LEADING CHANGE HANDBOOK

Concepts and Tools

Jody Spiro, Ed.D.

To download the handbook, please go to www.wallacefoundation.org

LEADING CHANGE HANDBOOK: *Concepts and Tools*

Table of Contents

FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. ASSESSING READINESS 3
- Main concepts
- Using the tool
- Tool: *Readiness Rubric*

III. ANALYZING STAKEHOLDERS 7
- Main concepts
- Using the tool
- Tool: *Stakeholder Strategizer*

IV. PLANNING EARLY WINS 14
- Main concepts
- Using the tool
- Tool: *Early Win Wonder*

V. MINIMIZING RESISTANCE 16
- Main concepts
- Using the tool
- Tool: *Resistance Reducer*

VI. USING COLLABORATIVE PLANNING 19
- Main concepts
- Using the tool
- Tool: *Collaborative Planning Parameters*

VII. SPREADING AND SUSTAINING CHANGE 26
- Main concepts
- Using the tool
- Tool: *Scale & Sustainability Score Sheet*

FOREWORD and ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This handbook and the tools it contains have been many years in the making. They were born and developed from a sense that there are several useful techniques for leading change that could be translated into tools to assist busy leaders. They reflect, and owe to, a rich body of thinking in this field as well as my own career experiences. This includes work I began as head of professional development for the operations department at Chase Manhattan Bank and continued through stints at the New York City Board of Education, Long Island University, and through my international public sector reform work at the Soros Foundations and Education Development Center. Over the last 16 years, hundreds of my students at NYU's Wagner Graduate School of Public Service have used these tools and materials. Most recently, during my work at The Wallace Foundation, state and district leaders participating in the Foundation's education leadership initiative have been using them as they pursue lasting change in their education systems.

The ideas and views expressed in this volume are mine alone. But I wish to acknowledge and thank my colleagues at The Wallace Foundation who helped me in exploring the use of these change tools with the Foundation's grantees. I am especially grateful to Richard Laine, director of the Foundation's education leadership initiative, who believed that these tools would accelerate the work of the grantees; Senior Program Officer Ayeola Boothe-Kinlaw, who co-led workshops with me and read through drafts, providing important feedback; Adriana Escobar, who assisted with the design and formatting of the document; and Lee Mitgang, the Foundation's Director of Editorial Services, who served as editor and thought partner for this handbook.

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

The subject of leading change is of paramount importance for leaders these days since it seems that the only *constant* is *change*[1] Change can be a dynamic and positive force for creating new strategies and putting them in action, stimulating creativity, diversity, learning and growth. But change of the sort this handbook is about is a deliberate disruption of the status quo. While the need for change will often be apparent to many or most of those affected, opposition, resistance and unanticipated consequences are all likely to emerge. These must be taken into account in the planning and implementation. Even positive change can be stressful. An effective change leader can maximize the opportunities of change while minimizing the risks.

Unfortunately many change efforts fail or are less successful than originally conceived. This is not surprising since unforeseen circumstances are likely to arise, participants may feel uncertain and unprepared for what is to come, stakeholders may oppose disruption of their current influence or people may feel disempowered. There can be no guarantee of success up front. Leading change therefore requires continuous analysis of the situation and mid-course corrections. It includes the ability to think several steps ahead and then plan the present with the future in mind, put plans quickly into action and continuously monitor and revise the work to take advantage of -or mitigate- unintended consequences as they arise.

A missing ingredient for many practitioners has been how to translate concepts into action, continuous improvement and sustainable results. This toolkit has been developed to fill that need in several key areas of the change process: assessing and improving participants' readiness; engaging stakeholders; planning "early wins;" minimizing resistance; using collaborative planning methods; and developing ways to bring initiatives to scale and sustain them over time.

As a leader of change, you will need not only to develop strategies, but also to project what will happen to various other parts of the system as a result. It is clearly desirable to plan for change at the beginning of an initiative; however you can enter the change process at any point as long as you recognize the dynamics of the change process and have tools to use. The chart on page two presents an overview of the change process, indicating where a tool in this handbook corresponds to an action step.

Whether one begins at the onset of the planning process or is trying to make mid-course corrections, there are key questions to be addressed: *How can we ensure that what is planned will be well implemented and achieves the original intention? What is the best way to start? How can we keep getting better at what we do and build those improvements into subsequent plans? What would scale and sustainability look like? What steps can we build into our planning and implementation to increase the likelihood of sustaining the desired change and expanding its reach?*

This handbook is designed to help you address these key questions throughout the change process. It includes six tools, a brief description of the underlying concepts of each and suggestions on how to use the tools and the resulting data. The tools are appropriate for any change circumstance: examining the organization internally, the external environment or even as a self-assessment of what you need to do to carry out each action step.

The handbook may be downloaded by going to www.wallacefoundation.org. You may find it helpful to use the tools online where the text boxes will expand to accommodate your narrative and where the calculations for the *Scale & Sustainability Score Sheet* will be done automatically when you click on the "total" boxes.

---

[1] Change means something different from the current state, a departure from the status quo. Change involves going from one situation to another – a period of transition. It is a continuous process. Therefore, change can best be considered as series of destinations that lead to further destinations. In this way, a leader can benchmark goals and indicators of success at various intervals and make course corrections as needed.

LEADING CHANGE ACTION STEPS

Be clear and specific:

- What is the desired change?
- What are the underlying concepts guiding the development of strategy?
- How will you know if you have succeeded?
- What are benchmarks along the way?

Start from where you are

- Assess and improve the readiness of participants
  Tool: *READINESS RUBRIC*
- Analyze stakeholders
  Tool: *STAKEHOLDER STRATEGIZER*

Build in an "early win"

Tool: *EARLY WIN WONDER*

Anticipate resistance

Tool: *RESISTANCE REDUCER*

Use collaborative planning

Tool: *COLLABORATIVE PLANNING PARAMETERS*

Plan for scale and sustainability and implement the plan

(Although this is listed near the end, plan for this from the beginning)

Tool: *SCALE & SUSTAINABILITY SCORE SHEET*

Build in on-going monitoring/course corrections

- Evaluate for continuous improvement and mid-course corrections
- Revisit readiness; it should improve and therefore strategies might change

SECTION II: ASSESSING READINESS

Main concepts[2]

As a first step, leaders should assess the readiness of the participants for the change before designing the intervention. "Readiness" refers to the combination of factors evident in participants: their previous experience with such endeavors, the degree to which they have the necessary skills and knowledge for the tasks ahead and their attitude toward undertaking this change (their enthusiasm and willingness to take responsibility). Groups that are "high readiness" (meeting the highest standards for *all* three categories of experience, attitudes and skills) need less structure from the leader. They can be more self-directed as long as there are clear and specific objectives and expected outcomes.

Bear in mind that if a group is low readiness in any of these three categories, you should consider them "low readiness" overall. And most groups undergoing a change will likely be low readiness since they will likely lack previous experience with the strategy that is changing. Such low readiness groups will need much more structure and guidance until they experience success and have more confidence in the change process and in themselves as they help carry it out.

In practice, you will want to employ different strategies to correspond with the readiness of any given group. For example:

<u>Low readiness</u> groups need HIGH STRUCTURE strategies, largely initiated by the leader, such as:

- Specific, clear outcomes (objectives) with timelines and evaluation criteria
- Templates for work plans and budgets
- A written meeting agenda including ground-rules for participation
- Written recording of decisions reached at a meeting that are promptly distributed[3]
- Continuous review of progress and mid-course corrections through a defined structure, such as regularly-scheduled meetings
- Structured questioning to lead group conversation[4]

<u>Medium-readiness</u> groups need MODERATE STRUCTURE strategies such as:

- Decision-sheets, perhaps written by each participant on a rotating basis for a series of meetings
- Jointly-set meeting agendas and ground-rules
- Collaborative planning[5]

<u>High-readiness</u> groups need LIGHT STRUCTURE strategies such as:

- Jointly setting the objectives and letting the group decide how to achieve them.

---

[2] Many of these concepts are elaborations of the work of Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard.
[3] A decision sheet template may be found on page 21.
[4] Never ask an open-ended question to a low readiness group or the group might spin out of control.
[5] See the *Collaborative Planning Parameters* on pages 22-25 of this handbook.

Experience suggests a number of other guidelines for leaders to keep in mind in assessing readiness:

- Levels of readiness will differ by task, even for the same group of participants**.** You will need to re-assess readiness for each activity.
- Leaders often have a reluctance to label a group as "low readiness" because they are colleagues and leaders want to think the best of everyone. Being low readiness is not a judgment on the worth of the group. It is a reality that needs to be considered when planning activities to gain their active and constructive participation in the change strategy.
- Because any group will contain people with different levels of readiness, you should design strategies for the lowest readiness participants to reduce the chances of their disrupting or slowing the change process. One technique for managing varying levels of readiness within the larger groups is to form smaller working groups according to participants' readiness, and structure the assignments of those working groups according to their readiness level.
- If no information is available, assume low readiness. You can always lessen the structure later if you determine otherwise as you go along.
- Readiness levels are likely to improve as the group becomes successful, gains more skills and develops more positive attitudes toward the change process. It is important to adjust your change strategies to take full advantage of increased readiness as it develops. If you don't recognize this difference, the group will "turn-off" at being given less discretion than they have earned.

Using the tool:

The *Readiness Rubric* can be used by the leader to: rate the group's readiness according to the three criteria (experience, skills/knowledge and attitude); match the amount of structure in the strategies to the group's readiness and periodically re-assess readiness as the process unfolds and participants' readiness improves. Alternatively, you can use the tool to ask participants themselves to assess their own readiness for the task. The *Readiness Rubric* can be most useful in determining how to group participants in collaborative planning processes and deciding how much structure to use when designing activities for the group (or breakout groups).

In addition, using the data from the three readiness categories (experience, skills/knowledge and attitude) enables you to identify the area(s) where greatest emphasis should be placed when trying to increase the readiness levels of the group. For example, gaining more successful experience can be attained through early wins (see the *Early Win Wonder* tool), attitudes may be improved through use of the *Resistance Reducer* tool and skills/knowledge may be improved through training. You may also want to use this tool to consider your own personal readiness for the change at hand and understand what you need to do to increase your readiness to accomplish the change goal.

Please note an updated version of the Readiness Rubric is available here (http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/district-policy-and-practice/Pages/leading-change-handbook.aspx

READINESS RUBRIC

5 = Completely
4 = To a large degree
3 = To some degree
2 = To a minimal degree
1 = Not at all

READINESS = EXPERIENCE + SKILLS / KNOWLEDGE + ATTITUDE

A. Enter your rating of each factor using the 5 4 3 2 1 scale.

A1. To what degree do participants have previous experience with change in general and with this type of change in particular?	A1. Score	

Aspects to consider when making your rating

- Have participants undergone change strategies in this area before? Successfully? Unsuccessfully?
- Do participants have positive experience with the type of change being addressed?
- Do participants have experience in the content area being addressed by the change?
- Do participants recognize and acknowledge that there is a problem that warrants change?
- If participants' experience has been negative, are they willing to take a leap of faith?

A2. To what degree do participants have the required skills/knowledge?	A2. Score	

Aspects to consider when making your rating

- Do participants share common definitions of the task/content?
- Do participants have the formal education in the subject matter of the change being considered?
- Is training available? To what degree are participants amenable to learning new skills and knowledge?
- Are resources available (subject matter experts, research)? Will they be used effectively?
- Are participants aware of what they do not know?
- Is there a willingness to learn together when the topic is new and knowledge is just emerging?

A3. To what degree do participants have the right attitude?	A3. Score	

Aspects to consider when making your rating

- Are participants open to change in general, and to this change in particular?
- Are participants willing to take responsibility (as opposed to blaming others or blaming circumstances)?
- Are participants flexible?
- Are participants comfortable with ambiguity?
- Are participants willing to take risks?
- Are participants willing to learn from mistakes?
- Are participants active listeners?
- Do participants have the skills/knowledge (a high rating in A2), but are not implementing?

A4. Score the Readiness

TOTAL READINESS SCORE = A1 + A2 + A3 (*Highest = 15)* →	

B. Determine Readiness Level[6]

Readiness	Score Range
Low	0 – 10
Medium	11 – 13
High	14 - 15

C. Identify Strategies To Use When Designing Activities

[6] Bear in mind that if even one of the three elements is low the group will be low readiness; most participants undergoing a change will be low readiness at first because they will lack the previous experience. If no information is available, assume low readiness.

SECTION III: ANALYZING STAKEHOLDERS

Main concepts

For the leader of change, one of the most important misconceptions is that it is enough to have a good idea for change that will benefit the work. By definition, if things are to change in a significant way, stakeholders will often see themselves as winners or losers – even after the benefits become apparent. Regardless of how good a change idea is, there are groups that are benefiting from the status quo and therefore may feel threatened, angry or disempowered if things change. Therefore, leading change effectively means accomplishing your goals in spite of opposition. So it is important for leaders to recognize which groups might lose power or influence with the proposed changes, minimize their opposition, provide openings for them to participate in devising improvements to the change strategy – but also to plan for opposition that cannot be addressed.

You will need to survey the landscape to identify stakeholders who stand to gain or lose from the contemplated change and to understand which of these groups has the power to derail the change you are seeking. To minimize such opposition, you can provide incentives to entice potential opponents to support the change and thereby determine mutual self-interest. You can also begin the change process by focusing on areas that excite relatively fewer passions ("zones of indifference"). You can engage potential opponents in collaborative planning, and use data to create a sense of credibility and urgency. As with the readiness assessment, analysis of stakeholders should not be thought of as a one-time occurrence. Stakeholders' positions change as the situation changes, so it is important to do the following analysis continuously throughout the change process.

Using the tool:

The *Stakeholder Strategizer* is most effectively used as a brainstorming device as several members of the planning team consider what they know about the various groups that will be involved in the change process. Knowing which groups may support or oppose you and why - and assessing their ability to promote or derail the change - will enable you to develop strategies to engage those groups that you identify as having the power to stall your efforts. Understanding which strategies are less controversial can also lead to tackling that issue first and, once having had success, going on to more challenging aspects of your change strategy. And publicizing that early success will help build support for further successes along the way.

Using the data from this tool will also enable the leader to negotiate "at the margins" – that is, finding ways to accommodate at least some of the concerns of key groups without compromising the essence of the change strategy. The analyses provided by the tool also enables the leader to use data to make decisions purposefully about how to engage specific groups and to build on what each key group will perceive as a sense of urgency for the change initiative.

STAKEHOLDER STRATEGIZER

I. WHAT GROUPS STAND TO GAIN OR LOSE FROM THE CONTEMPLATED CHANGE?

	GROUP	GAINS	LOSSES
SUPPORTERS	1.	1.	1.
	2.	2.	2.
	3.	3.	3.
	4.	4.	4.
OPPONENTS (In order of importance)	1.	1.	1.
	2.	2.	2.
	3.	3.	3.
	4.	4.	4.

II. WHAT GROUPS CAN THWART THE PROPOSED CHANGE?

GROUP	HOW?
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.

III. WHAT INCENTIVES CAN BE GIVEN TO THE OPPONENTS TO ENGAGE THEM?

GROUP (in order of importance)	INCENTIVE	WHY IT SHOULD WORK
1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.

IV. WHERE ARE THE "ZONES OF INDIFFERENCE" AND HOW CAN THEY BE USED?[7]

POTENTIAL ZONE OF INDIFFERENCE[8]	HOW TO USE
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.

[7] "Zones of indifference" are those areas that incite relatively less passion and therefore will garner relatively less opposition. Starting with these areas helps attain early success, credibility and momentum in order to implement strategies that generate less opposition.

[8] Make sure that you test your assumption that what you think is a zone of indifference actually is one. If you are wrong about defining something in this way, you will have unexpected problems.

IV. ARE THE OPPONENTS ENGAGED IN YOUR COLLABORATIVE PLANNING?

	Group	What Ideas are they contributing?
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

VI. WHAT WOULD EACH KEY GROUP CONSIDER TO BE URGENT REGARDING THE INITIATIVE?

Group		What would be considered urgent? How can that urgency be communicated? (What data exist to prove the urgency?)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

SECTION IV: PLANNING EARLY WINS

Change is a highly personal experience. Everyone participating in the effort has different reactions to change, different concerns and different motivations for being involved. The results of change are long-term, but the change *process* is incremental and continuous. To bring people along with you, they need evidence at each stage that the change will succeed and that is likely to yield positive results. That is especially true at the beginning, when skepticism about the benefits and possible costs is often highest. An effective change leader deliberately plans for "early wins" that demonstrate concretely that achieving the change goals is feasible and will result in benefits for those involved. You therefore should plan for achieving and documenting results that are evident within the first month or two that are:

- tangible;
- symbolic of a desired commonly-held value; and
- achievable.

By so doing, you will inspire confidence that the rest of the initiative can be accomplished. However, it is critically important that once the early win objective is selected and announced, it is achieved. To do anything less risks deflating confidence in the feasibility of the initiative. One way to get ahead of the game is to explore an early win within a zone of indifference that you identified when using the *Stakeholder Strategizer*. There is a stronger likelihood of achieving this strategy since it should be opposed less fervently by fewer groups.

Using the tool:

Use a separate *Early Win Wonder* tool for each potential "early win" strategy under consideration. You can use it alone or with your planning group as a vehicle for brainstorming possible early wins and determining whether they meet all the criteria. The analysis may be done for what the group might consider a win and/or what individuals in the group might consider as such.

The results can be used to rank the various strategies according to each strategy's likelihood of producing the desired early win. The tool can also help identify shortcomings in any strategy to increase its chances of succeeding. You might also use the data you get from using this tool to brainstorm ways to take a potential loss and turn it into a win.

EARLY WIN WONDER

What specific objective can be accomplished in the first month or two that is:

- *tangible;*
- *symbolic of a desired value; and*
- *achievable?*

Potential "early win":	

REVIEW FOR

GENERAL CHARACTERISTIC	**EVIDENCE OF THIS CHARACTERISTIC IN YOUR PROPOSED EARLY WIN**
▪ You are certain it can be accomplished within the timeframe	
▪ Accomplishing this objective will meet the common understanding of what constitutes "success"	
▪ There is a transparent, observable outcome, preferably data-informed	
▪ It will be perceived as important by many constituencies	
▪ It is an important symbol in the culture	
▪ It lies in a zone of indifference	
▪ Groups that oppose the change would perceive benefits if this objective were accomplished	
▪ It is not merely "nice" to do, but necessary to move the work forward	
▪ There are mechanisms to communicate the goal broadly, both at the beginning and again at the promised deadline for results	

SECTION V: MINIMIZING RESISTANCE

Main concepts

The preceding three tools centered on helping you anticipate resistance – by assessing and improving participants' readiness, by identifying potential opponents and either bringing them on board or minimizing their ability to derail your plans and by planning short-term wins as evidence that the change will result in benefits. There is a good chance that resistance can be prevented if the process is matched to the readiness of the group, strategies are in place to engage key stakeholder groups and early wins are built in.

There are additional techniques that can minimize resistance. The key, once again, is to recognize that change is a highly personal experience. Affected individuals must come to believe that there are more benefits to them than costs if the change succeeds. You need to identify as many barriers to success as you can and eliminate them.

Keep in mind, too, that often people hear the need for change as blaming ("If what we were doing was effective, why would we be asked to change?"). For the leader, then, empathy is critical. That is, you can take steps to minimize resistance by thinking like the intended audience. *You* may fully understand what you are trying to communicate, but the *audience* may be misunderstanding, or hearing something different from what you intended. A successful change leader therefore probes, listens actively and paraphrases.

A key concept that many leaders miss is that you sometimes have to accept "yes" for an answer *even if participants' reasons for saying "yes" isn't the reason you would prefer*. Often, the leader has one reason in mind behind the change goal, but individuals see different benefits and are willing to go along for those reasons. This is fine. As long as people sincerely see positives in the proposed change and are willing to participate, it doesn't have to be for the same reason the leader finds compelling.

Using the tool:

When using the *Resistance Reducer*, you can either project how others will respond, or you can ask participants to answer the questions themselves. The tool can be a non-threatening way of getting direct feedback from participants.

Experience and research suggest that participants will almost always be pleased to be asked sincerely for their feedback; however, the leader will get the most candid and useful information when responses are anonymous. By using the data, you will be aware of each individual's perceptions of the plusses and minuses and whether there is group consensus on some of these. If there is group consensus, you will be able to emphasize the plusses in your action plan and minimize, or at least acknowledge, the barriers from participants' points of view. The leader will also be armed with an understanding of how the change message is likely to be heard and revise the communications plan accordingly. You might want to repeat the administration of the *Resistance Reducer* at other points along the way in the implementation of the change strategies.

Please note an updated version of the Readiness Rubric is available here (http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/district-policy-and-practice/Pages/leading-change-handbook.aspx).

RESISTANCE REDUCER

For Each Change Goal or Strategy…….. The Plus/Minus Analysis

	Change Goal or Strategy	Plusses for those Affected	Minuses for those Affected (Barriers)
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

How I can emphasize plusses and minimize minuses:

Emphasize the plusses:	
Minimize the minuses (reduce barriers):	

RESISTANCE REDUCER

Translating the Message

WHEN I SAY…	PARTICIPANTS ARE LIKELY TO HEAR

How I will communicate this change strategy:

SECTION VI: COLLABORATIVE PLANNING

Planning and implementing change is most effective when people from diverse backgrounds and perspectives are involved. Such broad participation empowers people by giving them a sense of control and ownership of the strategy and the resulting changes. It also turns the change process into an enriching opportunity to examine multiple perspectives within the group; gain an understanding and appreciation of differing viewpoints; test long-held assumptions; surface and purposefully channel conflict; and build a network and team with other participants.

In short, collaborative planning is not only important for improving the strategies and developing buy-in for change. It has the added advantage, when done well, of providing opportunities for learning and growth among participants. It can help build a culture of learning in your organization in which risk-taking, flexibility and learning from mistakes are valued.

Establishing a climate of respect is an essential foundation for this work. Even if a climate of respect and good will is not fully evident at the start, the process itself can help breed it, even among formerly hostile constituencies. Since participants come with prior experience, this must be taken into account in two ways. First, critical reflection of their experience should be incorporated into the resulting plan; adding value to the plan and meaning for participants. Second, you may first have to address participants' long-held skepticism of planning in order to gain their active, positive cooperation.

The ideal collaborative process produces solutions that no one working independently could achieve. An effective planning group, then, is one in which people with diverse backgrounds and viewpoints are brought together, including people who may disagree with the prevailing wisdom but who will be called upon to support and/or implement the resulting program. An ideal size is from 10 to 15 people so an open exchange of ideas is encouraged. If the group is larger than this, smaller groups can be "broken out" for discussion sessions.

Typical ground-rules in an effective collaborative planning process may include that participants should: (1) be specific; (2) state comments in a constructive manner rather than being critical, offer potential solutions when possible; (3) stay on topic; (4) keep discussions factual, not personal; (5) use data to support arguments; and (6) listen actively to each other. For low and medium readiness groups, the facilitator must enforce the ground-rules. Even minor infractions, if ignored, can lead to disruptions of the group process. In a high readiness group, the participants themselves abide by the ground rules as a matter of cultural norm and enforce them as a matter of course.

The result of this process is a detailed document which defines the mission, objectives and strategies of the new policy or program. It delineates the activities which will be used, and assigns responsible staff with timeframes for task completion. Importantly, it also provides documentation of the decisions made along the way – a historical record that may be important as others come into the process later. Such documentation can be a hedge against the disruptions often caused by turnover among planning group participants.

An implementation team can be created from among the original planners. They may be charged with overseeing the implementation and for making timely revisions as necessary. For, just as with the other tools, it is essential that the *Collaborative Planning Parameters* be used in an on-going way throughout the change process. In this way, mid-course corrections can be made as needed and continuous improvement achieved.

The collaborative planning process is not easy or risk-free. The ego of the change leader or skepticism of participants can derail the process. Perhaps most consequentially, a leader might be tempted to weaken or over-generalize the decisions reached in order to achieve consensus or avoid conflict. For that reason, you as leader will need to prevent the collaborative process from straying from the core goals of the change strategy. You need to make clear from the beginning which aspects are non-negotiable. People appreciate not spinning wheels on something that cannot be changed. And you need to make it clear that the decisions reached will be the best according to the data and not necessarily those of consensus. You also obligate yourself to explain the rationale behind the decisions that are reached to the entire group.

Using the tool:

The *Collaborative Planning Parameters* are designed as a checklist for use by the leader or planning meeting facilitator to use in advance to plan the meetings and process by which the change strategies will be planned and implemented. The resulting data may be used by the leader/facilitator in conducting the meeting and making decisions during the meeting to ensure that the concepts presented in this tool are integrated. It is suggested that you use a "decision sheet" as shown on the next page to record the specifics of what is to be done as a result of the discussions. This becomes a contract between the leader and the participants. It also tests the assumptions of what was decided. This is important because sometimes the leader/facilitator is so pleased to get a decision that you assume, often wrongly, that everyone shares your understanding of what was actually decided. Shortly after the meeting, the draft decision sheet should be circulated for comments/revisions by participants. The leader should then ensure that those responsible for various decisions implement them by the stated deadline.

DECISION SHEET

MEETING OBJECTIVE:
DATE:
PARTICIPANTS:

	DECISION	**WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?**	**DEADLINE FOR THE ACTION**
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING PARAMETERS

Goal: To make the desired decisions while facilitating a learning experience for participants, without reducing the outcomes to only broad areas of consensus.

STRATEGIES	EVIDENCE (How do you know?)
ARE THE RIGHT PARTICIPANTS AT THE TABLE? ▪ Those with the authority to make decisions?	
▪ Those with important opposing voices?	
▪ Those who represent important internal and external constituencies?	
▪ Those who will ultimately do the work?	
CLARITY/TRANSPARENCY OF MEETING'S OUTCOMES ▪ Is there agreement that the topic of the meeting solves an important problem? Are data presented to support this?	
▪ Is there a written statement of what outcomes are desired from the meeting?	
▪ Is there an upfront commitment to the end-time of the meeting? Is that commitment always met?	

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING PARAMETERS

STRATEGIES	EVIDENCE (How do you know?)
READINESS ASSESSMENT/STRUCTURE OF MEETING ▪ Is group readiness high, medium or low (see *Readiness Rubric*)?	
▪ If readiness is low, is there high structure (for example: explicit ground-rules, an agenda, a mechanism for recording decisions and use of writing to focus the discussion[9])?	
▪ If readiness is medium is there medium structure: (i.e., the group has a chance to provide input to the agenda and the process that will be used)?	
▪ If readiness is high, does the group have sufficient autonomy?	
▪ Are the group's shared values furthered by the defined work?	
▪ Are there plans to *re-assess* readiness and adjust accordingly?	

[9] Writing can serve as a mechanism to facilitate participants' focus on specifics and gives them an opportunity to organize their thoughts before speaking. An effective device is a "critical incident" where grantees are asked to write one to two paragraphs answering three or four assigned questions about a specific circumstance related to the given topic. This is particularly effective when the last question asks for a solution to the issue discussed. For example: Think of a time in the past month when you experienced a specific problem with XX: (1) what was the issue? (2) how was it ultimately resolved? (3) how can it be prevented in the future? Such an exercise also can be used to bring participants' previous experience into the discussion in a structured way.

STRATEGIES	EVIDENCE (How do you know?)
PRE-WORK ▪ Is there assigned pre-work?[10]	
ATMOSPHERE OF RESPECT ▪ Are there light refreshments?	
▪ Are all group members encouraged to contribute? How?	
▪ Are participants heard? Are their opinions considered and incorporated? Are decisions explained, with the rationale behind them?	
MANDATES/CONSTRAINTS/NON-NEGOTIABLES ▪ Are all non-negotiables or mandates stated up-front?	
▪ Is there discussion of how to use those mandates to the advantage of the work?	

[10] Pre-work is important in order to start participants' thinking, to develop a common language, to demonstrate seriousness and to stimulate learning.

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING PARAMETERS

STRATEGIES	EVIDENCE (How do you know?)
<u>BUILD IN AN EARLY WIN</u> ▪ After a review of the agenda, have you used an activity that will result in a positive and productive experience for the group? Examples include: agreement on a broad mission statement or a critical incident explicating a previous success.	
<u>TEST ASSUMPTIONS OF WHAT HAS BEEN DECIDED</u> ▪ Is there a clear, concise and timely summary of what has been decided, who is assigned to do what and by when?	
▪ Do participants have input in reviewing and revising those decisions? Does this happen within a day or two of the planning session?	
<u>MECHANISMS FOR CONTINGENCY/ MONITORING/REVISION</u> ▪ Are there check-in points throughout the meeting to ensure that participants believe the work to be on-track? ▪ Are there specific ways in which modifications can be made as the work progresses after the meeting?	
<u>INTEGRATION OF LEARNING</u> ▪ Is the group solving a problem? Developing strategies that can be applied immediately? Learning from real life experiences? Forming supportive or informational networks? Acquiring new resources (knowledge, people, time)?	

SECTION VII: SPREADING AND SUSTAINING CHANGE

Main concepts

From the beginning of an initiative and throughout its life, scale and sustainability are key aspects to consider. Even if you succeed at your change goal, it means little if the resulting program does not spread or live on after the initial success.

Scale involves not only "breadth" – i.e., widespread adaptation of a program or practice – but also "depth," that is, evidence of penetration and high quality in all programs that result from the change. Too often "scale" is associated only with "spread" and the resulting programs may be numerous but are watered down versions of the original. For successful scale to occur there needs to be, first of all, a clear understanding of the core elements of the original model. As the program or practice spreads, there also has to be the right balance between preserving the essential properties of the original, and allowing for and encouraging local adaptations.

Sustainability involves not only the long-term staying power of the resulting program, but changes in people's behaviors. Adequate funding and supportive policies and laws are important to sustainability, but they aren't sufficient. To ensure that a program or practice is truly "in the water supply," people's attitudes and behaviors need to change, culture needs to change and key stakeholder groups must embrace the program as their own. Often, sustainability may *begin* with laws and policies and funding. But to last, a change must become embedded in the culture; in the attitudes values and behaviors of those most affected by it.

Taken together, scale and sustainability "convert best practice into common practice".[11] Importantly, you must consider not only how to plan for scale and sustainability, but for the difficult job of implementing those plans and revising them for mid-course corrections. It is important to distinguish between what is "on the books," versus what is really "on the ground". Therefore, the *Scale & Sustainability Score Sheet* tool presented here examines planning and implementation separately for each category so you can see the full picture of your scale and sustainability efforts to date, identify gaps and determine how to go forward. The tool is designed to be used for programs or practices that have evidence of high quality or demonstrated potential.

Using the tool:

Scale and sustainability planning should happen at the beginning of the work or as soon as possible once the program or practice has been identified. The *Scale & Sustainability Score Sheet* may be used by the leader, with a team, to determine what is needed to ensure the eventual scale and sustainability of the change strategy. It is important to engage a team because seldom does any one person have all the perspectives needed to perform this assessment holistically. The ratings and evidence provided by completing the tool should give the leader a good idea of the specifics needed in planning and implementation that are likeliest to result in scale and sustainability.

[11] PELP 2009, S. Childress and A. Grossman

SCALE & SUSTAINABILITY SCORE SHEET

STEP 1

DESCRIBE THE PROGRAM OR PRACTICE THAT YOU ARE CONSIDERING SCALING AND SUSTAINING

What is it? Why is it important? How do you know it is of high quality and valued? What results are anticipated?

STEP 2

LIST THE CORE OR NON-NEGOTIABLE ELEMENTS OF THE PROGRAM OR PRACTICE

STEP 3

RATE THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE KEY CATEGORIES OF SCALE & SUSTAINABILITY IN TERMS OF *BOTH* PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION [12]

	For Planning - There is:		For Implementation:
5 =	A comprehensive plan in place that all stakeholders “own”	5 =	All aspects have been fully implemented
4 =	A comprehensive plan in place that most stakeholders support	4 =	Most aspects have been fully implemented
3 =	A partial plan in place with some support	3 =	Some aspects have been implemented
2 =	A partial plan with modest support	2 =	Few aspects have been implemented
1 =	No plan	1 =	No aspects have been implemented

STEP 4

CONSIDER YOUR RATINGS FOR BOTH PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION IN EACH CATEGORY AND IDENTIFY WHAT IS NEEDED TO PROMOTE SCALE AND SUSTAINABITY

Fill in the right-hand column of the *Score Sheet*. This will lead you into development of strategies to further progress and fill gaps.

STEP 5

DEVELOP STRATEGIES FOR BOTH PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION BASED ON THE NEEDS YOU HAVE IDENTIFIED

Continue to monitor the categories of scale and sustainability throughout implementation and make mid-course corrections as necessary.

[12] If you are using the on-line version of this tool, the planning and implementation ratings for each category will automatically add together to show you a total rating. “10” is the highest score. You will also see a total rating for “scale” and a total of the average sub-totals for each sustainability category. “100” is the highest score. These scores should assist you in determining where you are versus where you want to be and where the gaps are both in each category and between planning and implementation.

SCALE & SUSTAINABILITY SCORE SHEET – Part I: Scale

To what extent have the following elements been incorporated into your program or practice?

	For Planning (P) - There is:		**For Implementation (I)**
5 =	A comprehensive plan in place that all stakeholders "own"	5 =	All aspects have been fully implemented
4 =	A comprehensive plan in place that most stakeholders support	4 =	Most aspects have been fully implemented
3 =	A plan in place with some support	3 =	Some aspects have been implemented
2 =	A partial plan with modest support	2 =	Few aspects have been implemented
1 =	No plan	1 =	No aspects have been implemented

RATINGS

SCALE CATEGORY		(P)	(I)	Total P + I	Evidence for the Rating	What Is Needed For Scale
I.	A model with demonstrated effectiveness or promise			0	(P) (I)	
II.	A program or practice not only in more places, but with high quality and depth of implementation in all those places			0	(P) (I)	
III.	A "logic model" or theory of action that identifies the steps leading to the model's desired outcomes			0	(P) (I)	
IV.	A justified hypothesis and/or research that supports the rationale behind the model			0	(P) (I)	
V.	Replication of identified core elements of the original model with contextual modifications. Ownership by local adapters			0	(P) (I)	
VI.	High demand for program or practice; fills an acknowledged need			0	(P) (I)	
VII.	A large number of supporters beyond "early adopters"			0	(P) (I)	
VIII.	Structural mechanisms by which the model can be spread			0	(P) (I)	
IX.	Personnel who are skilled in the model who can train others			0	(P) (I)	
X.	A strong implementation plan with monitoring and continuous improvement built in			0	(P) (I)	
	SCALE Total (P & I) →	0	0	0	**<--Combined Total (P+I)** *(out of 100)*	
	Total	(P)	(I)	(P+I)		

SCALE & SUSTAINABILITY SCORE SHEET – Part II: Sustainability

To what extent have the following elements been incorporated into your program or practice?

	SUSTAINABILITY ELEMENT	(P)	(I)	Total P + I		Evidence for the Rating	What is Needed for Sustainability?
I. LAWS, REGULATIONS, POLICIES							
a.	Supportive laws or regulations in place			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Institutionalized outcomes of the change (i.e., procedures, position descriptions, curriculum requirements)			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	I. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			
II. STAKEHOLDERS (Key individuals)							
a.	Key stakeholders engaged			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Little active opposition			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	II. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			
III. EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS (Key groups or organizations)							
a.	Key organizations engaged			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Key organizations perceive the program or practice as furthering their own goals			0	(P)		
					(I)		
c.	Union contracts support the program or practice			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	III. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			
IV. INTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY							
a.	Organizational goals furthered by the change			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Well-defined procedures and systems for implementation			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	IV. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			

	SUSTAINABILITY ELEMENT	(P)	(I)	Total P + I		Evidence for the Rating	What is Needed for Sustainability?
V. HUMAN CAPITAL							
a.	A clear and legitimate procedure of succession for those leading the effort			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Staff with the skills and knowledge to implement the new program or practice			0	(P)		
					(I)		
c.	An institutionalized system for training personnel in the skills needed by the program or practice			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	V. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			
VI. FUNDING							
a.	On-going funding from diversified sources			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Coordination of several funding sources to support the new program or building in the new program or practice within existing programs			0	(P)		
					(I)		
c.	Cost neutral strategies (reallocation of resources to the new program or practice including cutting funding to programs that are not working well)			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	VI. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			
VII. CULTURE							
a.	Program or practice furthers existing values and norms			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Favorable attitudes toward the new program or practice			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	VII. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			
VIII. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT (Formative Evaluation)							
a.	Continuous gathering of data to support the achievement of the change goal			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Provisions for monitoring, learning lessons and consequently making mid-course corrections			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	VIII. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			

	SUSTAINABILITY ELEMENT	(P)	(I)	Total P + I		Evidence for the Rating	What is Needed for Sustainability?
IX. COMMUNICATIONS							
a.	On-going communications mechanisms including use of media and public relations			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Transparency of progress to all constituencies			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	IX. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			
X. EVALUATION (Summative)							
a.	Assessment of the program or practice's accomplishments versus planned outcomes after a specified time period			0	(P)		
					(I)		
b.	Identified lessons learned			0	(P)		
					(I)		
	X. AVERAGE SCORES FOR CATEGORY	0	0	0			
	SUSTAINABILITY Total (P & I)	0	0	0	*(out of 100)*		
	Total	**(P)**	**(I)**	**(P+I)**			