12

Creating Organizational Change Initiatives

Elizabeth Lightfoot, Amy S. Hewitt, and John K. Sauer

Since the late 1970s, there has been a fundamental paradigm shift in service provision for people with intellectual disabilities. The shift from institution-based services to consumer-driven supports represents a great leap forward for inclusion and self-determination for people with intellectual disabilities and other supported individuals. It also represents a call to change for organizations that have traditionally provided services. Along with this change has come significant challenge in relation to personnel. Not only are organizations forced to reconsider service paradigms, but they are also faced with severe challenges in creating a workforce that understands, promotes, and has the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes (KSAs) to provide supports in this new paradigm. As community human services organizations strive to address workforce challenges, it is important for them to select and implement interventions that not only improve workforce outcomes but also advance inclusion and self-determination for the people they support. This chapter will provide an overview of the changing context of service provision, typical organizational responses to the changes, common types of resistance to organizational change and effective strategies for organizational change.

TARGETED FRONT-LINE SUPERVISOR COMPETENCIES

Primary Skills

13 Front-line supervisors (FLSs) understand and implement current state licensing rules and regulations and organization policies and practices and protect the rights of supported individuals.

FLSs write, review, and update policies and procedures in response to licensing reviews, changes in rules and regulations, and needs of individuals receiving supports.

FLSs solicit the input of individuals receiving supports and their families as well as follow federal and state rules and laws in the development of organization policies and procedures.

UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEM

The changing environment in which organizations provide direct support requires organizations to fundamentally change and restructure the way they provide services. There have been enormous shifts in since the late 1960s in how people with intellec-

tual disabilities live and receive services. And, until the 1980s, most people with intellectual disabilities had to reside in institutions in order to receive educational and habilitative services (Kiracofe, 1994). The passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (PL 94-142) changed this dynamic because it offered children with disabilities a free appropriate public education without requiring them to leave their parents' homes. During the 1980s, community-based services evolved as organizations developed group homes or large congregate care settings where people lived; day treatment sites or sheltered employment sites for people to spend their days; and special recreation opportunities for social activities. Since then, the field has been moving toward providing community supports that people with intellectual disabilities themselves choose and control. The advent of person-centered planning approaches has assisted in supporting individuals to make choices about how they want to live their lives. In unprecedented numbers, people with disabilities are now living in (and sometimes owning) their own homes in the community; working at real jobs for real wages; and participating in a wide range of community activities, from athletics to the arts.

Although this new approach to supporting people with intellectual disabilities signifies great opportunities for individuals and organizations, it requires enormous changes in both program design and the organizational culture of community human services organizations. It also requires new ideas about and approaches to personnel issues within these organizations. Studies on organizational change often describe the difficulties and barriers that organizations face when changing. Some of the most commonly documented sources of resistance to organizational change include 1) employees' perceptions of or past experience with change, 2) fear of the unknown, 3) an organizational climate of mistrust, 4) fear of failure, 5) concerns about job security, 6) peer pressure, and 7) fears about disruption of organizational culture. Studies of human services organizations shifting from institution- to community-based services have highlighted similar barriers.

Organizational development consultant William Bridges (1991) noted that resistance is sometimes mistaken as fear of change, when really the resistance reflects a fear of loss. As Bridges explained, the most common types of losses that employees fear are security (no longer being in control), competence (not knowing what to do and feeling embarrassed), relationships (losing contact with favorite team members or other people), sense of direction (clouded mission and confusion), and territory (uncertain feeling of work space and job assignments). In addition, Bridges described the stages that individual employees go through during an organizational change process: denial (e.g., saying "Things were good before," feeling stunned, rationalizing, refusing to hear information), resistance (e.g., expressing anger, feeling loss and hurt, blaming others, getting sick, doubting self), exploration (e.g., seeing possibilities, experiencing chaos, having unfocused work, clarifying goals, learning new skills), and commitment (e.g., having a clear vision, using teamwork and collaboration, finding balance). So, leaders and top management of community human services organizations must pay close attention to and provide the necessary supports for their employees to ease their transition through any organizational changes, such as moving

from a service-based residential program to a person-centered, choice-based, program that supports self-determination for individuals receiving support. As workforce interventions are selected, their impact on the overall mission of the organization and on the provision of person-centered supports should be kept in mind.

RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR SOLUTIONS

Organizational Change Models

Consultants and academics have created numerous models to explain how organizational change works. Some of the most prominent approaches are described here.

Classic Three-Step Model

The classic three-step model of organizational change, developed by Lewin (1951), still makes sense today. The first step is *unfreezing*, or creating an organizational climate ready for change by developing a sense of urgency, providing organizational vision, and attending to possible resistance to change. The second step is *changing*, in which the organization undergoes this change. In this stage, the organization's employees learn new information and develop new operating models and/or new concepts and values. The third step is *refreezing*, or institutionalizing the change. In this stage employees try out this new change and make any necessary adaptations. Positive reinforcement for this change is crucial during this stage. Many models of organizational change are based on these three steps.

Strategic Planning

Strategic planning involves an organizationwide attempt to identify the strategic direction (mission and vision) of the organization and to devise plans and time lines for moving in this direction. Numerous consultants have used and advocated strategic planning, but John Bryson (1988) has designed the most well-known model. In general, strategic planning entails first articulating the vision and mission or the organization. Next comes analysis of the external environment, including the general economy, funding sources, trends in services, and demographic characteristics, and the internal environment, including the strengths, capacity, and limitations of the organization. The organization then sets specific goals, determines measurable objectives for each goal, and devises an action plan to reach each objective. At each step in the strategic planning process, the organization must stay focused and committed to its strategic direction, that is, its mission. For example, an organization that provides residential services could decide that its mission will be "to provide supports to individuals to allow them to live where they desire in the community." This mission would then be the basis for all future decisions about the organization's goals, objectives, and actions. Strategic planning is most effective when people throughout the entire organization participate in the process.

Reengineering

A relatively new approach to organizational change is reengineering, also known as business process reengineering. Reengineering is often equated with radically redesigning an organization, rather than letting existing processes dictate what the future looks like for the organization. Reengineering usually focuses on redesigning the structures and processes governing how work gets completed within the organization (Davenport, 1993). The organization pays close attention to reevaluating what the customer or client views as the end product or outcome of the organization and rethinks how it can achieve this end product. Reengineering calls for structural and cultural change across all aspects of an organization and typically is designed in a top-down manner in which the executive leaders of an organization initiate and take the lead role in designing, implementing, and evaluating a systems change effort. The leadership team then involves the top management and mid-level managers, who, in turn, engage the FLSs and direct support professionals (DSPs).

Total Quality Management

In contrast to reengineering, the total quality management (TQM) or quality improvement model to organizational change involves more gradual changes to an organization's processes. TQM starts from how an organization is currently functioning and makes incremental changes in the organization's processes and outcomes. TQM calls for participation among all levels of employees and other stakeholders but is usually implemented within smaller subsections of an organization, such as at the unit level. The focus in implementing TQM is for the organization to consistently meet or exceed the demands of the customers or clients. Typically, quality improvement initiatives use statistical controls or other evaluative measures to ensure that the organization is meeting the customer's or client's needs.

Large-Scale Systems Change

Another kind of organizational change is large-scale systems change. This model, advocated by Bunker and Alban (1997), contends that involving the entire system in which the organization functions, including people both internal and external to the organization, is an effective method for organizational change. At the broadest holistic level, for a human services organization the entire system could involve the organization's staff, including the executive director, other managers, FLSs, and DSPs; consumers of the services, including individuals receiving supports and their family members; and other external concerned parties, including service coordinators, advocates, and government agency personnel. Other, less holistic large-scale systems change processes may be limited to change within an organization. In this case the entire system might include representatives from all departments, staff members working in various positions, and individuals receiving supports and their families. In large-scale systems change, all of these individuals work closely together in creating organizational change. Echoing what research has documented, Bunker and Alban (1997) suggested that the large-scale approach is effective because it includes all of the stakeholders affected by the change and shares information with these relevant parties and because change occurs more rapidly when all are involved.

Summary of Organizational Change Models

In many community human services organizations, visions and strategies for change are developed in a top-down fashion. Often executives, leaders, and sometimes boards of directors create a new mission or vision or institute new processes for an organization and completely exclude supervisors, DSPs, individuals receiving supports and their families, and other key stakeholders from these changes. Thus, many of the key stakeholders often have little commitment to achieving the vision. Conversely, when all of the key stakeholders are invited and encouraged to participate in the process, a common understanding emerges of the organization's strengths and weaknesses. The organization can use this information to create a preferred future that includes individual, small-group, and large-group ideas and can begin to move toward this vision. The lack of motivation, disillusion, mistrust, and unaligned direction in the first scenario is replaced with excitement, synergy, hope, and community in the second.

There are many approaches to achieving organizational change other than the ones just discussed, and many successful organizational change efforts have entailed activities that fit so closely with an organization's context that they cannot be distilled into a general model. However, there are similarities in many of these models. For example, most of the change models are linear and seem like a broader expansion of Lewin's (1951) basic three-step model. Other commonalities include the focus on deliberate planning of the proposed change; the inclusion of many people within the change process; the strong focus on goals, missions, or organizational outcomes as important in the change; and some attempt to cement the change in the culture of the organization. The next section illustrates how these theoretical models have proved helpful for community organizations in moving from institution-based to person-centered services. In the following section, the lessons learned from those examples are applied to strategies to achieve change in the area of workforce development.

Organization Conversion

There is a growing body of research on the ingredients of successful organizational change in shifting from institution-based services to person-centered, consumer-directed community supports that promote choice, respect, and recommended practice. Most of this research is in the form of case studies or small surveys of organizations making transformations, including studies of organizations converting from running sheltered workshops to providing supported employment (Albin, Rhodes, & Mank, 1994; Butterworth & Fesko, 1999; Garner, 1998; Magis-Agosta, 1994; Marrone, Hoff, & Gold, 1999; Murphy & Rogan, 1995); studies of organizations making the conversion from facility-sponsored services to supported living (Hulgin, 1996); and larger systems change strategies (Moseley, 1999). From these studies, eight common themes emerge as keys for successful organization change within consumer support organizations:

- Planned change strategy
- Action orientation
- Clear vision
- Strong leadership
- Organizational culture

- Continual staff support
- Flexible organizational structure
- Strong coalitions

Planned Change Strategy

The first common theme that emerges as key for making the change from facility-based services to providing person-centered supports is having a *planned change strategy*. A planned change can be either an incremental change, in which an organization slowly changes the way it provides services (e.g., phasing out several components of a sheltered workshop over 10 years and allowing people to continue to work during that time), or a radical change, in which an organization completely changes the way it provides services in one fell swoop (e.g., literally closing the doors of a sheltered workshop on a selected date). Although the organizational change literature shows that there is a growing need for more radical change because of today's turbulent environment, research in developmental disabilities has not shown that one type of planned change strategy is clearly superior.

Several case studies have shown that a rapid change strategy can be successful in making the conversion. For example, Garner (1998) described how a rapid change at Buffalo River Services in Tennessee worked better than a gradual change would have. Garner noted that this rapid change would not have been successful if it had not been planned in detail. Marrone et al.'s (1999) study of two organizations converting to supported employment from facility-based services also suggest that rapid change is essential to organizational change. Dufresne and Laux (1994) also asserted that holistic change is superior to incremental change. And, Hulgin's (1996) case study of an organization that switched from running group homes to offering supported living services discussed one of the main benefits of rapid change: avoiding the problems inherent in managing dual systems. One of the most noted barriers in incremental change is the problems organizations face when they are providing both facility-based services and person-driven services (Albin et al., 1994; Moseley, 1999; Walker, 2000).

Other studies, however, have shown that incremental change can be a successful strategy for some organizations. For example, Butterworth and Fesko's (1999) study of 10 organizations shifting from facility-based employment to community employment reported that organizations can be successful using either an incremental approach or a rapid approach to conversion. Similarly, Moseley's (1999) survey of 14 project coordinators implementing self-determination projects found that a variety of different types of implementation strategies were successful, ranging from a one-person-at-a-time incremental approach (implementing self-determination practices with one supported individual at a time), to a pilot program incremental approach (selecting a small group of individuals to try new self-determination approaches), to a radical system-wide reorganization (implementing new self-determination approaches throughout the organization for all individuals supported at the same time). The unifying theme of all successful change strategies is that all of them were planned.

Action Orientation

Although developing a strategy for change is important, the literature also shows that too much planning can inhibit change (Dufresne & Laux, 1994; Marrone et al., 1999;

Murphy & Rogan, 1995). An organization must be *action oriented*, whether it is planning a rapid, radical change or a more incremental change. If too much time is spent on planning, an organization may lose the momentum for change (Murphy & Rogan, 1995). This sense of urgency present in an action orientation can be the catalyst for an organization to successfully change from a facility-based to person-centered framework (Dufresne & Laux, 1994). If an organization has an action orientation, it will also begin making changes before actually knowing the details of how the change will proceed. Experiencing the change gives staff, managers, and individuals receiving supports the opportunity to see how the change actually works in practice and thus provides a framework for them to understand the proposed changes and move toward systematic change (Magis-Agosta, 1994; Marrone et al., 1999).

Clear Vision

A *clear vision* has been a key factor in organizational change in almost every documented study of organization conversion (Albin et al., 1994; Butterworth & Fesko, 1999; Dufresne & Laux, 1994; Garner, 1998; Magis-Agosta, 1994; Marrone, et al., 1999; Murphy & Rogan, 1995; Racino, 1994). An organization in need of change must recognize that the services that it has been providing have not been the best for the individuals whom it supports (Garner, 1998; Magis-Agosta, 1994) and must craft a unifying vision that clearly defines how the organization will provide services that are person centered. Developing a new vision requires an organization to understand the philosophical base of person-centered services and community supports and probably also to continually reexamine organizational values and practices (Walker, 2000). Albin et al.'s (1994) study of eight organizations pursuing changing from facility-based services to community supported employment programs found that the main challenges to pursuing changeover were conflicts in vision, values, and assumptions about community services.

Strong Leadership and Powerful Champions

An organization needs *strong leadership* to gain the momentum for change and to consistently articulate the organization's vision. This leadership is often found in the executive director or other top organization staff. Studies of organization conversion, however, have found that organizations making successful change have multiple leaders at both top and middle-level positions (Butterworth & Fesko, 1999). Although some organizations are lucky enough to have natural leaders who are committed to the change process (Garner, 1998), all organizations can benefit from developing leaders who are well versed in the dynamics of organizational change (Racino, 1994).

Organizational Culture

One of the key roles of a leader is to facilitate an *organizational culture* that is not only mission driven but also supportive of organizational change. A primary component includes generating in the organization support for risk taking by staff members (Butterworth & Fesko, 1999; Dufresne & Laux, 1994; Garner, 1998; Magis-Agosta, 1994). Because person-centered supports are radically different from the way staff may be used to providing services, staff need the freedom to take risks even though their ac-

tions might not always be successful. This focus on risk-taking can be tied to a culture of a learning organization (Racino, 1994).

Continual Staff Support

Another key element to the change process is to provide *continual support* to staff members who will actually be implementing these changes. When an organization shifts its values, the staff within the organization may have to make difficult, internal changes to their own values and perceptions of people with disabilities (Garner, 1998; Racino, 1994). Organization leadership and managers need to support staff members in making these changes and, in particular, should emphasize that although the organization had been providing well-intentioned services to supported individuals were well intentioned, these services were not resulting in the best outcomes (Racino, 1994). Organizations that have been successful in making changes have invested heavily in staff training (Albin et al., 1994; Moseley, 1999; Murphy & Rogan, 1995), consistently marketed the vision to the staff (Marrone et al., 1999), celebrated staff success (Magis-Agosta, 1994; Murphy & Rogan, 1995), and placed a strong emphasis on valuing the contributions of staff (Racino, 1994). One organization found support groups to be successful in helping staff process the changes they were making (Albin et al., 1994).

Flexible Organizational Structure

Along with culture, an organization's structure must also be *flexible* and conducive to organizational change. Some studies have noted that the change to person-centered supports works best when an organization flattens its hierarchy, removing levels of middle management (Garner, 1998; Murphy & Rogan, 1995). Although this may be ideal, an organization should at least allow for the flexibility that is required in providing person-driven rather than facility-based supports (Dufresne & Laux, 1994). This flexibility is needed in all aspects of the organization, from the establishment of staff procedures to the development of creative funding sources (Walker, 2000). Finding funds for person-driven supports can be a major difficulty (Albin et al., 1994; Moseley, 1999). An organization must focus unwaveringly on the quality of the lives of people, rather than on policies, organizational structure, regulations, or funding (Racino, 1994). In summary, although an organization must be flexible in all its efforts to make successful broad organizational change (e.g., moving from facility-based services to community-based supports), maintaining a focus on the quality of supported individuals' lives always needs to be paramount.

Strong Coalitions

Although strong leadership and an organization that promotes change are clearly important, organizations act within a broader external environment. Organizations must build *strong coalitions* that include all the people who the organizational change will affect. These coalitions must include key stakeholders both internal and external to the organization. These stakeholders include self-advocates, family members, DSPs, organization management, state organization staff, other community organizations, and other people in the community. A sense of joint commitment to community inclusion by all people involved in the change allows for better collaboration. Walker's (2000)

case study of an organization changing from facility-based services to providing supported employment and supported living services found that focusing on relationships among all members of the coalition was essential for successful organizational change. Moseley (1999) found that involving these key stakeholders from the beginning is essential.

STRATEGIES FOR RESPONDING TO THE PROBLEM

Just as organizations have had to undergo substantial change to move from promoting institutional or organization-focused services to providing person-centered and consumer-directed services, substantial change will also be needed to successfully revamp practices related to workforce development in organizations. Most community human services organizations have a hierarchical, top-down process for handling personnel policies and practices. People in direct support roles are not empowered and are rarely involved in determining effective strategies to improve retention and recruitment challenges. Organizations also tend to still use personnel practices that worked when they provided institutional or provider-focused services but that likely do not work as they offer person-centered, consumer-directed supports. As organizations consider changes specifically to address workforce development challenges, incorporating the characteristics of effective change processes into the plan is also helpful. Table 12.1 provides suggestions for how the key elements of the change process can be applied to workforce development issues faced by community human services organizations.

Use a Three-Step Model of Change

Lewin's (1951) three-step model of change can be applied to change related to personnel issues within organizations. To create a climate for change by stressing the urgency of the problem (*unfreezing*), organization leadership can provide quantitative data on turnover rates, vacancy rates, maltreatment reports, overtime usage, and increased costs related to staffing problems. These data are often a powerful tool (see Chapter 13 for strategies on gathering this critical data). Setting goals and establishing a vision, also parts of *unfreezing*, might be as simple as stating, "Turnover rates will be reduced to 20%, and there will be no more than a 5% vacancy rate across all DSP positions in the organization by year end." Or, the vision for change could connect consumer satisfaction and outcomes to direct support workforce issues (e.g., "Develop a competent, stable workforce to meet the expectations and desired outcomes of the people we support so that they live personally enriched and satisfying lives"). What is important is that there be a common vision that everyone is working toward. One of the best ways to ensure this and to anticipate resistance to change is to involve all key stakeholders affected by the change in determining the vision and the change process.

In Lewin's (1951) model, once the vision is set and key people know what needs to be done and are on board, the change has to occur. Often organizations get stuck during this *changing* phase. They are good at planning what should be done but not so good at doing it. Numerous steps can make up a process for change in workforce development. This book provides many examples of the interventions and actions that can be taken and that have been proven effective. During the changing phase it is criti-

Table 12.1. Important elements of effective change processes and their application to workforce development change

Element	Application
Planned change strategy	Determine at the onset whether or not the change will be radical or incremental. Radical change addresses an entire organization and occurs at once. Incremental change occurs slowly over time. For example, changes in wage scales or benefits would typically involve radical change, whereas developing a mentoring program might be more effective if incremental.
Action orientation	Select specific interventions and strategies. Identify the key players, resources, action steps, benchmarks, and time lines up front. Identify a task master to ensure that time lines are met and that action occurs. Hold people accountable for progress in carrying forward the plan of action. For example, if an organization is going to decrease vacancy rates through the use of a recruitment bonus, specific steps and benchmarks should be determined; a deadline for implementation should be set; and the key players for this action should be identified, understand their roles, and commit to the time lines.
Clear vision	All stakeholders must understand the scope and nature of the problem being addressed and the need for change. Everyone has to have a clear vision of how the change process will improve the situation or address the problem in an effective way. For example, at one organization everyone involved agrees that staff turnover rates of 80% have a negative effect on people who receive services. Everyone at the organization also agrees that reducing turnover to 40% will improve the lives of the people supported. Without a common vision, change could be stymied.
Strong leadership and powerful champions	Every change process needs strong leaders and powerful champions for whom the need for the change permeates their focus. Usually leadership only is thought of as the top executives and managers of an organization, and most of the time that is true. However, FLSs and direct support professionals (DSPs) are often overlooked as leaders and champions of change. When changes are being made to better the work lives of DSPs, DSPs are often the best leaders. In addition, self-advocates or family members may be strong leaders on these topics. Often these people's lives have been affected by turnover, vacancies, and poorly trained employees.
Organizational culture	Creating an organizational climate that expects and supports change and risk taking is important. One effective retention strategy is to empower direct support professionals to have decision-making authority and control over program-based issues. Often this is difficult for organization leaders because they perceive a loss of control or increased risk. Creating supports for such a change throughout the organization are imperative to the successful implementation of the change.
Continual staff support	All staff involved in a change process need ongoing support. Provide opportunities for them to discuss their fears, frustrations, experiences, and ideas. For example, if a new on-line training program for DSPs is implemented at an organization, it is important to provide support to employees as they enter the learning environment and as they figure out how to use their new knowledge in a real work environment. Also, it is important to check in with employees to ensure that they are doing okay and have the needed resources. It is also important to support organization trainers who take on new roles, such as moving from providing classroom training to acting as on-site coach.
Flexible organizational structure	One strategy to address workforce challenges is to move to self-managed teams. In this case, it is essential for an organization to be willing to flatten out its structure and modify many practices.
Strong coalitions	Often, it is hard to think about change outside of the environment where the change needs to occur. One thing is certain; the overwhelming majority of community human services organizations have similar problems. Partnering and building coalitions are critical. For example, any wage or incentive initiative requires strong coalitions because usually legislative action is required. Other interventions require or benefit from coalitions as well. For example, developing new training programs for supervisors or DSPs would be enhanced and more cost-effective if done in collaboration with other organizations in a given community.

cal not to underestimate the need for information and training. Everyone in the organization will need to understand what is occurring and why. Supervisors clearly must learn new ways of supporting, coaching, and mentoring employees; boards of directors must learn how to reprioritize budgets and priorities; administrators and managers will have to learn strategies to effectively reach out and include the opinions, knowledge, and skills of DSPs in all aspects of the organization's operation; human resources personnel may need to learn new methods of gathering and using data; and DSPs may need to learn new ways of supporting and embracing new employees. A learning environment must be established in order for the change process to be effective.

Measure Effectiveness of the Changes Made

It is equally important to measure the effectiveness of changes related to workforce development. Chapter 13 provides an overview of how to measure whether specific interventions actually worked. Organizations periodically and systematically need to evaluate the extent to which their identified mission or vision has been achieved and, if it has not, to refine its policies or procedures. Change processes, when effective, never end. Organizations must be prepared to continually change.

Chapters 13 and 14 provide more specific information about how to make organizational change to address specific workforce development issues. The models mentioned in this chapter may be helpful for organizations that are implementing a new intervention based on the strategies suggested in this book.

In the Spotlight: Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota — Organizational Change

Sheryl A. Larson

Lutheran Social Service of Minnesota (LSS) participated in a multiyear incremental change process to create a set of values within its Home and Community Living Services (HCLS) division that would support the emerging LSS mission and vision and guide the work of DSPs as well as the policy, program, and human resources development work of supervisors, managers, and administrators. A secondary outcome of this change initiative was to include FLSs and DSPs in the development of the core values for HCLS as well as in the creation and implementation of other interventions related to specific workforce challenges such as recruitment, retention, orientation, and training. LSS hoped to achieve higher staff satisfaction and productivity and the alignment among employees, policies, and practices about the mission, vision, and values of the organization and the HCLS division.

LSS, the largest private, nonprofit social service organization in Minnesota, has central offices in St. Paul and more than 200 statewide program sites. The HCLS division provides residential services to 685 individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities in 100 settings, including small group homes (about half of which are funded by Medicaid's Home and Community-Based Services Waiver program and half of which are funded by the intermediate care facility for persons with mental retardation program), parental homes, semi-independent living services settings, and small homes supporting individuals who are senior citizens. During the year 2000, the HCLS division employed 681 DSPs and 26 FLSs.

Beginning in January 2000, the HCLS leadership team decided to focus its attention on specific workforce development interventions to address challenges in recruitment, retention, and training. To guide their work in these areas, the team decided to

• Create a set of core HCLS values that would support the emerging LSS mission and vision as well as guide the work of direct support and managerial staff
• Include supervisors and DSPs in the development of these core values and any specific future interventions to address specific workforce challenges

Over the next several months, the team agreed to create a number of opportunities for all staff to help craft the set of core values:

• A values discussion at regularly scheduled meetings of supervisors and managers
• A process at each LSS residential site in the state to engage FLSs and DSPs in dialogues to provide input into the development of core HCLS values
• A values synthesis workshop (composed of four DSPs, five FLSs, three program managers, and three organization administrators) that reviewed the ideas from each site; created a first draft of core values; brainstormed strategies for incorporating the core values into the structures, practices, policies, and processes within HCLS; and explored how the core values could influence and shape individual supports and strengthen relationships among all key stakeholders.

The outcomes of these major events were exciting. Staff members were affirmed for their bright ideas and intensity of participation, and the leadership team was acknowledged for its planning, insight, and inclusive behavior.

Following these change events, the HCLS leadership team reviewed all the values material and developed five core values: *respect, personal development, individual support, safety,* and *sound management.* With the assistance of staff and administrators at different levels in the organization, the core values were incorporated into the fabric of HCLS structure and practice in the following ways: They were highlighted in realistic job previews and the process for hiring DSPs, inserted in orientation packets and discussed with new employees, described in the HCLS brochure of programs and services, infused into job descriptions and training curricula, and reviewed in the policy and procedures manual.

The development of core values and inclusion of staff in their creation was not always easy. The HCLS leadership team, DSPs, FLSs, and managers faced a number of struggles throughout this 18-month organizational process, including the following:

• The difficulty of maintaining employee motivation, focus, and momentum over a long period of time
• The barriers related to scheduling, costs, and time of DSPs and FLSs to participate in all change events
• The struggle of communicating the importance of staff input; deciding what feedback to use in changing products, practices, and policies; and informing all participants about the results of each change event

These and other struggles were acknowledged and dealt with by the leadership team, supervisors, and managers through meetings and discussions during the lengthy change process.

Creating a set of core values to guide HCLS and including DSPs and FLSs in more of HCLS's ongoing processes and operations was a success. The HCLS core values, in tandem with the LSS mission and vision, are now integrated in the organization's most important components. The HCLS core values do influence and guide employee actions. Also, HCLS continues to include DSPs and FLSs in operational teams, in planning groups, in workforce development activities and processes, and in external professional associations.

OVERCOMING IMPLEMENTATION BARRIERS

There are several potential barriers for an organization considering broad organizational change initiatives such as creating or revising the organization's mission, vision, and values. Some of the potential barriers include the following:

- The organization's leadership group and other employees may not believe that the initiative will have a direct and lasting impact on employee or organizational behavior or outcomes. This belief could become a self-fulfilling prophecy, meaning the change would never become a part of the culture of the organization or be used for direction-setting activities, for guiding problem solving or decision making, or for creating milestones for the organization's history and accomplishments.

    To deal with this type of barrier, the organization can 1) focus on consistent and continual communication between top leadership and managers and between managers, FLSs, and DSPs about the purpose, intended outcomes, support, and milestone accomplishments of the change initiative; 2) survey all employee groups about their thoughts, feelings, hopes, concerns, and suggestions related to the change effort's success and challenges and share the results with everyone; and 3) respond to employee's concerns, issues, and suggestions quickly, respectfully, and directly throughout the change process.

- There may be a lack of strong and ongoing support for developing and periodically renewing, improving, and revising the change initiative. This lack of change would lead to the certain and quiet death of the change initiative.

    To deal with this potential obstacle, top leadership as well as managers and supervisors must include discussions about the change initiative at every opportunity, from board of director's meetings, to work unit discussions, to policy and procedure development and revisions, to providing training sessions. Through these ongoing support activities, the organization's leadership and all employees will understand that the change effort is really going to take place.

- The organization may not have the time or money to creatively and openly develop and incorporate the change initiative.

    To respond to this potential barrier, the organization's leadership must make a strong commitment, both during initial discussions about the change effort and throughout the life of the change initiative, that the money and time to successfully implement a change process will be available.

- The organization may not incorporate the change initiative into all of its operations, practices, processes, and ongoing improvements. Or, the change may not be accepted and implemented by all the organization's units or sites.

    One key strategy to deal with this possible challenge is to design, implement, evaluate, and revise a pilot program with a few work units who embrace the change. Successful units should share the results of the change process with other units that initially were reluctant to become involved with the change process.

    The following list identifies how certain beliefs and actions of an organization's leadership group related to empowering employees to participate in a change initiative can have dire consequences within the organization:

- A leadership team that does not embrace employee empowerment, believe strongly in staff participation in decision making, or share information equally and quickly

to all employees will not be successful in the long term. Employees will not support the change effort, will not volunteer to pilot test the change, and will only share the bad news about the change process and outcomes.

- The leadership team that attempts to provide employees with only a sense of involvement rather than encouraging and supporting their meaningful and authentic participation will fail to garner the powerful ideas and strong enthusiasm of the employees. Token involvement is easily detected and will hinder the true empowerment of employees. For example, an organization that uses a survey instrument to gather employee ideas about a change process and then does not use or share the survey results risks complaints from the employees and resistance to engaging in the change process.

- Organization leaders that do not inform employees about an upcoming change project, inform staff adequately about the goals and intended outcomes of the project; or update staff about the progress, accomplishments, and problems of the project isolate employees from the change initiative and prevent them from sharing their ideas, volunteering their time, and embracing the change process.

All of these barriers may seem daunting, but knowing about them and incorporating strategies into the change process to deal directly with them can reduce the likelihood that they will stymie the change effort.

QUESTIONS TO PONDER

1. What are some of the strategies that can be developed and nurtured for incorporating your organization's mission, vision, and core values into the fabric and culture of that organization? How can one evaluate whether they have been incorporated?

2. How would you plan a large-scale systems change intervention for your organization? What potential barriers could you foresee encountering?

3. How can the principles of organizational change described in this chapter be incorporated into a plan to address recruitment, retention, or training challenges in your organization?

4. What is the meaning of *empowerment* as it is applied within your organization, to managers and supervisors, to work teams, to DSPs, and to the individuals receiving supports and their families?

5. How can supported individuals and their families be meaningfully included in your organization's change processes?

6. In the private sector, organizational change can ultimately be measured through the bottom line, or profit. If your organization is a nonprofit or public organization, how can your organization evaluate whether an organizational change effort was successful?

CONCLUSION

Selecting, designing, and implementing strategies to address workforce challenges in community human services organizations require substantial organizational change.

This chapter provides an overview of the dynamics of organizational change and describes several processes that can be used during organizational change to increase the likelihood that the workforce interventions described in this book will be successfully implemented. It will be helpful to keep these processes in mind while reading Chapters 13 and 14, which provide much more detailed information about the form organizational change might take to address specific workforce challenges. These chapters focus specifically on how to assess current status and evaluate change and on how to design a plan to guide the change process, respectively. Readers may wish to return to this chapter as they are designing their interventions for reminders about factors to consider in the process.

RESOURCES

Bunker, B., & Alban, B. (1997). *Large group interventions: Engaging the whole system for rapid change.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This book provides detailed descriptions about 12 different types of large-scale organizational interventions to bring about change. These methodologies deliberately involve a critical mass of the people affected by the change, both internally and externally, to make organizational change happen.

Carter, L., Giber, D., & Goldsmith, M. (2002). *Best practices in organizational development and change.* Indianapolis: Pfeiffer.

This state-of-the-art resource presents the most important ideas and effective strategies from experts and top companies in the field. Comprehensive in scope, this book addresses the five most important organization and human resource development topics—organization development and change, leadership development, recruitment and retention, performance management, and coaching and mentoring—and offers a practical framework for design, implementation, and evaluation.

Cummings, T., & Worlsey, C. (2000). *Essentials of organization development and change.* Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing. (Streamlined version of textbook)
Cummings, T., & Worlsey, C. (2001). *Organization development and change* (7th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing. (Textbook)

These texts are comprehensive overviews of organizational development and change. Although mostly geared for students, the texts provide a very detailed analysis. Either would be ideal as a desk reference for an organization that is contemplating organizational change.

Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading change.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

This practical resource for change was written by an expert in business leadership. It describes an eight-step process for organizational change that can be applicable to most organizations and places a key emphasis on changing behavior.