

2012

MARYLAND OPPORTUNITY COMPACTS

PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS IN
ACTION CHANGING LIVES, SYSTEMS,
AND POLICIES



**OPEN SOCIETY
FOUNDATIONS**

The Open Society Foundations work to build vibrant and tolerant democracies whose governments are accountable to their citizens. Working with local communities in more than 70 countries, the Open Society Foundations support justice and human rights, freedom of expression, and access to public health and education.

Acknowledgement: The Special Fund for Poverty Alleviation (SFPA) would like to thank Shelley Waters Boots, an independent consultant to the SFPA, for providing the research and writing for this report. Please direct questions or comments regarding this report to Shelley Waters Boots at watersboots@hotmail.com or Mimi Corcoran at mcorcoran@sorosny.org.

Open Society Foundations
400 West 59th Street
New York, NY 10019
www.soros.org

Copyright © 2012 by the Open Society Foundations



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
THE SPECIAL FUND FOR POVERTY ALLEVIATION	4
OPPORTUNITY COMPACTS.....	5
LESSONS LEARNED FROM MARYLAND COMPACTS	10
LOOKING FORWARD	13

MARYLAND OPPORTUNITY COMPACTS

PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS IN ACTION CHANGING LIVES, SYSTEMS, AND POLICIES

INTRODUCTION

Every day, there are millions of children across the country that are denied opportunities that affect their long term chances—whether it’s a lack of prenatal and infant health care, an absence of nutritious food, unsafe parks to play in, lack of stable housing, child care that doesn’t stimulate their early learning, crumbling schools, or the absence of a social network to connect them with employers and other caring adults in their lives.

That the decks are stacked in favor of some kids in America and most explicitly stacked against others, is undeniable.

So, in 2009, in the midst of a recession, the Open Society Foundations initiated the Special Fund for Poverty Alleviation in search of strategic investments that would expand opportunity and address these inequalities. This report summarizes the Open Society Foundations’ investment in a particular effort aiming to bridge a partnership between the public sector, private sector investors and non-profit service organizations to try to change the game for children in one community in Maryland.

THE SPECIAL FUND FOR POVERTY ALLEVIATION

George Soros and the Open Society Foundations launched the Special Fund for Poverty Alleviation in April 2009 as a catalytic fund that would spark

innovative investments to address the effects of the crisis in the United States. The Fund made significant investments, but for a limited time, with the bulk of the grants made by the end of 2011, with most projects anticipating completion by 2012. All investments required at least a 1:1 match. At the start, the Special Fund focused on humanitarian relief but then shifted to a focus on scaling and replicating successful direct service interventions using three key levers—benefits access, education, and work. The Fund’s investments focused on transforming life outcomes for individuals while working with federal, state and local governments, and the private sector to remove the structural barriers often inherent in our current systems and policies that limit access and remove opportunity for those in poverty. The Special Fund leadership worked with Open Society Foundations staff and with leadership at Open Society Institute-Baltimore (OSI-Baltimore) to plan strategic investments. They searched for innovative efforts with valued partners that allowed for short-term investments with system-altering impact that help alleviate poverty and expand opportunities for those in need.

Special attention was paid to investing in programs that can be scaled or implemented quickly but with the prospect of long-term sustainability. Because of the short-term nature of the Fund, it was also necessary to significantly tap other expertise and resources. The Fund worked to leverage the capacity of other institutions as grantees and

partners, and the existing leadership and infrastructure in states and cities. The Fund also co-invested with the federal and state governments to influence efforts with the potential for lasting policy change.

The Maryland Opportunity Compact was just the type of investment the Open Society Foundations hoped to find. It relied on short-term initial private capital, but had the potential to create lasting change in how systems serving children are financed. Most directly though, the investment in Maryland's Opportunity Compacts brought new opportunities for Baltimore's children at a time when they needed it most.

OPPORTUNITY COMPACTS

Opportunity Compacts grew out of the efforts of a group of non-profit, foundation, and Baltimore City and Maryland State government officials. These leaders had identified the high numbers of youth in foster care and juvenile justice systems as a critical, must-solve issue and were working to develop innovative approaches that could dramatically reduce the numbers of youth in custodial care without dramatically increasing costs to the state and local governments. Beginning in 2005, The Safe and Sound Campaign, led by Hathaway Ferebee, along with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, began working with others in Baltimore on an idea—what if they could seed an intervention with private investment for children in their community in Baltimore that, if successful, would cost less than the services government currently delivered and would produce better outcomes for the children? These early innovators believed that by negotiating a partnership with state government in advance, they could push the state to redirect subsequent state funding away from ineffective custodial programs towards better, more cost effective interventions. Motivated by the fact that Baltimore

MARYLAND OPPORTUNITY COMPACTS SUMMARY

2005: **Family Recovery Program Opportunity Compact.** Compact targeting substance abuse treatment for 861 parents with children involved in the foster care system. Service intervention affected 861 children and families. **RESULTS:** Significantly reduced the time spent in foster care. 654 children left foster care to live in nurturing and sober homes. Since 2005, has saved the state approximately \$14.8 million.

2007: **Multi-Systemic Therapy Baltimore County Opportunity Compact.** Compact serving 120 youth who are under the supervision of the Department of Juvenile Services with a proven, alternative intervention called Multi-Systemic Therapy. **RESULTS:** Ninety-two percent of youth did not recidivate within 1.5 years. Since 2007, has saved the state \$1.2 million.

2009: **Public Safety Compact.** Compact serving adults in the criminal justice system. The program has provided addiction treatment and re-entry services to 183 adults in the city of Baltimore. **RESULTS:** One hundred-seventeen adults have been released to Baltimore City with full supportive services and drug treatment resulting in a 31% lower recidivism rate over the course of one year and is on track to produce \$1.1 million in savings for this cohort.

2010: **Ready by 21 Jobs Project.** Compact to provide multi-systemic therapy and job training, plus paid internships, recreation and other enriching activities for youth, as well as community conferencing for a broader population of youth within the community. **RESULTS:** As of 2011, 160 youth have been engaged so far, with a 92% success rate for those who would have been confined. Additional project results will be available in 2012.



Photo credit: © Ed Kashi/VII Photos for the Open Society Foundations.

had hundreds of children languishing in foster care and had still more children in juvenile detention centers, they crafted and proposed the first of Maryland's Opportunity Compacts to city officials, as well as to state leaders within then Governor Bob Ehrlich's Administration.

In this agreement, the Safe and Sound Campaign secured private sector funding from the Annie E. Casey foundation, the Abell Foundation, the Baltimore Community Foundation, T. Rowe Price Associates Foundation and the law firm of Venable, Baetjer, and Howard to provide a set of evidence-driven services for parents with children involved in the foster care system.¹ Called the Family Recovery Program, case managers work with parents to receive substance abuse referrals and treatment either through the existing publicly funded treatment system or through the direct purchase of additional treatment services. The case managers conduct weekly drug tests of the parent

and provide the court with monthly progress reports on the parent's progress. When parents are successfully getting treatment, these reports help to accelerate reunification with their children from the foster care system.

The idea was that this intervention would produce better results for children and families and also save the state money in costly foster care placements. The agreement they struck with state and local officials was groundbreaking: if the project hit the agreed upon goals of permanency and saw costs savings through reduced time in foster care, then the state of Maryland would agree to fund the initiative at the start up level of service and split any net savings that the service produced between the initiative, which would receive 60 percent of any net savings, and the state's general fund, which would receive 40 percent.

This early compact has served 861 children and families—with 81 percent finding a permanent home outside of the foster care system with parents or with other relatives and 47 percent of these children returning to their familial home with sober parents—a rate that was better than existing reunification efforts used by the child welfare agency. Under the leadership of Molly McGrath-Tierney, director of Baltimore City Department of Social Services, the compact succeeded in decreasing the number of days in foster care—with children leaving care within two years of entering, cutting in half the typical stay in out-of-home placements for the city.ⁱⁱ

Overall these improved outcomes saved the state \$7.2 million and created a funding stream to support the costs of the program (which are approximately \$1.5 million/year). However, the net savings were not shared, due to the recession and a change in administration in the governor’s office. Still, these agreements were game-changing efforts that were producing important results, and in the years that followed, several additional compacts were added. In 2007, with a new Governor, Martin O’Malley, the Safe and Sound Campaign and its partners launched a second compact which targets adolescents who face placement in out-of-home facilities. In this intervention, youth who would

otherwise be placed in an out-of-home care facility are instead provided Multi-Systemic Therapy, a home- and community-based treatment. The third compact in 2009 targets people in prison with non-violent convictions and provided substance abuse treatment designed to decrease the length of incarceration. Finally, the Safe and Sound Campaign recently launched a fourth compact, called Ready by 21 Jobs Initiative.

Ready by 21 Jobs Project

The Ready by 21 Jobs Project is an initiative started in April 2010 that builds on the success of the second compact, using a proven intervention that saves state dollars and improves the life chances of youth involved in the juvenile justice system. The goals of the effort are to increase the success of young people aging out of foster care and/or those on a trajectory that further involves them in the juvenile justice system. This unique intervention not only provides intensive services for a targeted group of children already involved in the juvenile justice system, but also provides opportunities for many youth in the community at risk of system involvement.

As the fund’s director Mimi Corcoran noted, “This compact also linked two areas affecting the lives of youth that often don’t intersect, but should:



Photo Credit: Safe and Sound Campaign. Used with permission.

education and work. It seeded a coordinated strategy within government to look beyond departments and funding streams to ways that we can better allocate resources to accomplish our collective goal of creating opportunity.”

It is also differs from many other projects because the funding was seeded by a truly collaborative financing scheme that included private foundation investment as well as both state and local government support. The project brings together the Department of Human Resources, Department of Juvenile Services, the Governor’s Office for Children, Baltimore City Department of Social Services, the Family League of Baltimore City, the OSI – Baltimore, the Open Society Foundations and the Safe and Sound Campaign.

The Ready by 21 Project is designed to work with up to 100 youth who are facing a court ordered confinement in an “out-of-home” facility. Through this compact, the youth instead enter a proven¹ therapy program called Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST). This intervention focuses on “reducing antisocial behavior of adolescents by addressing the various systems that influence their behavior, including family members, peers, schools, and neighborhoods.”ⁱⁱⁱ MST strives to change how youth interact and respond in their homes, schools, and neighborhoods, finding ways to promote positive social behavior while decreasing antisocial behavior. The family preservation model of service delivery is used where therapists with small

¹ Started in the 1970s, this treatment strategy has been validated through two rigorous studies showing effectiveness in reducing arrests and incarceration among serious juvenile offenders compared to a control group and has produced sustained (2 to 4 years) benefits after the treatment began. According to the Promising Practices Network, it is currently being used in 30 states and in 11 countries outside of the United States, including Australia, Canada, Iceland, Norway, New Zealand, England, the Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, and Denmark.

caseloads (4-6 families at any given time) are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Services are provided to the whole family, not only the youth, and are provided in the family’s home at times convenient to them. The young people are provided with an opportunity to acquire their GED or high school diploma and enroll in a paid pre-apprenticeship program which leads to on-going employment.

This compact provides another 300 young people with job training and job placements services, through a combination of federal summer jobs funding as well as public and private funding for part-time jobs during the school year – enabling year-round work. Youth are given the opportunity to engage in an urban agriculture initiative (Farm to Fork Program), as well as “Youth Development and Peer-to-Peer” jobs where older youth teach other young people academic subjects, sports, culinary arts and a wide range of artistic and cultural arts. The compact architects also built into the project recreational and enrichment programs such as arts, athletic, and volunteer opportunities for up to 400 children to help develop leadership skills, talents, and a strong sense of self. Finally, the Ready by 21 Jobs Project also offers to up to 110 youth (engaged in the above programs) a Community Conferencing program, which uses a skilled facilitator to engage those affected by a crime or conflict and gives them the space to resolve it themselves, within their own community. This program has the support of the Baltimore Police Department as well as the Department of Juvenile Services, as a way to resolve problems within a community that avoids branding a youth with a criminal record but allowing for restitution and peace within the youth’s community.

When totaled, this effort aims to serve up to 800 children in Baltimore, and the project leaders anticipate saving the state \$7 million over two years.^{iv} The initial up-front costs for these various

services and interventions are \$4 million. Financing for this effort came from a range of sources, including private investment from the Open Society Foundations and the Family League of Baltimore City and public sector funding from The Governor's Office for Children, the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services, and the Maryland Department of Human Resources.

Less than one year into the project, 60 children have been served with Multi-Systemic Therapy supports, above the targeted 40 children the program aimed to serve. With the program running less than a year, 13 children had graduated from the apprenticeship portion of the program and are either working or in trade school full-time. Another 24 children had been enrolled in the job training and placement program with more participants joining as the program scaled-up.

Designing Compact Agreements

While these programs may seem straightforward, there are numerous details that make these compacts work. The right partners must be at the table and together, these parties must develop a document that lays out in clear details the terms of the agreement. For all of the Maryland compacts, state agency officials had to agree that new and more innovative services were needed for a portion of the population they were serving. As then Secretary of Juvenile Services Donald Devore noted, "These services are not for everyone, we're

not talking about the kids who are a threat to public safety. But clearly as we looked at this with the (then and now former) Secretary of Human Resource Brenda Donald, we knew we needed to try to reduce the number of children in group homes and residential treatment facilities. And with the state budget crisis, we also needed a way to reduce our costs."

Using the second compact as an illustration, the partners involved had to agree upon the variables to measure to determine if the intervention was successful. In this particular intervention, they agreed to measure recidivism for the children who would otherwise have gone to an out-of-home



Photo credit: © Ed Kashi/VII Photos for the Open Society Foundations.

placement. They had to specify the baseline costs of the out of home placement for children, and then agree on when and how to calculate recidivism. They would get the full cost of the savings counted in the calculation if the child did not recidivate in the 12 months after their referral to MST was accepted. They also calculated a proportional savings credit if the child returned to the Department of Juvenile Services in six months

or nine months from participating in the program. And, they outlined how to accrue savings if the youth moved out of Baltimore County.

Finally, the compact agreement laid out how any costs savings would be used—both the percentage that the state was willing to redeploy to the effort and what the state could retain as savings. In this agreement, the state agreed to continue to fund the number of MST slots laid out in the project. Further, they agreed that 50 percent of any of the costs saved above the costs of maintaining the program would be reallocated to the project team to expand funding for proven interventions for children known to the Department of Juvenile Services.

The mechanics of this agreement to request an appropriation in a grant back to the project management team are complex. Officials within the Department of Juvenile Services and Maryland’s Department of Budget and Management had to find a way to hold funding from one budget year to the next. They did this by using the state’s rainy day fund—to hold funding until outcomes from the compacts were realized and calculated by the Department of Budget and Management. The compact goes on to note that these costs savings can be redeployed “subject to the Governor’s authority under the Executive Budget Amendment,” so that future state budgets can reinvest savings.

This language, while truly innovative, was not binding for the state. Therefore, in several of the past compacts, the state, while continuing to reinvest in the interventions (and in some cases, increasing the funding for the interventions), did not share the excess costs savings with the various compact partners. Citing budget crises and an overall increase in youth detentions (though not from the children being served in the initiative which achieved a success rate 360 percent greater than the status quo), state officials said they could

not share the 50 percent cost savings with the programs.

Still, advocates and compact partners were not discouraged. As Hathaway Ferebee, the executive director of the Safe and Sound Campaign noted, “we still have a program that is nearly impossible to cut: it gets far better outcomes and costs far less than what the state would otherwise be mandated to do. And that, as an organizer, is an important tool to continue reforming the state budget priorities.”

LESSONS LEARNED FROM MARYLAND COMPACTS

In speaking with both philanthropic leaders, the innovative director of the Safe and Sound Campaign and government officials involved in the Maryland Opportunity Compacts, several lessons about these efforts have emerged. These lessons should be useful to recent efforts by the federal government as well as other national leaders (discussed in more detail below) which aim to integrate many of these principles into new ways of financing and sustaining proven interventions for children, individuals, and families.

Public/private partnerships can, and do, work

Private foundations, service providers, organizers and community leaders are all striving to find better ways to create opportunity for all the children within their communities and to ensure that they grow up healthy, get an education, and move to productive work and family lives. Service providers aim to reduce barriers but often struggle to make up for community deficits and address inequalities with limited resources.

Private funders in the form of philanthropies as well as individual donors and investors are looking

for proven organizations and services, but many want a sustainable funding stream to continue the services once it is up and running. Additionally, philanthropy often sits in a unique spot within communities to help forge these partnerships. As Jane Sundius, one of the thought leaders behind the Ready by 21 Project at OSI-Baltimore noted, “It is important for people to know that getting the right people to the table is critical for these efforts. Our role in philanthropy is to take a step back and connect the efforts of good strong organizations on the ground to what states and cities are trying to do - bringing these opportunities together to expand their impact.”

Public sector actors also struggle within the budget constraints they have to deliver new interventions or to test different interventions or supports while also maintaining the services they currently fund. And because the budgets are tilted so heavily towards high-cost responses- like prisons, juvenile facilities, and other after-the-fact responses, the public sector has little discretion or opportunity to re-structure their spending. Further, when entire systems need to be dismantled or significantly re-configured, there are both political and logistical challenges as shifts occur between one system structure and new more effective interventions. For example, significant outside interests and sometimes whole industries often work to keep funding as it currently exists since restructuring programs might mean a loss of government contracts and jobs. Even within government, costs savings from one department within state government (e.g. Corrections) might be recouped and then reallocated to another department (e.g. Human Services), effectively shifting balances of power and control.

Yet, visionary agency leaders like Donald DeVore at the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services knew that this is exactly what government leaders should do if we hope to stem the tide of youth into

his system. As he noted before he left his post in January of 2011, “MST and these alternative solutions are not for all kids in the juvenile system, but this is a tool that can help reform the juvenile justice and criminal justice systems. We have a \$2 billion deficit- so reform will happen-one way or another. But these compacts show us a way to do things differently- to transform practice and serve children more effectively and less expensively. People will resist because these are large systems to change... but we need leaders, inside and outside of government to work together as part of this larger systems reform effort. Otherwise, we’ll end up failing our children.”

Another important component often missing in many communities is this third party broker—like the Safe and Sound Campaign, that bridges the public sector constraints and opportunities, private sector investments, and non-profit service delivery organizations that are ready to prove they can provide better outcomes for kids and families within their communities. The vision of Hathaway Ferebee and her team were lauded by government officials, philanthropic partners and local service providers alike. Indeed, a third party that serves to bridge sectors might be the linchpin to successful compacts, since service delivery organizations often lack the extensive time and skill sets to negotiate state memorandums of understanding (MOUs), fundraise for significant investment capital to start these efforts, and manage a large and diverse group of multiple actors (such as funders, government officials, legislatures, and other stakeholders) required to come together for these compacts.

Finally, those involved in these efforts were not looking for short term pay-outs or quick fixes to long-term problems and entrenched systems. Hathaway Ferebee said it best: “compacts are but one more powerful tool in a long fight for opportunity and justice in our communities.

Structural problems are not solved by one method alone—we need these compact strategies, as well as other practice and policy changes in our communities and at the state and federal levels.”

In the end, compacts in Baltimore are proving, at least on a municipal scale, that there is a way to work together to produce better outcomes for individuals and save public systems money down the line. In a complex world of systems, supports, and funding streams—accomplishing these results is remarkable.

Conditions for Success

While there is no magic formula for ensuring a successful compact, there are some critical ingredients that will help ensure success in replicating this approach in other communities across the county. We outline just a few of these ingredients below.

THE RIGHT ISSUE TO ADDRESS. First, there are many systems that need reforming and countless ways in which we fail our children, families, and adults in communities; however, for a compact to work, the issue needs to be solvable by a compact structure: the current program must currently produce less than optimal outcomes and have a high per capita cost. So far, programs with high intervention costs such as juvenile justice, the prison system, or special education services seem to be good places to look for alternative interventions. Also, projects that tend to work best have a potentially quick (one-two years) turnaround in realizing costs savings, at least initially, given that state budgets and political cycles often are not geared for longer term payoffs.

THE RIGHT INTERVENTION. Second, there must be, for the issue being considered, a viable intervention. The alternative must have widely accepted, existing evidence that has already

determined its success through rigorous evaluation. There are a number of different efforts underway to identify these leading programs—from the Washington State’s Institute for Public Policy work to document evidence-based options to improve statewide outcomes⁷ to the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s policyforresults.org website, which references the best evidence-based programs to improve child outcomes. One key aspect of these evidence-based programs is an established way to target the intervention correctly to the right population, with tested screening tools or other methods, to help ensure that program results can be replicated in a new location.

A CREATIVE AND DETERMINED BROKER. Third, having a broker who is neither an investor nor program provider is essential to the development process. They bring the credibility and vision within the community to organize diverse parties together on innovative projects like compacts. They share the risk and when partners question the number of barriers to overcome, they remind the leaders that the existing programs do not work, often harm more than they help and consume a disproportionate amount of state dollars. A broker continually focuses the group on the potential benefits and maintains good collaboration between public, private, and non-profit sectors.

THE RIGHT LEADERSHIP. Fourth, at a number of levels, the right leadership is needed to ensure that the compact effort is successful. Within a community, you need a visionary broker who can work honestly with multiple parties. You also need strong service organizations that believe in data-driven accountability. The right leadership within local and state agencies is also critical—with administrators and officials who are willing to innovate on behalf of their clients and community and make good on funding promises if the intervention is successful in producing better outcomes and saving taxpayer dollars.

STRONG INVESTMENT PARTNERS. Fifth, having strong investor partners is key. These partners bring important seed funding to the effort, but that is just a part of their role. Funders also bring a willingness to put their names and reputations into an effort that will help shift public spending down the road. They are key in keeping the public partners and leaders at the table – using their investments and reputations to keep all partners true to their agreements.

METRICS AND MECHANISMS. Finally, successful compacts have strong, and agreed upon metrics for outcomes. Data drives these initiatives and thinking through the metrics early on is imperative. Along with that is a mechanism and method for re-deploying public funds into the effort, if the agreed upon outcomes are achieved. Funders are often drawn to these efforts by a guarantee that the public sector – the more sustainable funding partner over the long-term—will re-invest savings and change the way it addresses the issue or population within the community. A clear and binding compact is needed that goes beyond budget crises, changes in political leadership and other shifting sands. With the right mechanism in place, compacts can help ensure that parties make good on their promises and will allow compacts to remain a viable option in testing innovative, alternative interventions and expanding opportunity for individuals.

LOOKING FORWARD

Looking forward, there are a number of ways in which communities can take the lessons on compacts and replicate their effects. Most directly, communities in other states can test the power of compacts—either through similar interventions such as Multi-Systemic Therapy, re-entry interventions, or other proven strategies with the

potential to achieve better outcomes with fewer costs. Given the state budget crises looming in most statehouses across the country, now might be the best time to investigate a public/private partnership with state officials who are desperate to find cost savings in their budgets.

In addition to this important work at the state level, there have been several national developments that are complementary to the ideals of Opportunity Compacts. Advocates, researchers, policymakers, and foundations have watched with interest an effort being tested in the United Kingdom around social impact bonds. Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) are a new, experimental investment tool that brings private investment to promising social policy innovations. Under a social impact bond, private investors (philanthropies, individuals) invest in an intervention that promises to achieve better social outcomes for less than what government currently spends. If the program meets the agreed upon outcome goals, the government pays the investors back with interest. But if the program fails, government agencies don't reinvest in the effort or provide a return on the investment.

On the surface, SIBs focus less on re-investing public sector funding into the programs being tested and more on attracting new capital investors and repaying investors if better outcomes are achieved. Still, many of the components of a SIB are the same as components within Opportunity Compacts in that private dollars seed alternative interventions—reducing the up-front costs for government, and there is an explicit agreement with government on what happens when and if better outcomes are achieved for a particular population. Both efforts also focus on creating high quality alternative programs that provide positive outcomes for the clients being served at a lower cost—no easy task given the complexities of implementation and model fidelity

that have plagued social policy programs in the past. Recently, the Rockefeller Foundation provided support to the Nonprofit Finance Fund to help initiate a Social Impact Bond in the United States. Earlier this year, Massachusetts became the first state to issue an RFP for social impact bond strategies within the state. Regardless of the outcomes of these efforts, shared lessons between Opportunity Compacts and these emerging efforts to launch SIBs within the US will be important to track in the months and years ahead.

The Obama Administration has picked up on the innovative aspects of SIBs and in the 2012 budget set aside funding within a number of agency budgets to test “Pay for Success” projects. As the President’s 2012 budget documents describe, these projects would allow agencies to make performance based awards designed to “promote innovative strategies to reduce the aggregate level of government investment needed to achieve successful outcomes....”^{vi} While it is unclear at this time whether the federal funding will remain through the budget and appropriations process for this initiative, federal agencies are thinking about opportunities to test these strategies across various programs.

Opportunity Compacts can help improve on approaches like Social Impact Bonds, Pay for Success efforts, or other performance-based contracting by finding ways to ensure that new, successful interventions guarantee changes in public policy and repurpose public financing. In the end, these investments should help re-align government towards providing opportunity to all our citizens.

Acknowledgements

A number of experts and individuals were interviewed in the development of this report. Special thanks to former Secretary Donald Devore, Jane Sundius, Hathaway Ferebee, George Overholser, and Raphael Lopez for describing their work and for their important insights. Additionally, several reviewers provided invaluable input into early drafts of this paper, including Hathaway Ferebee, John Friedel, and Mimi Corcoran.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Opportunity Compact Architects and Intermediaries

The Safe and Sound Campaign

Hathaway Ferebee, Executive Director
John Friedel, Deputy Director and Director of Compact Development
hferebee@safeandsound.org or
jfriedel@safeandsound.org
410.625.7976

Government Officials

Maryland Department of Budget and Management

Marc Nicole, Deputy Director, Budget Analysis
mnicole@dbm.state.md.us
410.260.7288

Baltimore City Department of Social Services

Molly McGrath-Tierney, Director
443.378-4600

Philanthropic Community

The Open Society Foundations

Mimi Clarke Corcoran, Director, Special Fund for Poverty Alleviation
The Open Society Foundations
mcorcoran@sorosny.org
212.548.0662

OSI-Baltimore

Diana Morris, Director
Jane Sundius, Director - Education and Youth Development Program
dmorris@sorosny.org
jsundius@sorosny.org
410.234.1091

Annie E. Casey Foundation

Scot Spencer, Associate Director, Civic Sites
sspencer@aecf.org
410.547.6600

Social Impact Bonds Contacts

Nonprofit Finance Fund

Kristin Giantris, Vice President, Eastern Region
Bill Pinakiewicz, Director New England Program
Kristin.giantris@nffusa.org
William.pinakiewicz@nffusa.org

Social Finance, US

Tracy Palandjian, CEO
tpalandjian@socialfinanceus.org

Third Sector Capital Partners

George Overholser, CEO and Co-Founder
goverhsoler@thirdsectorcap.org
617-252-2929

Other Experts

Jeffrey B. Liebman, Malcolm Wiener Professor of Public Policy at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government
617.495.8518
jeffrey_liebman@harvard.edu

NOTES

ⁱ Safe and Sound Campaign. Personal interview with staff and review of internal documents. February, 2012. Baltimore, MD.

ⁱⁱ Safe and Sound Campaign. Personal interviews with staff and review of internal documents. January, 2011. Baltimore, MD.

ⁱⁱⁱ Safe and Sound Campaign. Personal interviews with staff and review of internal documents. January, 2011. Baltimore, MD.

^{iv} Safe and Sound Campaign. Personal interview with staff and review of internal documents 2011. Baltimore, MD.

^v See: *Return on Investment: Evidence-Based Options to Improve Statewide Outcomes*. July 2011. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Access via the Internet at: <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/11-07-1201.pdf>.

^{vi} Office of Management and Budget. *Fiscal Year 2012 Budget of the U.S. Government: Appendix*. Washington, D.C. Accessed via the internet at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2012/assets/appendix.pdf>.