moneyball essay example

[Economics](#), [Budget](#)



Every government needs funds to move its economy that is to propel it. These funds emanate from taxation and other sources such as issue of treasury bills and securities, borrowing (both internal and external) amongst others. As the government goes through elective politics measures must be put in place to ensure such funds are used in the most efficient and effective manner to pose itself as an accountable government. Therefore, they will try to fund programs that will live a lasting mark on the face of its citizens. Transition to moneyball is not a one day or night event; it's rather a progressive concern that must be pursued with great zeal. However, politics, personal interest and opposition on the running government will always curb such positive trend.

Effects of politics on policy formulation and implementation

The money ball suggested to replace baseball is keenly focusing on data paramount in making decisions pertaining to whether a program should be funded, the level of funding and whether to stop funding certain programs. Decisions are made not due to political influence and partisan politics. The article, for example, clearly brings out the strong voice of politics in the budget process that is in determining the priority of funding. They also are in a position to reduce or increase spending to the various programs operating under the federal government. Examples of programs given are health care, education programs to diminish poverty, youth programs. The congressman comes out strongly influencing the funding.

The politics have a negative influence in policy formulation and implementation. Most of the decision on the funding is based on personal interests. For example in the article there is the mention of one congress-

woman of Nevada, Shekkey Berkley in a meeting of congress-men in 2008 opposing a positive funding proposal in the dialysis industry. This was given by a budget expert; peter which was turned down. She accuses the budget expert and his colleagues of aiming to destroy the dialysis industry. She undermines their expertise saying they don't even have a clue of the kidney dialysis.

They hardly involve experts on the field to advice them. An attempt of the experts to engage them in such discussions just leaves them attracting more criticism of their " fancy analysis". For example, the democrats and republicans insisted on the stimulus bill (2009) funding and which they then worked to increase it in what is termed as " Obama care" legislation (2010). This was based on less valuable data scanned on the same. Evidence of the effectiveness of a program is not a criterion when passing some legislation. The mechanisms to see its proper implementation are not a consideration at all.

Politicians are very ignorant with analyzing collected information. For example, the congress seems not to consider or rather ignore the information collected on the effectiveness of the already implemented programs. For example, Bush administration is on record for having introduced a performance measure initiative done by the " Program assessment Rating tool" (PART). This aimed at identifying the federal government funded programs that did not perform as advertised to drive a strategic thinking. This was just politics in play. Some projects have adverse effects but still continue being funded. Politicians have also been coerced to influence policies positively.

Some are also calculative in their decisions. For example is the New York mayor who has better approach funding programs that seems to have promising future. The ones that have a potential to reduce poverty, to generate more returns to low income earners amongst other positive outcomes are prioritized.

Similarly public management initiatives have been downplayed by politics. Most of the initiatives need politicians' involvement in formulation and implementation. They don't focus on their success. When they pass legislation on funding several programs they don't draft strategies to ensure that tax payers' money are not wasted in lofty programs.

Some strategies by state budget committees and state departments have been frustrated by politicians. For example, the department of justice did a resourceful research on the funding scared straight program. The report depicted that the outcomes of the program was an increase in the likelihood of more kids likely to commit crimes. Funny enough the politicians continue to support the funding of such a program. This thwarts the efforts of committed workforces with great skills to enhance effectiveness in the federal government funding. Another example is on the event start program where the office of the management and budget spearheaded by John was attempting wanted to relocate funds from this program because of its poor performance.

Unfortunately having been founded a well liked republican congress-man and formerly a chairman of house education committee, the efforts by the public management experts are thwarted by the congress.

Other organizations have also been of great help. For example, NGOs like

Results for America have also joined the trend. This is advocating for at least one percent of total funds committed total program funding for analysis and evaluation.

In conclusion therefore the federal government is paving a trend of a movement from a base ball to money ball. This is through a rigorous analysis of programs and holding the politicians accountable for their actions in respect to their decisions related to funding programs.

Reference

Orszag, P., & Bridgeland, J. (2013). N/A. CAN GORVERNMENT PLAY MONEYBALL, n/a (n/a), 63-66.