# CAA BOARD AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT
## Table of Contents

## Preface

This pamphlet was written primarily by Jim Masters, who gets by with a lot of help from his friends—John Johnston, Cheryl Cromwell, Marge Schiller, Greg Newton and Betsy Rath, each of whom wrote part of this book. Significant concepts and portions of this workbook are excerpted from Gary Stokes' workbook—"Human Development: Building the CAA Staff and Board."

Jim was a community organizer who created many exciting events on the sidewalks in front of governmental offices in the early 1960's. Upon employment by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity in 1966, one of his first assignments was to organize and to be the Master of Ceremonies for an eleven-state conference on Black Economic Development, cosponsored by the University of Missouri, OEO and the St. Louis Mayor's Office. "But I don't know anything about this topic or about how to do a conference," Masters protested. His boss gave him the typical OEO response: "Then you'd better learn." So he did, and then began designing and presenting workshops regularly for OEO and then for New York City, where he was a Mayoral appointee in the Lindsay Administration.

In 1979, he was appointed as Director of Training for the largest training project ever launched in the CAA world—the implementation of the CSA Grantee Program Management System. Jim is a regular presenter at NACAA conferences, and at regional and state events for CAAs. Much of his work is done on-site at CAAs, trouble- shooting or doing program development or strategic planning or board retreats. "I really like helping a CAA board to blossom and grow. The CAA concept is still one of the best ideas in human services. An empowered CAA Board is a magnificent engine of improvement in a community." Jim has been called "community action's man for all seasons" and "one of the foremost trainers on the community action circuit."

Jim has a wide range of interests across the human services community. Some of his current projects are: managing the comprehensive revision of a Head Start Program's Policies and Procedures, drafted strategic planning guidance for the rural EZ/EC initiative, being the Conference Planner for the California Community Economic Development Association, authoring the new CAA Salary Survey, helping four California CAAs install case management systems, and being a master trainer with the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention's nationwide train-the-trainer project.

Jim has a B.A. in Cultural Anthropology and an M.S. in International Business. He is President of the Center for Community Futures, PO Box 5309, Berkeley, CA 94705. 510-339-3801, FAX 510/339-3803. Jim invites questions about the ideas expressed in this pamphlet, or any other issues related to your efforts to design or deliver training for CAA board or staff. Call him for a free phone consultation.

The preparation of this workbook was funded under Grant _____to the National Association of Community Action Agencies by the Office of Community Services, Family Support Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The contents, however, do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Health and Human Services.

## Overview

In the ideal world, the knowledge and skills a person needs to do a job would be limited to a manageable amount—and unchanging. You would find a person who knows what needs to be done and knows how to do it. You would hire that person who would do it, forever. End of problem.

However, in the real world, the needs of organizations and the people in them are constantly changing. Every organization is faced with the challenge of developing a system—a set of policies and procedures—by which its members can continually redefine their responsibilities and acquire the knowledge and skills needed to fulfill them. The external environment requires a commitment to lifelong learning and an organized approach so you are not overwhelmed with information.

This workbook will assist CAA managers to design and implement training and other developmental activities that will improve board and staff performance. The purposes of this improvement activity will vary depending on how the CAA defines its purpose and its mission.

CAA's that focus largely on "anti-destitution" activity, alleviating the pain of poverty by passing out food and other stuff will do one kind of training. CAA's that engage in human development activity to assist low-income people to change themselves and thereby climb out of poverty will do another. And CAA's that engage in institutional change to help create economic opportunities or to eliminate discriminatory barriers in the larger society will engage in another. The purposes will also vary depending on the person's role in the organization; e.g., board member, manager or line worker.

This workbook does not contain specific training curricula or attempt to prescribe the content of training either for CAA Board or staff. Other NACAA publications, for example the Planning Workbook and the Executive Directors Manual, include more substantive information on the purposes and history of CAAs. Instead, this workbook focuses on the principles and methods that a CAA Manager can use to identify whether training is the right methodology to deal with an issue, and if so how to design and deliver or otherwise acquire training that is needed.

This workbook will enable a CAA Manager to create an Individual Development Plan (IDP) for each staff person or board member. The IDP includes two levels of activity: ways to increase the person's ability to perform assigned tasks and the development of more general capacities. The IDP includes goals for each area of improvement and the intended methods for reaching those goals.

The goals usually involve enhancement of the person's knowledge, skill or attitudes. The methods for improvement are a combination of education, training and other personal development activities such as practice or supervisory coaching. The preparation of an IDP is based on the tried-and-true historical methods of human development.

Chapter I provides the basic concepts needed to prepare an Individual Development Plan.

Chapter II describes how to prepare an IDP for a staff person.

Chapter III describes how to prepare an IDP for a Board member.

Chapter IV is an overview of adult learning theory. If the individual has an IDP that is self-implemented away from the work site, then the individual will probably select learning methods that are compatible with their learning style. If the IDP includes any structured activity that is sponsored by the CAA or done at the CAA, then you need to consider the learning styles of the participants when selecting the implementation methods.

Much training and development activity consists of attendance at outside seminars and conferences. Increasingly CAAs are doing their own training in-house. The options are (1) to purchase "canned" training programs, (2) to have a staff person or a hired trainer tailor an existing training program to your specific needs, or (3) to design your own. Some additional thoughts about when to do your work in-house and when to buy it are included at the end of Chapter IV.

An overview of how to design training programs is included in Chapter V. Since the bulk of this workbook focuses on formal group training (as opposed to coaching or mentoring), understanding this chapter is central to making this workbook a useful tool.

An overview of key issues in the delivery of training is included in Chapter VI. If you are now purchasing training or doing some in-house training, use the information in these two chapters as a checklist to see if you are covering all the bases. If you want to design more of your own training this workbook will get you started. Even if you are not going to design your own training, knowing the basic principles of training design and delivery will enable you to be a much more sophisticated purchaser and evaluator of outside training services.

Now we move to topics of greater complexity. In the past, most training activity has been focused on individuals in the hope that they would be able to translate what they had learned into action in the workplace. The new emphasis is on developing the entire team together, often in or near the workplace. The intent is to increase the probability that whatever is learned in training is translated into action.

There are a number of Megatrends reshaping how organizations operate in America. Some of these trends are at the societal level. The effect of these social trends on traditional human resource management are described in Chapter VII.

Historically, the employer determined the content of staff development plans. The plan was derived deductively from the employer's idea of the mission or the business. The purpose of the plan was to help the employee make contributions to that overall purpose. The need for continuous improvement in service quality and for additional responsiveness to customers is now widely accepted in business and government alike. This creates several dilemmas for traditional staff development. In the new paradigm, control of the task content of the work shifts dramatically in the direction of the work team and the individual worker. We describe the difficulties these shifts create for traditional methods of staff development in Chapter VIII. We offer some suggestions that CAA managers can use to overcome the problems associated with a focus on improving service quality and customer responsiveness.

In addition to helping individuals improve, we also want to develop groups. These can be

an entire board or a committee, the managers as a group, or all or some of the staff in a single program. Given the increasing emphasis on improving the performance of groups, we have included materials to help you assess the effectiveness of team functioning and to diagnose problems that a group may be having in its operations. A framework for reviewing the structure of a group is included in Chapter IX.

A framework for reviewing group functioning is included in Chapter X. Use it to figure out what you have too much of—or not enough of—in a group.

Tools for assessing interpersonal operations, including resolving problems in decision making, are included in Chapter XI. Together, these three chapters give you the tools needed to diagnose about 90% of the typical problems that come up in group operations, whether they are CAA boards or staff.

Chapter XII looks at the new roles that managers and supervisor will play in a team-based environment. .

Chapter XIII looks at employee empowerment, and the need for some kind of systematic approach to delegation of more and more authority down, down, down.

Chapter XIV is an overview of Learning Organizations. This material is from Gary Stoke's work on Human Development. Stokes has done a terrific job of bringing the theory of MIT Professor Peter Senge and other systems dynamics experts into the CAA world.

There are some difficult issues that usually must be addressed in CAA Board Development. Their vision about what is possible and what their organization might do is all-too-often narrowly focused and limited to the specific programs they are operating. In Chapter XV we explore the self-limiting visions and suggest some approaches to help boards expand their horizons.

Chapter XVI pulls together the information from Chapters VII through XVI to help the CAA to create a Team or Group Development Plan (GDP).

Stoke's adds insights about the role of leadership in learning organizations in Chapter XVII.

More and more training will be developed and delivered through consortium models, where agencies with similar needs band together to accomplish a common purpose. The may be two or more agencies or their associations. We have included a few thoughts on this topic in Chapter XVIII.

How do you manage the process of changing the organization to implement these or other ideas in your CAA? John Johnston shares a model for managing organizational change in Chapter XIX.

Appendix A offers a brief history of the evolution of theory in organizational development. This will offer additional insight for the people who are interested in the "group" issues covered in Chapters IX through XVI.

Appendix B is a brief listing of resources.

Have fun!

## CHAPTER I: BASIC CONCEPTS

The conceptual framework used in the workbook for preparing staff or board development plans has four compartments. They are shown in Table 1. Within each compartment, you seek to improve the knowledge, skills or attitudes of the individual or group. The methods you use to bring about that improvement are education, development or training.

TABLE 1

| | Individual Development Plan (IDP) | Group Development Plan (GDP) |
|---|---|---|
| Task performance | | |
| Capacity building | | |

The left-hand column—**tasks** and **capacities**—describes two levels of developmental activity. **TASK** completion requires a specific set of knowledge and the performance of a specific set of activities. At the task level, the supervisor and the worker know in advance what is to be done—the purpose of the task and the activity to carry it out or complete it can be described. Tasks are usually time limited and they have an identifiable end result. The installation of an interior storm window or blowing in nine inches of attic insulation or helping a parent complete an application to enroll their child in Head Start are examples of tasks.

In most CAAs the lists of tasks to be performed come from one of four sources:

1. Program: purpose and activities: e.g. Community Services Block Grant (CSBG), Head Start, Weatherization (WX), LIHEAP, etc. These are described in regulations, work programs or contracts. These come from an agreement with a funder.

2. Profession: accountant, nurse, teacher. Some professions include credentialing or licensing standards which, when met, attest to the persons capacity to perform certain functions. NACAA's Code of conduct and CCAP describe some of these standards and expectations.

3. Agency policy, or discussion with supervisor.

4. Customers ask for it. If it is a unique, individual request then a judgement is made based on customer service standards. If patterns of requests start to show up in interactions with customers, then there may need to be a change in policy or practices to respond to this new factor in a more systematic way.

**CAPACITIES** are broader functions at a higher level of generalization than task-specific performance skills. There are a variety of functions in an organization that require generic skills in problem assessment, effective listening, communication, leadership, or problem solving. These generic skills are examples of what are called capacities in this workbook. Capacities enable a person to think on their own, to plan, to adapt to changing circumstances and to invent new solutions to problems as they arise. Capacities help us to recognize and seize opportunities. The knowledge of the history of CAA's may for example, enhance a person's capacity to understand social policy or to engage in development of new programs. (Incidentally, the history of community action is described in other NACAA publications and not included in this workbook.)

We can describe most of the tasks we need to do today, but future tasks for which a capacity may be used may not yet be known. CAAs should think both about how to develop capacities as well as to provide task-specific training.

One place where the agency writes it expectations about both capacities and tasks are in the job descriptions. Job descriptions typically include a mix of both specific tasks and broader functions or the capacities to perform those functions. The entry-level job description is heavily weighted toward task performance. At the higher managerial levels the job description is weighted toward broader functions or capacities with few specific tasks mentioned.

This distinction between task performance and enhancing capacities to perform broader functions is significant for CAA staff and board development because there is a tidal shift taking place in human resources management away from task oriented training toward capacity building. This means that on the whole there will be less training in how to perform a specific task and more training in capacities, such as analyzing the environmental context, diagnosing problems and applying generic problem-solving skills.

There are several interrelated dynamics that are causing this shift from task-oriented training to capacity development. A large body of research has accumulated that analyzes what happened to the millions of men who were trained under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Most of them received job-specific training. They received literacy training for the purpose of running a machine or performing specific tasks on an assembly line. As their jobs began evaporating in the l970's, millions of these displaced workers could not take their previous skills and use them in another work setting. Their job-related skills—including their literacy—was job specific. This revelation stunned the education, the employment, and training communities. One result of this is the new Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act of 1990 (the "Voc Ed Act") that requires vocational training to shift away from task-training and toward capacity building by focusing on learning about all aspects of the industry the person is about to enter, including: planning, management, finance, technical skills, underlying principles of technology, worker rights and responsibilities, community issues and health, safety and environmental issues. This is a revolutionary shift, and was put in place in 1993.

Another major factor is that the rate of change in most areas of our knowledge-based service-oriented economy is so great that employers now prefer to hire people who have broad

capacities and then do their own skill training in-house.

Employers want workers who have certain high-level capacities, and more and more employers want to do whatever task-related training is done—but they will be doing less task training and more capacity building. So there is both a shift of task training back into the organization and a reduction in the amount. The American Society for Training and Development, on a multi-year contract from the Department of Labor, has identified the following seven personal capacities and skills that employers want.

1. Learning how to learn; absorbing, processing and applying new information.

2. Listening and oral communications.

3. Competence in reading, writing and computation; sound basic academic skills.

4. Adaptability; creative thinking and problem solving; adapting to new situations without constant supervision.

5. Personal management, self-esteem, goal setting, motivations, personal responsibility for career development.

6. Group effectiveness, interpersonal skills, negotiation and teamwork.

7. Organizational effectiveness and leadership. Organize and motivate him/herself and others.

Source: **Work Place Basics: The Skills Employers Want.**
ASTD and U.S. DOL. ASTD Order Dept: 703/683-8129.

Notice that these competencies are both the competencies the employees in a CAA need—and the skills that people need to enter the work force and to succeed there, so building these competencies among your staff and among the low-income people you serve is essentially the same challenge. When designing your individual or group development plans, consider how these competencies relate to the purposes you are trying to accomplish. Factor them in—where they fit.

Former Secretary of Labor and Harvard Professor Robert Reich, in his book, **The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 2Ist Century Capitalism**, believes that we must make substantial investments in our nation's human capital if we are to compete successfully with Japan, Germany and other countries which have placed a high priority on the development of their work forces. Reich points out that the top 20% of American earners are able to export the product of their work to nations all over the globe because they are knowledge workers-symbolic analysts, as he calls them--whose products arc highly specialized. Production workers, however, who make up another segment of our work force, must compete with other workers who are paid much less elsewhere in the world. Service workers, the other category of workers in our work force, also fail to thrive because their pay and work status are affected by the general prosperity and by the ease of finding workers for unskilled jobs. Part of Reich's prescription is to upgrade

the work of as much of our work force as possible--moving more and more of our workers into the knowledge or symbolic analyst level of employment. Who will be responsible for such a massive national undertaking? Business certainly has a stake and a responsibility. Government at all levels, yes. And human service agencies and education institutions of each community. But if the public is becoming increasingly troubled by neglect of our human capital development, it is not necessarily ready to translate that concern into massive new investments in the education and human service infrastructure.

Taking the idea of general competencies one step further, the field of business strategy includes an idea of "core competencies," the essential knowledge, skills and attitudes your organization must do very well in order to successfully carry out your vision, mission, priorities and strategies. These core competencies are among your most valued assets; they are the basis of your key success factors. Building the personal competencies of all staff and the core competencies of your organization should be at the top of the leadership's agenda. Leaders will succeed to the degree they understand and develop these competencies.

Now that we have looked at the task-versus-capacity issues, we move on and look at what goes inside each box in Table 1 (on page 1).. This is where you describe the purposes you want to accomplish, the knowledge, skills or attitudes you are trying to improve, and the methods you will use to bring that about. Knowledge consists of ideas—of concepts or facts. Skills are the capacity to apply those ideas, to actually perform in the workplace. Attitudes are the values involved, and the motivations or willingness to do the tasks. Training is appropriate method to use to help people enhance their knowledge, improve skills or acquire new skills, or to change attitudes. Training is not the answer to every problem. For example there may be a problem to be solved or a goal to be achieved that should be done by a change in policy, by institutional change or by personal counseling.

There are three general categories of **methods** that are used to enhance knowledge, skills or attitudes. They are described below.

Education focuses on the highest or most general level of theory. Education is usually done by academic institutions, schools or colleges, that are away from the workplace. Many CAA's pay part or all of the cost for people to attend classes at these institutions. Development occupies the middle ground. Development seeks to create or improve a capacity for a person to accomplish a wide variety of tasks, some of which are known and many of which are as yet unknown. The focus is to help the trainee figure out and to practice taking a general concept and applying it to a variety of situations. This may include simulations or hands-on practice. (Some theoreticians use the term development only in conjunction with groups and do not apply it to individuals.) Training was the most narrowly defined of these concepts. It was to enable the person to accomplish a specific stated purpose, and if that purpose can be quantified and measured all the better. Training is usually some combination of self-study, classroom and on-the-job training.

In general, education and development seek to improve a person's capacities. Training seeks to improve performance of specific tasks. The next chapter describes how to take these concepts and to develop the Individual Development Plan (IDP) for a staff person.

## CHAPTER II: PREPARING AN INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR A STAFF PERSON

Gary Stokes has a useful framework for thinking about individual development which he calls “the CAA as a model for human growth and development.” The next paragraph describes it.

The people of the CAA and the organization itself have to model learning. As we become more consciously models of human capital development, we realize more clearly that the CAA cannot promote human capital development effectively unless it is developing its own human capital. The CAA, then, is for people who want to learn, grow and develop. Only those people can help other people learn, grow and develop. Only those people can help us build a knowledge organization powerful enough to help people out of poverty, help communities solve problems and influence public policy. Like all knowledge which is very valuable, gaining knowledge about staff and board development requires lots of effort, trial and error and years of commitment to building relationships with other people. But this knowledge is perhaps the most rewarding knowledge people can acquire, as any of us who have worked in a high functioning group of people can attest.

Ideally, the preparation of an IDP begins with a comprehensive listing of the tasks that the person actually performs over a full cycle of all their activities. The cycle may be a day, week, or month long, and it may include sub-cycles of varying lengths that are repeated. This is called task-skill analysis, job performance analysis, or any of several other names.

The tasks are measured in terms of the amount of time devoted to each. The degree to which each tasks relates to or underlies others is reviewed, i.e., what else depends on this task. Other factors are devised and all of them are used to rate the significance of each type of task. In a Head Start program, knowing how to recognize symptoms and provide emergency treatment for a severe disease may be of higher priority than showing a parent how to cleanse a minor scrape.

After the task mapping and rating is finished, then the knowledge, skills and attitude (KSA) needed to accomplish each task are identified. Knowledge includes ideas, concepts, or facts. Skills include the ability to recognize when the ideas should be used and being able to apply the ideas to accomplish the desired purpose. Attitudes include the value assigned to the task and the commitment or motivation to do the work.

This review should also uncover capacities that underlie or that must be present to perform several different tasks. By enhancing the underlying capacity the employee enhances their ability to do several tasks. The list of "seven generic capacities that employers want," included in Chapter 1 of this workbook offers one way to categorize the capacities.

Then the employer and the employee assess the employees knowledge, skills and attitudes against the list of what is needed to perform the task. Where the employee is lacking a desired KSA, then the employer and employee create a plan to enhance the employees KSA.

The methods and timetable are negotiated between the employer and employee, as well

as whether the activities will be done on company time and paid by the employer, what will be done on the employees time and paid by them, or how the time and cost will be divided between them in some way.

As a practical matter, comprehensive task listing can take several hours or days and it is rarely done. Instead, the work program, job description and immediate perceptions of the work to be done are discussed. The supervisor and employee will talk about "how things are going" and "where do we have problems" and "how can we improve things." They will identify a few key priority areas where the employer feels the employee needs to bolster their performance and a few key areas where the employee wants to improve.

The employer and employee then decide how to bring about the desired changes through some combination of education or training. Some types of education and training are provided by funders to enhance the operation of their programs, e.g. Head Start. Other types of education or training can be purchased from local management centers, colleges or other vendors.

Education and training can be a highly individualized activity, including self study. It may be one-on-one, with the supervisor functioning as a coach. It may be a more formal classroom setting. Many CAA's pay for part or all of the cost of employees to acquire education from local schools.

Career Development Assistance From Local Schools

A 1996 **Survey of Salaries and Other Benefits in CAA's,** conducted by the Center for Community Futures, asked CAAs about their policies on tuition reimbursement and other career development assistance. Of the 135 CAAs that responded to the survey, 49 or 36% responded positively when asked whether they assisted their employees with the tuition expenses of academic courses.

Twenty-one of these CAAs reported that they reimbursed 100% of tuition costs, and five CAAs reported that they reimbursed at least 50% of costs. However, many CAAs indicated that reimbursement was dependent upon whether the courses were job-related or required by the agency, and also dependent upon the employee meeting certain terms, including grade achievement. Some CAAs also stated that tuition reimbursement was provided only if funds were available.

The remaining CAAs had a variety of reimbursement practices. For example, eleven CAAs set dollar limits on tuition aid, ranging from $50 to a maximum of $1,000. Two CAAs had a flat-limit of $200. One CAA stated that they provided tuition reimbursement (100%) only for Head Start staff.

An earlier survey of 249 CAA's found one CAA that had a flat-limit of $400. Another had a range from $100 to $1,099—depending upon employee classification. Yet another CAA indicated that it paid a maximum of 50% per credit hour, and another that it paid for one class and the relevant class texts per semester. Two CAAs stated that they provided tuition reimbursement (100%) only for Head Start staff (including reimbursement for Child

Development Association credentials).

Two CAAs indicated that they gave their employees paid time off to study, and another that it would reimburse 100% of costs if the employee studied on personal time, but that the employee picked up all tuition costs if he or she went (and was allowed to go) on agency time. Another CAA provided loans for tuition costs, although employees with the agency for five years were exempt from repayment.

Finally, four CAAs noted that they made tuition payments based upon performance, or at least upon satisfactory completion of the courses. Two of these CAAs reimbursed 100% of costs if the employee received a course grade of "C" or better; another reimbursed 100% of tuition costs for an "A", 75% for a "B", and 50% for a "C". The final CAA paid 75% for a grade of "A", 50% for a "B", and nothing for a "C" or below.

Career Development Assistance in Addition to Courses at Local Schools

The 1996 survey found that thirty-five of the 135 CAAs (26%) responded positively when asked whether they assisted their employees with career development expenses in addition to classroom tuition in 1996. Such career development expenses were associated with seminars, conferences, books, and workshops. As with tuition expenses, several CAAs stipulated that the relevant expenses be work-related or required by the agency.

Of the 35 agencies that did assist employees with career development expenses, 28 CAAs paid 100% of the costs, and one CAA paid 50%. One CAA provided four paid hours per pay period to develop career goals. Another agency stated that reimbursement for career development is simply “determined on a case-to-case basis.”

The earlier survey found one CAA that specified a maximum of $200 per year, and two CAAs provided four and five hours of educational leave per week for career development activities, respectively.

The most important thing about an IDP is that it be written down. It can be retained in the employees' file and updated periodically. Be as specific as possible about the KSA to be obtained, where it will be obtained, when it will be obtained, and who will pay for it.

An example is given here. This contains more entries than would usually be the case for one employee in any give quarter or year, but we wanted to illustrate a range of possibilities.

**INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN** (draft format)

EMPLOYEE NAME: Jane Doe Date: tomorrow, 199x
PROGRAM/UNIT: WX
SUPERVISOR: J. Roe FOR PERIOD: May, 199x to April 199y

**A. JOB or TASK PERFORMANCE TO BE IMPROVED:**

| | TASK | METHOD | DATE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Blower door operation to state stds | State workshop | June, 199x |
| 2. | Blower door maint done to mfg specs | Seminar at manufacturing co. | Sept, 199x |
| 3. | Proper use of XYZ caulk | Supervisor OJT | begin Oct |

CAA/WX will pay training cost and travel for # 1—3.

**B. CAPACITIES TO BE ENHANCED.**

4. Learn to learn, and to absorb and apply new knowledge.
Course on thermodynamics. Local college, Fall term, 199x

CAA pays 50% of employees tuition costs, for passing grade, up to $150 annual maximum, for job related training.

5. Teamwork & excellence in-house seminar to be scheduled

6. Learn and apply new knowledge.
Home-remodeling contractors
License being sought MNO Contractor Jan, 199x

Employee is bearing entire cost. Will receive $500 pay increase when license is obtained in two years. Will then work ½ time in our for-profit home remodeling subsidiary.

7. Problem solving
Latest techniques Annual state assn meeting Dec, 199x
She wants to go to annual Big Blower Door Huffers and Puffers Conference. All our employees get three days paid release time for agency-approved personal development. CAA will pay her salary while she attends this two day meeting. CAA pays registration and travel only for supervisors. Employee is not a supervisor and will therefore pay her own registration and travel.

_____ _____
Supervisor approves plan: (Date) Employee Agrees: (Date)

You might or might not include example # 3. "use new XYZ caulk." If this was a routine upgrade or a simple product to use you might omit it. If a new product is tricky to use or there is possible liability associated with its use and you want to be able to verify who was trained or if you simply want a comprehensive log of all staff development activity—then you might include it.

You could have more elaborate descriptions of outcomes, e.g. "be able to demonstrate three new uses or applications of X, and train at least two-coworkers in these uses."

There are many other diagnostic tools available for use in improving individual capacities. The largest family of these are the "style" or "type" inventories. The style inventories, e.g. the Management Style Inventory and the Learning Style Inventory, help people to assess patterns in their behavior that may not always be known at the conscious level. They assess behavior.

There are at least one hundred of these. They can be purchased through the mail for $5 to $25 each. Training Magazine (on news stands), your local chapter of the American Society or Training and Development or any organization in the yellow pages listed under Organizational Development can help you locate these. They are usually self-administered, with a scoring code and explanations of what your scores suggest. Occasionally you get a real "eureka" insight where the-light-bulb-goes-on. The more frequent response is that you perceive that you really fit more than one of three or four of the patterns, or more confusing yet you seem to be a blend of elements from several of the patterns.

The "type" inventories try to show you what type of person you are. One of the more famous is the Meyers-Briggs personality inventory, which assesses a person based on their introversion/extroversion and other dimensions. So you discover that Meyers-Briggs "types" you as an I-P-S-J. Then you read their material about how the IPSJ “type” does relate to or could relate best to the other "types" that are given. This has received major attention from many large U.S. corporations. It can offer some interesting insights, but don't decide that since they think you are an I-P-S-J you can be only an IPSJ and never act in any other way. Sometimes these type descriptions are adopted by people as defining their whole existence. This obviously is a mistake.

There are several different ways to draft the IDP. You could have the employee draft the IDP and bring it to the supervisor for review and approval. You could have the supervisor draft all of the IDP’s at once, including the Group Development Plan for his/her unit(s). This would reflect their perceptions about what each individual needs to do to achieve overall goals.

Most of what goes into an IDP covers one budget year, but notice we intentionally included an example in the IDP where the workers involved in a program that is two years long. The two-year framework helps link the employee to the agency for that period and to show them how the major accomplishment will relate to their future work.

Goodwill is crucial in the development of an IDP, as the employee must be willing to admit to themselves and to the employer that there may be an area where they need or want improvement. The employee must be highly motivated because unless they seek out and involve

themselves in human development activity, it will not happen. Unfortunately, KSA can not be injected. It has to be desired by the person. Adults only learn what they want to learn.

Every employee could have an IDP, from the Executive Director on down. The first IDP is the hardest one to write because it involves thinking about all the tasks to be performed and the capacities that are needed. After the first one, they usually become cumulative in a step-by-step fashion.

A format for thinking about what might go into an Executive Director's IDP can be derived from the NACAA publication, **The CAA Executive Directors Manual**, available from NACAA. This publication suggests that an Executive manages five key relationships and supervises seven management functions. They are listed here:

A. Five Relationships

1. Board of directors liaison and support

2. Low-income people

3. Other community leadership

4. CAA staff

5. Funding agencies

B. Seven Major Management Functions

a. Planning

b. Community participation, organization and development

c. Program implementation and management (includes MIS and evaluation).

d. Personnel

e. Fiscal

f. Public relations

g. Staff and board development

An Executive can compare actual responsibilities to the more detailed listing of hypothetical tasks and responsibilities in **The NACAA Executive Directors Manual**. The Manual may help the CAA Director to make explicit both the detailed tasks and capacities needed to perform broader functions. The Director can then compare current knowledge with what they think would be needed to perform their responsibilities. Then they can identify ways to

obtain the knowledge, skills or attitudes that are desired.

An interesting planning tool can be created by comparing the five relationships and seven functions described above, with the list of "seven generic capacities that employers want," included in Chapter I of this workbook. The seven generic skills employers want offers an additional way to organize your thinking about what a CAA Director or any other person needs to have in order to do their job.

## CHAPTER III: PREPARING AN INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR A BOARD MEMBER

This involves a slightly different set of issues than preparing an IDP for a staff person. Board members are usually recruited because they already have some specific skill (lawyer, accountant, housing developer, personnel manager) or because they are part of a constituency or they can represent a specific institution. Sometimes, a person who is committed to your mission or your agency is recruited for the board then helped to obtain the knowledge and skills needed to perform a board role. So you can either recruit a person or "grow" a person to do a specific CAA board function.

There are dozens of generic workbooks for nonprofit boards that describe board members responsibilities for planning, fundraising and fiscal oversight, accountability to stakeholders, evaluating the executive director, etc. There are courses at community colleges, management support centers and through associations on "how to be a board treasurer" or "Parliamentary procedure." These offer an inexpensive way for board members to improve their ability to carry out a specific role or assignment.

For a description of individual board member roles and what a board member needs to know about a CAA, we commend your attention to the NACAA Board Manual. This will help you identify the particular area(s) or topics on which an individual board member may want to initiate self-improvement. The NACAA Board Manual helps CAA Board members to understand the scope, complexity and developmental history of what a CAA is and does. Most of this information can be absorbed in one reading or in a one-day workshop that provides an overview of CAAs and their history. Individuals may choose to help the CAA Board by focusing on one or more of its internal functions. A few of the key areas listed in the NACAA Board Manual are listed here:

Leadership (officers, committee chairs)
Internal structure and operations; e.g., by-laws
Nominating, recruiting new members
Planning
Personnel
Finance
Public relations, community relations
Staff and board development

Board members may want to specialize in one or more of the strategies that CAAs use to bring about change in the community:

Community organization and development
Program coordination
Program development/implementation/oversight/monitoring
Advocacy, influence public policy
Solving specific community problems
Resource mobilization
Outreach, information and referral, case management

Direct social services

All of these are areas where individual performance can be improved through self-study, participating on other boards, classroom training, or mentoring by other board members to name a few. Finding out what the individual wants to do is very important. As volunteers, if they don't enjoy doing it and don't want to do it, either they won't do it at all or they won't do it for long.

Boards have the ability to work with each other as a group, as a team. Boards of small CAAs almost never receive training in "effective teamwork." Instead, "the way we do things around here" and other traditional modes of operation are passed on from the old board members to the new members, who are "socialized" into the board's existing approaches. The new member usually has a difficult time in learning the jargon of the programs. In the course of the year or two it takes them to learn the words associated with the programs—they usually slip unconsciously into the old social structure. This may or may not be desirable.

Where a board already has a long-term vision, is aggressive and enjoys effective board operations, you want new people to "join the team." If the board is stodgy, micro-managing day-to- day operations, or dominated by one or two people then it may be desirable to change the way the board operates. This can almost never be done simply by sending one or two board members off to a training session. Large changes have to be done with the entire board in the room.

What can be accomplished by training one or two board members off site is to show them "there is a better way." They will then have to convince others that the status quo is inadequate, that change is needed. This "vision building" for an individual through their IDP can serve as a catalyst for change, but it is neither the method or the sum total of change. Having one or two board members get fired up about the need for change is a necessary condition, but it is not a sufficient condition. This change has to be carried out with the entire board in the room, going through a developmental process. The typical reasons why boards get hung up are described in Chapter X, as are some of the methods that can be used to initiate corrective action.

The "deductive" approach would be to build a list of all possible tasks and capacities for a board then check off which ones that individual will focus on and how you will help them improve. The "inductive approach" would start with the individual and their interests and list the specifics. An example of the latter type of a Board IDP is given here.

BOARD MEMBER INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (Draft format)

BOARD MEMBER NAME: F. Smith date: tomorrow, 199x

FOR PERIOD: May, 199x to April 199y

**A. JOB or TASK PERFORMANCE TO BE IMPROVED**:

| TASK | METHOD | DATE |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Carry out five new member recruitment methods | United Way workshop | Aug, 199x |
| 2. Bring back and implement six new ways we can use to publicize our CAA success stories. | NACAA Annual Mtg | Sep, 199x |
| CAA will pay registration cost and travel for # 1—2. | | |
| 3. Learn how different sectors in community and on tri-partite board can work together | Attend workshop on Diversity and Partnerships At CAA Assn Meeting | Fall, 199X |

| **B. CAPACITY TO BE ENHANCED**: | METHOD | DATE |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Learn more about the history and mission of CAAs. | Attend workshop at NACAA Conference | Sep, 199X |
| 5. Learn to apply community problem-solving methods described in NACAA Board Manual to two problems in our community. | Read.<br>Meet with staff<br>Report to plng cmte,<br>Select two probs.<br>Get board approval | May, 199x<br>Jun<br><br>Jun<br>Jul |
| Sep | | Initiate action |

_____ _____

Board Chair approves/date Board member Agrees/date

_____

Executive Director verification that funds are available/date

## CHAPTER IV: OVERVIEW OF ADULT LEARNING THEORY

This chapter highlights the importance of understanding adult learning theory and applying it to staff and board training. The method selected to achieve the IDP goal for an individual may be education, development or training. The individual may be the CAA Executive Director, a board president, a program director, an accountant, an outreach worker, a LIHEAP intake worker, a Head Start Teacher's Aide, or whomever.

There are basic principles that describe how all adults learn, regardless of the purpose of learning or their station in life. There is a solid core of research about how the brain works and about how the mind assimilates and the personality processes information. The pioneer in adult learning is Professor Malcolm Knowles. His work on adult education provides a universal language that all trainers understand and can use to design training programs and to select training methods. Dr. Knowles' conceptual framework organizes adult education into three categories: knowledge, skills and attitudes. What does the individual or group need to know (knowledge) or to be able to do (skills)? What values (attitudes) or other beliefs are necessary for them to use the knowledge and skills?

A group that is a focus for training may be all the CAAs in a state. It may be a single CAA. It may be the board of the CAA or a board subcommittee, or the management staff, or everyone in specific job title, or the staff from a particular program or a geographic location. The group has something that connects the members together that precedes and will last after the training event is over.

There is also a solid body of research about how individual work in groups, about how groups work, about what kinds of problems they have under different circumstances and what can be done to improve group functioning. An overview of this research is included in Appendix A.

The principles on how adults learn that are described here relate primarily to how individuals learn. The ways that groups learn about the topics on which they have some common future interest are mentioned in the chapters on group development.

So these ideas add up to a simple chart for organizing our thinking.

| | FOCUS OF TRAINING OR DEVELOPMENT | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Knowledge | Skills | Attitudes |
| PARTICIPANT(S) may be: | | | |
| Individual(s) or | | | |
| Group(s) | | | |

There are several basic principles of adult learning theory that apply to all adults.

The training goals and content must be compatible with the participants' skill and experience levels. (Don't start too far above or below their current level.)

Participants must participate actively in identifying learning needs, in performing learning activities, and in determining whether learning goals have been met. (Don't do all this for them in some canned way; let they help shape the training.)

A variety of methods are used to connect with the several types of learning styles. (More on this later in this chapter.)

The training content and activities help participants learn to solve real, job-related problems. (It has to be focused on the here-and-now. How will I use this tomorrow?)

Participants can see the relationships between the new learning, and their prior learning and experience. (If they don't see the connections, they will not retain it.)

Notice how these principles are embodied in the following summary of the National Head Start Association's Position Paper on "Standards for Training Programs in Head Start." This offers guidance that CAAs may be able to use for purposes in addition to Head Start. These are drawn verbatim from the NHSA Position Paper:

Goal 1: Training should support high quality service delivery.

Goal 2: Training should support staff development.

CAAs have always had a special commitment to career development. Training for all staff must include consideration of their personal and professional development. Such training should seek to expand knowledge and skills, competence, and opportunity for advancement.

Goal 3: Training should incorporate community members.

All training experiences should be available to community participants and volunteers to the maximum extent feasible.

Standards for Training Programs

1. Training must support professional development.

High quality training must support the professional development of program staff in order to:

* increase career options and advancement for staff; and
* enable programs and staff to work effectively with each other and with other organizations.

Training must be documented and, whenever possible, include provisions for college

credit or Continuing Education Units, and be applicable towards appropriate credentials or degrees. It also should be linked to an agency career development ladder and, where appropriate, result in increased compensation.

2. Training must be competency based.

Competency based training is designed to increase knowledge and change or improve behavior, and should include both formal instruction and practice. Provisions for assessing the effectiveness of the training, (i.e., competence) should be included in the training program. A variety of procedures should be employed to assess effectiveness, depending upon local conditions and individual variations. Examples of appropriate assessment procedures include (but are not limited to):

* Interviews
* Written or oral assessments
* Observations
* Interviews/questionnaires from third parties

3. Training programs must reflect local needs and values.

Effective training programs must be tailored to reflect the needs of local programs and communities. The selection and delivery of training must include consideration of:

* Target population language and education level
* Local priorities and resources
* Local culture and values

4. Training programs must respect individual experience, accommodate individual differences and be accessible.

Effective training programs incorporate principles of adult education, including building upon past experience and utilizing an approach which accommodates a variety of learning styles and media.

5. Training programs must reflect multicultural perspective and values.

Training program content must avoid cultural bias, stereotypes or misinformation about ethnic or cultural groups. (This ends the summary of the NHSA Position Paper.)

The place you can hit the nail on the head and satisfy all the adult learning styles is in your selection of training methods. There are dozens of training methods that can be used. You select the methods (1) to accomplish the specific objectives you have identified for changing knowledge, skills or attitudes, and (2) to appeal to a variety of learning styles.

If you want to impart knowledge, you help participants retain **the main points** by communicating those points **both visually and verbally**. Give these points to them in writing.

If you want real skill development, you must give them a chance **to practice** the new skill. At minimum this means a desk exercise. Hopefully you can get them up and moving in a simulation or role play. Ideally, they try it back on the job then have another change to talk about it with the instructor.

If you are trying to change attitudes—you must give people a chance **to talk about the issue** among themselves. They have to try the new attitude on for "fit" and get some feedback from others or the new attitude will not stick.

You also select methods that relate to the learning style preferences of the participants. Most individuals have a learning style preference; that is, a particular way that they prefer to learn or that they learn most easily. Some people learn through their fingertips. Some people learn from the words spoken by others. Some people learn by reading. Some people learn only if their own mouth moves. There is no right or wrong or good or bad here; there is only what works. In a one or two- hour workshop, the trainer may have time to use only one training technique. In a one or two-day workshop, the trainer should appeal to several of the adult-learning styles.

McBer and Company, 17 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts is one source of workbooks on adult learning styles based on Malcolm Knowle's theory.. The workbooks describe how to help people uncover their preferred learning styles, and how to select training methods that appeal to different learning styles. A brief list of examples of the learning style and methods that people with that style will find most useful are drawn from the McBer material and are given below.

a. Seeing. Written material is distributed, flip charts or other visuals are used.

b. Hearing. The content will be explained through lecture, audio or videotape, etc.

c. Talking. There is an opportunity for participants to discuss the subject matter, to "reality test" it with peers, and to "talk it through."

d. Doing. Participants get to practice, through desk exercises, simulations, etc.

The handout materials, lecture, and visuals (flip charts) should relate to and reinforce each other. This may seem obvious, but too many training events take place with handout materials that have no obvious relationship to the lecture.

After a training session, it is absolutely predictable that some participants say "I liked the lecture best," or "I didn't understand the material until we got into the small groups." Occasionally, it means that the trainer didn't use a training method correctly. Usually this type of feedback usually means that the participant learned the most when their preferred learning style was used.

A who does training that appeals to only a single learning preference is limiting the amount of learning that will take place. The single biggest mistake in the design of events is that

the event uses only the preferred learning style of the designer. So the event has nothing but lectures, or nothing but panels of "talking heads."

If you use several different training techniques, the learning methods begin to reinforce each other. People retain much more of what they see and hear than of what they either see or hear. When you are reviewing proposals you received in response to your training RFP you should look for a trainer who uses several methods to close the gap between where you want people to be and where they are now.

So by way of summary, we offer the following grid as a way to organize your thinking about the relationship between the purposes, learning styles and methods. You fill in each box with a method appropriate for that combination of purpose and learning style.

| | PURPOSE(S) OF TRAINING OR DEVELOPMENT | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Knowledge | Skills | Attitudes |
| Learning Styles | | | |
| A. See | | | |
| B. Hear | | | |
| C. Talk | | | |
| D. Do. | | | |

You can use these concepts to design your own training, to upgrade your existing training, or to be a more sophisticated purchaser of training.

As a general proposition, it is both cheaper and better to have existing staff members conduct as much of the work related to helping people on individual development and training as they have the knowledge and skills to do. There are several advantages to this.

From an organizational perspective you want to develop into a “learning organization” where people are charged—and charged up—about learning. Chapter XIV goes into this in greater detail. You want your staff to develop their coaching and mentoring skills because these are increasingly going to replace the classic supervisory approach of “Do it my way because I’m the boss.”

In terms of your staff, doing this in-house prompts staff to stay current on the latest knowledge and skills—it help them improve their own skills. Secondly, it helps to engage all staff members in a dialogue about "best practices." Thirdly, some topics—like the general orientation for new staff or board members—can really only be done by people who know a lot about the CAA, i.e., by people who are already there. Fourthly, you may develop something you can sell to an adjoining CAA. Another important reason is that it cheaper; you simply can not afford to buy all that is needed from outside. So develop this capacity inside your agency. As a general proposition, a CAA will buy staff development in general and training in particular from outside only when you cannot get it done inside.

In the next chapter we describe how to design a formal training course. This information si also useful in that it serves as a guide about what to look for in a training design you are purchasing from somebody else.

# CHAPTER V: TRAINING PROGRAM DESIGN PROCESS

The design process consists of seven steps:

1. Assess the needs and problems. (pp. 22-23)
2. Analyze the characteristics of the learning group—the trainees. (pp 24-27)
3. Design the curriculum (goals, topics, specific learning objectives and methods). (pp 28-31)
4. Draft the agenda. (p. 32)
5. Select/orient trainers. (p. 32)
6. Develop materials. (p. 32)
7. Set up the event. (p. 32)

Each of these seven steps is described below.

## 1. Conduct the Needs Assessment

The needs assessment phase of developing a training program consists of three integrated processes: organizational analysis, performance standards review and performance assessment.

The needs assessment should be guided by TWO overriding principles. # 1 is that you are looking for a performance problem or a learning need that can be solved by training, and # 2, the description of the "training problem" and the "training goal" are written down on a piece of paper BEFORE the training is designed or selected. This may seem obvious, but there are many, many training programs that are created in the hopes they will solve some problem that cannot possibly be solved by training. These other problems may be policy problems, or power-struggle problems, or interagency problems, or funding problems, but they are not going to be removed by increases in the knowledge or skills of the training participants. The question to ask—and answer—is "Will a change in the knowledge, skills or attitudes on the part of the participants lead to a change in the need, problem or situation?" If the answer is probably not, then don't try to deal with the issue through training. Some of the questions to answer as you look at the organization and performance issues are listed here.

### A. Organizational Analysis

1. What are the purpose and mission of the organization(s) (CAAs) needing training?

2. In what general areas does the CAA need additional training to carry out its mission? What are the "problems" to be solved by training?

3. What priority or urgency is there to solve these problems?

### B. Performance Standards Review

1. What are the standards of performance that exist for the organization? For the groups of people?

2. The tasks for each group or position will be identified, along with examples of minimum and maximum competency in the need area. What is an example of minimum competency? Of maximum competency?

3. Standards will be set for:

    * The level of knowledge that should be established among trainees (know).
    * The level and types of skills that should be established (do).
    * The attitudes or motivating factors that must be established for the new knowledge and skills to be used (feel).

C. Performance Assessment

1. Then assess how existing levels of performance compare with what is required to the standard. What is the gap?

2. Identify what is lacking or what is needed in terms of:
    * Knowledge
    * Skills
    * Attitudes

The result of the needs assessment is the statement of a problem that can be solved by training:

Example #1. Clerical personnel do not know how to correctly fill out reporting forms for FEMA.

Example #2. Head Start Policy Council does not understand the role of the CAA Governing Board.

Example #3. CAA Board members have not been able to raise any money, although they unanimously passed a motion to raise $10,000 by the end of the program year.

Example #4. Outreach workers have not begun distributing AIDS prevention information because they do not understand why the CAA is involved or they do not agree with the CAA being involved in AIDS prevention.

The next step in the design process is to review the status and needs of the participant group.

2. Learning Group Analysis

This is a summary of the reasons "why adults learn" as described by Malcolm Knowles and others. Special thanks to Greg Newton for his editorial input into understanding learning

groups. We use these ideas to help us understand the subgroups of people who may be participants in our training program. We reviewed these issues briefly in Chapter 4, adult learning theory. They are restated here in the sequence they need to be considered in the design process.

I. The training should be related to the immediate interests of your participants. The training that will be most effective for your members has several characteristics:

a. It helps them do their job better.

b. They can use it immediately—right after they return home.

c. It enhances career development—and future job prospects.

d. It does not repeat what they already know.

e. It starts from the point of current knowledge, skills, and attitudes. People can see how it relates to what they already know.

f. It focuses on practical how-to's, and not on broad generalities or ivory-tower approaches.

g. It is trend consistent. It is grounded in the realities of the 1980's, 1990's and beyond.

h. It encourages their participation in training since adults learn best when they share their views and are actively involved.

i. It is interesting and fun.

II. The training should be focused on the specific needs of your audience.

Some trainers deliver the same workshop over and over, no matter the audience. Some trainers will customize the training to your specific needs, if you can tell the trainer what those needs are. In order to do this, the trainer needs to know (a) what you want the participants to leave the session with, and (b) what they bring into the session with them.

A trainer needs to know what you want the participants to:

a. Know. What knowledge do you want them to leave with?

b. Be able to do. What skills do you want them to learn or practice?

c. Think. What attitudes do you want them to have about a subject?

The training can have as its purpose changes in one or more of the K-S-A factors.

In order to fill the gap between the participants' current knowledge, skills and attitudes

and what you want the outcome of the training to be, the trainer needs advance information about the participants. The trainer needs to know baseline information about their CURRENT knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

The ideal approach to describe their existing K-S-A is to tell us for each of the groups of participants who will be in the room; (a) their current position titles, (b) average number of years on the jobs, c) span of control, (d) familiarity with the subject matter, and (e) level of current expertise. Since you may not have that information, tell the trainer about those factors for identifiable subgroups of participants.

If you are presenting a workshop, the training is easier when the entire audience is very similar in terms of their level of K-S-A at the start of the session. For example, you may have all "hot-lunch" program directors who have been on the job an average of five years and supervise about twenty people each, and whose knowledge of the training topic is at the intermediate level. You can move a homogeneous group forward very quickly because people are starting at more or less the same point.

At the other end of the spectrum is an audience where there are wild differences; e.g., you have mixed apples and oranges and put the technical experts, lay board members, top managers, and beginning clericals into a one-day session on some narrow topic. This audience has very little in common with each other.

However, most audiences contain a mixture of levels of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (especially attitudes). The typical situation is more like the normal curve, or "bell curve," where most people are within a close range of the average of the entire group.

In the absence of information prior to the session, the trainer can still learn the K-S-A of the audience. The trainer will usually begin the session with an exercise like "stand up, say your name, job, and what you want out of this session." Or the trainer will ask "buzz groups" of two or three people each to identify “the two or three things you most want out of this session.”

These methods warm people up. They let the few people who may be new to the group to introduce themselves. While this is happening, the trainer is mentally tabulating the responses to (a) determining why people think they are here and (b) locating the differences between what the sponsor says people need and what the participants identify as needs, c) making a list of points the participants want the trainer to be sure and cover, and (d) picking the general level of difficulty at which to begin the presentation.

This say-your-name may seem redundant for those participants who know each other and meet regularly, but it puts the "old hands" and the "first timers" onto a more equal footing. Most importantly, it's also a good way for a trainer to get needed information from the audience before beginning his or her presentation.

Any person who does presentations should know that 80-90% of the needs of the audience can be satisfied by keying the presentation to the needs of the large middle group. The trainer also knows that in keying to this middle group, he/she has automatically started "over the

head" of the small group in the audience who are beginners, and that the beginners needs will be perceived as being "too simplistic" by the participants who are the most expert on the subject.

Note c) above, "the points to be sure and cover." You can tell within the first thirty minutes of the session how participants will rate the training at its end—because you have learned the specific issues that have to be addressed for the participants to believe the session was worthwhile. Cover as many of these issues as you can. If you are not going to cover a topic either because you don't know anything about it or because it is too far afield—then just tell the audience why it won't be covered. After you have told them what you will and won't cover, then ask them "Are we ready to proceed?" Most will nod or say "yes." Then you say "ok," and you have just reached a "contract" with the participants about what the workshop is going to do. If the trainer does nothing else but provide information that responds to the listing of "what we want" —the great majority of the participants will rate the training highly!

More and more human services agencies and associations are designing their own training or using a request-for proposal (RFP) format to hire trainers to conduct workshops at their state, regional and national meetings. This is a positive trend because it helps both you and the trainer clarify what you want done.

So you should include in your own design or RFP:

a. What you want the participants to know (knowledge), be able to do (skills), or to think (attitudes) about the subject.

b. Describe the characteristics of the proposed participants. Tell the prospective trainer what he/she already knows, is able to do, and what he/she believes.

If you do these two things, you will get a much better quality of design or proposal.

A summary of the issues that you want to cover to analyze the characteristics of the prospective trainees is given next:

a. What learning deficits are shared by enough people to warrant investment in a training program?

b. Are the deficiencies in common among an identifiable group of people (CAA Directors, CAA Board Chairs, CAA Board Members, planners, etc.)?

c. What is the range of knowledge? Novice to expert? All expert? You want as homogeneous a learning group as possible!

d. Are there attitudinal issues among an identifiable group of people?

e. Can these people be sent elsewhere to be trained?

f. Can the deficiencies be grouped together and handled in a single training event?

Approximately how much time would it take to address each deficiency? Are the deficiencies related to one another?

g. Do the people who share common characteristics think of themselves as a group (i.e., CAA Directors, WX Supervisors, etc.)?

h. Should training groups be assembled based on worker/job or other characteristics?

i. Do the prospective participants perceive that they need training—do they perceive a deficiency?

j. Are they interested in spending time to learn? Are there any other events coming up that will assemble people who might also then be given a specific training program?

k. Is "the boss" requiring or encouraging cooperation?

l. Are there logical groups in terms of need to know, common interests, readiness to learn?

3. Develop the Curriculum

After the needs have been assessed and the learning group analyzed, then the curriculum can be developed. Any curriculum designer need to constantly consider what I call The Big Issue in Design: Capacity of Participants to Absorb of Information.

The old saying that the mind can absorb what the seat can tolerate is absolutely true. Unfortunately, many people who buy training services have an academic degree which they earned years ago by the "iron bladder" method of tolerating daisy-chains of 50 minute lectures. That is the way they remember learning, so that is the way they expect others to learn.

The reality is that the average adult has an attention span in a lecture of about twenty-five or thirty minutes, maximum! After that, you begin losing significant numbers of people with each minute that passes. My guess is that the traditional fifty minute college lecture ends at the fiftieth minute because after that, nobody is listening any more—not even the professor.

After presenting information, you have to give adults a chance to do something with it. That "something" can be thinking about it as they walk to the water fountain. It can be talking about it with peers. It can be applying it to a desk exercise by answering some questions. But invite them to do something with it that prompts them to think about it, talk about it, apply it to their job.

But what usually happens is that another twenty to thirty minutes of lecture is piled on top of the first twenty minutes of lecture... wrong approach. What happens is that you create information overload; it's water off the duck's back.

People need their information in digestible chunks or modules. Some people who buy training want to look at the agenda. That only tells you how much time is going to be spent on a particular topic. Of greater interest is whether or not the training is going to provide digestible chunks of material within that time period. Each module should include:

a. The main idea.

b. The three or four major sub-elements of the main idea.

c. Examples of each of the three or four components.

Adults love examples of how the idea plays out in real life—of how it works and does not work. Examples are entertaining. More importantly, the reason adult learners need examples is that only about 25% of the population can take a general concept and see how it relates to their work situation. Another 30% can see how to apply the concept if you give one example. Yet another 30% of us only get the main idea if you give us two or more examples that we can compare and contrast. So if you give two examples, you should have about 85% of the audience covered.

And yes—you still went right past the other 15%. They are the learn-by-doing group. They only "get it" after they have had a chance to actually try it a couple of times either in a practice session or after they are back on the job.

d. A summary that relates the examples back to the components, and relates the components back to the main idea.

Those of you who were in the military service will recognize the "tell them what you are going to do, then do it, and then tell them what you did" approach. The military has spent mega-bucks developing these methods for helping adults learn, and they work.

The trainer should be able to relate every single digestible chunk of material, every module that is presented, back to some specific change you are trying to bring about in the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of participants. Trainers often call these desired changes the "training objectives" of the module.

A "trainer's guide" or "trainer's workbook" is different from the participant's workbook. The trainer's guide contains the over-all purposes of the workshop, how each module helps accomplish those purposes, the specific objectives and structure of each module, and the examples the trainer will use to illustrate the points being made. Not all of the examples are included in the participant handouts. This is where hiring trainers who are knowledgeable about your program or topic of interest pays off—they can provide examples from their own experience that illustrate the points or highlight specific concerns of your attendees.

So... you may want to look at the agenda and participant handout materials, but these won't tell you how effective the training is going to be.

You can get more of the information you want if you ask to look at (a) the training objectives and (b) the lesson plan or lecture outline for a single module. These will give you a much better idea of how much of the subject is going to get transmitted to the participants. You probably don't need to look at all of these; the quantity is more than you will want to deal with. And most trainers will not share all of these, because this is their "stock in trade" and is usually considered proprietary information. But do look at one example to see if the trainer has determined how a topic is related to your training purposes.

The old saw that "a good trainer can train on almost any topic" has an element of truth in it—IF he/she has a general knowledge of your program area, AND there are clear training objectives, AND good lesson plans that relate content back to purposes.

Now we look at the twelve specific steps in curriculum design.

1. Define the goals of the proposed training program in relation to the needs or problem statement formulated in the needs assessment process. The goal is just the "flip side" of the problem statement.

Problem Statement: Workers can not fill out the FEMA reporting form.

Goal: Workers will be able to correctly fill out the FEMA reporting form.

2. For each goal statement, include some general measure of how and when an observer will be able to tell that the desired result has occurred. Make it explicit. "By the end of this workshop" or "By September 15th...."

3. List the topics or subjects that must be covered to achieve the goal.

4. Sequence the topics in a way that they are logically related to each other, and that they relate to the participants experience and interest.

5. Establish the general shape of the event (number of days, location, general types of instructional methods) in ways that are most appropriate and acceptable to the participants.

6. Select evaluation/feedback methods (questionnaire, follow-up interviews, etc.).

7. For each topic, set instructional objectives in terms of the knowledge, skills and attitudes.

8. Identify the specific training methodology for each topic (lecture, workshop, desk exercise, videotape, role-playing, etc.).

9. Make sure that each activity in the learning process is keyed to a specific adult learning criteria; e.g., it must be problem-centered, experienced-based, applicable immediately, and at least partially self-directed.

10. Make sure any process tasks (small group discussions, etc.) have explicitly stated objectives, process instructions, and products.

11. Build in time to relax, assimilate and process information.

12. Build in climate setting or "ice breaker" techniques.

The following chart can be used to summarize your conclusions about the curriculum. I often do one of these for each module, which is usually one-hour long. Thanks go to Bob Reisett for his early work on this jewel.

# FORMAT FOR A MODULE

---

TITLE or
SUBJECT

---

PURPOSES or INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

KNOWLEDGE

SKILLS

ATTITUDE

---

| | High | Medium | Low |
|---|---|---|---|
| CHARACTERISTICS OF LEARNING GROUP | | | |
| K | | | |
| S | | | |
| A | | | |

---

SPECIFIC
MODULE TOPICS

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.

---

SEQUENCE OF
EDUCATION
ACTIVITIES

TIME FOR EACH

---

LIST OF MATERIALS
and A/V NEEDED

4. Draft the Agenda

This is a chronology that shows the starting time for each topic; it also shows the amount of time allotted to each topic. It often lists the speaker as well.

5. Select/Orient Trainers

This may be an in-house person or a contracted trainer.

6. Develop or Select Materials

This, in theory, is supposed to be done last. In many cases it is the trigger for the idea of a training program in the first place. You can always tell the "inductively" conceived training, because it misses other relevant publications. "Deductively" designed training that starts from a broad topic area usually has several handouts related to the topic.

Most training works off of existing materials, i.e. materials designed by somebody else. It is very time-consuming and expensive to develop your own materials.

7. Organize the Event

This is the scheduling, site selection, marketing and room- setup. Now that you have started thinking about the on site aspects, the next chapter will elaborate on some of the key factors in making the actual conduct of a training event a success.

## CHAPTER VI: DELIVERY OF TRAINING—HOW TO MAKE IT WORK

There are four areas to pay special attention to in the on- site management of training. If you cover these four bases, your participants will get more out of it and will give you good evaluations. They are:

* The administrative roles.
* Making sure each trainer has some structured way to present their information.
* Running small groups correctly.
* Evaluating the results.

1. Roles To Be Performed On Site at the Training Event

The creation of a multi-day, multi-trainer event requires an administrative superstructure just like a short-term "project." Each of these administrative responsibilities must be specifically assigned to somebody.

There are seven sets of responsibilities that must be carried out to insure success. For smaller events you may not need all these roles. But for large training events and for conferences, you will.

One person may do more than one of these tasks. For the first few training events that you do, and for any event with more than 100 people, I suggest that you have different people function as Official-in Charge, Training Director and Master/ Mistress of Ceremonies. They may have other functions (as trainers, etc.), but our experience has shown that it is difficult to effectively combine any of these first three roles.

Official in Charge: This is the person who can answer policy questions and who speaks for the sponsors. He/she is often in the hallway in conversation about various issues. For that reason, there should be a separate training director.

Training Director: This person is in charge of the agenda and decides, based on feedback from participants and trainers, whether to extend or shorten the time allotted for a subject or for questions, when to take breaks, and when to stop and start modules. This person can reassign trainers, discussion leaders and logistics people, if needed. All trainers, discussion leaders, and logistics people report to the training director. The training director must remain in the training room while the session is underway. This person usually chairs staff meetings during the planning process for the event.

Master/Mistress of Ceremonies: This person provides the introductions to each module, emphasizes or summarizes important points, covers items the trainer may have left out, and restates the linkages between components. This bridge role provides continuity and "fills holes." The experience has been that the MC is usually very focused on their role and cannot function as training director as well.

Logistics Coordinator: Handles facility. Makes sure handouts and training materials are

reproduced and on site. Makes sure flip charts, paper, pencils, name tags, etc., are on site. Audio visual and any other necessary equipment. Supervises registration, collection of fees.

Trainers: The people who present the content of each module.

Discussion Leaders: This is the facilitator who keeps the discussion moving. You may have a separate resource person who can answer technical questions but who is not necessarily a facilitator, or you can combine these roles.

Discussion Coordinator: This person makes sure that the trainers meet with the discussion leaders to inform them of the (a) purpose, (b) tasks, and © products for each small-group workshop. He or she is responsible for the logistics and assignments connected with workshops. There is usually an assumption that the discussion leaders will somehow ascertain their role for themselves. Experience has shown that this hope is rarely fulfilled. The discussion leaders must be briefed. Instructions for both workshop leaders and for workshop participants MUST BE IN WRITING.

Everybody wants to have enough time to prepare properly for a training event. This is crucial for people who may not have much experience as a trainer. Usually the Training Director, the Logistics Coordinator, and the Trainers are going to need a month to prepare. After the Trainers have prepared, the Discussion Coordinator can visit with each of them and make sure they have written clear instructions for each small group discussion.

The official in charge does not have that much preparation to do. The small-group discussion leaders can be selected and briefed on site.

The quality of your events will be directly related to the amount of planning and preparation that goes into them.

2. Suggested Structure of a Presentation

A. Introduce yourself.

B. State the purpose of your presentation—make explicit the learning objectives. "From this presentation, you will learn the following three things: 1, 2, 3."

C. List the topics you will cover to accomplish the learning objectives. With times attached, this becomes the agenda or outline of your subject matter.

* EMPHASIZE "The most important points are..."

* STATE EXACTLY what you want them to know/feel/be able to do after they have listened to you.

* Ask them: what topics do they want you to cover? (In effect you "contract" with them

on topics to be covered. With adults, if you cover the topics they say they want you to cover, 85% will rate the session satisfactory or better!

D. During your presentation of the content:

* Limit yourself to three or four major new ideas.

* For each major idea or main point, describe:

1. What it is.
2. Why it is important/how it is perceived by others.
3. Give at least two examples to illustrate it. "In this case...and in this other situation..."

* Make sure the level of your presentation is appropriate to the audience's:

Knowledge
Skills
Attitudes.

You want to start at the point where their current knowledge stops, e.g., take them that next step. You can ask them questions during your talk, Do you know about...?" "Should I talk about...?

* Make sure they can absorb the amount of material you are providing. Do NOT overwhelm them with hundreds of ideas, pages of material, slides, and flip charts. The attention span of the typical American Adult begins to fade after 25 minutes. And, periodically they must process what they have heard in order for it to stick in their minds.

D. During your presentation of the content (continued):

* In order to make sure they absorb and understand it, provide them an opportunity to process the information and apply it to their existing knowledge and experience. "Talk to the person sitting next to you about this. Come up with an example from your experience... and share it with that person or with the group."

* And, ALWAYS leave time for Questions and Answers! Questions come in three basic forms.

1. About 10% are idiosyncratic questions. The question relates uniquely to a local situation. Nobody else in the room—and that usually includes you—can figure out what the question is really about. Give a BRIEF answer and if that does not satisfy, say that "I need a lot more information on that; can we talk about it during the break?"

2. About 10% are a person offering some opposing point of view, correcting a factual error that you made, or just tooting his own horn. That's fine, too. "Thanks for your ideas."

3. BUT ABOUT 80% of questions asked are either (a) about gaps in your presentation and several people in the audience will be saying to themselves, "I was just thinking the same thing," OR (b) people applying what you said to their local situation and asking you if they are on the right track.

One of the odd things about Q&A is that it is almost impossible to tell from the question itself which of these three categories it belongs in, so <u>treat all questions seriously</u>.

E. Then to wrap up, you say:

"In summary, the main points are...."
You REPEAT what you said in #3.

F. "We have learned how to...."
You REPEAT #2.

G. THANK the audience for listening, then handoff to the M.C. or to the next speaker.

DO THESE THINGS and people will appreciate your presentation.

3. Rules for Small-Group Discussions

A. ALL INSTRUCTIONS for small groups MUST BE IN WRITING. Describe the:

* Purposes. What is to be accomplished in terms of:

    Knowledge?
    Skills?
    Attitudes?

* Tasks/Activities. How are we supposed to do this?

* Product(s). What specific products should we produce?

B. IDENTIFY FOR YOURSELF THE ROLES to be performed in the small group, and either recruit people in advance OR ASSIGN THE GROUP ITSELF to select a person to fill the roles.

* Discussion Facilitator
* Resource Person (expert on content)
* Recorder
* Reporter

Why Small Groups? Small group discussions give adults a chance to relate the subject matter to what they know. We include additional information on it here because this is one of the training methods that new trainers have trouble with.

Small groups give adults a chance to reality-test the material with the perceptions of their peers. Will that work? Did you believe what that trainer said?

It gives them a chance to fine tune their understanding, to lock it in.

It gives them a chance to expand or enrich their understanding by getting other examples from peers of how the idea might work or how it does or does not work in their situation.

It lets them develop a consensus on some points.

It gives them a chance to get their ideas onto the record.

It lets them talk it. Some people don't believe something until they hear it come out of their own mouth. This is the "If I didn't say it, it must not be real" syndrome.

C. To make a small group discussion successful:

Decide exactly what purposes you want the group to accomplish. For example:

"The purpose of the small-group discussion is to take these three principles and for each person to resolve how to apply at least one of those principles when he/she gets back home."

Write down the specific tasks and amounts of time for the group to achieve the purpose.

EXAMPLE OF WRITTEN INSTRUCTION:

1. Take five minutes to read summary of the three principles on page six. Individually, think about how each of those concepts will be of use to you on your job.

2. Next, take fifteen minutes and have each person in your group give an example about how he/she would apply at least one of the concepts to his/her job.

3. Have the group discuss these ideas for another fifteen minutes.

4. Have each individual write down how he/she will use at least one of the concepts back on the job.

5. Have the group select at least two examples that illustrate each of the three concepts. Write these examples on a piece of newsprint.

6. Come back to the plenary session when you are done, and be prepared to report your findings.

Trainers who rattle this off verbally and expect participants to remember these instructions after they stop in the toilet on the way to the group discussion SHOULD BE FINED. It all went right down the drain.

You can tell how productive most small groups are going to be at the starting point—before they ever begin their discussion. If the purposes and tasks are written down and the written instructions are physically present in each group, most of your groups will be productive. If they are not written down, you are taking a wild gamble at best.

A few organizations hire professional facilitators for their small groups. Most human services organizations use their own participants to facilitate small group discussions. Hopefully you can pre-select the people who will fill these roles and give them a briefing. If not already selected, the group should select the reporter and the facilitator.

The FACILITATOR should begin the small group by restating the purposes, reviewing the tasks and the written instructions, asking everybody to introduce himself, then diving into it. The facilitator helps the group to use the rules the group has agreed to use for the discussion. The role of the facilitator of each small group typically is to make sure everybody has a chance to talk, to keep the conversation focused on the subject, to prevent monologues, to keep it moving if it stalls by calling on somebody or moving on to the next topic, to keep to the schedule, and to send somebody to get the trainer if the group gets deadlocked. Differences of opinion are desirable. Heated discussion is stimulating, as long as it stays on the topic.

The role of the REPORTER is to record the conclusions of the group and to report them to the larger group.

In some cases, there is a RESOURCE PERSON who provides factual information the members may not have. The resource person is often an expert on the subject matter, but he/she should not be allowed to decide on the merits of the issue instead of the group coming to its own conclusion. The experts provide input, not conclusions.

It is better to separate these roles than to combine them. Don't have one person try to do two jobs.

In summary, small groups are a valuable learning tool through which adults can relate the concepts to their real-life situations. To reach their maximum potential, each small group needs written instructions and a facilitator to keep it moving. If you want feedback from them about the major outputs from the group, then a person must be assigned in advance to collect and report that information.

4. Evaluating the Results

Trainers lust for the information from a well-designed evaluation form. It is instant market research. It tells you about holes in your show. It tells you that you have developed a habit of fiddling with your zipper that is very distracting. It tells you how wonderful you are. It tells you that most people liked the workshop. It tells you what people did not like about it. It lets you adjust for the future to deliver an even higher quality product and to satisfy your customers. Evaluate!

There are five major issues here. The first step is to find out if you did what you were trying to do. The other is to look at how the material is used back on the job. The third is how to ask the questions. The fourth is to decide when to ask for the feedback. The fifth is how you interpret the feedback.

A. Determining if learning objectives were actually met

If you have specified the objectives in advance you can measure the result by asking the audience specific questions related to them.

This can be multiple choice or open-ended. It only takes two or three questions to determine if they "got it." Avoid the appearance of a test by using a small number of questions—even humorous questions will elicit whether or not they heard you and understand you and remember it.

B. Short-term (event) versus long-term (actual use)

The true real evaluation is whether they use what they learned from the workshop back on the job. You can enhance this transfer process by assigning the participants at the end of the workshop to "spend five minutes talking with your seat mate about how you will use this back on the job. Write down the two or three most useful ideas.... Anybody want to share thoughts with the group?"

Do a mail-out evaluation two months later—and compare those results with the results obtained at the end of the training event itself. Or, call ten of the participants and ask them "How are you using or not using the results of that training?"

C. Structuring and interpreting the evaluations

Always, always ASK SEPARATE QUESTIONS on the:

* Logistics
* Content of the training
* Personality of the trainers
* Each of the separate training methods used
* Materials

If you do not provide different "slots" for feedback on these topics, then participants will mingle them together when they report back. A chilly training room comes back as "terrible training." Poorly collated materials come back as "trainer unprepared." We want feedback whether it is good and bad, but you have to give people separate categories.

If you do not ask about each training method separately, the person's learning style preference gets reported instead of how effective that particular technique really was. All you discover is that people whose learning preference is reading liked the handouts, those whose style is listening liked the speech or the lecture, those whose style is talking liked the small groups. But that is no news. You really want to know if the small group accomplished the objectives you set for it, if the lecture content was too advanced or too elementary, etc.

Use the "Bronx" method to gather information on what you really want to know about! The Bronx methods is, "So ask already!"

D. The realities of life and how they apply here:

If you are lucky maybe 60% of those registered will complete the evaluation form.

Timing is everything. If you really want a written evaluation then include it as a component of the agenda itself—just before the scheduled adjournment time. Do not wait until you have said "thank you" and everybody is packing up briefcases and you suddenly say "oh and by the way, we'd really appreciate it...." Too late. They mentally left at the point you (a) said thank you, or (b) you went past the scheduled adjournment time, or c) you closed your briefcase, (d) or you moved the evaluation into the afterthought category by saying "is there anything else, oh yes the evaluation."

Now another real problem: many people conclude that the real information transmittal has stopped at the point they receive the evaluation form. If the seminar ends at 4:00 pm, a few people will not come back that afternoon anyhow. They have an early flight; they want to miss the rush hour; they did not want to come anyhow. But if you hand out the evaluation just before lunch—about 15% of the people in addition to those other non-returnees will conclude "the real work is done here" and will not come back that afternoon.

So when do you hand it out? A few people put it in the packet. This is useful for capturing negative information, because at the point a person gets ticked off and leaves, he will often whip out the form and write on it. Some trainers hand it out at the start of the last day. Some just before lunch and some distribute it just after lunch.

I like handing it out at the end of my presentation, just as I am finishing the summary. Keep talking until everybody has a copy of the form. Keep talking as you move to the back of the room. Then say “Now, I’m going to give you two minutes to fill out the feedback form. You can leave it at their table or give it to me on the way out” Then, as you have reached the back door, then say "thank you" for coming.

On multi-day events, do a mini-feedback at the end of each day. Even one or two questions will help you refine the next day's activity. "What do you want to make sure we cover before the end of this seminar...?" This also helps you pick up the expectations that have changed during the seminar—after the opening where you asked participants "What do you want to learn?" I like to take a flip chart, draw a line down the middle, put a “plus” on one side and a “wishes” on the other, and ask people for one or two word phrases for each column. Very effective.

E. Figuring out the response

It is impossible to meet the needs of every participant. Your event was very well done if it met the needs of 85% of those in the room. A few are so ecstatic about being away from the office and being in that terrific hotel that you could have read from the telephone book all day and they would have given you a high rating. For a few it will have started at too advanced a level. They just could not catch up. For a few others, it will have been too elementary. A few did not want to come; the boss made them do it, and they have been angry about it all day. Unfortunately most of these people have left long before the end of the training, so unless you put the evaluation form in the packet you do not get their feedback.

Where you do get feedback, you start by shifting your thoughts all the back to the design

phase and from that point onward you try to figure it out. Did we correctly understand the K-S-A needs of our participant group? Was the buyer (sponsor) of the training correct in their perceptions here? Was the trainer? Did we design the training correctly? Did we use a variety of methods to reach different learning styles? Did we describe it accurately in the brochure? Did we do what we said we were going to do? Did we cover all the "I wants" identified during the opening? If you missed the one thing a person put up there then that person is usually an unhappy camper.

Most human progress takes place slowly. There are no magic wands in training. It may take weeks or months or even years before an individual or a group absorbs and begins to use most information. They may go to three or ten different information sources before and accumulate ideas before they use them. Human behavior moves in many directions. Enjoy the show.

Chapters IV, V and VI have taken you through the tried-and- true methods for designing and delivering a successful training event. Now we move to topics of greater complexity.

Chapters VII and VIII look at environmental factors and trends influencing how CAAs will operate.

Chapters IX, X and XI review how all organizations operate. Taken together, these three chapters cover about 85% of the issues that will come up in preparing Group Development Plans.

Chapters XII, XIII and XIV add some additional tools for making the transition to more of a team-based operation.

Chapter XV takes some of the ideas and shows how they might apply them to two “types” of CAA’s, one of which uses these approaches to stay up with the times and another that is stuck in the past.

Chapter XVI then pulls these concepts into a format for use in preparing a Group Development Plan.

Chapter XVII adds some ideas from Gary Stokes on the role of leadership in a learning organization.

Chapter XVIII explores the role of associations in leading the learning process.

Chapter XIX is a model for managing organizational change, from John Johnston.

## CHAPTER VII: SOCIAL TRENDS AFFECTING HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The use of the training design methods described in the Chapters IV, V and VI was pretty straightforward until about five years ago. There are hundreds of tools for organizational analysis, skill assessment, capacity measurement, job testing, etc. There are shelf loads of canned training programs that trainers adapt to create effective training for an individual or an organization.

Then about five years ago a key component of the conceptual framework on which training design was based began to unravel. That component is the nature of the organizations that are the primary focus of most training, be they businesses or governmental agencies or private nonprofit agencies.

For almost five hundred years all organizational structures in business and government were created in the image of the ancient military and religious organizations. They were pyramids, with the power and authority concentrated at the top. The big boss decided what was to be done. Each sub-boss gave orders to the next boss down, who broke the tasks down into smaller and smaller units until finally at the front lines each worker did one little bundle of tasks. On assembly lines, each individual worker had a very specific job—putting bolt A through hole B and putting on washer C and then putting on nut D and tightening it all up. And that was it. (And, as our teenagers say—B-O-R-R-R-I-N-G.)

Performance-based training was the typical approach that was used. The employer could figure out exactly what each worker was supposed to do. This was derived deductively starting with the purpose of the organization. There might be dozens or thousands of different roles in a large organization, but in theory if all were performed properly then the entire organization would achieve its purpose. The description of the responsibilities of each of the individual roles—the job description combined with performance targets—was the statement of **ideal expectations**. Then you could measure how much of that the individual worker(s) could actually do. That was the **real level of performance**. You described the difference between the ideal and the real, and that became the subject of the training you would do for that individual worker or for that group.

The hierarchical, compartmentalized form of creating and managing organizations worked when the purpose and strategies of the organization were determined primarily from above. It worked when the management had much higher levels of skill and training than did the rest of the workers; recall that until about 50 years ago most Americans did not have a high school diploma. It worked when the management had information that it had to interpret in order for workers to be able to use it. It worked when almost all the tasks to be performed in a job were finite and explicit; you really could make a list. And you really could learn a particular body of knowledge that would enable you do that job forever.

It worked when the assumption was the boss had the “brains” and the workers were the “backs” or the “hands.” The boss was the only one who could figure out “what was to be done” because the boss had the information and the workers did not. Because the boss had the

experience and the workers did not. Because the boss had provided the capitol used in the business, and the workers did not.

It worked especially well when the economy was based on the tangible products that came out of agriculture and manufacturing, when most of what people did was focused on growing food and on making the physical products. It was possible to figure out the economic value of the contribution made by each individual (role) to the process. In other words, it worked when the instrumental value of the work in producing a tangible product was the core around which the reward system was organized. It worked when, in most businesses and governments, people tended to have one career in their lifetime. There was a visible career path "up the ladder" leading to a retirement.

It worked when the customer was relatively ignorant of the technology behind the product or service. It worked when the bosses understood the technology and the workers did not. It worked when only the bosses could operate those fancy new machines, called computers.

It worked when the customer had few alternative choices—when he had to buy your product or service or go without. It worked when there was time for customer or employee questions to percolate up the daisy chain and for the answers to filter back down. It worked when things moved slowly enough for a normal person to keep track of them.

It worked when employees were willing to accept in the workplace the same set of social class and power relationships that existed in the rest of society; i.e., where white males were predominant in the work force in the organizational hierarchy.

What unites all the characteristics under which the old hierarchical organizational systems worked? **Every one of these historic conditions and assumptions has either been seriously undercut or no longer exists.**

These changes in our economy, in technology and information processing, in social values and in the premises underlying organizational functioning and the magnitude of the impact of these changes on training and development are analogous to the changes and impact of the dissolution of the Soviet empire. The old style of management is now a lot like Eastern Europe—the old paradigm on which it was built is evaporating, so there is enormous turmoil and uncertainty. So Eastern Europe has a lot of obsolete governmental structures lying about, and managers and trainers are stuck with a lot of obsolete technology of their own. But at least trainers don't have nuclear weapons!

Many public and private nonprofit agencies still have old- fashioned structures struggling to work in the new environment, a new environment where the workers, the customers and the nature of work have undergone dramatic change.

We now have managers and workers who have very similar education levels and who work off the same information base using the same information technology. Most workers could, in fact, do most of the jobs in the organization, and they know it.

The nature of work itself has changed so that the service we provide or the information we share is the core of what the customer wants. Most j-o-b-s do not have anything to do with physical stuff any more; they have to do with information, or ideas, or attitudes, or moods.

Customers have much more power. You had better serve the customer what he wants and you had better do it immediately. You either keep him happy or he will not come back. If he has a choice he will go to your competitor. If he does not have a choice and is stuck with you, then he may come back but he will very quickly begin to resent you and to dislike you.

In an economy based on service and information, the front- line worker actually has better information about what the customer wants than the boss does. The worker must be able to respond immediately to the need, and to package the "service" in a way the customer finds useful. This is true for both the private sector, the government services and services provided by private nonprofit organizations.

In most service jobs you can not predict exactly what the job will consist of on any given day. Instead, you have a general idea about a very large range of possible actions you might be called upon to take; then you come into contact with the customer and you "make up" your job to meet their needs.

The old up-the-salary-scale method of motivating workers is not as powerful as it used to be for the majority of workers, and for that 22% of Americans who the United Way research describes as the "new values" group—salary does not motivate them at all. The intrinsic value of the work in achieving their personal goals, not the instrumental or dollar value, is what is most important to them. Control over the work and the workplace is far more significant as a motivator than is the possibility of a promotion in five years.

This means that we can seldom teach or train a person to do- the-job. Instead we can assist in developing capacities so he/she will be able to invent his/her job on a day-by-day and hour-by-hour basis.

The old theories about organizational structure have been stood on their heads. The boss now is a coach or a quality monitor, with most of the day-to-day decisions being made by workers who are in direct contact with the customers—out of the boss's sight.

The new concepts in organizational development are about "self managing teams" and "teamwork" where the work takes place under only the most general guidance about purposes and quality standards. The new idea is that a group of five or ten or twenty workers take the responsibility upon themselves to decide what is to be done, how to do it, how to organize themselves to do it—and then they do it.

It is ironic how humankind has come full circle. The movie the "Clan of the Cave Bear" is an anthropologically accurate rendition of life before 10,000 B.C. For the several hundred thousand years before agriculture and village life, small groups of people wandered the earth hunting and gathering their next meal. These were self-managing teams in the most literal sense; they were managing their entire life! Now we rediscover the role of the clan as the core of the

service economy, and the organizational development task is the creation of teams that work like clans. The idea that quality is something that comes from the dictates of the boss is being abandoned, and is being replaced by concepts like "Total Quality Management" where the individual worker assures that quality exists in every transaction with the customers using the customers' definitions of quality.

The profound changes in the nature of work, workers, customers and the implications on how organizations function had carried over to create confusion in some of the other categories we historically have used to describe what we do.

We still use the concepts of education, development and training as described in Chapter 1, Basic Concepts, but there is some reshaping of these concepts underway because of the forces described above.

Historically, people got their education then moved permanently into the workplace and applied that education to their work. Most organizations that provided training for their workers did so because they micro-managed the employees' work and trained them on each tiny aspect of it.

Given the changes in the environment, in the nature of work, in the form of organizations and the characteristics of workers, it is now much more difficult to determine exactly what an individual or a group needs by way of training, development or education.

The rate of growth and the volume of information related to any occupation are increasing dramatically. In the 1500's, everything an adult needed to know to live a productive life could have been written in on amount of paper that is about the same as one issue of the Sunday New York Times. Now, there are a thousand books a day published. At current rates of knowledge expansion, in the year 1997 we now have "on the books" (pun intended) only about 10% of the amount of knowledge that will exist in the year 2047. You have to read faster and faster and you will never keep up. So you have to be selective. And you have to be committed to "lifelong learning."

This means that you have to continually update your knowledge and skills. We are shifting in the direction of helping employees learn what they feel they need to know and what their customers want them to know —with the hope that their study has at least some relevance to the workplace. We have shifted in the direction where most individual learning is self-selected and self-directed.

In some cases we also know about a specific body of knowledge a person needs to be a good Head Start Teacher or a Weatherization installer. But for most workers what we now need them to get is an education which enhances their capacities to do a wide variety of tasks.

Given the uncertainties and rapid changes, how do we design and deliver effective training? We use the tried-and-true methods, where they still work, but with a skeptical eye on their utility.

What we used to take as a given, such as the CAAs purpose, mission and services now has to be re-clarified during every training design process. You can not take much for granted when both the environment and the organization and the employees are continually changing. These “earthquakes” and “tidal waves” do not make training an impossible task, but it does add several steps and a few hours to the design process.

In the next chapter we look at how the quality driven- customer-driven aspects of these Megatrends begin to impact on CAAs. We compare the old idea of training based on the job-description with the new ideas of continual change and customer responsiveness. There are no magic wands here—there are a tough set of challenges.

# CHAPTER VIII: ISSUES OF QUALITY AND CUSTOMERS

One of the hottest new approaches to management goes under the rubric of Total Quality Management or "TQM." This phrase encompasses the work of several management theorists, such as Edwards Deming, Juran, et. al Most of the early work in this area was done to improve the operation of manufacturing companies. About eight years ago, TQM was extended to services, such as accounting, medical and financial advisors. About two years ago, it was extended to publicly funded services, including social services.

One of the pioneers in the effort to adapt TQM for use in CAAs is John Johnston and Associates, 4011 West 12th St. Lawrence, KS 66044, 913/841-0774. John is doing seminars and consultation with individual CAAs interested in adopting these methods. John summarizes the major principles of TQM that apply to CAA operations below. Remember that "quality is a journey, not a destination."

A. Three Benefits of Quality

1. A significant increase in productivity.
2. Greater staff commitment and job satisfaction.
3. The capacity to take advantage of trends.

B. Three Quality Principles—Quality Organizations:

1. Consistently, insistently focus on quality.
2. Involve people at all levels, all the time.
3. Continuously improve.

C. Six Features of Quality Organizations

1. Self-motivation, not external motivation.
2. Self-management, not external control.
3. Coaching/facilitating, not supervising/monitoring.
4. Work done in teams, not individual jobs.
5. Multi-skilled staff, not single skilled staff.
6. Few management levels, not many management levels.

There are several issues that the adoption of quality principles may raise for CAAs. We can use the above sequence to comment on these issues.

**Issue B.1. Consistently, insistently focus on quality**—as defined by the customer.

The questions here are—who is the customer? And how do they define quality?

A focus on 100% customer satisfaction 100% of the time is the key element in any transition to QUALITY. In QUALITY systems, it is typically assumed that everyone both is a customer and has customers, both inside and outside the organization. And, a customer is defined as being the next person in the line... the person to whom a product or service is provided directly.

Some human service program officials view everyone and everything as a customer, including local elected officials, program participants, taxpayers, funding source agencies and officials, state legislators, other human service agencies and their staffs, businesses and business leaders, the community at large, etc. It is not possible to pursue 100% customer satisfaction 100% of the time for such a broad array of customers. Whose standards of quality will you choose to emphasize? You may have to narrow the focus as to which groups you will use to determine if quality if present in your organization. Program officials must distinguish between "customers" and "other constituents" (funding sources, elected officials, and others).

We suggest the you define customers as the program participants, their families and communities. Obtain an understanding of their definitions of quality and then structure the CAA to meet those standards and desires. This is in contrast to "delivery of predetermined services." In instances in which their relative satisfaction differs, emphasis should be given to fully satisfying the community. Officials of human service programs should define their "primary customers" as the communities in which they operate.

Programs should also measure customer satisfaction in terms of community perception of the quality of the results. Example: An individual who is abusing alcohol or drugs might be "100% satisfied" if he can just get enough financial assistance to make continued abuse possible. The community may have a different opinion as to what is needed; a change in the person's behavior. Most members of a community will agree that it is desirable to reduce the incidence of unemployment, hunger, homelessness, substance abuse, physical and sexual abuse, or illiteracy, and they will not (and should not have to) focus on the program strategies that you use to achieve that result.

A focus on quality invariably starts taking you back up the line from the problem to the source of the problem. Over time, human service programs should focus less on treatment and more on the prevention of human problems. The community will usually prefer prevention to treatment. Prevention is invariably cheaper, and some treatment programs do not always serve their intended purpose or achieve the desired results.

**Issue B.2. Involve people at all levels, all the time**

Who writes the description of the work to be done? And is it fixed in stone or can it be changed?

Being customer driven means that the customer exerts major influence over the

transaction, as opposed to receiving a standardized "injection" of services. There are two pieces to this concept. The first is—the purpose the transaction is supposed to help achieve. The second is—the method by which the purpose is to be accomplished.

In the TQM approach the worker and his/her colleagues are vested with the responsibility for identifying and adopting continuous improvements in process, to immediately adopting the newest methods that meet the customers needs. This is in contrast to having the responsibility for improving the methods located elsewhere, or fixed in a rule book of procedures.

Let's take a service delivery program, like WX. The energy- saving purposes to be accomplished are fixed in federal law, and that kind of statement of purposes is present in all programs that get federal money. Now lets look at the means. Most WX programs deliver a standard set of "measures," e.g. the big six or the big ten. The procedure for installing the measure is predetermined. A specific procedure may be required by the state agency or developed by the subcontractor. If the measure is indicated for a dwelling, the customer's choice is—do they want it or not.

The problem is that this is exactly counter to the principle that the worker and the customer agree on the ends, then make up a set of means that involves the customer in the decision-making process, and then the worker tailors the product to the specific concerns of each customer. Even when the range is tightly bounded by professional standards, licenses, or other means, the customer has at least some flexibility and authority in the process.

So there are at least two possibilities here. One would be to say that TQM cannot be used in the rule book programs. The other is to narrow the focus within which TQM operates, so that worker and customer process can still take place within the boundaries permitted by the rule book.

**Issue B.3. Continuous Improvement**

If continuous improvement is desirable, how do you make that happen if any modification has to be approved by six layers in the organization?

The desire for standardization and accountability tends to freeze systems in place. The need for competitiveness, customer responsiveness and rapid technological advancement demands experimentation and rapid adoption of what works best. All organizations have to find a balance between preserving the status quo and changing to something different. Most organizations that have made major changes in this dimension find that they have to produce changes in the corporate culture. This includes the formal and informal reward system, the power relationships between managers and workers and the many, many unspoken but powerful assumptions that people have about "the way we do things around here."

So there are two sets of issues here. One are external relationships that bind the organization to a certain way of doing things or to a certain course of action. The outside entity may agree to your proposed changes, or they may decide you are too troublesome and seek some other entity that will play by its rules.

The other set of issues are internal to the organization. If you want big changes internally you have to initiate and stick with a process to bring about those changes.

The challenge: can programs where procedures are mandated down to the tiniest detail back off and give workers more latitude in deciding HOW the work should be done? This is imperative if self-motivation and self-management are to be increased.

**Issue C.1. Self-motivation, not external motivation**
**Issue C.2. Self-management, not external control**

How are people motivated? In Appendix A there is a review of the evolution of theory of human motivation in organizations. The fundamental principles that are now current are that people will be motivated if they believe the work has value to society, to the customers and to themselves, and if they have a substantial amount of control over the work.

One definition of creeping bureaucracy is: an entity where every decision made by the higher-ups seems to compel them to make two more decisions related to that one, and where every new information category that is created inevitably leads to reporting of additional details about its subcategories, where every form splits into two forms and every staff person needs an assistant. Bureaucracy just—grows. You must actively work against its growth. Maintaining high motivation and commitment to quality is a problem when workers have no authority over what is to be done or how it is to be done. In rule book programs there is a danger of either the workers giving up and just going through the motions, or of sitting behind their desks and hiding behind their rigid insistence on the customer jumping through an endless series of hoops.

Consumers now react negatively to bureaucratic approaches no matter where they find them. If they can switch they will switch to another provider of service. If they cannot, then they will keep coming—and they will dislike the experience intensely. This does not enhance the agency's image in the community.

One challenge is to help the workers take more responsibility for insuring that quality is present in every transaction, and help create the kind of organization where the workers have the policy space to respond as much as possible to the customers concerns.

Another challenge is to negotiate with the funders so that the agreement with them focuses on results, outcomes and goals—but the means for achieving them are delegated down to be as close to the front line workers as possible.

**C.3. Coaching/facilitating, not supervising/monitoring**

The historic attitude of supervisors was often derived from the military model; "I'm the sergeant, you're the private. Do it because I say to do it." The TQM approach is a much more collegial approach in which the supervisor earns the respect of workers by virtue of their knowledge and experience, not because they have more power. Can we stand the traditional approach to management on its head and have the bosses function as coaches instead of judges?

**C.4. Work done in teams, not by individuals**

What level of accountability should be used by the agency to measure results? In most agencies the unit of accountability is fixed at the individual level. The intent in TQM is to measure more of the results at the team level and less at the individual level, with the team itself having most of the responsibility for correcting or improving the performance of its members.

The human animal is a social critter. The focus on the rugged individual that is present in American culture is very different from most other cultures, where the individual is perceived in the context of social groups.

Management guru Tom Peters suggests that all businesses create separate profit centers that have no more than 60 people in each. After agreeing on a very few general goals and ground rules, then you let them run themselves. They are, of course, responsible for producing the negotiated outcomes or goals.

If the workers produce the best results by working in teams, can we shift to a system where we have team quotas instead of individual quotas? Can we let the work teams devise their own methods and standards?

**C.5. Multi-skilled staff, not single skilled staff**

One way to get past the deadly "assembly line" mentality and the ultimate boring quality of many jobs is—to let the workers do several jobs! It takes time to implement, but the basic idea is "cross training" or "job sharing" in which people acquire the skills to do more than one type of task, and then rotate among those tasks. If you are using team-based operations, you train every person on the team to do every job the team needs to do. Then they can switch around. This is a great way to cover for workers who are sick or on vacation, too. The work never stops just because one person is not there.

**C.6. Few management levels, not many management levels**

Most CAAs are pretty good about not being loaded up with lots of bureaucracy. Some of the historic functions of bureaucracy were to parcel out information, reallocate resources or reassign workers. When all workers have all the same information available to them and all are trained in whatever is needed for the team to perform, some of these historical reasons for management levels begin to evaporate. A promotion to management is often used as a reward for a job well done, not because the organization needs another manager. Find other ways to reward successful performance.

So the new emphasis on customers and quality found in management disciplines such as TQM will require changes in how work is defined, organized and performed. It will require changes in organizational structures. It will require changes in the role of supervisors, and experience has shown that many first-line supervisors are tenacious in hanging on to their roles, power and prerequisites. That position that they worked for years to obtain suddenly starts changing shape, and many people do not like it. But if you combine both determination and

tender-loving-care in the process of defining the new roles, people do make the transition.

A more general place to begin our review of organizational development and group improvement is with the governance structure in the organization, the CAA Board and the Executive Director. Some perspectives that help us think through what may be needed in CAA Board development are reviewed in the next chapter.

# CHAPTER IX: ELEMENTS OF GROUP DEVELOPMENT

By Elizabeth K. Rath, with input from Frank Johnson, Anne Collins and Kathi Fisher.

Team building is an on-going process that enables a group with a given task to work together more effectively. This chapter lists some of the questions that groups ask of themselves as they form.

1. Getting Ready to Work Together

Who are we?

* What information do we need to know about each other?
* What do we want to learn?
* What personal resources do we each bring to this team?

Why are we here?

* What are our hopes and concerns for this team?
* What do we want to get from our participation?
* What support do we want?

2. Who Called Us Together?

* Who are we accountable to?
* Who will be affected by our work?
* Where do we fit in the overall organizational plan?
* What are the ground rules?

3. Where Are We Going?

* What is our purpose? Goals? Task?
* Do we all understand them in the same way?
* What are our priorities?
* Who has information about the task?
* Do we need more information? From whom?

4. How Will We Work Together?

* How do we want to function on this team?
* Who wants to do what?
* Who will chair our meetings? Do we want a rotating chair?
* Who will be the recorder and record our decisions?
* What other roles do we need?
* How will we make decisions?
* What is our agenda?
* How much time do we have? When will we begin and end our meetings?
* How often will we meet? When next?

* How will we communicate with others?
* How will we deal with conflict?
* When/how will we evaluate our process—at the end of each meeting? Throughout the meeting?
* Who will do what before the next meeting?

5. Reflecting On and Evaluating Our Work

* How well are we working together?
* How do we feel about the work we are doing?
* Are we spending enough time on our maintenance needs?
* How are members held accountable for tasks they said they would do?
* What is the trust level of the group?
* Are we listening to one another?
* How well do we handle differences?
* Is everyone encouraged to participate?
* What do we need to do differently?

# CHAPTER X: GROUP NEEDS AND MEMBER FUNCTIONS

By Elizabeth K. Rath, with input from Frank Johnson, Anne Collins and Kathi Fisher.

There are three areas of need operating simultaneously in every group/team. They are group **maintenance needs, task needs and individual member needs**. It is important for every group/ team to find some way to balance all of these needs so that the team can work effectively together. No one person can be expected to meet all of these needs. The success of the group/ team often depends on the members' ability to share responsibility for performing the needed functions. This shared leadership uses the resources of more members, and stimulates creativity, higher group morale, interest and concern.

The following is a list of the group maintenance needs and some of the functions that can be performed to meet these needs.

1. **Maintenance Needs**: Every team has the need to hold together and to strengthen, support and maintain the working relationships of its members.

Member Functions that Meet the Maintenance Need

Harmonizer: Works to reduce tension between members by requesting people to explore differences.

Gate Keeper: Works to help others get into the discussion and to keep communication channels open.

Encourager: Is warm, friendly and responsive to others; praises others for their ideas and contributions; reinforces risk-taking behavior.

Tension Reliever: Eases tension and makes work more fun by joking, suggesting breaks, and by proposing fun approaches to the work.

Compromiser: Offers a compromise which yields status when own idea is involved in a conflict; will admit error and will modify own position in the interest of group cohesion.

Standard Setter and Tester: Asks group if it is satisfied with its procedures, norms and standards.

Evaluator of Emotional Climate: Asks members how they feel about the way the group is working and about each other; shares own feelings.

2. **Task Needs**—Every team has the need to do a meaningful job.

Member Functions that Meet the Task Need

Initiator: Suggests ways to proceed; proposes tasks or goals; defines a group problem and suggests ideas for solving a problem.

Information and Opinion Seeker: Asks for facts, ideas, information, opinions, feelings, feedback or clarification of suggestions.

Information and Opinion Giver: Offers facts, opinions, ideas, suggestions, and relevant information to help group discussion.

Clarifier and Elaborator: Interprets ideas or suggestions, clears up confusion, defines terms, indicates alternatives and issues before the team, presents examples and develops meanings.

Summarizer: Pulls together related ideas or suggestions and restates and summarizes major points discussed.

Reality Tester: Examines the practicality and workability of ideas, evaluates alternative solutions and applies them to real situations to see how they work.

Consensus Tester: Asks if the team is nearing a decision, checks with members of the team to assess how much agreement has been reached.

3. **Individual Needs**: The members of every team have their self- needs which are brought to the group and influence their interaction.

Member Functions that Meet Individual Needs

Awareness: What is your body telling you? Where are your tension points?

Owning: Acknowledging to yourself the sources of your tension.

Deciding: How much do you want to share now and how much can you shelve?

Leveling: Letting others know what's going on in you—stating what you think, feel, want.

Confronting: Telling other people the effect their behavior has on you.

Asking for Clarification: Letting others know when you are unclear about something.

Listening: Really paying attention to what others are saying.

Checking Out: Finding out whether others understand things they way you do.

Recommitting Yourself: Deciding to "get in there" and work on the task.

When the task need is not met and when the task functions are not performed, the task will not get done. When the maintenance needs and the individual needs are not met, the team members will often demonstrate some behaviors that are not helpful and which also keep the team from accomplishing its tasks.

Behavior that Keeps a Team from Accomplishing Its Task:

Aggressive: Criticizing or blaming others, showing hostility against the group or an individual.

Blocking: Interfering with group process by going off on a tangent; giving personal experiences unrelated to the problem, arguing too much without hearing others.

Withdrawing: Acting indifferent or unconcerned; being passive or not involved in the team task in an attempt to remove the source of uncomfortable feelings.

Competing Trying to produce the best ideas; talking the most; attempting to be the most popular.

Dependency/Counter-Dependency: Leaning on or resisting anyone in the group who is or represents authority.

# CHAPTER XI: IMPROVING GROUP FUNCTIONING—A FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION

By Elizabeth K. Rath, with input from Frank Johnson, Anne Collins and Kathi Fisher.

Process is concerned with what is happening between and to group members while the group is working. Group process focuses on how a group works/interacts together rather than on what it talks about. Group process or group dynamics deals with morale, feeling, tone, atmosphere, influence, participation, decision- making, leadership, etc. Looking at group process entails making observations about group behavior, getting the facts, and developing and offering guesses about what the behavior means. Feedback to the group would be a three-step process: (1) Share observations; (2) ask members how they feel/what they think and what they think they should do about observation; and (3) offer your guesses about what the behavior means.

The following are some observation guidelines to help you analyze group behavior.

## Participation

* Look for differences in the amount of participation among members.

* Who are the high participators? Low participators?

* Is there any shift in participation—did the low participators become active or did the high participators become quiet? What is your guess about a reason for this interaction?

* How are the silent people treated?

* Who interrupts? Who gets interrupted?

* Who talks to whom?

* Who keeps things going?

## Influence

* Who is always listened to and/or followed?

* Who is never listened to and/or followed?

* Is there a struggle for control of the group? What impact does this have on group members?

Styles of Influence

* Autocratic: Does anyone try to get his/her own way? Does anyone try to block group action when things aren't going his/her way? Does anyone try to act as a judge of other's behavior?

* Peacemaker: Does anyone work to support group member decisions? Does anyone work hard to avoid conflict, to keep things calm? Is anyone only willing to give positive feedback?

* Laissez faire: Does anyone receive attention by staying uninvolved? Is anyone withdrawn, uninterested, apathetic? Does anyone demonstrate an "I don't care" or "It doesn't matter" attitude?

* Democratic: Does anyone try to include everyone in a group discussion and decision? Is anyone open to negative feedback and criticism? Does anyone try to deal with conflict in a problem-solving way?

Types of Group Decision-Making

* Self-authorized: Does anyone make a decision and carry it out without checking with other group members?

* Handclasping: Do any two or more members join together to get "their" decision? How does it impact the group?

* Cliques: Do decisions seem to be made by some group members outside of the regular meeting and then acted on at subsequent meetings?

* Baiting: "We all agree, don't we?"

* Majority: Is there evidence of a majority pushing a decision through over other members' objections?

* Unanimity: Is there pressure for everyone to agree/ conform?

* Plop: Does anyone make a contribution that does not receive any recognition or response from the group? What impact does this have?

* Consensus: Is there any attempt to get all members participating in decision-making?

Group Atmosphere

* Is there an attempt to suppress conflict? Are there efforts to keep everyone happy?

* Who seems to prefer conflict? Does anyone seem to enjoy provoking others?

* Are people involved and interested?

Membership

* Are there subgroups?

* Are there "insiders" and "outsiders?" How are they treated differently in the group?

* Do some members move in and out of the group? Is there any body language that might suggest that? Can you guess at reasons for this shift in and out?

Feelings

* What signs of feelings do you observe in group members?

* Does anyone seem to want to block the expression of feelings, especially negative feelings? How is this done? Is it done consistently?

Norms

* What standards or group rules seem to be operating?

* Are there certain topics that cannot be discussed (e.g. sex, religion, the leader's behavior, etc.)?

* Are group members overly polite? Are only positive feelings allowed? Do members agree with each other too readily? What happens when members disagree?

* Are there norms about the kinds of topics that can be discussed or the kinds of questions that can be asked?

## CHAPTER XII. NEW ROLES FOR MANAGERS AND SUPERVISORS IN A TEAM-BASED ORGANIZATION

Managers and supervisors continue to exercise some their traditional roles, such as operation of the measurement systems that keep critical performance variables within preset limits. Over time, they decide less and begin to perform more functions similar to those described below.

They may develop skills around certain problem-solving techniques that make them a coach to several teams. They may be a mentor to one or more teams. They may be a team leader.

Initially it may easier for a person to learn and practice these roles, especially the team leader role, outside of their historic area of responsibility. Over time, they do more of these type of new roles and less of their traditional supervision role. Eventually, they may be able to perform these roles within their traditional area of responsibility without confusing the new roles with the historic supervisory role.

*LEADER.* Primary responsibility for developing the belief system that sets the general direction and tone. Articulates the vision and values—frequently. Reminds people why we are doing this—frequently.

*SPONSOR/CHAMPION*. These are the "cheerleaders" for the effort within the bureaucracy. They may have to help open up policy space, to protect those who are involved in change, or help obtain resources.

*MENTOR*. Advises team leaders, facilitators as individuals. Does not necessarily meet with the entire team. Can interpret the belief systems and corporate culture and help employees apply them to their area of responsibility.

*QUALITY ADVISOR*. This person is familiar with the theories of quality improvement and/or has experience with other quality improvement efforts and can bring that to the team(s).

*COACH*. May or may not be a team member, but directly assists the team(s). Suggests alternatives, options, approaches. May teach or demonstrate specific problem-solving methods to help team members develop the specific knowledge and skills to use analytic and problem solving tools. Functions as a consultant to a team on problem solving. Helps the team develop and use interactive control mechanisms to adapt to the changing environment. May suggest improvements in decision making methods for use within the team. May suggest review of ground rules, group maintenance or task roles.

*TEAM LEADER.*

Describes management's goals for the team.
Helps clarify the purposes and goals with the team.
Manages the logistics. Obtains resources, such as technology, needed by team.
Manages transitions that call for a renewal of team basics.
Recruits team members. When a new members come on, the team leader orients them

by: reviewing agency mission, team purpose, schedule, ground rules, accomplishments to date, etc.
Describes his/her opinion of the expectations that team members have of each other; urges the new member to reality-test those perceptions and develop their own opinions.
Brings in help. Helps team identify a need to invite a coach or technical person to assist on a problem.
Takes out info. Serves as interface or spokesperson between the team and other units or organized groups of customers.
Monitors the boundaries—the "do not's" "Boundaries are especially critical in those businesses in which a reputation built on trust is a key asset." (Robert Simons, Professor, Harvard Business School)

*FACILITATOR.* Keeps discussion moving. This is the role that helps the group make sure at least some people are performing the group maintenance roles and that at least some people are engaged in performing the task roles. Monitors compliance with and points out violations of the ground rules. May suggest improvements in decision making methods for use within the team. May suggest review of ground rules, group maintenance or task roles. Helps the group learn how to manage conflict.

It works best if you rotate the facilitator role, and if a person other than the team leader or supervisor is the facilitator.

TEAM MEMBER. And on some teams the manager or supervisor is just a team member, like everybody else.

## CHAPTER XIII. EMPOWERMENT and ACCOUNTABILITY

Left alone, the NORMAL DYNAMIC in hierarchical organizations is that power flows up, up and up. About 95% of most authority to act is delegated from above. Empowerment seeks other sources of authority, including that drawn from (a) the vision, mission, values and customers, and from (b) telling employees "find out what customers wants, and if it is within our vision—do it." Empowerment is helping workers understand that their job is not just to do a standard set of tasks, but to figure out what the tasks should be. Empowerment is encouraging employees to try new ways to accomplish desired results, and tolerating the failures that efforts at innovation always bring with them.

EMPOWERMENT is moving power down, down, down. It is the conscious delegation of authority and responsibility to people so they can exercise more power over analysis of, recommendations about, decisions about and management of work. Empowerment is giving people more control over their tools, time and other resources they need to do their work. Everybody in the organization already has some bundle of responsibilities for which they exercise, variously, the authority to recommend to somebody else who decides, or to decide. The goal is to re-size and reshape each of these bundles to give the employee teams as much authority and responsibility as possible. This may involve delegating authorities, changing how they connect to others, re-sizing, re-configuring or otherwise changing the bundle.

Empowerment is moving authority/accountability as far down as possible. The first step is to unravel, or de-blob, existing processes and types of authority. Invite each team or layer to reach up for what they need and ask for specific delegations of authority. Delegate, delegate, delegate as much as the workers can handle. Level A consciously delegates authority down to level B, and B sends it down to C, etc. Send it as far down as the people can handle it.

LEVEL A
Can Recommend what to whom:
Can Decide _____ Accountability is by: _____

LEVEL B
Can Recommend on these subjects:_____
Decides _____ Accountability_____
Decides _____ Accountability_____

LEVEL C
Recommend_____
Decides _____ Accountability____
Decides _____ Accountability____
Decides _____ Accountability____

# CHAPTER XIV: LEARNING ORGANIZATIONS

This chapter is from Gary Stokes' workbook: Human Development: Building the Staff and Board.

THE KEY COMPETENCE: THE ABILITY TO LEARN

Employees and board members of CAAs, like people in all knowledge organizations, must be in a continuous state of learning. The people of the knowledge organization must have the ability to absorb, process and apply new information quickly and effectively.

Since the overall thrust of the CAA's mission is human capital development, mastery of how to learn is at the heart of the agency's work. Most low-income people served by the agency will participate fully in our nation's life—working, parenting, participating in the community—only if they have a chance to learn how to participate.

**The Learning Relationship Many Low-Income People Want and Need**

Low-income people—like all human beings—learn, grow and develop in relationships with other people. They need people in their lives who:

- See their potential and wants to see that potential realized.
- Is not afraid to encounter serious problems in their life and family
- Is willing to make a substantial commitment of time and energy to the relationship
- Understands that the learning relationship is a partnership of equals—with learning flowing both ways

It is clear that the people in the agency need the same things in their relationships. In fact, all of our best relationships share the characteristics of the learning relationships—our marriages, our friendships, our work relationships. In these relationships we grow and develop. We share knowledge. We give and receive invaluable feedback. We become more competent together. We have fun. We suffer through each other's challenges. We are transformed together in these human relationships

## LEARNING RELATIONSHIPS INSIDE THE AGENCY

**The Need for Parallel Process**

Because the primary job of the agency is partnering with low-income people to help them learn, and because that is such a difficult job, the people of the agency must be experiencing the challenges and benefits of learning themselves.

**This dynamic is called parallel process.**

Everyone in the agency—top and mid-managers, line staff directly serving low-income people and support staff—needs to appreciate the gravity of the agency's assignment and needs to believe that people can learn, grow and change. That understanding can only come when learning is a central issue in their own employment and life outside the work place.

**The Key Relationship: Team Leaders and the Team Member**

In the knowledge organization the team is the key set of relationships for learning. The team leader (and this is a better title than supervisor--a word which suggests hierarchy) has the primary responsibility for the development of core competencies and for achieving parallel process. As the initiator of the learning relationship with each team member, the team leader must pursue a process very similar to the process we use when we pursue a learning relationship with a low income person or family:

- We have to get to know each other and earn trust
- We have to assess--determine what we want to accomplish together, what things need doing
- We figure out what we have to learn to accomplish our goals
- We may need to identify additional learning partners we'll need to reach our goals
- We need to develop strategies to learn what we want to learn

One little problem: many people--maybe most people--have never experienced a work place whose leaders' top priority is entering into a learning relationship with the staff who report to them. Learning relationships require high trust levels-levels the agency may not have achieved. Therefore, the top management team is the first team to learn how to create these key relationships. The Executive Director enters into a learning relationship with each of the top managers. They, in turn--as they experience the tremendous benefits of the learning relationships themselves--enter into learning relationships with mid-managers, who will in turn enter into learning relationships with the people on the line. Staff development becomes the top priority of every agency staff member with reporting relationships. Further, the negative impacts of the hierarchy can be dampened, since the learning relationships are relationships of shared power.

**Assess Staff Learning Levels**

The agency needs learners to succeed, but not all staff members are learning. As team leaders assess the relative vitality of each team member's learning, they discover that staff fall along a continuum of learning characteristics:

| stuck/stagnant | ebbing and flowing | vibrant/open |
|---|---|---|

**STUCK**: Most organizations employ some people who are not learning--at work or anywhere. We know them because they are predictable. They may be somewhat productive, because they learned a lot before they got stuck. Most of us have been stuck at some time in our lives.

**EBBING AND FLOWING**: Many employees learn in spurts for periods of time; during these periods we observe real growth and development. When people are flowing, they are discovering themselves, their potential. But then, inexplicably, the same people stop learning--maybe even seem to regress. The same person who last month seemed so open and alive to opportunities for growth seems to have retreated, withdrawn, become stuck. Months later, just as inexplicably, the learner re-emerges.

**VIBRANT AND OPEN**: These employees are people who have put learning at the center of their lives; intellectually and spiritually, these vibrant people are often the agency's top producers. They are constantly improving things in the agency. They expect to be given a rich array of learning opportunities in the work place; if they don't get them, they find employment elsewhere. These people are unpredictable in their creative approach to life.

Everything team leaders do as staff partners-in-learning is aimed at helping their team members move up the continuum of learning. In parallel process, staff do exactly the same thing with low-income families.

**The Challenges of the Team Leader**

Team leaders who become masters of the learning relationship are perhaps the greatest treasure of the knowledge organization. In a relationship with them, people learn, grow and thrive. Their teams become dynamos of knowledge production. Their team members become highly committed and energized. They always solve whatever problems present themselves. They themselves are models of what the organization values.

This mastery, like all mastery, takes years to achieve. The mastery is achieved in two places. One is in the learning relationship with his or her team leader, a relationship where the challenges of people development can be discussed, rehearsed and learned. The other place is in the learning relationships with team members, where the team leader learns through practice, confronting problems, trying approaches and getting feedback.

Mastery with team members is attained over time by facing the challenges presented by team members. Persuading a team member whose learning is stagnant that things have to change is very difficult; the team leader's authority may be challenged by the team member; the team leader's clarity about the situation may be questioned; even motives may be challenged.

Trying to help a team member who ebbs and flows to see that a more consistent commitment to learning is necessary can also be very difficult. What does the team leader say when confronted with, "I am doing my job adequately! "?

And keeping up with the needs of the vibrant learner can be plenty challenging for the team leader. Vibrant learners are hard to please; their appetite for opportunities can be intimidating for team leaders who may feel a strong need to be in control all of the time or wouldn't mind taking a rest from all of that learning energy once in a while.

**Goals & Objectives: The Agency Framework for the Learning Relationship**

What does the agency need the team leader to produce in relationship with team members?

1. We want to be able to ensure that each person is accountable and productive.

2. We want to generate constant improvement and innovation by every staff member.

3. We want to ensure that every staff member has the opportunity to grow and develop with the partnership of the team leader.

In addition to this internal focus on learning, the CAA can also set up continuous learning relationships with:

* the people the CAA serves.
* other organizations, including other agencies and funders.

## CHAPTER XV. ISSUES IN CAA BOARD DEVELOPMENT

Most of the boards of the nation's 954 CAAs operate acceptably or better most of the time. For those boards that are operating well and have a written plan for their own future development, we wish them well. This section is written for boards that are not operating as well as they want to or that do not have a conscious plan for their continued development. There are several types of typical problems in board development.

The first issue area is in defining "what is the agency supposed to be doing," or “what business are we in?”

The second issue is helping the board to unravel "the difference between ends and means," between the desired results and the strategies or programs that will be used to achieve them.

The third issue is to sort out the difference between what the board does and what staff does.

The fourth issue is to correctly describe the type of change that people want to have take place in the board; is it a problem that is solved by individual development, is it group development of a routine nature, or is a change in the structure or operations of the board needed? Individual development and group development of a routine nature can be handled inside the CAA, but if a change in the nature of the group itself is desired then the board will usually need an outside facilitator.

The fifth issue area is the skill level of the person helping the board to develop.

The single biggest issue in helping boards of most CAAs to improve is to help them expand their own vision about what the agency can actually accomplish; about what the organization is supposed to be trying to do. If they don't believe significant change is possible, they create a self-limiting vision and then organize themselves in a way that this becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Even boards that once had a grand vision can take a turn for the worse; it is like watching an implosion that takes place in slow- motion over a period of years.

A board may lack clarity around its purpose, or that is confusion over the mission or just have a very small definition of what is possible. This usually results in a board that is focused inward, downward and backwards. We'll describe this as a Type X board.

The Type X board does not spend its time focused outward on the warp-and-woof of the social institutions of the state or the community; it spends its time focused inward on what it does. It does not look to reshape other organizations or more powerful elements of the community; instead it focuses downward on people who have less power than it does—on its staff and clients. It does not focus on long-terms issues and the future; it looks backwards to review what the staff have already done.

Type X becomes funder-driven in the literal sense. It accepts the limits of the vision of

each funder as being the limits of what are possible in its community. It assumes that its job is to "run programs" that somebody else defines. The board member becomes the on-site volunteer field representative for the funder, constantly checking to make sure the program is in compliance with the funder's regulations. It says its role is "making policy" but spends almost all its time on review of what the managers did last month. It focuses on the past and not the future. Measure the amount of time the Type X board spends going over past actions and staff actions versus the future and its own actions, and you will typically find that they spend about 95% of their time on the old inside stuff and 5% on the new outside stuff.

The Type X board's focus on internal operations shifts attention away from the ends the organization is to achieve. Type X spends most of its time on means rather than ends. It focuses on the methods by which programs are operated. It does not delegate enough of the responsibility for means to the staff. Instead it wants to review the options and then select the means. The negative effect of focusing on means and not on ends is that over time the focus on means relieves the staff of the obligation to achieve goals as long as "we did it the way you said to do it."

This ends-versus-means confusion begins to evaporate simply by talking about it. This topic has been dealt with in greater detail by Dr. John Carver in his publication "Eighteen Principles for Effective Leadership by the Board of Directors," and his other publications.

The Type Y board focuses outward, upward and forward. Type Y has both clarity of purpose and a strong sense of mission. The Type Y board spends most of its time defining the ends the organization is to achieve, the results and impacts it wants to bring about. It spends its time on the vision of a new future and on its own role in the strategies to use to get there. It does not decide on ends and then delegate everything else to the staff. It has its work plan to carry out, its roles in achieving the ends, including mobilizing the press, the community, the politicians and other necessary resources. It spends most of its time on external relationships. It pushes open the policy space within which the CAA staff will operate. It mobilizes new resources to assist low-income people. It identifies undesirable activities in other institutions that harm people and seeks to stop them. It seeks to create new behaviors within and relationships between other organizations that will benefit low-income people. It is willing to focus on areas where it has little or no power, and it seeks to enhance its influence there.

The Type Y board knows that most of what goes on in funded programs really belong to the funders and the professional staff. The programs are described in detail in thick rule books and procedure manuals that are constantly evolving and are impossible to understand unless you spend weeks, months or years immersed in them. Staff are paid to understand these rules and the politics of how they change and a volunteer board member rarely has the time, the information base or the interpersonal interactions needed to understand these rule books. Type Y board members know that whenever a board member dives into the rule book they are usually in over their head. This board may send letters to funders suggesting changes in these rules or waivers from them, but most of these letters are staff-developed.

The Type Y board knows that it needs to understand the basic concepts around the money and the politics of the funder, but it is a waste of time to pore over old fiscal reports to insure

micro-compliance with funders regulations. If there is any malfeasance or misfeasance—the professionalism of your own management staff, the funders themselves, the CAA's check-and-balance fiscal system and your other management systems and even your competitors or opponents will detect it 99.9% of the time before the board ever has a clue. They will blow the whistle for you.

The Type Y board knows that absolute perfection in fiscal matters with no questioned costs probably may mean that your management is too tame, never challenging the status quo or using resources in the most aggressive way to achieve the organizations broadest goals. A manager who steals from you should be fired on the spot and charged with the crime. A manager who uses a funder's resources creatively to pursue the CAA's other goals should be commended. The Type Y Board may have general sentiments like "if you are going to nudge a funder's rules so hard they will terminate our funding, we'd like to discuss this risk with you before it hits the fan." But that is a very different position from being terrified of an auditor who questions any cost—and of demanding perfect compliance with all rules to avoid questioned costs. The Type Y board worries most about nonfeasance on the big goals it wants to achieve, not misfeasance on the rule sets within which its funded programs operate.

The Type Y board sets broad goals and then contracts with its Executive Director to reach them. The Executive Director then organizes the work and the staff to achieve the goals. New methods may come up from a professional publication or a training program or from a client or out of a staff person's head—and the ED is supposed to encourage staff to try those new methods and keep the ones that work best. By agreeing on the ends then by giving staff the responsibility for picking the best means possible, you empower them and fix the responsibility for performance and for constant improvement where it belongs—on the staff person. You challenge them to change, not to keep doing it the same way over and over whether it works or not.

The Type Y board insures that management systems are in place, for personnel, fiscal, information, inventory and other necessary controls, but the Board does not need to second-guess the conclusions that management makes while operating those systems. A personnel grievance becomes a question of "Do we have a grievance procedure in place and was it followed?" The Type Y board is not involved in second guessing the merits of the he- said, she-said arguments that took place weeks or months ago. The Type Y board lets the systems work; it doesn't constantly challenge the validity of these systems or the best judgement of the managers who operate them.

Now the two "types" of board described above are for purpose of illustrating two different general orientations. Most boards are a mixture of these two sets of attributes. The board development task is to figure out the kind of board that a board wants to be, then to help it to get there.

The trainer's task is to determine how to expand the vision. What are the largest purposes and definition of mission that group can handle? Just like trucks, groups have different "load factors." Then you identify which behaviors are really functional and which are dysfunctional in terms of achieving the expanded vision. Once you calculate what should be changed, then you

ascertain what can be changed. Once you discover what can be changed, then you decide how to change it and when to do it. Then you conclude who is going to facilitate or manage this process. This brings us to the next problem area.

The next hurdle is to correctly assess the type and scope of change that is desired. Individual development or group improvement that is not designed to fundamentally change the nature of the group itself can be handled internally. For these purposes, the position of the person who is helping the process would not matter. Marginal change is the way most human change occurs. A committee learning a new planning skill is straightforward. It can be assisted by a staff person.

The other type is basic change, where the board and Executive Director recognize that a new strategic plan or a new vision or a new sense of mission is required. This level of change requires that the person who is facilitating the process has the ability to say "the Emperor has no clothes" during the problem definition phase. It requires the ability to say "it sounds like there may be a need to re-think the basic assumptions you have underlying your current sense of purpose or mission." And it requires the ability to suggest alternative patterns of interaction without being seen as trying to enhance your own position.

This role must be performed by somebody who has no vested interest, or at least nothing to lose, because this role usually means change that affects power and status relationships, and that often means you irritate some people. If you are an integral part of that social system, you may not want to be the person who is up front when the people in the room are talking about how it needs to be changed. If you are a staff person, it is unlikely you will take the risk of really challenging people.

The sessions that seek change that are managed by a person inside the power pyramid often produce no change. In any existing social group the best way to see the probable future is to look at the immediate past. The dynamics that produced the immediate past will continue to chug along unless they are changed. The group may have good intentions about changing, but in the same way that much of the water is invisible to the fish swimming in it most social behavior is invisible or only partly understood by the people engaged in it. The workshop for change inadvertently becomes a validation of the status quo—because that is what the inertia factor in social systems is designed to do! A dynamic to change the status quo can be initiated internally, but it usually has to be catalyzed or completed by some outside dynamic. This outside factor can be an external challenge, or it can be an external organization or person.

So a CAA can and should handle most individual change and most routine change internally. But a change in the way the group operates is desired, then bring in an outsider to help do it.

The fifth issue is related to the fourth. The question is whether or not the person has the technical skills to help the group both to learn new knowledge and skills and to change its behavior. Implementation of new knowledge or skills sometimes requires knowing how to get the group into a new behavior pattern. A social group is a set of people that have a history. They have ongoing personal relationships. They know each other; they have opinions about each

other. They have different roles in the group. They have different interests and levels of knowledge about topics and defer to each other's expertise on specific topics. They chase each other around, for romance or profit or glory or just for the entertainment of aggravating the other person.

In addition to the techniques you use to help individuals learn you will also need organizational development ("OD") skills. Helping a social group learn requires skills that go beyond presentation skills—because groups of people learn in ways that are different from the ways that individuals learn.

The group's definition of what constitutes reality is often very different from any single individual's definition. A favorite example in the OD literature is "The Abilene Effect." It is the story of a large family where each individual was asked "Did they want to go to Abilene." (The road to Abilene, Texas was a hot and dusty drive in the 1950's, before auto air conditioning.) Each person said "Yes," not because they wanted to go personally but because each perceived that one of the other family members did want to go. So they all went on a journey that nobody really wanted. Later, they figured this out. But by then they had already finished the trip.

You have to get the group definition to the surface, and assist them to reach an agreement that they want a new definition and then reach agreement about what the new definition is! And after you have helped the group learn how they want to change, then you have to know how to implement it—to change the behaviors within the group.

There are several types of people who are in a position to help a board to make major changes. A brand-new Executive Director or a very well-entrenched ED can do this. A local college teacher or a management center staff person might be able to help. Even a volunteer or a new employee can do this as long as they are not already socialized into the system. And of course this is the stock-in-trade of organizational development consultants and professional trainers. If you have a consultant who also knows your industry, and who understands the forces at work on it and has specific examples of other CAAs that have expanded their capacity—this person can move you ahead even further and faster. The NACAA can refer you to people in your area. And a new approach to helping your CAA improve is to have peer consultation or peer evaluation of your agency.

The corollary to the issue of the scope of change is the role of the individual in changing himself versus changing the group. We know from organizational theory that an individual rarely has the opportunity to apply what he has learned elsewhere in his group setting unless the group has already decided that the new learning/behavior is desirable. The reason there is continuity and stability in social groups is precisely because either they do not accept deviation from established norms, or they accept change only under predefined circumstances.

To send a person off site to be trained or educated is effective if the purpose is to benefit that individual, or if the group has already said "we want you to act differently so go learn how to do it." But we should not confuse this type of training with the desire to see a change in the group itself. This type of change is rarely accomplished by training one or two individuals from within the group. It requires training or development of the entire group—together.

The area of leadership enhancement is a good example. If the purpose is to enable an individual to function more effectively in the existing group then they can be sent to a learning event by themselves. If the intent is to help the entire group function more effectively, then the whole group needs to participate together.

Agencies that have a formal training plan and budget often allocate their time and other resources between these different types of purposes:

a. Individual improvement. (Board member or staff person)

b. Group of board or staff members trained as a group.

The next three chapters describe (a) how groups form, (b) the areas of group needs and member functioning, and c) what you should look for when you are assessing group operations. Each chapter focus on a particular aspect of group operations. The frameworks and dynamics described in Chapters IX through XI give you tools that will enable you to identify about 85% of what goes on (and goes wrong) in groups.

## CHAPTER XVI. PREPARING A GROUP DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The preparation of a GDP requires that you:

* Identify the group, and every individual in it.

* Assess their needs, or identify the problem area where change is desired.

* Prepare a development plan for the group.

1. Identify the group

After a task is assigned to a group if the group changes composition you may have to restart some parts of the task all over again. This often occurs when there are changes in members in negotiating teams. This idea challenges us to pay more attention to the composition of the group, and of changes in the membership of the group. In terms of group development, it highlights the need to make sure that we have the people in the room who are critical to the task. And there needs to be a process for managing the arrivals and departures.

This author facilitates many CAA Board retreats. There is a problem when no one knows exactly who is going to actually come to the retreat. If the people who do arrive on time have to sit around for a half hour past the starting time to see who is going to show up for the strategic planning process, I know that this is a group that needs to discuss its membership and operational issues as soon as possible. The composition of the group and the time when it forms need to be managed. Don't just let it happen by accident.

A staff group may be a somewhat more captive audience, but there is always one person who can't sit still, or who can't tolerate being in the room with his/her coworkers. Now this is the person who should be there, because this is probably a person who creates much of the dissonance in the office. His/her presence is essential if real improvements are to be made in group functioning. The energy will make any meeting exciting for everybody!

So the point here is to make sure you get the people into the process whose presence is significant for whatever it is that the process is supposed to create.

The other point is that any group is different from the sum of the individuals in it. If the group members attend a particular course as individuals and then you ask them to use the results of that course in a group task, you will get a totally different result than if you had all of them attend the course together. So sequencing their attendance to reduce the impact on the budget or to provide for coverage of the office is usually counterproductive in terms of the group using the new information in their team functioning. Train them all at once.

2. Identify the need or the capacity to be developed

How cosmic is it? Are we talking total rejuvenation here, or improving the performance

on a task? Is this a heart transplant or a Band-Aid? Diagnosis is the first step in organizational development. Where are you and where do you want to be? What are the barriers?

One approach is to begin at the highest level of generalization possible and review the needs in society or your community, the historic spirit of the Economic Opportunity Act, the activities described in the CSBG, the CAA's purpose and mission and then deductively map out the specific actions that are needed. As one set of categories for organizing your thinking on the needs of the entire CAA, you could use the list of roles of the CAA Director as described in the NACAA Executive Director Manual (summarized on page 10 of this workbook) because those roles penetrate every corner of the domain in which the CAA operates.

The other way is more practical and is the way that most users of this workbook will proceed. That is to treat chapters VII through XIII as checklists of the issues that your CAA may need to address. Go through all these checklists and identify which of them are possible areas for improvement.

Chapter VII highlighted some social trends that are changing the nature of organizations in America. Do these trends affect your CAA yet?

Chapter VIII explored the implications of the Total Quality Management paradigm for publicly funded programs that require strict adherence to detailed procedures. Are the TQM and customer service issues beginning to impinge on your CAA? Are these issues relevant yet? How are they affecting you?

Chapter XV explored some specific issues in CAA Board development. Is your CAA a Type X? If so, does it want to change? If it does, this is probably the first order of business, as it will need to develop itself organizationally before it can take on other issues. Is it a Type Y, or at least more Y than X? If so, it is already functioning at a high level organizationally and can focus its attention on community problem solving and other tasks.

Setting priorities on the items that are relevant for your CAA could be a management function, perhaps with input from a staff development committee with representation from each program. Or this may be a role for the board personnel committee. The "short list" of issues to be addressed become the priorities.

3. Develop your plan with the who, why, what, when and where included in it. WRITE IT DOWN. Here are some examples of GDP's. You can use a standardized format like the draft one here, or you can just write a memo.

EXAMPLE

**GROUP DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

(Note: You can do one plan for each group, or you can do a composite plan for several groups like this example)

FOR PERIOD: May____to April____

**A. JOB or TASK PERFORMANCE TO BE IMPROVED:**

| TASK | METHOD | START DATE |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Enhance Board's group decision making | SEE EXAMPLE 1 BELOW | May |
| 2. Expand Board role in community problem-solving. | SEE EXAMPLE 2 BELOW | July |
| 3. Launch public relations campaign for Community Action Week | Obtain "how to" packet from NACAA | Oct |
| 4. Develop strategy for recruiting new board member | Obtain ideas from NACAA Board Manual. | Nov |

| **B. CAPACITIES TO BE ENHANCED.** | METHOD | DATE |
|---|---|---|
| A. Improve teamwork in WX program . | SEE EXAMPLE 3 BELOW | Nov |
| B. Improve customer service in LIHEAP Program | SEE EXAMPLE 4 BELOW | Dec |
| C. Learn to learn, and to apply new knowledge | Use methods in Robert Kaplan's book "The Balanced Scorecard" throughout the agency to enhance learning processes. Begin process in: | Dec |

_____

Plan approved: (Date)

EXAMPLE 1. **Improve Board Decision Making Process**

**The Development Challenge: Board has problems in making decisions that stick.** Many decisions made in one meeting fall apart and have to be re-discussed. This may be due to the excessive use of the "Plop" decision making method. The "plop" method does not create widespread buy-in by all the members, so there is no investment in or ownership of the decision.

**The approach to skill-building (Do in May____)**:

a. Planner discusses problem with Executive Director and Board chair, prepare handout materials.
b. Executive Director distributes materials to the Executive Committee.
c. Schedule 10 minute discussion of this issue at next Executive meeting. ED + planner.
d. Executive Director seeks permission to add one-hour training module on decision making methods to a future board agenda.
    1. Develop some humorous examples of decision making methods.
    2. Develop mini-issue case studies that can be used to practice new methods.
e. Planner will conduct the training. All board members will be urged to come! Role play will make it fun!

EXAMPLE 2. **Skill Development in Community Problem Solving**

**The Development Challenge. Board focuses only on internal program operations. The new Board Officers have expressed a desire for the Board to take a larger role in solving problems out in the community.**

**The approach (Start in July____)**:

a. Using the community problem-solving process described in the **NACAA Planning Manual**, Executive Director will assist our board to engage in five community problem- solving projects over the next 24 months.

b. Using the insight gathered from those experiences, Executive Director will encourage Board to move up into a broad-gauged community needs assessment and planning process. If they agree:
c. Take the Comprehensive Anti-poverty Planning Process described in the NACAA Planning Manual and have our board planning committee and Executive Director adapt it for our purposes. Deputy Director will assist on this.

d. Begin needs assessment for the comprehensive process by June____. Planner to gather background data by____.

EXAMPLE 3. **Teamwork Improvement**

**The Development Challenge: WX Program Director wants crews to improve teamwork. WX staff have discussed this and agree.**

**The approach (Start in November____)**:

1. Obtain a team self-assessment instrument from a vendor,or design your own. Conduct with staff at regular staff meeting next month. (CAA and WX Dir, 1 Hr)

2. Based on assessment results, select 3 - 4 team strengthening exercises, such as, for example:

| | |
|---|---|
| Understand how WX fits with rest of CAA. | (The ABC case study) |
| Planning and organizing. | (The DEF case study) |
| Getting new team member (staff person) up to speed. | (Orientation Kit.) |

Each simulation can be run in 2-3 hours as an adjunct to regular staff meetings. A complete facilitator handbook comes with each kit. Staff person Mr. XYZ can facilitate. By using these tools, groups both gain understanding of the problems they are having and develop solutions to them. There are literally hundreds of these training tools available. See the appendix for a partial listing of commercial training tool providers.

EXAMPLE 4. **Attitudinal Shift & Skill Building**

**The Development Challenge: Our LIHEAP staff have slipped into a fill-out-the-forms mentality. Their conversation with our "customers" focuses only on the paperwork. Empathy with the clients about their other problems seems low.**

**The approach (Start in December____):**

An internal staff development process will assist staff to review and discuss how to apply desired principles of human service delivery. Ms. J will begin the process with a one-half day overview. For the next six weeks we will spend one hour in each staff meeting discussing how to apply key concepts from readings from Lisbeth Schorr's book, Within Our Reach, including:

* crossing traditional service boundaries,
* flexibly apply services to meet the needs of individual families,
* see the family in the context of surroundings,
* care about and respect clients,
* provide services that are easy to use,
* shape services to the needs of those they serve.

After discussing how these principles can apply to LIHEAP, we will bring in facilitators from Our Town College who spend ½ day each week for three weeks training and coaching to sharpen individual skills in: active listening; effective communication, and customer service.

## CHAPTER XVII. ROLE OF LEADERSHIP IN THE KNOWLEDGE ORGANIZATION

This Chapter is from Stokes, “Human Development.” Now we can begin to understand ourselves in a new way. Community Action Agencies are knowledge organizations whose main asset is the knowledge of their staff and board. Most CAAs do not have much cash reserve, property or other tangible assets. What we do have is the knowledge of our people-knowledge

which can be packaged and offered as grant applications, grant and program management or tapped to solve all kinds of community problems or to form good public policy decisions . Most importantly, when low-income people come to the CAA for help, they meet the people of the CAA—not a program. They meet someone with a certain amount of knowledge, a certain amount of skill and a certain set of attitudes. If they are lucky, they meet someone who is skilled at helping low-income people grow.

When we come to understand ourselves as knowledge organizations, everything changes. We still have all of the problems CAA leaders have to solve, but we wake up to the realization that the solution to all of our problems will be found by our people. And we realize that there is literally no limit to the amount of knowledge we can accumulate. Because we want to increase dramatically our productivity, our effectiveness and our influence, we begin to concentrate on the expansion of our treasure--our staff and board. As our store of knowledge grows, a wonderful characteristic of vibrant knowledge organizations kicks in: The more knowledge the agency accumulates and the more knowledge it uses, the wealthier it becomes. Knowledge is an asset which grows as we use it.

Executive Directors of community action agencies are leading their organizations at a time of profound change in leadership thinking all over the world. A great deal of analysis is being done by academics, organizational consultants and leaders of organizations about how the most effective leaders think, learn and act. This analysis of effective leaders and their organizations is producing hundreds of articles and books on the subject of effective leadership. It is also producing many leadership seminars, training programs and new college and university courses.

New interest in the leader has evolved because research has made clear that effective leaders increase the standard of living for their employees, their vendors, their customers and the community in which their organizations reside. These leaders are focused on increasing the productivity of the system in their stewardship.

Understanding the theories and practice of the new leadership paradigm as they relate to the non-profit and government sectors has not been easy. Most of the teaching about the new leadership has been articulated only for the business sector, especially the teaching about productivity enhancement through a focus on quality. Now, however, Deming, Drucker and other experts are applying their new leadership research to the non-profit and government sectors. William Glasser, for instance, has applied Deming's quality management teaching to the leadership of the public schools. In his book "The Quality School" he outlines some of the differences between the old leadership approach (the approach he believes is almost universally used in today's public schools) and the new leadership approach:

**The Old Approach: "Boss-management"**

1. The boss, usually without consulting the workers, defines the tasks and the standards. Workers are expected to comply, making any necessary adjustment.

2. The boss tells the workers how the work is to be done, without showing them how to do

it, rarely asking them how they think the work might be done better.

3. The boss or a designee inspects the work without involving the worker. Workers, then, deliver only enough quality to get by.

4. The boss punishes when workers resist or uses some other form of coercion to extract obedience. Managers and workers become adversaries.

The boss-management approach, Glasser says, is much more interested in the needs of the boss than the workers.

**The New Approach: "Lead Management"** The new leadership approach, implemented fully in only a small number of organizations and described a bit differently by its main proponents is called "lead management" by Glasser. who lists its main characteristics:

1. The leader collaborates with the workers to define the quality of the work to be done and the time needed to do it. The needs and skills of the workers are always an important factor in the leader's planning.

2. Leaders show workers how to do the job so that the workers can know exactly what management expects. Workers are continually invited to provide ideas for finding a better way.

3. Leaders ask workers to evaluate or inspect the quality of their own work, trusting in their expertise about quality work.

4. The leader is a facilitator, creating a non-coercive, non-adversarial atmosphere and providing the best tools and other means to accomplish the work.

## FIVE DIMENSIONS OF CAA LEADERSHIP MANAGEMENT

CAA Executive Directors wanting to learn more about the new leadership paradigm attend seminars or enroll in classes which teach this new thinking and this new management behavior. They read books by the authors mentioned above. Then, however, they have to figure out how to apply this learning without benefit of many models in the human service or education system. And if the Executive Director feels somewhat under-prepared for the task ahead, think about the staff and board, who probably have even less knowledge and experience than the Executive Director. The most knowledgeable management experts in the world agree that it is extra-ordinarily difficult for leaders and workers to change from the low-trust environment of boss-management to the high-trust leader management or quality management approach. Few of us has worked in the latter environment.

Therefore, Executive Directors have to define what their CAA believes is productive, quality work in the agency. Here are five dimensions of quality CAA work which the Executive Director might use to frame the agency discussion:

- *Accountability*. Does the CAA have a clear mission, understood by all of the staff, board members and other stakeholders? Does the CAA have a written strategic plan, created with full participation of staff, board, the low-income people served and other stakeholders? Is the plan a living reality, constantly referred to, constantly guiding leadership's thinking and efforts?

Does the CAA have an annual plan which reflects the strategic commitments?

Does the agency provide a system of accountability for the work of each staff person, documenting what leadership and each staff person have negotiated?

Do evaluation systems tell staff and board what impacts agency programs have on the level of risk experienced by low-income families? On communities? On other institutions in the community?

- *Staff Development*. To what extent has the CAA focused on the development of the staff?

- *Innovation*. To what extent is the CAA an innovator? To what extent is everyone in the CAA invited and empowered to innovate? To what extent are commitments to constant improvement and innovation built into job descriptions, work planning and compensation decisions?

- *Organizational* Partnerships. Do leaders of the CAA understand the quality of the agency's partnerships with other organizations and constantly work toward strengthening those partnerships? Does the CAA take the lead in creating strategic alliances? To what extent is knowledge pouring into the CAA from organizational partnerships? Are staff well prepared at all levels to create and strengthen relationships with community members and with others in the system?

- *Public Policy.* To what extent is the CAA impacting public policy to benefit low-income families? Is the CAA providing data or information which contributes to policy decision-making? To what extent is the CAA an influence with local school boards, city councils, county government and state government. To what extent does the CAA collaborate with other organizations to increase public policy sensitivity to the issues of poverty?

Most leaders in the world are finding the questions of leadership for quality management more than a little intimidating. There is nothing easy about increasing dramatically the productivity of an organization's work force. The key to Executive Director development, however, is in addressing these issues

## CHAPTER XVIII: ROLE OF ASSOCIATIONS IN CAA DEVELOPMENT

In the 1960's and 1970's, Federal funding agencies assumed responsibility for the entire domain in which their funded programs operated. Training and technical assistance money was available for all the internal functions and external relationships that were important to the effective operation of the program and the sponsor. It included task training for workers in the program. It included capacity building for the sponsoring organization, such as public relations, fundraising, board development, personnel management, information system development and all the other generic functions that had to be present in an organization to operate effectively and to improve itself.

In the early 1980's, there was a reduction in federal funds for Training and Technical Assistance (T&TA). The second trend that reduces T&TA for capacity building purposes is illustrated by one of many examples from the way the Department of Labor has operated for the last fifty years. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA) started as a highly decentralized program with the local sponsor calling most of the shots, including defining the program purposes and activities. As time passed DOL wrote rules that were more and more prescriptive. At its demise CETA had thick rule books specifying procedures down to the microscopic level. The Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) is on this same pathway. As this trend toward focusing on the tiny procedures occurs, the Feds lose interest in the broader capacity building activity. They focus more and more on training people to perform the specific tasks that they have prescribed. The broader education and development needs get squeezed out. The, the program chokes to death on its own procedures—while missing the major environmental shifts that should be precipitating changes in strategy and programs.

Several block grants now have a low Federal presence, and probably because of that they also have relatively few federal resources focused on T&TA. (HHS, bless them, is beginning to expand their interest in capacity building because they see how it connects to service quality and to results.) Most state block-grant administrators, including CSBG offices, limit their focus to strict accountability issues, fiscal, property, etc. They do not get too involved in helping CAAs to improve their organizational capacities.

Many of the things that are needed for an organization to function effectively, such as board development, public relations, fundraising, personnel management—these are outside the scope of what most federal and state administering agencies will now pay for. But it is precisely this type of training and development that is the lifeblood of a delivery system, that keeps its member agencies competitive. So the individual CAAs and their associations have an expanded role in figuring out how to meet their long-term needs.

There is one problem. I call it "the hope that springs eternal from the hearts of all humans" problem. We want it all, we want it now, and we want somebody else to pay for it. The professional associations are between a rock and a hard spot. Too many people have expectations that have been carried over from the good old days, when we were awash with trainers, consultants, subsidized conferences, $10 workshop registration fees and inch-thick workbooks by the handful—all paid by "the Feds."

The current economic situation is that local agencies have to take the lead on defining their individual and collective training needs and on acquiring the T&TA they need. Most board and staff training and development has to be paid for out of the coffers of the local agency. This may be in the form of dues to the association, market-rate registration fees or fringe benefits for workers for tuition and books at the local college. This situation calls for each CAA and each association to develop a long-term plan, with board and staff development being treated just like an ongoing "program" with its own work plan and budget.

The good news is groups of CAAs and CAA associations are taking the lead in designing and delivering high-quality training. Since there is usually not enough federal or state money to pay for it, the association often has to charge market-rate registration fees in order to pay the costs.

The principles for marketing any type of service—accounting, financial, legal— all apply to the marketing of training programs. You are selling information. It is an intangible. The NACAA and the Missouri Association of CAAs both have manuals on marketing, so the general principles will not be repeated here in detail.

There are four marketing issues that do merit a comment. They are: (1) when the audience is self-selecting; (2) when the sponsor has policy-driven objectives; (3) as an issue for trainers, and (4) if the training has to pay for itself.

1. When the audience is self-selecting, give as much information as you can about what people should know or be able to do in order to benefit from the workshop. Describe who should attend in (a) job, (b) subject, c) skill and (d) experience terms. Be very specific to roles and experience levels; e.g., "for licensed accountants who have been on the job for more than a year and who want to learn about the OMB circular XIX." Or, "for new Executive Directors who have never managed a CAA and who want to learn about the history of CAAs." Or, "for mechanics who have mastered the art of ABC small engine repair and want to learn about the new GIZMO technology." This will help people make a judgement about how their level of knowledge and experience related to your workshop—and to select themselves in or out of the event.

   For each audience that you are trying to draw to the workshop, give at least one example about how it will help them do their job. Talk about how they can use it immediately to achieve their purposes. Remember that most people only go to training if they see an immediate benefit to themselves.

2. When the sponsor has specific policy-driven objectives, such as trying to improve all CAAs or help them adopt a new opportunity, there is always a question about how far "out front" the leadership is from the rest of the group. Will the members know what the sponsor is talking about?

   Will they agree? The way to avoid problems here is to reality-test the purposes and content of training by calling a few potential participants to see if these ideas fit with their perceptions.

Association sponsors are usually good about predicting the K-S-A and interests of their members, but at least 1/3 of the time some refinement of their concepts will enable them to create a better event.

3. The trainers need as accurate a description of the event as they can get. The participants—your customers—are happy to the extent you meet or exceed their expectations. The primary source of customer expectations is the written materials about the event. You want the event to be seen as a step forward, but do not promise a ride on a Titan II Rocket Ship unless you can deliver it. Whatever you set as the expectations in the advertising copy becomes the MINIMUM the participants will accept. If you meet that minimum, they are happy. If you do not, they are not.

4. If the event has to pay for itself, then you must understand what the competition is doing. If there are courses that have descriptions like yours for $50 at the local community college and you discover they have been advertising these courses to your audience for two years, then you have a challenge in marketing a similar workshop that will cost participants $195.

   Most CAAs spend more money to attend training and seminars that are outside of the CAA network than they do to attend seminars sponsored by CAA associations. Always look at the training being offered to CAAs by other training vendors when you are thinking about an association sponsored event.

So CAA Associations are moving to increase the amount of capacity building and other training needed by CAAs. With careful planning that focuses on the job-related needs of the employees, by reality-testing the concepts involved, by pegging the marketing materials at a level that promises progress without exceeding what can be done, and by looking at the competition, CAA associations can thread their way through the minefield of developing and delivering effective and financially feasible training.

There are many ideas included in this workbook. How do you get them going in your CAA? John Johnston shares an approach for managing large scale change in an organization in the next chapter.

# CHAPTER XIX. MANAGING ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

By John Johnston

## INTRODUCTION

The first step in any organizational change effort is to agree on the extent of change desired, to decide how bold to be. There are four possible change objectives.

1) Improve what is being done now
2) Fix a problem
3) Respond to an external threat to survival
4) Create a next-generation organization

Improvement starts with measuring performance against a known standard. It is expert driven and involves capacity building...enhancing knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Positive change is a result of training, score keeping and coaching.

Solutions to problems are designed against criteria, not standards. Negative features are replaced by positive ones through changing structures, practices, and technology. Positive change is a result of an organized process involving the assignment of problem solving responsibilities and tasks.

Responding to an external threat to survival is leader driven trial and error. It is trend driven changes in focus, structures, and practices that often includes both failure and success. Positive change is partly the result of paying closer attention to trends...to what other organizations are doing that works...and partly a matter of luck. Even a blind hog that gets out and roots around finds an acorn now and then.

In the past five years a number of CAA's across the country have set out to consciously and systematically create next generation organizations. Leaders in these CAA's have chosen to look at the world differently. They are engaged in a principle and paradigm driven organization-wide learning process that is directed toward finding new and increasingly more effective anti-poverty strategies that will permanently get people out of poverty.

The CAA next generation change efforts that are succeeding share a number of features. Boards and staffs pay less attention to the what and who of yesterday than they do to the how of change today and tomorrow. They recognize that things are the way they are because they got that way, and they acknowledge that without thoughtful systematic effort things will get even more...that way. They see the major barriers to organizational change to be an inability to think through and understand systems and processes and insufficient capacity to design and make improvements. Positive change results from the use of a proven change process and change techniques.

A PROVEN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE PROCESS AND TECHNIQUES

There are a number of proven change processes. The labels and number of elements in these processes vary and their sequence changes, but in general they consist of variations of the following nine steps.

1. Think and talk about change  Create urgency and build change momentum
2. Decide to change
3. Figure out what "business" you are in and how to keep score in this business
4. Attend to change mechanics
5. Find out where you are now
6. Decide where you want to go
7. Build capacity
8. Design, make, and assess improvements
9 Check results  Repeat Steps 1 through 8

**1. Think and Talk About Change...Create Urgency and Build Change Momentum**

People need time to think and talk about change and concerted efforts must be made to build momentum for change before change can occur. In every successful change efforts leaders systematically talk about and promote change and make a broad range of change materials and learning opportunities available to persons throughout the organization.

**2. Decide to Change**

At some point a clear message regarding a decision to change must be made. A line needs to be drawn in the dirt, and ways need to be found to let the entire organization participate in and formally acknowledge this decision.

For example, the Board and senior managers of a CAA in Maine recently decided to change. To make this decision clear to employees and to the community they selected a new name for the corporation and added the phrase "help figure out how to do your job and every other job in the agency better" to every agency job description. To insure that the agency's staff joined in this decision they used the occasion of an annual picnic to give every employee a helium balloon with the old agency name on it that employees released into the air in unison and watched sail out of sight. Then, every employee was given a copy of his or her old and new job description, and together they threw their old job descriptions into a fire. In short, they openly, publicly, and collectively marked the end of the old and the beginning of their new Agency.

**3. Figure Out What "Business" You Are In and How to Keep Score in This Business**

Determining what business you are in is surprisingly difficult, even for "widget" makers, and it is a decided challenge for CAA’s.

Taking manufacturers first, twenty years ago every Holley Carburetor Company employee assumed that they were in the carburetor business and they kept score accordingly. Holley knew exactly how many of its various sizes and types of carburetors were made and sold. With the advent of electronic fuel injection systems, now standard equipment on all cars, Holley found out to its regret that it was not in the carburetor business. Instead, it was in the business of helping drivers introduce an ignitable mixture of air and gas into the tops of cylinder heads. When another company figured out how to do this more efficiently Holley lost the "business" it had—but had mis-perceived.

Most CAA's struggle with two forms of "business" confusion. If asked what business they are in most give an answer that is some variation of "making carburetors". That is, they describe what their agency does, not what difference it makes in the lives of poor people. Many CAA's have also been affected by "business" creep, sometimes to the point of transformation. That is, their business has changed, sometimes radically, but their core operating assumptions and the expectations of funding sources have not.

Given that it is a forests-and-trees problem, it is easier to contemplate the nature and impact of "business" creep in different but related anti-poverty networks. Taking but one of many possible examples, without a formal change in mandate the child protective services system nationwide has assumed responsibility for a target population and for tasks once performed by welfare case workers. That is, as is evident in the following data and it has unwittingly and without intending to do so become, in part, an anti-poverty initiative.

Half of the children involved in founded reports of child abuse and neglect live in families that receive welfare assistance. Seventy-two percent of the children in foster care in California, 77% in Michigan, and 86% in New York (over half of the foster care caseload nationwide) come from welfare eligible families. In an Oregon study of foster care children more than 80% of their biological mothers and fathers had not finished high school. And, this system is now charged with addressing forms of educational neglect...parents who permit chronic truancy, fail to obtain remedial education for their children, etc. as well as emotional neglect...inattention to a child's emotional needs, chronic spouse abuse, etc.

How did this happen? The line between these two systems blurred more by drift than by design...things are the way they are because they got that way. Among a number of contributing factors, resources were not made available for the extended social services activities envisioned when welfare payments and welfare case management functions were split in the mid-1970's, but for a variety of reasons were made available for child protective services.

In short, a great deal of hard thinking needs to be done both about the "business" of CAA's and about score keeping for this "business". This will require substantial effort and insight on the part of CAA boards and staffs, and will involve clarifying existing mission confusion and untangling mission creep, transformation, and overlap.

**4. Attend to Change Mechanics**

The existing CAA network produces exactly what it is designed to produce, no more and no less. And, it is not designed to delivery program services, not produce organizational change. To make next generation organizational change happen CAA's will need to create organizational change mechanisms and assign people to play five change roles; sponsors, champions, change team members, problem solving team members, and support staff.

**5. Find Out Where You Are Now**

The direction to "B", where you want to go, depends on the location of "A", where you are now, and this makes accurately describing "A" a critical task. The best, most objective way to do this externally is to have an independent third party ask people in the community including program participants what they think the CAA exists to do and how well it is succeeding in this regard. Internally an independent third party can be used to ask, tally responses to, and analyze probing, 360 degree questions. How does the Board view its own work, the work of senior staff, the work of line level staff, program participants, CAA anti-poverty effort partners etc. How does the senior staff view its performance, the Board, line level staff, program participants, partners, etc.

Admittedly, an honest, open examination of this type is as much fun as getting teeth cleaned, but it serves the same purpose. It gets the patient ready for the next step, whatever that step may be.

**6. Decide Where You Want to Go**

Describing B, where a CAA wants to go, needs to involve clarifying and quantifying both short and long term objectives.

A number of program evaluations and studies are available that suggest that next generation CAA anti-poverty activities will necessarily involve broader use of strategies that have been characterized generically as community building and specifically as assets based development, community empowerment, and sustainable community development.

However they are labeled, these approaches feature one or more of the following elements.

Community ownership of strategies
Community assets as a starting point
Sustainability
A concern with racial equity
A concern with prevention
Collaboration and partnerships
A focus on outcomes

Community-building strategies, using community assets to take advantage of

opportunities, have always been a part of the CAA world, but most CAA efforts have consisted of professionals providing services that address identified needs of children and families. Increasingly, however, CAA's are experimenting with strategies that involve community building, and this is likely to be the dominant CAA strategy in the future.

To illustrate the difference between these two approaches, the designs of most current youth programs have a needs/programs/professionals focus. They assume that young people have needs that require attention, and that programs staffed by professionals are the best way to address these needs. This leads communities concerned with a variety of types of inappropriate teenage behavior, for example, to hire professionals to develop and staff teen centers and recreation facilities and to enforce curfew laws.

In contrast, an assets/opportunities/community focus leads to different program designs. A CAA might assume that the entrepreneurial skills of older people who make and sell handicrafts, dog houses, and other products and who sharpen saws, fix small engines, and provide other services and the energy and mobility of young people are community assets that represent an opportunity to create seniors/youth/business partnerships. These partnerships would generate substantial supplemental income for both parties and contribute in a variety of ways to improving the quality of life in the community. Business owners, even ones who are 16 years old, have little time and inclination to do so and much to lose by engaging in socially inappropriate behavior.

**7. Build Capacity**

People have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to do what they are doing, no more and no less. If they are to do anything different capacity building is required. Accordingly, any effort to create a next generation CAA must involve setting out what capacity building will need to be done, for whom, by whom, utilizing what resources

As in the case of organizational change, a great deal of promising pioneering work has been done and much is known about the design and operation of next generation structures and management systems. That is, "best practices" in terms of the structure and operation of organizations have been developed and tested and serious attempts to use these practices in the public, private, or non-profit sectors consistently result in a 40% reduction in operating costs and significantly increased customer (participant) satisfaction.

Labels vary, but in general there are six key next generation organization structure and operations elements, and a useful way to discuss these elements is to use the decidedly un-catchy acronym BAFMTRB.

The BA in BAFMTRB stands for Basic Assumption. In the public and nonprofit sectors, there is some disagreement as to who "customers" are, but all next generation agencies and organizations are driven by a conviction that they exist to 100% satisfy customers and more, 100% of the time.

The F in BAFMTRB is for two Features. All next generation agencies and organizations provide products and/or services and they constantly work to improve what they provide.

The M in BAFMTRB is for three Musts. Next generation agencies and organizations involve people, empower people, and communicate with customers, however defined

The T in BAFMTRB is for Techniques. The nine most common next generation techniques include the following.

Flatten
View the organization's people as its greatest asset
Keep score using success measures rather than quotas (That is, score keeping from the customers' perspective rather than the organization's)
Fully and openly share information Insure that objective data drives decisions
Recognize and reward quality performance
Focus on value...add what does, take out what does not add value
Promote learning
Think and act “we” not “they”

The R in BAFMTRB is for Results. The basic assumption, features, musts, and techniques described above lead to three results.

Committed, motivated, capable employees...people who are and consider themselves "winners"
Best in the business products and services
Satisfied customers

The B in BAFMTRB is for Benefits. The basic assumption, features, musts, techniques, and results described above provide organizations two benefits.

Organizational strength
The ability to solve problems and take advantage of opportunities

Typically, CAA’s that seek but do not reach next generation status turn BAFMTRB upside down. They start where they should end...with organizational strength and an ability to solve problems, and they try to work backwards through best practices, techniques, musts, and features to satisfied customers. Invariably, they get lost on the way. Substantive and beneficial change is not the beginning but the end product of six steps that start with a commitment to fully satisfying “customers".

**8. Design, Make, and Assess Improvements**

Changes are not necessarily improvements. In fact, despite the best of intentions even painstakingly designed changes in the way CAA’s are structured and operate often make them less efficient and less effective

Any next generation organizational change effort must include provisions for designing improvements, incorporating them in CAA operations, checking to see if they do make things

better, and then adopting, adapting, or abandoning these efforts. In W. Edwards Deming's formulation CAA's must incorporate P-D-C-A...planning, doing, checking, acting...in their transformation efforts.

**9. Check Results...Repeat Steps I Through VIII**

The last step of the nine step improvement process is to insure that the process repeats endlessly, and provision must be made for this. This involves checking results, drawing conclusions about improvement efforts and opportunities, and repeating Steps I through VIII. In practice, this will not be a linear process. Instead, CAA's involved in next generation organizational change will rather quickly need to be engaged in all nine change steps.

SUMMARY

CAA's can improve what they do now, fix problems, respond to external threats to survival, or work to create next-generation organizations. The choice is theirs. Creating a next generation organization is clearly the most difficult and ambitious of these tasks, but in the end, the most rewarding, for CAA's and for poor people. It is not necessary to start this journey at zero, pioneers have been at work for some time and much important work has been done. And, it is not necessary to make this journey alone. There are CAA's across the country who have embarked on this journey that are interested in sharing their experiences.

## APPENDIX A: EVOLUTION IN THEORY ABOUT SOCIAL GROUPS AND ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT

This section is an overview of some of the highlights and trends of organizational theory and group development. Special thanks go to Dr. Leroy Durham for suggesting several of the works referenced here.

The academic analysis and study of groups of people by non- religious scholars was first done in European universities by German sociologists. Max Weber's work, Gemeinschaft and Gessellschaft, is a classic. Weber postulated that there were three types of legitimate authority: rational/legal, traditional and charismatic (the "gift of grace"). The rational/legal authority is most often found in modern societies in both business and governmental entities. Traditional authority is found primarily in tribal and some informal social groups. Charismatic authority is found primarily in religious groups and some political movements.

The focus of Weber's interest was on rational/legal authority. This authority assumes that there is a sphere of obligations for the organization and a written set of rules that govern behavior. There is a bureaucratic, administrative hierarchy. The people in this hierarchy run the machinery but do not own it. Power is fixed to the position or role, not to the individual who occupies it. In theory, candidates are selected based on technical qualifications. People can resign or be fired. The hierarchy offers a career path, and promotion is by seniority or achievement, or both. There may be social class distinctions within the hierarchy, e.g., management and labor, officers and enlisted personnel, clergy and laymen.

Weber postulated that the characteristics of this modern form of organization were universal in "...church and state, of armies, political parties, economic enterprises, organizations to promote all kinds of causes, private associations, clubs and many others." M. Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. The Free Press, 1947, pp. 328-40.

As Weber saw it "The choice is only between bureaucracy and dilettantism...." In other words, either you managed according to the rational/legal principles which he had described—and obviously loved—or you would be a miserable failure. Weber's theories were the dominant paradigm that was used by organizational theorists from all western nations for decades.

H. Fayol, in General Industrial Management, Pitman Press, 1949, described the following key principles of management: division of work, authority, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interests to the general interest, remuneration, centralization, line of authority, order, equity, stability, initiative and "esprit de corps," or "spirit of the group."

If you had good "esprit de corps" in your organization, then structure and order were somewhat less relevant. But since Fayol perceived that good esprit de corps rarely existed, he relied primarily on good old structure and order. Structure it right, keep that discipline up—and you would be getting about all there was to get from the workers. The workers were considered too ignorant to decide anything by themselves; it was up to management to run the show.

Frederick W. Taylor's work titled Scientific Management, published in 1911 explored Weber's ideas in U.S. business corporations. Taylor's theories were very mechanistic and treated workers as cogs in the gears.

The famous Hawthorne experiments helped define a new era of American management. Beginning in 1924, workers who were assembling electrical devices (mostly telephones at the Hawthorne Works of Western Electric) were subjected to variations in their work environment. If the lights were brighter, the production went up. If the lights were darkened, the production went up. If it was colder, the production went up. If it was warmer, the production went up. Finally they figured it out: if you pay attention to the workers, and it does not much matter how you do that, the workers feel better about the work and production goes up. This discovery, called "the Hawthorne effect," initiated a deeper analysis of what makes workers feel good. Management theorists moved to do more detailed research about the relationship between structure and functioning.

It took many experiments and many years for the results of the Hawthorne experiments to be validated by Elton Mayo (1933), T.N. Whitehead and other professors from Harvard Business School. Hawthorne finally resulted in many of the ideas about more humanistic treatment of workers being adopted in factories during the Second World War. The influx of women into the factories helped provide another perspective on worker treatment as well.

Most of the work that had been done in the 1940's and 1950's relied on individual case studies that began with detailed descriptions of the formal organizational structures. The analyst started with a conceptual framework which was usually a vision from social psychology or anthropology. The theories of that era placed a high value on the functioning of the entire entity and on consensus and harmony. The person went out and found it—or perhaps imposed it awkwardly on a social system that only partly reflected its principles. There was a growing suspicion that these theories did not account for much of what went on in organizations and could not explain frequent failures of organizations of all types to meet their stated goals.

The 1950's saw the arrival of sensitivity training. Professor Kurt Lewin from M.I.T. led a team to help improve racial relations in New Britain, Connecticut. The intention was to help people know more about each other on the premise that if they did they would be more tolerant. (This increase in familiarity with the other person sometimes resulted in the intensification of the original animosity rather than a reduction of it.) In the course of assessing what was going on, Lewin discovered the participants were learning as much or more from each other and from the behavior of the group members as they were learning from the faculty. The T-group, or training group was born. This evolved over the years into small-group discussion as we know it today.

An Industrial Psychologist named Edwin Flieshman worked with International Harvester in the 1950's and made an extremely important discovery that "the effects of training were intimately related to the culture, or climate, of the department from which the men came". (From The Growth of Organizational Development, page 18). So "we knew that organizational change was not likely to occur as a result of an individual change strategy unless the objective of the training was in the same direction as a prior decision for overall organizational change". (p. 18). In other words, if you send one person off to a training program, it will not have any effect on the

organization unless the organization has already made a commitment to change in the way that is consistent with the training.

Professor Douglas McGregor, in The Human Side of Enterprise, McGraw Hill, 1960, pp 33 --57, captured some of the optimism of that era by comparing the assumptions about human beings that undergirded management theories. He said there are two basic groups of theories, Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X assumes that man was a brutish beast that disliked work and had to be "coerced, controlled, directed and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth an adequate effort." McGregor took psychologist Aaron Maslow's hierarchy of needs and categorized the contexts in which the needs took place. McGregor suggested that man had two sets of needs, those that relate to a person's self-esteem (autonomy, achievement, competence and knowledge) and those that related to his reputation (status, recognition, appreciation, respect by others). These positive factors undergirded the types of theories he called "Theory Y."

McGregor summarized the assumptions of the Theory Y group as (1) work is as natural as play or rest; (2) people will satisfy their need for self-esteem and reputation by doing good work; (3) people will not only accept but will seek responsibility; (4) most people can do most jobs, and (5) businesses of the day were using only a small part of human potential. McGregor was a breath of fresh air and shifted attention to a more developmental approach to working with people. McGregor took his theories and used them at Esso Oil Company and Union Carbide to engage in the early form of what became known as "team building."

Some people jumped to the conclusion that man is basically an O.K. critter and left alone will do the right thing. So they suggested that managers simply remove control and let the critter go. McGregor cautioned against this extreme.

In the mid 1960's, Frank Herzberg took a closer look at Aaron Maslow's assumptions about what people need or expect and made some startling discoveries. In his book Work and the Nature of Man, World Press, 1966, Herzberg put forth "the motivation- hygiene theory." Like many of the recent findings in how humans work in groups, this is a difficult concept for many people to apply because it flies in the face of common sense. Or more accurately it flies in the face of what our historical assumptions have been about why people work. Until Herzberg, the theories had all assumed that there were ten or so major motivators, primarily pay, fringe benefits, etc.. These motivators were either present to a high degree or down a continuum to a low degree. Herzberg discovered that there are really two very different and unrelated sets of factors at work. He un-raveled and reclassified the motivators into two groups: things that determine job satisfaction and things that determine dissatisfaction.

Now let's look at the two groups. The factors that created job satisfaction were "achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement." These factors all relate to "man's relationship to what he does, his job content, achievement, ...growth in a task." Herzberg calls these the "motivators."

The factors that could create dissatisfaction were "company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions." These all "...describe his

relationship to the context or environment in which he does his job." These are "hygiene" factors.

O.K., so far, huh? Now, here comes the tough part. Each of these groups is unipolar. They are not directly connected with each other. The factors that could cause dissatisfaction, if they were absent, did not produce satisfaction, they simply reduced the level of dissatisfaction. These "hygiene factors can prevent job dissatisfaction, they have little effect on positive job attitudes."

The factors that produce satisfaction, the motivators, if they were absent, did not produce dissatisfaction, they just produced an absence of satisfaction. Gulp!

In other words, the two sets of motivators are not really connected with each other. This torpedoed the fundamental theory that worker motivation was directly and primarily tied to the paycheck and that by raising pay higher and higher you could motivate high performance, overcome resistance and offset poor working conditions.

Furthermore, if the motivator sources of satisfaction are present, low pay and terrible working conditions will be relatively unimportant. If the "motivator" sources of satisfaction are absent, you cannot really compensate for that by bringing about improvements in the hygiene factors. So in the absence of the motivator sources of satisfaction—action to change the hygiene factors by producing higher pay, a new desk, a different boss will not change the worker's satisfaction level. The entire foundation underlying management and labor relations up to that point went out the window.

Quoting Herzberg, "In summary two essential findings were derived from this study. First, the factors involved in producing job satisfaction were separate and distinct from the factors that led to job dissatisfaction. Since separate factors needed to be considered, depending on whether job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction was involved, it followed that these two feelings were not the obverse of each other. Thus, the opposite of job satisfaction would not be job dissatisfaction, but rather no job satisfaction: similarly, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction, not satisfaction with one's job. The fact that job satisfaction is made up of two unipolar traits is not unique, but it remains a difficult concept to grasp."

B.F. Skinner looked at the human animal and decided this critter could be controlled primarily though the stimuli that it received. He argued for rigorous control of the environmental factors to shape human behavior. Emery Air Freight used Skinner's work to construct a workbook that lists 150 types of recognition and rewards. Only positive reinforcement—and no punishment—is used to motivate workers.

Other theorists focused more on the group and less on the individual. Kurt Lewin's famous "force field analysis" is one of the classic tools of organizational development. The review of driving and restraining forces, and the methods that could be devised to influence each, made a major contribution to how groups work. You can either add more positive forces, or best of all reduce the restraining forces. The modification of group norms or standards should be the focus of organizational change. "If one attempts to change an attitude or the behavior of an individual without attempting to change the same...in the group...then the individual will be a

deviate and either will come under pressure to get back into line or will be rejected entirely." The Growth of Organizational Development, p. 31.

Chris Agris provides a variety of tools for individuals to use to influence groups. His touchstones are that people must "own up," they must "express emotion" and they must "experiment with new behaviors."

Another contribution to the role of the individual and the group, specifically between the leadership functions and the group, was made by H.A. Simon, in his 1960 book The New Science of Management Decision, Harper & Row. Simon focused on how decision making worked, or worked best in groups. His assumptions about the nature of man harkened in the era of participative management, where the boss is a leader and a coach instead of a drill sergeant. "Man is a problem-solving, skills-using, social animal. Once he has satisfied his hunger, two main kinds of experiences are significant to him. One of his deepest needs is to apply his skills, whatever they may be, to challenging tasks—to feel the thrill of a well-struck ball or the well-solved problem. The other need is to find meaningful and warm relationships with other human beings—to love and be loved, to share experience, to respect and be respected, to work in common tasks. Particular characteristics of the task environment are significant to man only as they affect these needs. The scientist satisfies them on one environment, the artist in another, but they are the same needs."

In the 1960's and 1970's, different methods of analysis which involved sampling across large numbers of organizations began to highlight some of the shortcomings of the case-study method.

The inconsistencies between the theories as illustrated in the case studies and the findings from the surveys were described by M. Crozier, Comparing Structures and Comparing Games, from Hofstede and Kassem (eds.) European Contributions to Organizational Theory, Van Gorcum Press, 1976. Crozier suggested that much of what went on in organizations was actually the results of complex interactions that are "games played according to some informal rules which cannot be easily predicted from the prescribed roles of the formal structure." He does not mean "games" in the negative sense used by many people as in "he's playing games." Crozier means games in the game-theory, with complex sets of rules and interactive behaviors that change quickly depending on the circumstances and the postures taken by other teams or players. He was able to use this method of analysis to show why "...centralized public agencies do not have a close control over their field officers.... Higher ups do not know and do not want to know field officers as long as there are no problems. This is management by exception but without policy. There is no communication among peers. This is basically a divide and rule game...." Crozier's contribution was to reveal even more problems that had to be addressed to improve performance in an organization.

D.S. Pugh, in the journal **Organizational Dynamics**, Spring of 1973, pp. 19—34, looked at the relationships between the structural elements such as: centralization versus decentralization, structured versus unstructured, line control versus impersonal control, standardized tasks versus nonstandardized tasks, and formal versus informal organization. This was one of the first formal analyses that showed that organizations can have various combinations and degrees of

these factors. The rigid paradigm was being undercut and more dynamic elements and combinations of relationships were being described. Pugh recognized that there were very powerful forces that influenced workers which he called "implicitly transmitted custom." This is the forerunner of what we now call "corporate culture."

Pugh also recognized that most bureaucracies have inherent dynamics toward what he called "standardization of task control procedure." This is good old "creeping bureaucracy," where one new form to fill out begets another, and where the impulse to control an activity automatically leads to the impulse to control the one just on the other side of it. Look out, Pugh warned, it's alive and it wants to eat you!

Pugh also began a comparison between British and American companies in the same industry, and found the Americans use far more paper than did their British counterparts.

Joan Woodward in **Management and Technology** began to trace the cause and effect relationship between "a system of production and its associated organizational pattern". She found that in firms that relied on individual units or small batches, the chain of command was short. In firms with large batch or mass production the chain of command was long. Applying her findings to human service systems, we should find that programs that have standard units of service which are the same for all consumers will have large bureaucracies and long chains of command; those that tailor their service to meet the needs of individuals will have much flatter organizational structures. And this is what we do find.

Other theorists looked at the organization as a whole instead of at individuals in groups or at groups. These theorists often characterized the entire entity according to a single theme, such as being "a benevolent autocracy" or a "participative management system." Many of these themes related to the power relationship or decision-making methods that were "most often" found in that organization. Other theorists over simplified the psychological concepts formerly applied to individuals or families, and used them to describe the entire organization and to psychoanalyze it.

By the late 1970's most organizational theory accepted the assumptions of McGregor's Theory Y and Simon's ideas about decision making. Attention shifted to how formal or informal leadership and decision making took place in groups. F.E. Fiedler and others focused on the role of leadership in the organization and how different approaches to leadership affect the other workers. Leadership is seen as a learned behavior, not as a personality trait. What style of leadership that works best in different situations? How do you pick leaders when the situation in which the leader must function is constantly changing? How long does it take a leader to become effective in his role? How does the leader function as a definer of the rules of the game, or as a team leader for those who are playing in a particular game?

In the 1980's several additional dimensions of organizational behavior were explored. The focus on corporate culture once again explored the unwritten assumptions that existed within the organization. The premise is that the corporate culture is heavily influenced by past crises and that much of today's behavior is designed to avoid dangers that occurred in the past. It is very typical in CAAs, for example, to find a "survival" mentality at work, with a major unspoken

goal being to defend the existence of the organization. This developed first during 1973 when it appeared the federal funding agency was being shut down, and many CAAs received notices on federal letterhead to "cease operations." It was reinforced during the 1980's when most budget proposals from the executive branch proposed "zero funding" on one or more of the principal funding sources of CAAs. In additional to the public policy issues and political aspect of this, there is a direct effect on the attitudes and moods of the board and staff of agencies so affected. A "bunker mentality" of raising the drawbridges, not making waves, and saving money for a possible crisis can affect ongoing operations. This is not to pass judgment on the merits of any of this, but simply to illustrate that there are historic issues that have a profound effect on the vision of what is possible or desirable, and any organizational development effort must uncover these issues.

It is a short step from corporate culture to national culture, and there is now an emphasis on the cultural diversity of both the workforce and the people served. This also takes us into interesting differences among peoples in their orientation to time, personal space, food and work. Edward T Hall's work "The Silent Language" initiated a while new field of study—body language. Professor William Newman at Columbia University has analyzed the "cultural assumptions underlying U.S. management concepts. Gert Hofstede's 1980 analysis of the attitudes toward work of 116,000 people employed in 50 countries by a major multinational corporation is a classic in this regard. A large and growing body of work is used by managers of international businesses for working with people from other countries. Theories of culture also provide useful frameworks for analyzing other social subsystems and social groups within a culture. Two excellent sources of additional information on this topic are the Intercultural Press, PO Box 700, Yarmouth, Maine 04096, and the Society for International Education Training and Research (SIETAR), located in Washington, D.C.

Attention is being given to stimulating creativity and innovation among all workers. The recognition of dramatic shifts in social values, political systems, and economic systems has prompted a wave of theory and training programs on how-to-manage- change. This is in response to the feeling that "the faster I run the behinder I get," or that the number of variables with which one must cope is overwhelming.

Several years ago pressure began to build for a change away from the old assumptions that large organizations are the norm, and that hierarchy is in the very nature of organizations. Size and hierarchy all take time to run, and a speedy response to a challenge or a speedy implementation of a new idea is seen as an essential tool for competing in the future. Management theorists like Tom Peters are now saying that no work unit should contain more than 60 people, and that if you have a larger organization it should have subunits that are free-standing and self-governing so they can respond immediately to competitive challenges.

So time is a significant new dimension in which competition takes place. The other new dimension is quality. Quality, quite simply, is whatever the customer says it is. This poses a dilemma for publicly funded-entities like CAAs that may perceive that they have dozens of stakeholder groups who consider themselves as customers for whatever the CAA produces. Or, worse, that they have only one customer to whom the have to pay attention—the funder. John Johnston begins to work us through this dilemma by sorting stakeholders into two groups, those

who have an interest in what you do, and the consumers of your services.

So organizational theory has become much more sophisticated and penetrating as time has passed. Our understanding of the human animal and how it functions individually and in groups has continued to expand exponentially. That is the good news. Nadler and Tushman, **Organization Dynamics**, Autumn, 1980, describe one such "Framework for Organizational Behavior" that can be used to sort out what is going on in a group. Their theory is that many problems in an organization are the result of a lack of congruence between the internal elements of the organization itself. Their model can be used to assess the tasks, people, formal arrangements, the informal organization—and the environment, resources, and history of the group. It is a kind of strategic planning analysis applied to organizational dynamics.

Dialogue is used in a new form of organizational development and facilitation called "Affirmative Inquiry." This is based on the principle of "start with your successes and build on your strengths" One expert on this approach is Marge Schiller, 49 Rockwood Road, Hingham, MA 02043, 617/749-4373. Marge has done a lot of training in the community action world.

Professor Karl Weick from Ohio State puts forth Amendments to Organizational Theorizing that suggests that the observation of everyday events, everyday places and everyday questions is far more important than the use of theory.

The shift away from hierarchy is also having profound implications for all organizations. The typical organization is a "networked organization" or "matrix management," or it is organized as an "Adhocracy" a term Alvin Toffler popularized in his book Future Shock.

The September, 1991 special issue of the Scientific American focused on the impact of communications, computers and networks. The article on "Computers, Networks and the Corporation" by Thomas Malone and John Rockart, pp. 128—136, describes how the need for hierarchy that existed under old information management technologies is now gone. "These organizations depend on many rapidly shifting project teams and much lateral communication among these relatively autonomous, entrepreneurial groups."

The bad news is that there are now dozens of theories with hundreds of elements and thousands of interrelationships on the lists of what needs to be reviewed as you do an analysis of an organization. You have to have several different sets of tools available, either for use in specific situations or for use as your understanding of the group evolves or for use as the group itself evolves. It takes time to learn about the group and to assess it. Fortunately, organization development practitioners are usually involved with an organization in a process of improvement over time. The change effort is not seen as a single event where everything must happen at once. It is seen as a multidimensional effort.

Some practitioners consciously adopt or just slowly settle into a particular "school of thought," where they only use one set of tools and one set of developmental techniques no-matter-what, and the splice local examples into their presentation to validate the model they are presenting. This produces those eerie workshops where the message sounds plausible while the participants are in the room, but five minutes after you leave you can't remember a word that was

said.

The other part of the bad news is that there is almost never a magic wand, even though this is what people hope for—especially during a crisis. There is only long, slow process involving many dynamic elements.

The era of the single strategy or one-shot intervention is largely gone. What is needed is long-term development of BOTH the organizational units AND the individuals within them. This involves a combination of group development, group training, individual education and individual training. A general framework for group and individual training and development and some of the specific methods are given in this workbook. The rest await your own research and discovery.

## APPENDIX B: A Few Resources

American Society for Training and Development. 1640 King Street. Alexandria, VA 22313.
703/638-8100 FAX 703.683.8103
This is the most important professional association for trainers. Excellent publications, including "Training and Development Magazine" and "Info-Line Workbooks."
http://www.astd.org

Center for Community Futures. Jim Masters. Training design and delivery. Board training.
PO Box 5309, Berkeley, CA 94705
510.339.3801 FAX 510.339.3803
http://www.cencomfut.com

Drucker, Peter,. **Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Nonprofit Management**.
Harper & Row. 1986.

Glasser, Ira. **The Quality School**. Harper and Row, 1990.

HRD Press. 22 Amherst Road, Amherst, MA 01002. 800/822-2801
Good diagnostic tools, simulations, training curricula.

John Johnston and Associates
4011 W 12th St Lawrence, KS 66049
913/841-0774
jjohnston@juno.com

Organizational Development Network. 76 South Orange Ave, South Orange, NJ. 07079
201/763-7337

Stokes, Gary. Mid Iowa Community Action, 1001 S. 18th Ave, Marshalltown, IA 50158.
515.752.7162

Training Magazine. On news stands. Good articles, but if you subscribe you will be on the mailing list of every commercial training company in the Western Hemisphere.