



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

MBA PROFESSIONAL REPORT

**Promoting Enterprise Success within Team Based Entities in
Hierarchical Organizations: A Study of Business Systems
Modernization (BSM) Initiatives at Defense Supply Center
Richmond (DSCR)**

**By: Trent Kalp
Cory Schemm
Jim Strauss
December 2006**

**Advisors: Deborah Gibbons
Doug Brook**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE December 2006	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED MBA Professional Report	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: Promoting Enterprise Success within Team Based Entities in Hierarchical Organizations: A Study of Business Systems Modernization (BSM) Initiatives at Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR)			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Trent Kalp, Cory Schemm and Jim Strauss				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) Organizational change is extremely challenging within hierarchical public organizations. Hierarchical structures, deeply embedded cultures, and employee resistance are some of the characteristics that impede an organizations ability to transform and implement change. In February 2005, Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) began a transformational process entitled Business Systems Modernization (BSM) to improve organizational performance by providing higher value to its customers, attaining better financial performance, and maintaining sales and economies of scale. The purpose of this MBA professional report is to establish and test a theoretical change model applicable to public hierarchical organizations implementing performance related change efforts such as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Specifically, this professional report will identify organizational change elements and methodologies necessary for successful transformation initiatives. By identifying and validating hypothesized change model variables, this professional report will develop a change model that can provide DSCR and other public hierarchical organizations with effective methods for predicting desired outcomes. Additionally, this professional report will provide DSCR with recommendations to improve employee adoption, acceptance, and application of recently implemented KPI performance measurements.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Organizational Change, Organizational Transformation, Hierarchical Organizations, Diagnostic Change Model, Change Management, Organizational Climate, Key Performance Indicators			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 235	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**PROMOTING ENTERPRISE SUCCESS WITHIN TEAM BASED ENTITIES IN
HIERARCHICAL ORGANIZATIONS: A STUDY OF BUSINESS SYSTEMS
MODERNIZATION (BSM) INITIATIVES AT DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER
RICHMOND (DSCR)**

Trent Kalp, Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy
Cory Schemm, Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy
Jim Strauss, Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 2006**

Authors:

Trent Kalp

Cory Schemm

Jim Strauss

Approved by:

Deborah Gibbons, Co-Advisor

Doug Brook, Co-Advisor

Robert N. Beck, Dean
Graduate School of Business and Public Policy

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

PROMOTING ENTERPRISE SUCCESS WITHIN TEAM BASED ENTITIES IN HIERARCHICAL ORGANIZATIONS: A STUDY OF BUSINESS SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (BSM) INITIATIVES AT DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER RICHMOND (DSCR)

ABSTRACT

Organizational change is extremely challenging within hierarchical public organizations. Hierarchical structures, deeply embedded cultures, and employee resistance are some of the characteristics that impede an organizations ability to transform and implement change. In February 2005, Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) began a transformational process entitled Business Systems Modernization (BSM) to improve organizational performance by providing higher value to its customers, attaining better financial performance, and maintaining sales and economies of scale. The purpose of this MBA professional report is to establish and test a theoretical change model applicable to public hierarchical organizations implementing performance related change efforts such as Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). Specifically, this professional report will identify organizational change elements and methodologies necessary for successful transformation initiatives. By identifying and validating hypothesized change model variables, this professional report will develop a change model that can provide DSCR and other public hierarchical organizations with effective methods for predicting desired outcomes. Additionally, this professional report will provide DSCR with recommendations to improve employee adoption, acceptance, and application of recently implemented KPI performance measurements.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	BACKGROUND	1
1.	Defense Logistics Agency (DLA)	1
2.	Defense Logistics Agency’s Role in National Security	4
3.	Transformation and the Department of Defense	5
4.	Transforming Defense Logistics Agency	6
5.	Transforming Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR)	6
B.	PURPOSE.....	7
C.	RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	8
D.	BENEFITS OF STUDY.....	8
E.	SCOPE	8
F.	ORGANIZATION OF PROJECT REPORT	9
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	11
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	11
B.	ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE	11
C.	KURT LEWIN, THREE-STEP MODEL.....	12
D.	JOHN P. KOTTER, EIGHT STEP MODEL.....	13
1.	Kotter’s Eight Step Model.....	13
a.	<i>Establish a Sense of Urgency</i>	<i>13</i>
b.	<i>Creating the Guiding Coalition</i>	<i>13</i>
c.	<i>Developing a Vision and Strategy</i>	<i>14</i>
d.	<i>Communicating the Vision</i>	<i>14</i>
e.	<i>Empower Broad-Based Action</i>	<i>15</i>
f.	<i>Generating Short-Term Wins</i>	<i>15</i>
g.	<i>Consolidating Gains and Producing More Change</i>	<i>15</i>
h.	<i>Anchoring New Approaches in the Culture.....</i>	<i>15</i>
2.	Additional Considerations.....	16
a.	<i>Leadership vs. Management.....</i>	<i>16</i>
b.	<i>Training.....</i>	<i>16</i>
c.	<i>Alignment.....</i>	<i>17</i>
E.	DAVID A. NADLER AND MARK B. NADLER: CYCLE OF CHANGE.....	17
1.	Congruence Model.....	17
a.	<i>Inputs.....</i>	<i>18</i>
b.	<i>Strategy.....</i>	<i>18</i>
c.	<i>Output.....</i>	<i>18</i>
d.	<i>Work</i>	<i>18</i>
e.	<i>People</i>	<i>19</i>
f.	<i>The Formal Organization.....</i>	<i>19</i>
g.	<i>The Informal Organization</i>	<i>19</i>
h.	<i>Organizational Fit.....</i>	<i>19</i>

2.	Cycle of Change.....	20
a.	<i>Recognizing the Change Imperative</i>	20
b.	<i>Developing a Shared Direction.....</i>	21
c.	<i>Implementing Change.....</i>	21
d.	<i>Consolidating Change</i>	23
e.	<i>Sustaining Change.....</i>	24
F.	RICHARD BECKMAN AND REUBEN T. HARRIS: ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSITIONS	25
1.	Defining the Future State	25
2.	Assessing the Present	25
3.	Transition State.....	25
G.	LARRY BOSSIDY AND RAM CHARAN: EXECUTION	26
1.	Linking Reward to Performance.....	27
2.	The Social Software of Execution.....	27
3.	The Importance of Robust Dialogue	28
4.	Leaders Get the Behavior They Exhibit and Tolerate	28
H.	JOSEPH H. BOYETT AND JIMMIE T. BOYETT: THE GURU GUIDE	28
1.	Resistance.....	29
a.	<i>Perceived Negative Outcome</i>	<i>29</i>
b.	<i>Fear of More Work</i>	<i>29</i>
c.	<i>Habits Must Be Broken.....</i>	<i>29</i>
d.	<i>Lack of Communication</i>	<i>29</i>
e.	<i>Failure to Align with the Organization As a Whole.....</i>	<i>29</i>
f.	<i>Employee Rebellion.....</i>	<i>29</i>
2.	The Necessary Ingredients for Successful Change	30
a.	<i>Establish a Need to Change.....</i>	<i>30</i>
b.	<i>Create a Clear, Compelling Vision That Shows People How Their Lives Will Be Better.....</i>	<i>31</i>
c.	<i>Go for True Performance Results and Create Early Wins ...</i>	<i>31</i>
d.	<i>Communicate, Communicate, Communicate and Communicate Some More</i>	<i>31</i>
e.	<i>Build a Strong, Committed, Guiding Coalition That Includes Top Management</i>	<i>31</i>
f.	<i>Keep It Complex Stupid</i>	<i>32</i>
g.	<i>People Do Not Resist Their Own Ideas</i>	<i>32</i>
I.	TREASURY BOARD OF CANADA SECRETARIAT: CHANGING MANAGEMENT CULTURE.....	33
1.	Stage 1: Understanding	33
2.	Stage 2: Vision and Strategic Planning.....	34
3.	Stage 3: Implementing the Plan.....	34
4.	Stage 4: Transition.....	34
5.	Stage 5: Follow-Up.....	34
J.	SUMMARY	35
III.	CHANGE CAMPAIGN MODEL	37

A.	INTRODUCTION.....	37
1.	Change Elements.....	37
a.	<i>Vision</i>	38
b.	<i>Goal Congruence</i>	39
c.	<i>Training</i>	39
d.	<i>Communication</i>	39
e.	<i>Sense of Urgency</i>	40
f.	<i>Incentives</i>	40
g.	<i>Cooperation and Coordination</i>	40
h.	<i>Leadership</i>	40
i.	<i>Power and Politics</i>	40
j.	<i>Measurement</i>	41
k.	<i>Resource Allocation</i>	41
2.	Change Campaign Model.....	41
a.	<i>Phase 1: Recognizing the Need for Change</i>	42
b.	<i>Phase 2: Develop the Vision</i>	43
c.	<i>Phase 3: Preparation</i>	43
d.	<i>Phase 4: Implementation</i>	43
e.	<i>Phase 5: Consolidation</i>	44
f.	<i>Phase 6: Sustainment</i>	44
IV.	METHODOLOGY	45
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	45
B.	MODEL BUILDING	45
1.	Focus Groups.....	45
2.	Informal Interviews	46
C.	SURVEY CONSTRUCTION, ADMINISTRATION, AND MEASURES	46
1.	Survey Design and Administration	47
2.	Clustering of Survey Items into Scale Scores	49
3.	Measures	49
V.	DATA ANALYSIS.....	51
A.	OBJECTIVES	51
B.	REGRESSION ANALYSIS	51
C.	RESULTS	52
D.	DISCUSSION	56
a.	<i>Practical Application</i>	61
F.	REVISED CHANGE CAMPAIGN MODEL.....	62
VI.	DSCR REPORT	63
A.	INTRODUCTION.....	63
B.	DSCR CHANGE CAMPAIGN IDENTIFICATION	63
C.	CHANGE ELEMENT SURVEY RESPONSES	64
1.	Sense of Urgency	64
2.	Goal Congruence.....	66
3.	Leadership and Vision.....	69

4.	Training	72
5.	Resource Allocation	74
6.	Measurement	76
7.	Communication	79
VII.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY.....	83
A.	SUMMARY	83
B.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY	83
1.	Compare Change In Hierarchical Public Organizations and Private Organizations.....	83
2.	Analyze Hierarchical Organizations That Have Experienced Transformation Failure.....	84
3.	Analyze Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) That Do Not Have Hierarchical Command Structures.....	84
4.	Evaluate the Composition and Appropriateness of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) Being Implemented within the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA)	84
C.	CONCLUSIONS	84
	APPENDIX A. DSCR SURVEY QUESTIONS	87
	APPENDIX B. DSCR SURVEY ANSWERS	113
	APPENDIX C. OPEN-ENDED SURVEY RESPONSES (ANSWERS APPEAR EXACTLY AS ENTERED INTO QUESTIONNAIRE).....	153
	APPENDIX D. EXCERPTS FROM DLA’S TRANSFORMATION ROADMAP.....	191
	APPENDIX E. FACTOR AND RELIABILITY ANALYSIS RESULTS.....	205
A.	RESOURCE ALLOCATION.....	205
B.	TRAINING	206
C.	COMMUNICATION.....	207
D.	LEADERSHIP	208
E.	MEASUREMENT.....	208
F.	GOAL CONGRUENCE.....	209
G.	SENSE OF URGENCY	210
H.	KPI DESIRED OUTCOME	211
I.	ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESIRED OUTCOME.....	212
	APPENDIX F. REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS.....	213
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	215
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	217

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	The Congruence Model (from Nadler & Nadler, 1998)	18
Figure 2.	The Cycle of Change (from Nadler & Nadler, 1998)	20
Figure 3.	Change Campaign Model (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss, 2006).....	38
Figure 4.	Change Campaign Model Phases (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss, 2006).....	42
Figure 5.	Revised Change Campaign Model (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss, 2006)....	62
Figure 6.	DSCR’s location on the Change Campaign Model (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss, 2006).....	63
Figure 7.	Sense of Urgency Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	65
Figure 8.	Sense of Urgency Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	65
Figure 9.	Goal Congruence Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	66
Figure 10.	Goal Congruence Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	67
Figure 11.	Leadership Summary Graph	70
Figure 12.	Leadership and Vision Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	70
Figure 13.	Training Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	72
Figure 14.	Training Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)	73
Figure 15.	Resource Allocation Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)	75
Figure 16.	Resource Allocation Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	75
Figure 17.	Measurement (Metrics) Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)	76
Figure 18.	Measurement (Metrics) Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	77
Figure 19.	Communication Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	79
Figure 20.	Communication Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006).....	80

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	KPI outcome model means, standard deviations, and correlations (bolded text identifies variables with significant correlation to KPIs)	52
Table 2.	Organizational Climate outcome model means, standard deviations, and correlations (bolded text identifies variables with significant correlation to Organizational Climate).....	53
Table 3.	KPI Desired Outcome Model Summary (** significant at $p < .01$ and *** significant at $p < .001$)	54
Table 4.	Organizational Climate Desired Outcome Model Summary (* significant at $p < .05$, ** significant at $p < .01$ and *** significant at $p < .001$)	55
Table 5.	Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Resource Allocation	205
Table 6.	Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Training	206
Table 7.	Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Communication	207
Table 8.	Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Leadership and Vision	208
Table 9.	Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Measurement	208
Table 10.	Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Goal Congruence	209
Table 11.	Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Sense of Urgency.....	210
Table 12.	Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for KPIs	211
Table 13.	Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Organizational Climate.....	212
Table 14.	KPI Model OLS Regression Analysis Results.....	213
Table 15.	Organizational Climate Model OLS Regression Analysis Results.....	214

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge our thesis advisors, Professor Doug Brook and Professor Deborah Gibbons, for their assistance and guidance throughout this process. We appreciate your dedication, support, and coaching for the last ten months. We could not have completed this task without your help. We are greatly indebted to you. Thank you very much!

Special thanks go to the Director of Defense Supply Center Richmond, RDML Mark Heinrich, for inspiring us with this idea. Additionally, authorizing us unlimited access to your command and granting us permission to conduct the survey questionnaire enabled the project to come to fruition. It is the researchers' hope that the results will provide benefits commensurate with your unwavering support. We would also like to thank CAPT Sylvester Abramowicz and CDR Clifford Noe for their tireless efforts in supporting us as "unofficial" members of our project team. Additionally, we would like to thank those DSCR employees that assisted us during the gathering of information and data in addition to all employees at DSCR who participated in our survey questionnaire. We know your time is precious and sincerely appreciate your assistance.

To our families, we would like to express our most heartfelt appreciation for the consideration and understanding that all of you have shown us throughout our 18 month NPS experience. Without your love and support, we could not have met the challenges that came with the pursuit of our graduate degrees. Special thanks to Dana, Amy, Lauren, Emily, Shannon, Casey, and Justin. We could not have accomplished this without your support. Thank you!

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

This study formulates an organizational change model that identifies elements and principles necessary for promoting enterprise success within team-based entities in hierarchical organizations undergoing or planning to undergo change. The study tests hypothesized change model elements through applied research in the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) of the U.S. Department of Defense. By examining a hypothesized organizational change model, using computational analysis methods, we identify key principles and potential interventions for improving the change process at one of the Defense Logistics Agency lead centers, Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR). DSCR was chosen to test the hypothesized model because DSCR leadership is seeking methods or models that will assist them in getting their employees to adopt, accept and apply a new performance measurement system that has recently been implemented. Furthermore, DSCR is representative of other Department of Defense (DoD) hierarchical organizations. Therefore, this study can provide a specific frame of reference for DSCR in conjunction with providing a generalized model for other DoD agencies to use as a benchmark for implementing organizational change initiatives.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Defense Logistics Agency (DLA)

The Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) is a U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) agency. DLA supplies the nation's military services and numerous civilian agencies with the critical resources they need to accomplish their worldwide missions. DLA provides wide-ranging logistical support for peacetime and wartime operations as well as emergency preparedness and humanitarian missions. Since its creation in 1961, DLA has grown to become a worldwide logistics combat support operation ([http://www.dla.mil/DLA%20 Brochure.pdf](http://www.dla.mil/DLA%20Brochure.pdf)).

DLA is headquartered just outside Washington, D.C., and has a staff of approximately 21,000 civilian and military employees working in 48 states and 28 foreign countries. DLA supplies nearly every consumable item America's military

services need to operate. In short, “if America’s forces can eat it, wear it, drive it, or burn it, chances are that DLA helps provide it” ([http://www.dla.mil/DLA%20 Brochure.pdf](http://www.dla.mil/DLA%20Brochure.pdf), p. 1).

DLA has supported every major war and contingency operation in the past four decades ranging from the Vietnam War to Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. Despite past successes, DLA continues to transform in order to refine its ability to respond quickly and effectively to the evolving needs of its customers. In light of DLA’s current transformational efforts, then acting director, Vice Admiral Keith Lippert, issued a *Transformation Roadmap* (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006) identifying DLA’s “plan and commitment to dramatically improve war-fighter support at a reduced cost through business process re-engineering, workforce development, technology modernization, and organizational change” (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, Director’s Foreword). Despite successes in 2004 and 2005 in terms of exceeding virtually all performance metrics such as material availability, low customer wait times, and low cost recovery rates, Vice Admiral Lippert cites three primary reasons for continuing transformational change within DLA.

Vice Admiral Lippert states first that “transformational change is the right thing to do for DLA’s ultimate customers, America’s war-fighters, who expect, demand, and deserve dramatically improved support at less cost” (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, Director’s Foreword). Second, Vice Admiral Lippert states that it is the right thing to do for the nation’s taxpayers in terms of cost reductions. “As stewards of the public trust, it is incumbent upon the agency to leverage best business practices to achieve all appropriate savings” (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, Director’s Foreword). Finally, Vice Admiral Lippert states that transformational change is the right thing to do for DLA. “As the Defense Department’s only Combat Logistics Support Agency, DLA has a broad-based, joint service mission. However, numerous governmental and

commercial activities operate in or at the margins of DLA's mission area. If DLA does not maintain a strong, best-value edge, they will lose sales and the associated economies of scale that are critical to remaining the war-fighter's most effective and efficient provider" (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, Director's Foreword).

Furthermore, Vice Admiral Lippert states that "transforming logistics is a continual process and not an end state" (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, Director's Foreword). Therefore, DLA is leaving its legacy business model and organizational structures in order to transform into the following:

- A robust customer-focused agency with world class military service and war-fighting partnering capabilities;
- A manager and integrator of the supply chains essential to military readiness with world class commercial supplier partnering capabilities; and
- A single, fully integrated enterprise. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, Director's Foreword).

To achieve the aforementioned objectives, DLA has undertaken 13 transformational initiatives citing that no single initiative is transformational by itself. Rather, each leverages the capabilities of the others. Delivery of all programs is necessary for full realization of the agency's transformation (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, Director's Foreword).

This ongoing transformation will fundamentally alter DLA's core business model, supporting processes, and systems architecture. At the core business model level, customer focus, supply chain management, and seamless partnering constitute DLA's transformation. DLA also views organizational alignment among internal functions as a key contributor to their transformation efforts. In the past, DLA operated as a traditional holding company, where a number of semiautonomous activities such as its Inventory Control Points and Distribution Centers reported to a centralized headquarters staff. The

agency has taken the strategic steps required to establish a “single, tightly integrated organizational structure where DLA is, and perceived to be, one enterprise” (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, Executive Summary).

Excerpts from DLA’s *Transformation Roadmap* summarizing the 13 key initiatives inherent to DLA’s transformation appear in Appendix A. Together, these initiatives are designed to “meet the evolving needs of the war-fighter and the ever changing nature of warfare” (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap*). The implementation of these 13 initiatives will require significant change throughout DLA’s organization. This study will focus on the organizational changes related to one of DLA’s 13 initiatives, Business Systems Modernization (BSM), at DSCR. BSM is the most “significant information technology and re-engineering effort in the Defense Logistics Agency today” (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap*). It is DLA’s program to replace the agency’s 1960 vintage materiel management systems with commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software. BSM is an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Supply Chain Management system that will replace the agency’s legacy systems in order to link the entire supply chain from customer to supplier. To implement the reengineered business process and maximize the benefits of BSM, DLA is creating a new organizational structure and a new job model which emphasizes distinct customer and supplier support by establishing customer facing and supplier facing organizations (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap*).

2. Defense Logistics Agency’s Role in National Security

The purpose of the United States National Security Strategy (NSS) is to document the nation’s plan to achieve and maintain security and prosperity in the years ahead. The goal of the NSS is to “help make the world not just safer, but better” (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap*). To achieve this goal, eight strategies are laid out. One of the eight strategies applicable to DLA is to “transform America’s national security institutions to meet the challenges and opportunities of the twenty-first century” (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap*). This NSS strategy serves as the overarching tenet for DLA’s transformation. One of the necessities of

America's military is "the ability to deploy the men and women of our armed forces to any location in the world and to sustain them there in an exceptionally high state of war-fighting readiness for indefinite periods of time" (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap*). The success of the military forces is "wholly dependent upon the superior personal readiness of American Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen and Marines; the readiness of the aircraft, ships, tanks and other platforms essential to combat, and the nation's ability to sustain readiness, regardless of the locale or duration" (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap*). DLA's critically important role in national security is clearly reflected in the fact that the military services rely on the agency for 100 percent of their subsistence items, medical materiel, construction and barrier materiel, footwear and protective garments and a myriad of additional items that are essential to personnel readiness. DLA provides 100 percent of the services' world-wide fuel and energy requirements that act as enablers to the essential elements of force projection. DLA also provides 95 percent of the repair parts the services require to keep their equipment maintained and operational. Finally, DLA provides for the appropriate reuse opportunities and final disposal of excess military property including hazardous items and unique military items. DLA's skillful management of this mission is an essential ingredient in overall material readiness and is required for successful deployment and sustainment of American Forces in support of the NSS (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, p. 1).

3. Transformation and the Department of Defense

The National Defense Strategy of the United States of America (NDS) supports the NSS by establishing a set of overarching defense objectives that guide DoD's security actions and provide direction for the National Military Strategy (NMS). It builds upon the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) process and addresses President Bush's focus on preparing DoD to meet 21st century challenges. The NDS details four implementation guidelines, one of which is "Continuous Transformation" (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap*). The stated purpose of continuous transformation "is to extend key advantages and reduce vulnerabilities" (The Defense Logistics Agency,

Transformation Roadmap). DLA's transformation has the same purpose. However, the implementation of the 13 initiatives will require both programmatic and organizational changes. DLA understands this vast span of transformation and is attempting to address: process, technology, information management, organization, workforce skill and culture, as well as others in its transformation plan. The DLA transformation strategy is an effort to directly support and align with the NSS, NDS and NMS (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pp. 2-3).

4. Transforming Defense Logistics Agency

As the Department of Defense transforms to meet current and future threats, DLA must "engage in a more focused, collaborative approach to customer and supplier relations, satisfying their dynamic requirements with state of the art system solutions" (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap*). Furthermore, DLA insists that these transformational issues must be addressed in a unified fashion so that all DLA organizational entities operate under the same exceptional standards as one enterprise. The aforementioned 13 key initiatives have been identified by DLA as essential to the requisite transformation (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, p. 3).

5. Transforming Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR)

Not all of the above mentioned 13 initiatives have been placed into practice, but Business Systems Modernization (BSM) is underway.

DLA has a network of four individual lead centers that purchase and manage a variety of supplies and services. One specific lead center that will be the focus of this project is Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR), which is located in Virginia. DSCR is the aviation supply manager for DLA and is responsible for supplying products with a direct application to aviation. DSCR supports approximately 1,300 major weapons systems with its 2,000 employees (<http://www.dscr.dla.mil/userweb/pao/commanderswelcome.htm>).

In adherence to directives issued by DLA headquarters, DSCR is currently implementing BSM initiatives. A subset of BSM that DSCR is currently incorporating is a performance measurement metric called Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). KPIs measure efficiency and effectiveness of DSCR and its many internal branches and divisions. DSCR is implementing BSM changes in phases in order to “roll-out” the various branches and divisions at different intervals. Internal organizations designated for KPI implementation have been given the designation of Integrated Supplier Teams (ISTs). ISTs within DSCR are at varying stages of implementation.

As with many changes, DSCR is experiencing personnel challenges with respect to their KPI implementation initiatives. Recent surveys conducted by the Denison Company illustrate the challenges that DSCR is having from an employee perspective. Specifically, the corporate climate survey results indicate that DSCR’s leadership is having a difficult time conveying agency goals and objectives as they relate to BSM and more specifically KPIs. Additionally, DSCR leadership is under the perception that the KPI implementation is outpacing employee cultural change. DSCR leadership has concerns about this gap and its future ramifications on agency performance.

In summary, cultural change within DSCR is trailing their business model. DSCR has identified the new business processes to be implemented and is concerned about the work force properly understanding and embracing these new initiatives. DSCR leadership is seeking more effective methods to implement their BSM KPI initiative. Additionally, DSCR leadership is seeking methods or models that will assist them in getting their employees to successfully adopt, accept and apply KPIs as part of their daily climate in order to close the gap between DSCR transformation initiatives and employee cultural change.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to formulate an organizational change model that identifies elements and principles necessary for promoting enterprise success within team-based entities in hierarchical organizations experiencing change. Specifically, this project will develop and evaluate a theoretical change model for Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) intent on improving employee adoption, acceptance, and application

of Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Business Systems Modernization (BSM) Key Performance Indicator (KPI) initiatives. This study will provide specific recommendations for DSCR in conjunction with providing a generalized model for other DoD agencies and hierarchical organizations to use as a benchmark or frame of reference for implementing organizational change initiatives.

C. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. General Research Question

What organizational change elements and principles are necessary for promoting enterprise success within team-based entities in hierarchical organizations?

2. Specific Research Question

How can Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) improve employee adoption, acceptance, and application of Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Business Systems Modernization (BSM) Key Performance Indicator (KPI) initiatives?

D. BENEFITS OF STUDY

This study formulates an organizational change model that can provide a frame of reference or guideline for hierarchical organizations undergoing or planning to undergo change. Additionally, this study provides specific recommendations to assist Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) with their ongoing organizational change initiatives.

E. SCOPE

The scope of this research project covered five areas of study. First, background information was provided on the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) and addressed the reasons why DLA leadership has embarked upon their specific transformational initiatives. The second phase provided a background and discussion on key aspects of organizational change. This phase used theories and ideas from literature to construct a hypothesized model of change for organizations currently experiencing or soon to be experiencing change. Phase three of this research project tested the hypothesized change model against desired DSCR outcomes via a survey. This phase used the data extracted from the survey to validate and/or invalidate the hypothetical change model developed during phase two. Validation through data analysis provided evidence supporting the

viability of our hypothesized change model for use throughout DSCR, DLA and in other organizational change efforts. By selecting Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) as case subjects, these results will be especially applicable to other military and/or hierarchical organizations. The fifth and final phase provided conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for future research on the topic of organizational change within hierarchical organizations.

F. ORGANIZATION OF PROJECT REPORT

Chapter II reviews selected organizational change models and theories.

Chapter III establishes a hypothetical phase campaign change model for hierarchical organizations.

Chapter IV describes the methodology used for this research project.

Chapter V provides a data analysis of a survey distributed at DSCR that will be used to validate and/or invalidate hypothesized change model elements as they pertain to specific desired outcomes via computational analysis.

Chapter VI offers analysis and answers to the research questions and provides recommendations for DSCR to apply validated elements of the hypothetical change model.

Chapter VII summarizes the research and conclusions of this research project and provides recommendations for future research.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides several examples of leading organizational change literature to provide an understanding of the various schools of thought regarding this topic. A generic overview of organizational change with its inherent challenges is offered to set the stage from which the leading theorists expound on their recommendations. Next, each selected change model is presented in a brief context. While each organizational change model and theory is unique in its respective approach and construct, conceptual similarities become readily apparent. The chapter concludes by identifying and summarizing the similarities within the selected models that establishes the basis for the model to be tested and applied throughout this MBA professional report.

B. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

William A. Pasmore, author of Creating Strategic Change, eloquently describes organizational change:

The unfolding interplay among all [the factors surrounding change]...makes the process of change mysterious if not miraculous, as dynamic an achievement as any mankind could hope to accomplish. The process is beautiful to behold, enchanting in its shifts between subtlety and storminess, no more predictable in its course than the cutting of a river through granite. With its origins in our spirit and our primal acquaintance with it, change in human systems remains as thrilling to experience as the wind of a thunderstorm sweeping across an open lake. Slightly apprehensive, forever expectant, we approach change in organizations with our heads and hearts fully engaged, straining toward the goal like a horse pulling a heavy carriage. We will succeed: we will make the organization better: we will arrive at the moment of fulfillment in which we can look back upon our work and rest at least momentarily, with pride (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 47).

Organizations operate in a dynamic and ever-changing environment thus necessitating a continuous effort at maintaining relevancy. While keeping an eye on the future, organizations are forced to evolve and change so as to either maintain or improve their standings within their respective environment. Change is often difficult and painful.

According to Boyett and Boyett in their book, The Guru Guide, between 50 and 70% of organizational change efforts failed during the decade between 1980 and 1990 (1998). Each organization, even those in similar fields is unique and different by way of internal structure, culture or both. As a result, there can be no “cookie cutter,” “one size fits all” approach to change management. Thus it is imperative that any organization anticipating a change effort take the necessary time to familiarize itself with the change literature so that it may make an educated and informed decision when exploring the possibilities of organizational change. According to leading theorists, while success can not be guaranteed, the potential of failure can be minimized. Accordingly, each theorist prescribes their recommended steps and strategies for successful organizational change. From these theorist’s change models, the researchers will identify and prescribe those change elements and recommend a change model that can be applied toward Defense Supply Center Richmond and other hierarchical, team-based organizations that are undergoing change.

C. KURT LEWIN, THREE-STEP MODEL

One of the earliest theorists on organizational change was Kurt Lewin. In his work, Field Theory in Social Science (1951) he introduced the “force field analysis” that explains the resistance and driving factors involved in change (Cameron, 2004). The essence of his theory was that the driving forces must overpower the resisting forces. To effect change, either the resisting forces would need to be reduced, the driving forces increased or, more preferable, a combination of the two (Cameron, 2004). Consequently, Lewin proposed a three step model. The first step is to “unfreeze” the organization’s current state. To accomplish this, Lewin advocates defining the current state to include the resisting and driving forces. Properly communicating the “gap” between the current state and desired end state is imperative. Next, the future desired end state must be envisioned. The second step is to transition the organization toward the desired end state through active involvement and participation. The third stage involves “freezing” the organization in its new desired end state. In order to freeze the organization in the new and desired end state, the organization must reward the successes, adopt the new standards and establish policy (Cameron, 2004). For DSCR and other hierarchical, team-

based entities undergoing change, driving forces need to be increased and resisting forces need to be decreased to have an effective change process. While this is a broad and generic statement, other theorists described in this literature report present more detail on how to accomplish this recommendation.

D. JOHN P. KOTTER, EIGHT STEP MODEL

John Kotter's Eight Step Model is one of the more well known and applied change models of today. In his book, Leading Change, Kotter explains,

Even if an objective observer can clearly see that costs are too high, or products are not good enough, or shifting customer requirements are not being adequately addressed, needed change can still stall because of inwardly focused cultures, paralyzing bureaucracy, parochial politics, a low level of trust, lack of teamwork, arrogant attitudes, a lack of leadership in middle management, and the general human fear of the unknown (1996, p. 20).

Kotter proposes an eight step process to transform organizations.

1. Kotter's Eight Step Model

a. Establish a Sense of Urgency

By far the biggest mistake people make when trying to change organizations is to plunge ahead without establishing a high enough sense of urgency in fellow managers and employees. This error is fatal because transformations always fail to achieve their objectives when complacency levels are high (1996, p. 4).

Therefore, Kotter suggests identifying and discussing crises, potential crises and, or major opportunities (Kotter, 1996).

b. Creating the Guiding Coalition

Kotter (1996) emphasizes building a coalition with the right membership. The coalition must be staffed with the right people that can make change happen. Specifically, he identifies four characteristics essential for effective guiding coalitions:

- Position power: Must have enough key players throughout the organization to push through the change.
- Expertise: Must have enough relevant experience to make informed and intelligent decisions.

- **Credibility:** Must have a coalition staffed by members with good reputations.
- **Leadership:** Must have sufficient and proven leaders to drive the change process

c. Developing a Vision and Strategy

A vision, as defined by Kotter, “refers to a picture of the future with some implicit or explicit commentary on why people should strive to create that future” (1996, p. 68). A vision should be helpful and motivating while acknowledging that some sacrifices might be necessary yet will result in personal satisfaction (Kotter, 1996). Moreover, a good, clear vision will help align the workforce and enable them to execute their individual roles without constant redirection from management (Kotter, 1996). Kotter (1996) identifies several characteristics of an effective vision:

- ***Imaginable:*** Conveys a picture of what the future will look like.
- ***Desirable:*** Appeals to the long-term interests of employees, customers, stockholders, and others who have a stake in the enterprise.
- ***Feasible:*** Comprises realistic, attainable goals.
- ***Focused:*** Is clear enough to provide guidance in decision making.
- ***Flexible:*** Is general enough to allow individual initiative and alternative responses in light of changing conditions.
- ***Communicable:*** Is easy to communicate; can be successfully explained within 5 minutes.

d. Communicating the Vision

Kotter explains that the power of a vision is unleashed only when the majority of the enterprise has a common understanding of its goals and direction (1996). As such, the enterprise must use every communication vehicle in its power to help communicate the vision. Kotter lists several key elements to help effectively communicate the vision (Kotter, 1996):

- ***Simplicity:*** all jargon and techno babble must be eliminated.
- ***Metaphor, analogy, and example:*** a verbal picture is worth a thousand words.
- ***Multiple forums:*** big meetings and small, memos and newspaper, formal and informal interaction—all are effective for spreading the word.

- **Repetition:** ideas sink in deeply only after they have been heard many times.
- **Leadership by example:** behavior from important people that is inconsistent with the vision overwhelms other forms of communication.
- **Explanation of seeming inconsistencies:** unaddressed inconsistencies undermine the credibility of all communication.
- **Give-and-take:** two-way communication is always more powerful than one-way communication.

e. Empower Broad-Based Action

To empower broad-based action, Kotter prescribes eliminating any obstacles. Furthermore, any systems or structures that undermine the vision must either be changed or eliminated. Finally, risk taking and non-traditional ideas, activities and actions must be encouraged (Kotter, 1996).

f. Generating Short-Term Wins

In order to generate and sustain momentum through the change process, visible improvements or “wins” are needed to engage the workforce (Kotter, 1996). In a lengthy change process, motivation may falter resulting in decreased momentum toward the desired end state. Therefore, short-term wins must be constructed to show and celebrate gradual improvement. These ceremonies must be visible so as to recognize and reward the individuals and teams that enabled the improvement (Kotter, 1996).

g. Consolidating Gains and Producing More Change

As the wins increase, thus adding to the credibility of the organizational change, these gains must be consolidated to change any remaining systems, structures and policies that do not fit the vision. Efforts need to be increased to hire, promote and continue to develop the employees who are able to implement the vision. Successful momentum can help reinvigorate the change process with additional projects (Kotter, 1996).

h. Anchoring New Approaches in the Culture

Once the desired end state is achieved, management must clearly articulate the connections between the new behaviors and the resulting organizational success. For

example, the new customer and/or productivity oriented behavior, more effective leadership and management resulting in better performance must be identified and communicated to ensure sustained success (Kotter, 1996).

2. Additional Considerations

In addition to the eight steps, Kotter (1996) also emphasizes the difference between leadership and management, the importance of training, and the need for alignment.

a. Leadership vs. Management

Kotter takes note to explain the differences between Management and Leadership as a way to identify the critical importance of leadership within the change process. According to Kotter, “Management is a set of processes that can keep a complicated system of people and technology running smoothly. The most important aspects of management include planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, controlling, and problem solving” (1996, p. 25). On the other hand, Kotter explains that leadership, “defines what the future should look like, aligns people with that vision, and inspires them to make it happen despite the obstacles” (1996, p. 25). Visions and strategies can not be formulated by those who only know plans and budgets and who think in terms of hierarchy and management (Kotter, 1996). In Kotter’s experience, large, older organizations are likely to be over managed and under led due to a lack of leadership combined with arrogance, insularity and bureaucracy (1996). This is not to say that there is no place for competent management within the change process. However, as Kotter identifies, “leading change” is the greater challenge. “Only leadership can blast through the many sources of corporate inertia. Only leadership can get change to stick by anchoring it in the very culture of an organization” (Kotter, 1996, p. 30).

b. Training

Simply providing training is not enough. Is it the right kind? Is it performed at the right time? These are questions that Kotter brings up to emphasize the importance of proper training. “People are expected to change habits built up over years or decades with only five days of education” (Kotter, 1996, p. 108). Technical skills alone are not enough. Social skills or attitudes may need to be taught for change to take

place. Additionally, follow through education is required to provide solutions to problems encountered while in the job after the initial introductory training (Kotter, 1996).

c. Alignment

Finally, Kotter mentions the importance of ensuring that all of the internal systems are aligned with the vision. A mismatch in any of the areas could lead to failure. Only with a harmony of structure, culture and vision can an organization successfully implement change (Kotter, 1996). Kotter's Eight Step Model is particularly relevant in the case of DSCR and other hierarchical, team-based entities. All eight steps are viewed by the researchers as valid change elements and will be tested for relevancy during the survey applied toward DSCR.

E. DAVID A. NADLER AND MARK B. NADLER: CYCLE OF CHANGE

David and Mark Nadler present their "Cycle of Change" which builds upon David Nadler's earlier work on the "Congruence Model." Thus, it is imperative to have a fundamental understanding of the congruence model prior to exploring the cycle of change.

1. Congruence Model

The Congruence Model presents the concept of organizational fit. The model is useful to understand and predict patterns of organizational behavior and performance (Nadler & Nadler, 1998). The congruence model as depicted in Figure 1 describes "systems" as a set of elements that receive inputs from the external environment where it undergoes some form of transformation and produces an output (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).




Figure 1. The Congruence Model (from Nadler & Nadler, 1998)

a. Inputs

The inputs come from the external environment to include all forces, conditions and players that operate outside the organization. The inputs exert some form of constraint upon the organization (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).

b. Strategy

Strategy is the set of decisions made by the organization in terms of configuring its internal resources to meet the demands, opportunities and constraints imposed by the environment (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).

c. Output

Output encompasses the pattern of activities, behavior and performance of the system and represents the ultimate purpose of the organization. (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).

d. Work

Work represents the basic and inherent tasks to be performed by the organization and is the defining activity of the organization (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).

e. People

Nadler (1998) describes four characteristics of employees that must be analyzed in order to perform diagnostics on any organization.

- What knowledge and skills do the people bring to their work?
- What are the needs and preferences of the people in the organization in terms of the benefits they expect to flow from their work?
- What are the perceptions and expectations they develop over time?
- What are the demographics?

f. The Formal Organization

Nadler describes the Formal Organization as:

Organizations of every kind have developed formal organizational arrangements; structures, systems, and processes that embody the patterns each organization develops for grouping people and the work they do and then coordinating their activity in ways designed to achieve the strategic objectives (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 35).

g. The Informal Organization

The Informal Organization consists of the arrangements and interactions that overlap the formal structures and processes. Nadler describes four aspects that encompass the informal organization (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).

- Organizational culture—the values, beliefs and behavioral norms.
- Informal rules and work practices.
- Patterns of communication and influence.
- Actual behavior of leaders, rather than their prescribed roles.

h. Organizational Fit

The most important aspect of the congruence model is not the components themselves, but an understanding of how the components fit together and affect one another. Nadler and Nadler (1998) explain that the tighter the fit, the greater the effectiveness. Only by understanding how the components of an organization fit together and affect one another can an organization hope to successfully embark on change (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).

2. Cycle of Change

Nadler and Nadler's cycle of change can be broken down into five distinct stages: 1) Recognizing the Change Imperative, 2) Developing a Shared Direction, 3) Implementing Change, 4) Consolidating Change and 5) Sustaining Change (Nadler & Nadler, 1998). Surrounding this cycle are the external forces that constantly influence and manipulate the change effort. In the center of the cycle of change is assessment and learning which depicts that the process is continuous and ongoing throughout. Figure 2 illustrates this "cycle of change."




Figure 2. The Cycle of Change (from Nadler & Nadler, 1998)

a. *Recognizing the Change Imperative*

Recognizing the Change Imperative answers the question of what is going wrong (Nadler & Nadler, 1998). Nadler recommends using the congruence model to test the organizational fit of the various elements to see what is working and what is not.

Nadler recognizes that comparisons must be made of the strategic objective with the current performance in an effort to diagnose the need for change (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).

b. Developing a Shared Direction

Once the need for change has been determined, the Leadership is faced with 1) establishing the vision and direction for change and then, 2) building a coalition to support and ensure the change effort (Nadler & Nadler, 1998). According to Nadler, “The first step involves the communication of a fundamental direction for change. Details come later, as the plan develops and adapts to changing market conditions” (1998, p. 78).

c. Implementing Change

In order to successfully implement change, Nadler and Nadler (1998) recommend the following steps:

Redefining strategy and rethinking the nature of the work required to employ that strategy (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 79).

Redesigning the organization’s formal structure, systems and processes (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 79).

Rebuilding the operating environment of the organization and creating informal arrangements that support the new strategy and work requirements (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 79).

Restaffing: making sure the right people are in the right jobs in keeping with the new strategy, structure, work and culture (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 79).

Recognizing that leadership is the most critical factor for organizational change, Nadler offers leaders to consider four basic questions (Nadler & Nadler, 1998):

What is the content of the change? What is the leadership’s vision of the new operating environment? What will support and sustain the organization’s strategic objectives? (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 213).

Where are the leverage points for creating change? Where in the organization will change offer the greatest opportunity for creating a new operating environment? (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 213).

What interventions—specific actions that interrupt the normal flow of business—offer the greatest potential for changing the culture and people’s behavior? (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 213).

Where and when should leaders introduce specific interventions? What are the tactical choices available to change leaders? (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 213).

Nadler takes note to mention the importance of communication to successfully implement change:

It’s essential for the organization to use every means at its disposal to communicate the key messages relating to culture change. All of the company’s communication processes—employee meetings, newsletters, video conferences, broadcast email and company web sites, voice mail, letters from top management mailed to employee’s homes, videotapes—the entire arsenal of corporate communication tools should be unleashed in a concerted campaign to hammer the key messages home (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 224).

Additionally, Nadler mentions the importance and criticality of education. Specifically, Nadler explains that employees require highly structured training session. If the organization is developing or changing its culture, the employees will require training to provide them the necessary skills to thrive within this new culture (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).

Feedback is yet another important area within the change implementation process. Nadler mentions:

Organizations, teams and individuals can be expected to sustain behavioral changes only if they receive constant, meaningful feedback. The organization must develop specific behavioral objectives, so that at each level in the organization people can both receive feedback on their own behavior and give worthwhile feedback to others (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 225).

Additionally, alignment is identified by Nadler as an essential part of the change process. The organization's structural change management processes like goal setting, budgeting and performance measurement must be in congruence with the organization's operational environment (Nadler & Nadler, 1998).

Finally, Nadler mentions the importance of recognition and reward. As Nadler points out, "If the new culture objectives are to be believed and accepted, then the formal and informal systems for assessing people's work and recognizing that rewarding appropriate behavior have got to be consistent with the new environment" (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 226).

d. Consolidating Change

This stage of change is a period of instability where there is a danger of losing progress and perhaps regressing due to lack of momentum. This stage begins with an assessment. All of the initiatives that have been introduced in the earlier stages must now be measured to determine the results (Nadler & Nadler, 1998). Nadler identifies three activities within the consolidation change stage. The first stage is "communication and diagnosis" (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 80). This stage requires the senior leadership to determine what is and is not working by using a variety of both formal and informal techniques to include: interviews, surveys, focus groups and formal assessments (Nadler & Nadler, 1998). The second stage is "refinement." (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 80). Refinement requires the information gathered in the first stage to be processed and then utilized to alter the change plan. The third and final stage of consolidation is to incorporate the new changes into the organizational fabric (Nadler & Nadler, 1998). This stage requires numerous techniques available to the organizational leader to support the strategy and desired operating environment. Nadler notes that this stage is especially important for the leaders to "walk the talk" and reward those who support the change and remove those who resist (1998, p. 80). Furthermore, Nadler describes that this stage now requires that managers below the senior most leadership must assume a more direct involvement within the change process. In other words, the change must dilute downward throughout the organization so that it take can take root and flourish.

e. Sustaining Change

In the final stage identified by Nadler and Nadler (1998), the top leadership must stay vigilant while the changes within the organization settle and take on an air of normalcy. Nadler and Nadler recognize that the first three stages are where the majority of management's efforts are focused. Moreover, Nadler and Nadler comment:

This final sustaining stage also continues the consolidating stage, in that management needs to constantly reassess the effectiveness of each element of the change program and stay sufficiently flexible to modify the plan when necessary. This is the time to iron out the fit—to reconnect the web of relationships among organizational components that had to be ripped apart to clear the way for radical change (Nadler & Nadler, 1998, p. 249).

It is in the sustaining stage where the changes begin to take hold. In an effort to allay management's fear of losing momentum, Nadler and Nadler again call for communication. As described earlier, Nadler and Nadler emphasize all forms of communication to be used to maintain the change momentum. Additionally, Nadler and Nadler (1998) calls for the Human Resource practices such as measurement and performance assessment, pay systems, rewards, etc... to be aligned with the organizational change. Finally, Nadler and Nadler (1998) describe that the most important and visible decisions for management involve the rewarding, promoting, hiring and firing decisions as they relate to the organizational change. Nadler and Nadler present a viable change model that is similar to Kotter's yet present its elements in a cyclical vice linear progression. Furthermore, Nadler and Nadler's cycle of change model incorporates the importance and presence of constant external influence with internal assessment. These concepts are directly applicable toward DSCR and other hierarchical, team-based entities and will be incorporated, almost in its entirety, within the researcher's hypothesized model.

F. RICHARD BECKMAN AND REUBEN T. HARRIS: ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSITIONS

Beckman and Harris (1987) use a more simplistic model that summarizes the change process in three distinct conditions: defining the future state, assessing the present state, and the transition state.

1. Defining the Future State

Beckman and Harris proclaim the importance of defining the future so it can act as a guide for the development of the change strategy (Beckman & Harris, 1987). Beckman and Harris acknowledge that the vision alone is not enough to generate the necessary energy to achieve change. Therefore, Beckman and Harris subscribe to developing a “midpoint goal” to provide a description of the organization’s desired state between the present and future state (Beckman & Harris, 1987, p. 45). This is especially important for transition within hierarchical organizations as personnel working in lower tiers of the hierarchy may not be able to envision the ultimate desired end state as it may appear surreal and unobtainable. The insertion of a midpoint goal can filter some of the end state complexities that may be involved and provide personnel with a realistic expectation of success. Following obtainment of the midpoint goal, personnel within the hierarchy will then be more confident and capable of visualizing the ultimate desired end state given the progress leading up to the midpoint goal. In this way, the journey does not seem as lengthy or insurmountable.

2. Assessing the Present

Before making specific tactical action plans, the organization must accurately assess the present state. Beckman and Harris specifically assert, “What is needed is a detailed behavioral description of the system’s organization—current and recent, formal and informal—and its relevant environmental relationships” (Beckman & Harris, 1987, p. 57).

3. Transition State

In order to transition from the present to the future state, Beckman and Harris (1987) specify that management must determine the major tasks and activities while

establishing the structures and management mechanisms to accomplish the tasks. Specifically, Beckman and Harris explain the concept of the “activity plan.” The activity plan,

specifies the critical activities and events of the transition period; when first moves will take place, when meetings will be held to clarify new roles, what info will be communicated to whom on what day, and when the new structures will start to operate (Beckman & Harris, 1987, p. 72).

The activity plan has five characteristics:

- **Relevance:** activities are clearly linked to the change goals and priorities.
- **Specificity:** activities are clearly identified rather than broadly generalized.
- **Integration:** the parts are closely connected.
- **Chronology:** there is a logical sequence of events.
- **Adaptability:** there are contingency plans for adjusting to unexpected forces.

The activity plan must specify the critical activities and events that will take place throughout the transition period. Additionally, it must detail what information must be communicated and when new structures will begin to operate.

In summary, the activity plan is to be used as the roadmap and must be realistic, effective and clear (Beckman & Harris, 1987). Beckman & Harris’s model is similar to Kurt Lewin’s model in its fairly broad presentation, yet it incorporates several of the key elements that other theorists describe in more detail. For hierarchical, team-based organizations and DSCR specifically, to successfully undergo organizational change, they will have to incorporate the three organizational conditions as described in the Beckman & Harris’ model.

G. LARRY BOSSIDY AND RAM CHARAN: EXECUTION

Larry Bossidy and Ram Charan explain in their recent book, Execution, that:

Most efforts at cultural change fail because they are not limited to improving the business’s outcomes. To change a business’s culture, you need a set of processes—social operating mechanisms—that will change the beliefs and behavior of people in ways that are directly linked to bottom-line results (Bossidy & Charan, 2002, p. 85).

Their work is not unique but adds credence to the previously described models. Bossidy and Charan (2002) explain that people's behaviors must be changed to produce results. To accomplish this, they describe how the desired results must be clearly defined, followed by an explanation of how to achieve those results. Individuals who achieve the desired results are rewarded while those that do not either have rewards revoked, are reassigned or let go (Bossidy & Charan, 2002). Furthermore, Bossidy and Charan discuss the importance of coaching, follow-through, feedback and rewards to help tie individual performance and behavior toward the desired results. Specifically, in their chapter dealing with organizational change, Bossidy and Charan (2002) discuss four primary organizational change concepts.

1. Linking Reward to Performance

The foundation of changing behavior is to link rewards to performance and make those linkages transparent. That which gets appreciated, respected and rewarded defines the organization's culture (Bossidy & Charan, 2002). Individuals, acting naturally out of self-interest, will value that which is recognized and appreciated within the organization. However, leadership must be careful not to set high standards only to watch from the sidelines. Leaders must be able to coach their employees and help them to achieve success (Bossidy & Charan, 2002).

2. The Social Software of Execution

Bossidy and Charan liken an organization to a computer in that the organization has both "software" and "hardware" (2002, p. 97). Recognizing that organizations consist of a "social system", they name the software "social software" (Bossidy & Charan, 2002, p. 97). Specifically, the social software contains the values, beliefs and norms of behavior (Bossidy & Charan, 2002). On the other hand, they describe the hardware as the organizational structure that includes: rewards, compensation, communication systems, and hierarchical distribution of power (Bossidy & Charan, 2002). As the authors explain, it is the software that brings the hardware to life (Bossidy & Charan, 2002).

Within the software aspect, Bossidy and Charan explain the concept of the "software operating mechanisms" (2002, p. 98). The software operating mechanisms are

the “formal or informal meetings, presentations, even memos or e-mail exchanges—anywhere that dialogue takes place” (Bossidy & Charan, 2002, p. 98). Furthermore, the software operating mechanisms “are where the beliefs and behaviors of the social software are practiced consistently and relentlessly and spread the leader’s beliefs, behaviors and mode of dialogue through the organization” (Bossidy & Charan, 2002, p. 98). By linking the software operating mechanisms to the measurement and reward system, the authors introduce the concept of a “social operating system” (Bossidy & Charan, 2002, p. 98). It is the social operating system that drives an organizations culture (Bossidy & Charan, 2002).

3. The Importance of Robust Dialogue

You cannot have an execution culture without robust dialogue—one that brings reality to the surface through openness, candor, and informality. Robust dialogue makes an organization effective in gathering information, understanding the information, and reshaping it to produce decisions. It fosters creativity—most innovations and inventions are incubated through robust dialogue. Ultimately, it creates more competitive advantage and shareholder value (Bossidy & Charan, 2002, p. 102).

The authors underscore the importance of candor by having the management advocate “truth over harmony” (Bossidy & Charan, 2002, p. 102).

4. Leaders Get the Behavior They Exhibit and Tolerate

Finally, Bossidy and Charan (2002) explain that if the leadership wants its employees to embrace the elements of organizational change, they must set the example. More to the point, leaders will get the behavior they exhibit and tolerate. The authors, quoting author Dick Brown, state: “You change the culture of a company by changing the behaviors of its leaders” (Bossidy & Charan, 2002, p. 105). The Bossidy and Charan organizational change model is pertinent to this study because the change elements they espouse are reaffirmed by other change theorists and considered extremely relevant by the researchers to DSCR and other hierarchical, team-based entities.

H. JOSEPH H. BOYETT AND JIMMIE T. BOYETT: THE GURU GUIDE

Joseph and Jimmie Boyett compiled the work of many well known authors regarding management thinking in their book, The Guru Guide. Of particular interest

was the chapter pertaining to the management of change. Specifically, the authors explain six reasons why organizations encounter resistance and then discuss seven ingredients necessary for successful change.

1. Resistance

According to the authors, there are six widely accepted reasons for resistance (Boyett & Boyett, 1998).

a. Perceived Negative Outcome

The individual or group that must change will be negatively affected by the change, or at least thinks they will (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 50).

b. Fear of More Work

Employees perceive that the change will result in their having more work to do and less opportunity for rewards (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 50).

c. Habits Must Be Broken

Changes require that employees alter long-standing habits (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 50).

d. Lack of Communication

The organization does not effectively communicate the what, why and how of change and does not clearly spell out expectations for future performance (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 50).

e. Failure to Align with the Organization As a Whole

The organizations structure, business systems, technology, core competencies, employee knowledge and skills, and culture (values, norms, beliefs, and assumptions) are not aligned and integrated with the change effort (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 50).

f. Employee Rebellion

Those who resist change do so because they feel it is being forced upon them (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 50).

Boyett and Boyett quote Daryl Conner, author of Managing at the Speed of Change, “we do not resist the intrusion of something new into our lives as much as we resist the resulting loss of control. In short, people don’t resist change as much as they resist being changed” (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 56).

2. The Necessary Ingredients for Successful Change

Boyett and Boyett identify seven key ingredients to ensuring change is successful.

a. Establish a Need to Change

A unique way of understanding the need for change is to review a popular change formula: $C = A \times B \times D > X$ where

C = the probability of change being successful.

A = dissatisfaction with the status quo.

B = a clear statement of the desired end state after the change.

D = concrete first steps toward the goal.

X = the cost of change.

In brief, the formula states that if you want people to change you have to (a) convince them that they need to change, (b) provide a vision of how much better their lives will be if they do change, and (c) demonstrate that you know what you are doing by generating some positive results early in the change process. Arguably the most important of these ingredients is (a), waking the organization up to the need of change (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 56).

The authors further explain that if leadership wants to get employees to change, they need not be given a choice (Boyett & Boyett, 1998). More specifically, the authors explain that all of the executive leadership, as much as 75% of the managers and a majority of the employees, must ascribe to the change to be effective (Boyett & Boyett, 1998).

b. Create a Clear, Compelling Vision That Shows People How Their Lives Will Be Better

Boyett and Boyett describe the importance of a vision by stating that “a vision is critical to directing efforts, aligning activity and inspiring people to take action” (1998, p. 59). A vision provides an understanding of where the organization wants to go (Boyett & Boyett, 1998).

c. Go for True Performance Results and Create Early Wins

The bottom line is that the end result must be about improved customer oriented performance. Therefore, “successful change programs begin with results—clear, tangible, bottom line results and the earlier they occur, the better” (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 60). Furthermore, the authors describe that in order to obtain energy, commitment and excitement during the change process, a clear connection must be made between the organizational change activities and desired results (Boyett & Boyett, 1998). In order to reach the ultimate desired end state, short-term, highly visible victories that directly relate to the change effort are necessary. Void of these short-term victories, organizations will be unable to create the necessary momentum required to reach the ultimate goal.

d. Communicate, Communicate, Communicate and Communicate Some More

The authors mention the undeniable importance of communication throughout the change process. In their studies, inadequate communication was one of the primary reasons for change failure (Boyett & Boyett, 1998).

e. Build a Strong, Committed, Guiding Coalition That Includes Top Management

For organizational change to be successful, the Boyett’s argue for a strong guiding coalition of executives, line managers, technical experts and informal leaders (Boyett & Boyett, 1998). The guiding coalition is responsible for helping the CEO articulate the vision, communicate with large numbers of people, help eliminate obstacles and generate short-term victories (Boyett & Boyett, 1998).

f. Keep It Complex Stupid

Boyett and Boyett advocate an approach that is unique from other authors studied in this literature review. Specifically, they mention that “large-scale, complex change may be easier to accomplish than small-scale, incremental change” (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 66). Essentially, “since organizations are made up of interdependent parts, it is sometimes easier to change everything vice just one part” (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 67). The authors describe 10 culture components that must be considered when implementing change. All of these components rest on the premise that old habits must be replaced and that new and desirable habits must be reinforced to replace that which reinforces the old way of conducting business (Boyett & Boyett, 1998):

- Rules and Policies
- Goals and Measurement
- Customs and Norms
- Training
- Ceremonies and events
- Management Behavior
- Rewards and Recognition
- Communications
- Physical Environment
- Organizational Structure

g. People Do Not Resist Their Own Ideas

According to the authors, this may be the most important element in achieving successful organizational change. “People who participate in deciding what and how things will change not only are more likely to support the change but also are actually changed themselves by the mere act of participation” (Boyett & Boyett, 1998, p. 69). Boyett and Boyett’s organizational change elements closely resemble those of the aforementioned change theorists cited. However, one aspect unique to the Boyetts' and vastly relevant toward DSCR is that the Boyetts' advocate the principle that large-

scale, complex change may be easier to accomplish than incremental small-scale change. DSCR is in the midst of a comparable change and may find the principles of Boyett and Boyett to be relevant.

I. TREASURY BOARD OF CANADA SECRETARIAT: CHANGING MANAGEMENT CULTURE

In 2003, the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat embarked upon a study analogous to this study. Within the study, the Secretariat analyzed numerous informational sources and theories related to organizational change. Based upon the Secretariat's analysis of relevant change theory, the Secretariat developed a unique model worthy of inclusion within the Secretariat's internal organization. In their work, the Secretariat describes three types of change models. The first is the "top-down" model (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003, p. 2). In this model, the emphasis rests on leadership. While the human factor is not ignored, the focus is on performance outcomes that drive cultural change (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003). The second model is "transformational leadership" (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003, p. 2). In this model, it is conveyed that change can not be forced down. Rather, a climate must be created and established to accommodate change (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003). The third model is the "strategic approach" (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003, p. 3). An analogous example of this model is Kotter's eight step process. This model, as described above, does not begin with a vision. Rather, it begins with an embryo dependent upon a sense of urgency for change. The cultural change is deemed unsuccessful until the people associate new behaviors that contribute to the desired end state (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003). The Secretariat developed a five stage change model that combines elements of all previously mentioned models.

1. Stage 1: Understanding

Before anything else, leaders must build an understanding of the organizations current culture by collecting information on the types of behaviors being practiced. In other words, they have to understand their own leadership style, the organization's culture, and where it is now (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003, p. 4).

2. Stage 2: Vision and Strategic Planning

This stage requires the development of a desired end state (vision) and a gap analysis between the desired end state and the present state. The development of a strategic plan is then called for based upon the gap analysis. Measurable targets focused upon early successes should be instituted within the strategic plan. Additionally, a team should be established and trained to help implement the changes (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003).

3. Stage 3: Implementing the Plan

This stage has two steps. The first step is to build a platform with leaders explaining the change and how the change will be beneficial to employees. Second, the leaders must communicate the change (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003).

4. Stage 4: Transition

At this stage, people must simultaneously “let go” of the old and embrace the new. This state is where change initiatives traditionally lose momentum. Short-term victories must be established and celebrated. Communication must be constant. The people must continuously be motivated towards the behaviors that will lead to the desired end state. Additionally, leadership must “walk the talk” and remain consistent (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003).

5. Stage 5: Follow-Up

In this stage, it is imperative to measure progress and solicit feedback while continuing to adjust and improve (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003). Not surprisingly, communication is cited again as being important to momentum sustainment. Successes and failures need to be noted and the strategy iteratively updated so that continued implementation can progressively improve (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2003).

The Secretariat’s five stage model is a result of studies involving various change models. Although this model is a combination of top-down, transformational leadership and strategic approaches, the five step model prescribed presents specific change elements relevant to DSCR and other hierarchical organizations.

J. SUMMARY

This chapter identified and briefly discussed several organizational change theorists and their respective models considered necessary to successfully implementing organizational change. Although the various authors use different approaches or ascribe to different timelines for introducing aspects of their models, common elements emerge. Therefore, it is concluded that these contiguous elements should be carefully considered by any organization undergoing change. The common elements consist of the following: a clear and well articulated vision, strong leadership, a respected and empowered guiding coalition, effective training, continuous communication, sustained urgency and momentum, progress measurement and structural and cultural alignment.

For the purpose of this study, the common elements present in the literature review will be utilized to establish a change model deemed applicable to the organizational change efforts at DSCR. These eleven change elements are: 1) Vision, 2) Goal Congruence, 3) Training, 4) Communication, 5) Sense of Urgency, 6) Incentives, 7) Cooperation and Coordination, 8) Leadership, 9) Power and Politics, 10) Measurement, and 11) Resource Allocation. These eleven elements will be integrated into a six phase change model. This “Campaign Change Model” consists of six phases: 1) Change recognition, 2) Vision/Desired End State, 3) Preparation, 4) Implementation, 5) Consolidation and 6) Sustainment. The theoretical and hypothesized change elements will be computationally analyzed utilizing data extracted from survey responses of DSCR employees to determine relevance and statistical significance. Following computational analysis, a course of action will be presented for DSCR and related hierarchical organizations experiencing top-down directed organizational change.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. CHANGE CAMPAIGN MODEL

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter details how the proposed change model was constructed. From the Literature Review in Chapter II, several common elements surfaced among the different organizational change models. Additionally, a DSCR site visit and focus group interviews with its employees revealed supplementary elements deemed necessary for inclusion within a change model. The elements extracted from the literature review, DSCR site visit, and researcher intuition is coalesced into a hypothesized change model. These synthesized change elements are then incorporated into a six phase “Change Campaign” model that can be applied to a hierarchical, team-based entity undergoing top-down directed organizational change.

1. Change Elements

Chapter II detailed several works describing organizational change. Despite the different approaches used by the various authors, several common elements became apparent:

- A clear and well articulated **vision**
- Structural and cultural **goal congruence**
- Effective **training**
- Continuous and effective **communication**
- An established and maintained **sense of urgency**
- **Incentive** utilization
- Employee **cooperation and coordination**
- Strong **leadership**
- Neutralizing negative organizational **power and politics** struggles
- Progress **measurement**
- Effective **resource allocation** plan

Additionally, the DSCR site visit and focus group interviews revealed a theme among DSCR employees that there is a perception and belief that a lack of necessary

resources is inhibiting both the employee and the organizations ability to successfully accept and implement change. While the concept of “resource allocation” was not directly spoken to in the literature review, we feel this element is significant and will be inserted into the hypothesized change model and tested for relevance with the other elements. Figure 3 depicts the eleven change elements composing the Change Campaign Model.




Figure 3. Change Campaign Model (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss, 2006)

a. Vision

It is imperative that the desired end state of the organization be clearly and effectively stated. A well articulated vision that is understandable to the employees provides the roadmap during organizational change that helps to answer the question “why”. This is fundamentally important to organizations as employees need to

understand why the status quo is no longer sufficient and why changes are necessary. Leadership and management must take the necessary time to carefully craft a vision that is clear, concise and inspirational.

b. Goal Congruence

Alignment is the element that ensures the new structure and/or cultures along with all of the elements are properly aligned with the desired end state. Vision, communication, training, tools, climate, leadership and measurement must be aligned with the organization's desired end state. All of these elements must be in synchronization with each other in order for the organization to meet success.

c. Training

As new structures and/or cultures are introduced to organizations, a robust training program must be incorporated to facilitate the change process. During organizational change, individual jobs and organizational cultures are removed from a stable state and placed into a state of flux. Departure from the status quo naturally and expectedly brings about anxiety and uncertainty. Therefore, training programs must be established that specifically address the newly defined job requirements, requisite levels of knowledge, and the organizations cultural expectations. If people are moved into a new job, they must be given the necessary training tools to meet their performance expectations. Should the organizational culture change such that individuals are now required to interact and share data and knowledge with their peers, they need to receive training on how to effectively work with others. Training must not be a mile wide and an inch deep. Follow-on training to ensure knowledge and performance expectations are being met must also take place.

d. Communication

Communication must occur both vertically and horizontally throughout the organization at all times, especially during times of change. Communication is critical. All other change elements require effective communication. Communication within an organization is often interpreted as the flow of information between leadership and employees. Though this is an accepted interpretation of communication, this simplistic interpretation understates the importance of effective networking

communication that must be present among all levels within the organization. Open lines of communication between leadership, management and among employees is paramount to successful change efforts.

e. Sense of Urgency

All levels of the organization undergoing change must be imbued with a strong sense of urgency to affect the desired change. Urgency must continually be fed by momentum toward the desired end state. Momentum must be sustained through the achievement and celebration of short-term objectives that are on the path toward the organization's desired vision.

f. Incentives

Incentives must be properly aligned with the organizational structure and culture. Organizational and personal incentives must result in behavior and performance that leads the organization toward the desired end state. Organizations must carefully consider the ramifications associated with incentives and ensure incentives are in alignment with the ultimate goal.

g. Cooperation and Coordination

Cooperation and Coordination among and between employees and management is essential to establishing a team oriented environment in which information sharing and support create a setting that is conducive for change. Additionally, effective cooperation and coordination may contribute to improved employee morale.

h. Leadership

The Leadership element consists of both the executive and change coalition leadership in the change process. The credibility of the leadership in the eyes of the organization is essential to successful change management. Are leaders "walking the talk" or just simply going through the motions? Leading by example is imperative.

i. Power and Politics

Properly evaluating actual or perceived power and political struggles within an organization will provide insight to the organization regarding expected

resistance and/or acceptance of the organizational change. As a result, leadership/management can take the necessary steps to curtail resistance and promote acceptance.

j. Measurement

Measurement is the element that allows the organization to determine where they are in the change process in relation to the desired results. Proper metrics must be established in order to measure the resulting change. Moreover, measurement facilitates leadership in making sound and informed course correction decisions during the change journey. All levels of the organization must see and understand the metrics so that they understand how their individual performance relates to the overall organizational goal.

k. Resource Allocation

Resources: Employees, Management and Leadership require the necessary resources to ensure change success. Resources can include properly placed personnel, appropriate job related tools/equipment and adequate time/training for job completion.

The aforementioned eleven change elements will be tested by performing a computational analysis of DSCR employee survey data to determine relevance and explanatory power as it relates to desired outcomes. After testing, the researchers will apply the relevant change elements to the six phase “Change Campaign” model. The researchers’ intent is to prove that these relevant change elements must be present throughout the six phases of the Change Campaign model in order for sustainable and successful organizational change to occur in hierarchical organizations.

2. Change Campaign Model

Based heavily on Nadler and Nadler’s Cycle of Change model, the Change Campaign Model was developed to identify the various phases of change an organization will undergo and to identify the key elements needed during the change process. As

shown in Figure 4, successful change is not a completely linear phenomenon, but one that permits the ability to assess and make course corrections while still maintaining an overall forward movement.




Figure 4. Change Campaign Model Phases (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss, 2006)

In contrast to Nadler's model, the researchers believe that the process of planning and preparing for change warrants a separate phase. Supported by Phase 2 of the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat change model, we believe that hierarchical organizations must successfully plan and prepare for the organizational change process. Therefore, we incorporate a Phase 3 (Planning and Preparing for Change) within our change model as it is deemed integral to ensuring the change process is successfully managed throughout hierarchical organizations.

a. Phase 1: Recognizing the Need for Change

At this initial phase, the organization realizes that change is needed to meet the new desired end state. The status quo is determined to be unacceptable. As a result, the executive leadership within a hierarchical organization determines and identifies the new desired end state. Leadership is a ubiquitous element to this phase. Leadership is entrusted to accurately assess the current organizational structure/culture and determine whether or not the organization needs to change to meet the desired end state.

If in fact change is required, leadership must then determine what the desired end state is and perform a gap analysis to decipher the necessary changes that will enable the organization to transform into the newly desired organization.

b. Phase 2: Develop the Vision

The second Change Campaign phase is to develop and announce the vision. The vision must be clear and concise. The vision must reach and be understandable to all levels of the organization. The change elements of Leadership, Vision, Cooperation and Coordination, Power and Politics, and Communication are present in this phase. Leadership is tasked with constructing and promulgating the new vision and in ensuring that the organization clearly understands the vision as employees will be reluctant to embrace a vision that is not understood. Leadership must utilize various forms of communication to disseminate the intent and content of the vision. To develop the proper communication strategy, the leadership must have a good understanding of the organization's climate.

c. Phase 3: Preparation

The Preparation phase entails all the work that must be done to move from conceptual change to actual implementation. Activities such as the identification of specific structural and cultural changes occur in this phase. All eleven change elements are relevant and used in this phase: Leadership, Vision, Measurement, Goal Congruence, Sense of Urgency, Resource Allocation, Communication, Incentives, Cooperation and Coordination, Power and Politics, and Training. As such, significant preparation, thought, and planning are required in this phase to properly prepare the organization for the upcoming change.

d. Phase 4: Implementation

The fourth phase in Campaign Change is the actual implementation of the change developed from the preparation phase. This is where the organizational structure and culture begins to take new shape as the organization moves toward its desired end state. The implementation phase is a very dynamic phase and thereby requires the utilization of all eleven change elements.

e. Phase 5: Consolidation

The Consolidation phase provides the organization an opportunity to assess the changes that have been made to ensure its direction is leading it toward the desired end state. The Consolidation phase includes the flexibility to make course corrections and adjustments should an unintended direction emerge. While all eleven change elements are once again accounted for in this phase, the elements of Goal Congruence, Measurement, Training, and Communication are at the forefront. These elements are required to assess the organization's progress and direction, but also to create sufficient energy to make the necessary modifications.

f. Phase 6: Sustainment

The final phase of the Change Campaign is that of Sustainment. In this phase, the organization has reached or is close to reaching its desired end state and begins to focus on sustaining its progress and momentum. Leadership must stay vigilant during this phase to ensure positive progress does not degenerate. Communication and Training continue to play crucial parts in addition to Measurement and Goal Congruence which are used to determine whether or not the change effort is maintaining the desired course and speed.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. INTRODUCTION

This project utilized the results of informal interviews, four focus group meetings conducted with members of the supplier-facing business unit at Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR), and reviews of academic literature, to build a theoretical organizational change model. This model intends to identify change efforts that promote employee adoption, acceptance, and application of Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Business Systems Modernization (BSM) Key Performance Indicator (KPI) initiatives at DSCR. The elements of this model were tested using a survey to determine the significance of each of the model variables as they pertain to the objective. Based on synthesized analysis of survey data and theoretical model concepts, the researchers will provide recommendations to DSCR leadership to better align proven model variables with DSCR's existing model/practices to achieve project objectives.

B. MODEL BUILDING

The emphasis of the literature review centered on organization change models and the conceptual similarities between them. The theories, ideas, and concepts gleaned from the literature review serve as the foundation for building the Change Campaign model. Information obtained through focus groups and informal interviews then helped us develop the Change Campaign model. The data obtained using these methods was analyzed by the group members and used to tailor the Change Campaign model's elements to DSCR's specific change journey.

1. Focus Groups

Four focus groups were conducted with employees of the supplier-facing business unit at DSCR during the researchers' site visit. The focus groups were organized by employee position and pay grades. Group One was composed of Acquisition Specialists. Group Two was composed of Product Specialists. Group Three was composed of Supply Planners. Group 4 was composed of Branch Heads and Assistant Branch Heads. The

employees in Groups One through Three were General Service (GS) levels ten through twelve. Group four consisted of GS thirteen and fourteens. Each focus group met for approximately 60 minutes.

Each group was asked to comment in three general areas: Please tell us about your experiences relating to the BSM transition process. What would you change about the BSM transition process? Please share with us your feelings towards the organizational realignment associated with BSM referred to as “Big Bang” within DLA. Additional questions were asked to guide the groups as necessary. The various differences between employee positions in Groups One, Two and Three and the seniority of Group Four make it possible to ask more specific questions concerning each groups BSM transition experience. Each of the groups was able to provide the researchers with multiple perspectives of the BSM transition process at DSCR.

2. Informal Interviews

A total of approximately 20 informal interviews were conducted with members of DSCR and DLA leadership teams to further educate the researchers on the challenges of the BSM implementation process. Conducted via telephone, the format of the interviews was structured consistent to that of the focus groups, i.e. participants were asked to comment, from the unique point of view of the individual’s leadership position, on the BSM implementation process. The interviews were designed to allow participants to provide general background to the researchers so that a better organizational change model was created. Pay grades of the interviewees included for military O-5, O-6, and O-7; civilians were GS-14, GS-15, and SESs. Each interview lasted approximately 60 minutes.

C. SURVEY CONSTRUCTION, ADMINISTRATION, AND MEASURES

Information obtained from the focus groups and interviews was combined with the material from the literature review to generate the survey questionnaire (Appendix A). The survey questionnaire data were analyzed to determine the significance of each element of the Change Campaign model in predicting specified desired outcomes.

1. Survey Design and Administration

After initial development, the survey questionnaire was pre-tested by a six-member group including one professor and three students, to evaluate the survey questionnaire design in terms of instruction clarity, understandability, and length. Once the pre-test changes were complete, the survey questions were forwarded to DSCR's human resources department and to DSCR's chapter of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE) for approval.

The format consisted of questions pertaining to eleven independent input variables and two dependent output variables contained in our theoretical organizational change model. The eleven input change element areas were: Vision (four questions), Goal Congruence (sixteen questions), Training (thirteen questions), Communication (seven questions), Sense of Urgency (twelve questions), Incentives (three questions), Cooperation/Coordination (three questions), Leadership (four questions), Power/Politics (three questions), Measurement (nine questions), Resource Allocation (ten questions), Open-ended General Comments (six questions), Demographics (twelve questions) and one statement of consent question. The two output change element areas were: BSM/KPIs (thirteen questions) and Organizational Climate (five questions). There were 90 questions pertaining to the input change element areas and 18 questions related to the output elements. A six point Likert scale was employed to record respondent answers. The scale was composed of the following responses: Strongly Agree, Agree, Somewhat Agree, Somewhat Disagree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. All questions were mandatory except the open ended general comments section. However, respondents were able to stop the survey at any time by clicking the "exit this survey" button on the top right hand corner displayed on every page. Lastly, demographic questions were asked in the following areas: military background, education, job title, length of time in current job, total length of DSCR service, pay grade, BSM change agent background, BSM start date, division, and age. The entire survey required approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

The supplier-facing business unit of DSCR consists of 905 employees. The survey was made available to 543 employees in the FAB (146 employees), FAD (201

employees), and FAE (196 employees) divisions of the supplier-facing business unit of DSCR. These specific divisions were selected because they represent three of the largest divisions within the supplier-facing unit of DSCR. All individuals within the FAB, FAE, and FAD divisions were invited in an e-mail message to complete an optional, anonymous, confidential web-based questionnaire on DSCR's BSM and KPI implementation process. The web link to the survey questionnaire was forwarded in the e-mail message. Upon pasting the link into a web browser, the respondent consent form appeared on the screen. Upon clicking "Yes" at the bottom of the consent form, respondents were taken to the first page of questions. Employees who clicked "No" were taken to the final "Thank You" page of the survey, where they clicked the "exit this survey" page and the survey browser closed. The questions in the survey were organized by model elements. For example, the second page of questions was listed under the title "Resource Allocation." Under this title was the statement "Please help us to understand your perception of the resources allocated to you." Each page of questions pertaining to each input and output model element was shown to the respondents in similar fashion. Under each question were the answer choices in a horizontal row. Respondents were able to select only one answer from the six choices.

The survey was conducted online using Survey Monkey, available at www.surveymonkey.com. A very user friendly system, this software enabled the researchers to track the survey results in real time in order to maintain up to the minute situational awareness of the data.

Of the 543 people contacted, 177 personnel opened the survey link, and 169 clicked "Yes" on the consent form. 150 personnel answered all of the mandatory questions. This was an 85 percent completion rate for those opening the survey and an 89 percent completion rate for those agreeing to the stipulations cited in the consent form. Speculation on the cause for less than a 100 percent completion rate would suggest that the survey questionnaire was too long; respondents tired of answering the questions and clicked the "exit this survey" button before completion. Overall, 31 percent of the 543

people contacted agreed to participate in the survey with 28 percent of the 543 people contacted completing the survey. The 150 data points gathered encompass 17 percent of DSCR's entire supplier-facing business unit (905 employees).

2. Clustering of Survey Items into Scale Scores

The survey response data were extracted from Survey Monkey software and imported to an excel file. Following validation and cleansing of the DSCR survey data set, the data were converted to a file compatible with SPSS v. 15.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software. A multivariate approach was then used to analyze survey questions simultaneously in order to cluster respondents and group questions. A principle component factor analysis was conducted with a threshold of .50. A reliability analysis was then performed on relevant factors with an established Cronbach alpha threshold of .70. Responses to questions that exceeded established factor and reliability analysis thresholds were transformed into scale scores by averaging values for individual items in each scale. This process yielded seven rather than the expected eleven predictor variables because vision loaded together with leadership as one construct. Vision and leadership will collectively be referred to as leadership from this point forward. Additionally, cooperation/coordination and power/politics loaded together with communication and will be referred to as communication from this point forward. Finally, the items intended to measure incentives did not load together and were dropped from further analysis.

3. Measures

Individual responses were categorized as nominal, ordinal or scale in accordance with the construct of each individual question. A multivariate approach was then used to analyze survey questions simultaneously in order to cluster respondents, group questions, and make model predictions with greater accuracy.

A simultaneous compound multivariate approach was used to measure factors via principal component analysis. Correlation tables, intuition and trial and error were used to notionally determine which individual questions related to specific concepts. Compound measures composed of several questions relating to critical concepts with values equal to or greater than .50 were retained for further analysis.

A reliability analysis was conducted on each factor to determine whether the set of survey questions formed a reliable scale and measured single concepts with reasonably high inter-correlations. Variables with a Cronbach's alpha measure equal to or greater than .70 were deemed reliable scales. Our Goal Congruence variable included eight items (alpha = .890), Training included 15 items (alpha = .923), Communication included nine items (alpha = .910), Sense of Urgency included ten items (alpha = .874), Resource Allocation included twelve items (alpha = .898), Leadership included four items (alpha = .812), and Measurement included three items (alpha = .781). Additionally, our dependent variables consisted of KPIs (ten items with alpha = .836) and Organizational Climate (five items with alpha = .834). Four of the hypothesized independent factors did not produce sufficient individual Cronbach alpha outputs and were loaded with other variables. Detailed results of the factor and reliability analysis are contained in Appendix D.

New individual variables were created for each of the nine remaining factors (seven independent and two dependent) of relevant clustered survey responses by creating scale scores. The individual responses for each question within each factor were averaged to create the scale score and resultant variable for each survey respondent.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

A. OBJECTIVES

The ability to identify critical variables within an organizational change model is paramount to successfully implementing change within any organization. Furthermore, hierarchical team-based public organizations attempting to implement change are often faced with the unenviable task of prioritizing and determining variables that will provide the greatest contribution to overall change efforts. Although qualitative information about organizational change contributes to our understanding of hierarchical team-based enterprise change, it is inadequate to create measurable standards and actionable guidelines for successfully implementing change within the aforementioned environments. Actual tests of specific hierarchical team-based organizations could provide the foundation for such action. These tests can be accomplished using statistical models of individual and enterprise activities that collectively create enterprise outcomes. These results can then be predictably applied to public and team-based hierarchical organizations undergoing change and can be utilized as benchmarks in the construction or adaptation of an organizational change model specific to individual activities. We used Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis to identify the researcher hypothesized elements relevant to the desired changes at DSCR.

B. REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Multiple regression analysis was utilized to determine the unique role each variable plays in predicting the outcome. It provided a measure of the total explanatory power of the model in addition to providing an estimate of whether a variable is a statistically significant predictor or not. Utilizing OLS, a control model, main effect model, and interaction effects models were analyzed.¹

¹ Various multiple regression techniques were utilized to determine the relationships between the desired outcome variables and the seven predictor variables. Specifically, a log regression, square root regression, OLS (Ordinary Least Squares) regression and squared variable regression were run. Main effects remained consistent across all modeling approaches, so the OLS method was determined to be adequate.

C. RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among variables appear in Table 1 and Table 2.

Variable	KPI	Resource Allocation	Knowledge & Training	Comm & Feedback	Leadership	Metrics & Measures	Goal Cong	Urgency & Momentum
Mean	2.9660	3.7525	3.6487	3.5438	3.0000	3.7392	3.5204	3.3965
Std. Dev.	0.7757	0.9072	0.9088	1.0324	0.8695	0.9195	0.9342	0.8527
KPI	1.0000	0.4857	0.4410	0.6528	0.3257	0.5323	0.7492	0.7853
Resource Allocation	0.4857	1.0000	0.7560	0.5998	0.3298	0.4875	0.6738	0.6036
Knowledge & Training	0.4410	0.7560	1.0000	0.5777	0.4690	0.5933	0.6122	0.5219
Comm & Feedback	0.6528	0.5998	0.5777	1.0000	0.3131	0.5467	0.7227	0.7190
Leadership	0.3257	0.3298	0.4690	0.3131	1.0000	0.2591	0.3434	0.1834
Metrics & Measurement	0.5323	0.4875	0.5933	0.5467	0.2591	1.0000	0.6641	0.5334
Goal Cong	0.7492	0.6738	0.6122	0.7227	0.3434	0.6641	1.0000	0.7745
Urgency & Momentum	0.7853	0.6036	0.5219	0.7190	0.1834	0.5334	0.7745	1.0000

Table 1. KPI outcome model means, standard deviations, and correlations (bolded text identifies variables with significant correlation to KPIs)

Variable	Org Climate	Resource Allocation	Knowledge & Training	Comm & Feedback	Leadership	Metrics & Measures	Goal Cong	Urgency & Momentum
Mean	4.2895	3.7525	3.6487	3.5438	3.0000	3.7392	3.5204	3.3965
Std. Dev.	1.0611	0.9072	0.9088	1.0324	0.8695	0.9195	0.9342	0.8527
Org Climate	1.0000	0.6286	0.4929	0.7073	0.1684	0.4140	0.7187	0.6477
Resource Allocation	0.6286	1.0000	0.7560	0.5998	0.3298	0.4875	0.6738	0.6036
Knowledge & Training	0.4929	0.7560	1.0000	0.5777	0.4690	0.5933	0.6122	0.5219
Comm & Feedback	0.7073	0.5998	0.5777	1.0000	0.3131	0.5467	0.7227	0.7190
Leadership	0.1684	0.3298	0.4690	0.3131	1.0000	0.2591	0.3434	0.1834
Metrics & Measurement	0.4140	0.4875	0.5933	0.5467	0.2591	1.0000	0.6641	0.5334
Goal Cong	0.7187	0.6738	0.6122	0.7227	0.3434	0.6641	1.0000	0.7745
Urgency & Momentum	0.6477	0.6036	0.5219	0.7190	0.1834	0.5334	0.7745	1.0000

Table 2. Organizational Climate outcome model means, standard deviations, and correlations (bolded text identifies variables with significant correlation to Organizational Climate)

A summary of regression results appear in Table 3 and Table 4. Detailed results of the regression analysis are contained in Appendix E.

Variable	B Coefficient	Significance
Resource Allocation	-0.073	0.294
Training	-0.112	0.120
Communication	0.056	0.329
Leadership	0.151**	0.003
Measurement	0.063	0.270
Goal Congruence	0.251**	0.002
Sense of Urgency	0.498***	0.000

R Square	0.700
Model Significance	0.000***

Table 3. KPI Desired Outcome Model Summary (** significant at $p < .01$ and *** significant at $p < .001$)

Variable	B Coefficient	Significance
Resource Allocation	0.276*	0.009
Training	-0.032	0.765
Communication	0.392***	0.000
Leadership	-0.157*	0.036
Measurement	-0.184*	0.034
Goal Congruence	0.502***	0.000
Sense of Urgency	0.015	0.893

R Square	0.642
Model Significance	0.000***

Table 4. Organizational Climate Desired Outcome Model Summary (* significant at $p < .05$, ** significant at $p < .01$ and *** significant at $p < .001$)

Relationships that are significant at $p < .05$ are considered to be meaningful. For the KPI desired outcome regression, predictor variables consisting of Leadership ($B = .151$, $p = .003$), Goal Congruence ($B = .251$, $p = .002$) and Sense of Urgency ($B = .498$, $p = .000$) emerged as the primary determinants. R-squared for this model was .700, indicating that 70 percent of variance in outcomes can be predicted using these variables. For the Organizational Climate desired outcome regression, predictor variables consisting of Resource Allocation ($B = .276$, $p = .009$), Communication ($B = .392$, $p = .000$), Leadership ($B = -.157$, $p = .036$), Measurement ($B = -.184$, $p = .034$), and Goal Congruence ($B = .502$, $p = .000$) emerged as the primary determinants. The two negative coefficients for Leadership and Measurement had small but significant negative effects on Organizational Climate. R-squared for this model was .642, indicating that 64 percent of variance in outcomes can be predicted using these variables. The absolute value of the unstandardized coefficients for each predictor can be utilized to determine the magnitude of influence for each variable as it relates to the desired outcomes for each model. For

example, for every 1-point increase in perceived Sense of Urgency, KPI outcomes increased on average .498. For every 1-point increase in perceived Goal Congruence, Organizational Climate outcomes increased on average .502.

Efforts were made to construct a controlled regression model in addition to a main effects model by inserting several control variables into the regression analysis to determine whether or not demographic variables (prior military service, education, job titles, time in BSM position, years worked at DSCR, pay grade and/or division) had any impact on the regression results. In running various regressions with numerous combinations of control variables, the results minimally changed and were therefore omitted from further analysis. None of the control variables were significant predictors of outcomes.

Additional efforts were made to construct an interaction model. All interaction effects up to and including the 3rd order were examined and subsequently analyzed via regression. Though some of the regression results were slightly different, they were deemed insignificant and would provide little additional value to the data analysis. As a result, an interactive model was omitted from further analysis.

D. DISCUSSION

Results of the statistical models indicate that Sense of Urgency, Goal Congruence and Leadership have greater influence on improving the adoption, acceptance, and application of KPIs within DSCR. Furthermore, Urgency and Goal Congruence stand out as the primary determinants. This is not to say that the other variables are insignificant. Rather, this only serves as a mechanism to identify the most significant organizational change elements as they relate to predicting KPI desired outcomes. These results indicate that organizations operating in a constrained resources environment, such as DSCR, should focus their efforts in these areas to achieve the most benefit. The R-squared for the KPI desired outcome model was .700. This figure strongly supports the belief that desired KPI outcomes can be predicted by using the hypothesized variables as evidenced by the 70 percent explanatory power of the model variance.

Additionally, results of the statistical models indicate that Resource Allocation, Communication, Leadership, Measurement, and Goal Congruence have significant influence on the Organizational Climate within DSCR amidst BSM implementation. Moreover, Resource Allocation, Communication, and Goal Congruence emerged as the most significant variables in predicting the Organizational Climate. Again, this is not to say that the other variables are insignificant. Rather, these results indicate that hierarchical organizations undergoing change will gain the most benefit towards improving the Organizational Climate by focusing in these areas. The R-squared for the Organizational Climate desired outcome model was .642. This figure strongly supports the belief that desired Organizational Climate outcomes can be predicted by using the hypothesized variables as evidenced by the 64 percent explanatory power of the model variance.

It came as a surprise that the hypothesized variables of Incentives, Cooperation/Coordination, Power/Politics, and Vision were deemed insignificant during the statistical analysis. However, an explanation for the absence of these items during the regression analysis can be explained by the fact that these variables were categorized into other variables. Therefore, these variables are still relevant, but did not meet the criteria for inclusion as a separate distinct variable. For example, many aspects of Vision are correlated to Leadership as leaders generally define and promulgate this message. Likewise, remaining aspects of Vision correlate to Communication as leaders must communicate this message. As a result, the hypothesized variable of Vision was partitioned into several other variables and was unable to satisfy significance thresholds independently. However, elements of Vision were able to improve the reliability and significance of other variables. Similarly, Cooperation/Coordination and Power/Politics were subject to comparable partitions during the principal component and reliability analysis. The Incentives variable did not exceed significance thresholds independently and did not correlate to any of the other variables. It is believed that the survey questions pertaining to Incentives were either poorly worded or too few in number. As a result, Incentives were removed from the model.

Another interesting discovery was that Leadership had opposite effects on KPI and Organizational Climate outcomes. The regression results indicate that a positive perception among employees regarding DSCR leadership will improve the KPI desired outcome. From an intuitive standpoint, this is not surprising as employees would be more apt to support KPI initiatives promulgated by leadership if they had more confidence, trust, and respect for the leadership implementing the initiative.

However, the effects of Leadership on Organizational Climate were surprising. The regression results indicate that a positive perception among employees regarding DSCR leadership will actually have a negative effect on Organizational Climate and vice-versa. At first glance, these results seem counter to intuition. However, upon further qualitative analysis, this relationship may be explainable. It is quite possible that a negative perception among employees regarding Leadership may actually improve an organization's climate. As mentioned in Chapter II, change within an organization may be resisted by employees for a myriad of reasons. Taking this literature a step further, the researchers believe that in conjunction with this resistance, employees may develop an "us versus them" attitude if they perceive they are being forced to change by leadership within the organization. Under these circumstances, the establishment of an "us versus them" mentality may actually cultivate a climate which is more conducive to bonding, communication, cooperation, information sharing, empathy, etc., among employees as they may have the opinion that leadership is acting counter to their best interests and that they can only count on each other to combat these negative beliefs. Therefore, the employees may establish a united front to counter the perceived negative changes being implemented by leadership. Employees may believe that they cannot count on leadership to protect their individual interests such as job security, promotion, recognition, etc., and begin to look to their fellow employees to fill this void and provide reassurance. This naturally strengthens the bonds between employees and creates a more favorable organizational climate from the employee perspective. For example, an analogous military illustration would be that of the effects a perceived "bad" Commanding Officer has on the organizational climate within the wardroom² of a US Navy ship. The

² Wardroom is a term used to describe the collective group of Officer's stationed on a Navy ship.

tendency of the ship's wardroom based on the researchers' experience is to bond and overcome the forced change or undesirable initiatives perceived to be promulgated by the Commanding Officer. The wardroom establishes a similar "us versus them" viewpoint in order to overcome the perceived negative leadership of the Commanding Officer. Based on focus groups and open-ended questionnaire responses, "Leadership" is perceived by DSCR employees to include the executive leadership of Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Headquarters. Therefore, the employees are more than likely categorizing DLA Headquarters as the "them" in their "us versus them" mind-set and not necessarily the leaders within DSCR.

The inverse of this relationship must also be explained to provide credence to the researchers' interpretation. The regression statistics indicate that a perceived positive perception on Leadership has a negative effect on Organizational Climate. The researchers have concluded that an inverse relationship between perceived Leadership and Organizational Climate can also be explained. It is conceivable that employees may cultivate a combative environment and climate when there is a perception that capable, trustworthy, and caring leaders are leading the organization. Employees that have confidence, faith, and trust in their leadership may be more inclined to expend efforts to try and capture the attention of the leadership as they believe the "trusted" leaders will properly recognize, reward, or compensate them for their individual efforts. As a result, a divided and bellicose environment ensues as many of the employees try to gain individual attention in anticipation of recognition from leadership. Though not statistically supportable, it is concluded that the aforementioned qualitative analysis explains the negative coefficient for Leadership as it relates to Organizational Climate.

Finally, an interesting relationship emerged between the effects of Measurement on Organizational Climate during the regression analysis. The regression analysis indicates that a positive understanding of Measurement (KPIs) has a negative impact on Organizational Climate and vice-versa. Similar to the Leadership regression results, this relationship is counter-intuitive. One possible explanation of this relationship is that employees may have the perception that they were not consulted and/or solicited for input regarding the implementation of the new measurement methods. Moreover, those

employees believing that they were not consulted consider the change to be mandated as opposed to communal. Furthermore, based on focus groups and open-ended questionnaire responses, employees with a relatively comprehensive understanding of the new measurement system may feel as though KPIs do not or will not accurately assess their individual performance. The employees may have gained an understanding of the new measurement via perceived “forced” instruction but are not supportive and/or content with the new measurement. As a result, those employees will tend to have a negative discernment of the initiatives being implemented by DLA leadership and subsequently spoil their opinion of the Organizational Climate. Despite a perceived compulsory understanding of the measurement, the employees are not satisfied with the climate as they may believe that the new measurement was not a collaborative effort between the employees and leadership and/or that the new measurement does not accurately assess their individual performance. Conversely, it is plausible that employees not understanding the new measurement system do not have enough comprehension of the new measures to instigate fear and uncertainty as it relates to their individual performance evaluations and associated recognition. Furthermore, it is likely that those individuals not understanding the new measurement system did not feel pressure from leadership to forcefully gain knowledge of the new measures. If they had felt the pressure of leadership, they probably would have learned the minutiae of the new measurement standard. In either event, employees not understanding the new measurement system may have a positive outlook towards the organizational climate as they may not understand the intricacies of KPIs as it relates to their individual job assignments, may not believe that they were “forced” to learn, or may believe that KPIs have had little impact on them personally or on the organizational climate as a whole. Therefore, those employees not truly understanding the new measurement system may have a more positive outlook on the organizational climate. Again, though not statistically demonstrable, it is concluded that the aforementioned qualitative analysis explains the negative coefficient for Measurement as it relates to Organizational Climate.

a. Practical Application

By testing a hypothesized organizational change model for team-based hierarchical public organizations, statistical analysis provides information, benchmarks, and guidelines for similarly constructed organizations. For example, the current results suggest that hierarchical organizations may be able to increase the adoption, acceptance and application of new metrics and/or processes among employees by ensuring the collective organization has a sense of urgency associated with the change and that the organization sustains momentum throughout the change. Though this may be more descriptive than prescriptive, further review of the statistical analysis suggests that improvements in an organization's Sense of Urgency will have the greatest impact on the desired KPI outcome. As shown in Table 3, improving Sense of Urgency will increase KPI outcomes by a factor of 3.5 as compared to improving Leadership; improving Sense of Urgency will increase KPI outcomes by a factor of 2 as compared to Goal Congruence. Utilizing this statistical methodology, organizational leaders can judiciously allocate limited resources to those areas having the greatest effect on the desired outcome.

Additionally, the current results suggest that a hierarchical organization may be able to improve the organizational climate of its employees amidst change by ensuring goal congruence exists within the organization as it relates to the organization's current practices and procedures and its desired end state. The statistical analysis suggests that the organizational climate for employees is most directly correlated with actual or perceived goal congruence within the organization. Based on this analysis, it is reasonable to conclude that employees become frustrated and disenchanted when their daily tasks are not in alignment with the organization's desired end state. Conversely, it can be concluded that employees are more satisfied and happy if actual or perceived goal congruence exists within the organization. Goal congruence takes many shapes and sizes and can include a myriad of an organizations actions or inactions. This model cannot decipher the specific elements that increase or decrease the level of goal congruence within an organization. Rather, this model will serve as a means to identify the importance of goal congruence to improving organizational climate. Organizational

leaders will then need to conduct further analysis in this area to ensure goal congruence exists from the top down within their organization.

F. REVISED CHANGE CAMPAIGN MODEL

Chapter III developed a hypothesized Change Campaign Model (Figure 3) giving equal weight and importance to each of the hypothesized elements. However, after testing the model, it was determined that the contributing elements are not equal with respect to predicting a desired outcome. Figure 5 illustrates a revised model that considers the relative importance and explanatory power of the predictor variables in determining a desired outcome that is associated with the installation of new measurement and metrics within a hierarchical organization.




Figure 5. Revised Change Campaign Model (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss, 2006)

VI. DSCR REPORT

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will discuss specific findings in the DSCR survey in light of the validated model discussed in Chapter 5 as it relates toward improving DSCR employees adoption, acceptance and application of BSM KPIs. Specific survey responses within the individual change elements indicate where DSCR Leadership and Management can focus their efforts. The validated change variables are presented in order of importance with the most important preceding the less important. At the end of each variable presentation is a brief discussion on possible recommendations to correct problematic areas.

B. DSCR CHANGE CAMPAIGN IDENTIFICATION

DSCR's last division to incorporate BSM processes was completed in August, 2006. As a result, DSCR has now completed Phase 4 (Implementation) and has entered Phase 5 (Consolidation) in the "Change Campaign" shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6. DSCR's location on the Change Campaign Model (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss, 2006)

It is within Phase 5 (Consolidation) that DSCR now must assess the changes that have occurred to ensure they are properly aligned with the desired end state. The change elements of Goal Congruence, Sense of Urgency, Measurement, Resource Allocation, Training, Communication and Leadership are essential to this phase. If the assessed

direction does not connect to the desired end state, then leadership is required to make the necessary course corrections to ensure success. It is recommended that DSCR leadership encourage sustained implementation while attending to human issues that determine the organizational climate. This phase is critical. Only through proper self assessment and necessary course corrections can DSCR enter the sixth and final phase of Sustainment and reach their desired end state.

C. CHANGE ELEMENT SURVEY RESPONSES

Each variable of the tested Change Campaign Model will be addressed in order from most to least relevant as discussed in Chapter 5. A summary graph incorporating all the survey responses under the particular change element will be presented to provide an overall measure of respondent satisfaction within that element. Individuals who answered “Agree or Strongly Agree” are shown in Green; “Somewhat Agree” are shown in Light Green; “Somewhat Disagree” are shown in light red; “Disagree, and Strongly Disagree” are shown in Red. As there was no “Neutral” response available and the chosen six point Likert scale forced respondents to make a choice, it is recognized that there may be some true “neutral” responses among the “Somewhat Agree/Disagree” giving them an inflated measure. As a result, the researchers felt it was important to visually break out the “Somewhat Agree” and “Somewhat Disagree” answers into a distinct category to better illustrate the break out of respondents on either ends of the spectrum.

1. Sense of Urgency

Figure 7 summarizes survey respondent perceptions of a Sense of Urgency within DSCR.




Figure 7. Sense of Urgency Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

Overall, urgency had 62% of respondents answering in the affirmative. The graphs presented in Figure 8 present three questions where there was significant disapproval.




Figure 8. Sense of Urgency Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

Recommendation: Respondent enthusiasm toward BSM, as well as short-term wins, appears to be areas where DSCR Leadership can focus to improve KPI adoption, acceptance and application. John Kotter's book, Leading Change, (1996) explains that to be effective, a short-term win must be visible, unambiguous and clearly related to the organizational change. Therefore, DSCR should either modify the existing program or develop a program to identify, celebrate and publicize short-term wins. Furthermore, various incentives directly related toward BSM and/or KPI proficiency should be reviewed and considered. As the workforce experiences somewhat frequent, reaffirming events, it is expected that individual motivation and enthusiasm will prevail.

2. Goal Congruence

Figure 9 summarizes survey respondent perceptions of Goal Congruence within DSCR.




Figure 9. Goal Congruence Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

The summary graph indicates that a slight majority of respondents answered positively with regards to DSCR Goal Congruence. However, the graphs in Figure 10 below display several individual questions asked in the survey that generated less than positive responses.




Figure 10. Goal Congruence Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

Nadler and Nadler, when describing the concept of fit in their congruence model, explain, “In systems the interaction of the components is more important than the components themselves” (1998, p. 37). An organization can be viewed as a complex system of interrelated parts. In order for the system as a whole to function effectively, all parts must be in synchronization. More specifically, organizations must ensure that all facets of the organization, including the new structure and culture, are properly aligned with the desired change plan.

Figure 10 above provides respondent survey results of where there is a perceived disconnect among interrelated parts. First, there is yet to be substantial buy-in from the workforce that BSM will achieve the desired results such as “reduced cost to the war-fighter”. Additionally, 50% of the respondents did not agree that the desired end state of BSM is clearly defined. Respondent belief that the KPI metrics are aligned with DSCR success as well as individual performance is lacking. Furthermore, during the focus group interviews, frustration was expressed over the belief that DLA Leadership is preaching KPIs, but continues to hold individuals accountable for legacy metrics. This lack of congruence causes frustration among employees that prevents complete embracement of the new BSM system. Additionally, the measurement of legacy metrics provides a reasonable excuse in the minds of employees to justify their resistance to adopting, accepting and applying KPIs.

Recommendations: Continuing efforts should be made to help the workforce gain a better understanding of how BSM will help DSCR achieve the desired end state. With the researchers’ implied assumption that KPIs are the correct performance measurement, all levels of DSCR must quickly embrace the new measures and retire the legacy system. Employees will continue to focus their attention and efforts on the metrics that leadership is holding them accountable to. By continuing to utilize two measurement systems, leadership is undermining their goal of KPI implementation. Though it is understood that existing KPIs do not have the ability to measure many of the legacy metrics deemed important to leadership, it is better to enforce imperfect KPIs than attempting to enforce both KPI and legacy metrics if in fact the desired outcome is a KPI environment. Whether KPIs are capable of measuring the specific data DSCR leadership is concerned with should not be the primary concern at this point in time. Rather, leadership must display their stated importance of KPIs by only measuring KPIs. Employees will then realize the importance of KPIs and begin to adopt them. With that being said, it should be anticipated that a decline in organizational performance may initially emerge as currently established KPIs may not be ideal and may not incorporate the necessary elements that determine DSCR’s success.

Furthermore, a measurement that ties individual performance into organizational performance must be constructed. This connection is critical to aligning an individual's performance with that of the desired end state of the organization. The individual employees should be a part of this process as the very nature of their involvement will gain buy-in to the newly established parameters. The establishment of an additional measurement separate from KPIs that ties employee performance to organizational performance may seem to contradict previous analysis stating that two measurement systems cannot be in place simultaneously. Therefore, this additional measurement system should be called, considered and enforced as KPI subset metrics. Simplistically speaking, this may mean that DSCR should assign new KPI naming conventions to legacy metrics even though the same measurements would be taken. It is true that employees are not naïve and will realize that leadership merely changed the names of legacy metrics and are continuing to measure the same performance outcomes. However, employees will begin to associate all metrics and measurements as KPIs. This association will foster a climate that is focused on KPIs and may eliminate some of the concerns employees have with respect to being forced to choose between legacy or KPI metrics, even if in name only. Until KPIs themselves can be refined to measure that which leadership deems important, DSCR must develop a cultural environment that only consists of KPIs. The mention of the word legacy in and of itself will continue to undermine DSCR efforts. A singular KPI naming convention will also be beneficial to new employees as they would associate any and all measurement and metrics as KPIs.

3. Leadership and Vision

Based upon the results explained in Chapter V, the separate change elements of Leadership and Vision were consolidated into one variable. Figure 11 shows the summary of survey respondent perceptions of Leadership and Figure 12 shows respondents trust of Leadership and BSM level of knowledge.




Figure 11. Leadership Summary Graph




Figure 12. Leadership and Vision Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

Overall, the elements of Leadership and Vision are positive and effective within DSCR. However, there are some concerns as identified by the survey respondents. While the question related to the trust of DSCR leadership is positive, 41 percent answered negatively. Furthermore, the BSM test question was designed to test respondent knowledge on the “vision” of BSM and how it is supposed to allow DSCR to achieve its desired end state. While the majority of respondents answered the BSM test question correctly, the amount that did not answer correctly combined with those that answered “I don’t know” should be of some concern. Additionally, as discussed in great detail within the Discussion section of Chapter V, DSCR leadership should attempt to mitigate the negative relationship between leadership and the organizational climate. Though the BSM change initiatives are already underway and unlikely to change, it may serve DSCR well to reevaluate newly instituted KPIs with the assistance and contribution of DSCR employees. Even if the KPI initiatives are here to stay, employees need to

believe that their opinions are being heard and that they are not being forced to change. The very fact that leadership would extend this gesture in terms of soliciting employee feedback may mitigate some of the “us versus them” attitudes. Additionally, open forums may assist leadership in identifying and dispelling any fallacies existing within the workforce as it relates to the implementation of KPIs. It is understood that “town hall” meetings are already taking place within DSCR. However, leadership should attempt to identify supplemental and/or alternative ways in which employees can provide their feedback. A sense of intimidation and/or fear of reprisal may exist within an all inclusive DSCR town hall meeting. One possible solution is to institute a morale and welfare committee in which selected and/or volunteer members of specific divisions, ISTs, etc., gather employee input, feedback, and concerns from their respective employees. This would potentially eliminate the tainted feedback leadership is receiving as employees would be more inclined to convey their true feelings to a fellow employee vice senior leadership. The leadership could then address the “morale and welfare committee” concerns within the town hall forum. It is critical for both DLA and DSCR leadership to institute a belief among employees that KPIs are the right thing to do and to dispel any misconceptions associated with KPIs. A major step in achieving this objective is to mitigate the negative relationship between leadership and organizational climate.

Recommendation: The negative responses on the “trust” question can possibly be explained by the respondents transferring their personal anxiety and frustration with the change process onto the leadership or those who they perceive responsible for the change. While a perception, it still warrants the attention of leadership. DSCR should continue to work on fostering and nurturing the trust between the workforce and the upper echelon management. In addition, continuing efforts should be made to ensure the workforce truly understands and appreciates how BSM will allow DSCR to achieve its vision. As depicted in Figure 12, 36% of respondents do not know the overall intention and benefit of BSM. Therefore, it is unreasonable to believe that these individuals will be capable of accepting, adapting or applying KPI metrics if they don’t understand the all important “why” question.

4. Training

Figure 13 summarizes the survey respondent perceptions of Training with regards to BSM and KPIs.




Figure 13. Training Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

Overall, the Training component of BSM and KPI reflects a slightly positive summary. In Figure 14, individual question results provide guidance on where DSCR should focus attention to battle potential perception issues relating to knowledge and training.




Figure 14. Training Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

Additionally, focus group interviews and open ended survey questions were utilized to gather employee viewpoints and feelings on how DSCR could improve BSM training. To summarize, many respondents expressed their wish for more in-depth hands on training vice the mass, point and click Power Point presentations. Furthermore, respondents expressed the need for additional follow-on training. All open ended survey responses are located in Appendix C. Leadership is highly encouraged to read through the various responses in order to gain a better understanding of the perceptions of DSCR employees.

Recommendation: DSCR should place an emphasis on ensuring BSM and KPI related training is providing the necessary knowledge and skill sets to its employees. A more robust and iterative training program focused on specific job skill sets is critical. Employees at the IST and Branch level who display a certain level of proficiency above their contemporaries should be recognized and utilized in a formalized fashion to help bring others within their IST or Branch up to speed. As these individuals are familiar with working real world BSM issues and problems in a “live” environment, they have the ability to provide meaningful training and assistance that can supplement external personnel training on theory. The ideal training solution is a combination of both external BSM theory oriented trainers and internal IST practitioner trainers. In lieu of the existing BPA composition, it is recommended that a combination of external, full-time trainers specializing in conceptual and theoretical elements of BSM be combined with the floor level recognized area experts. Although this arrangement is almost assuredly happening informally, it is recommended that this process be embraced and formally recognized. The training team members should be recognized with status and incentives that correlate with their personal qualifications and success as a trainer. Finally, some form of incentive should be established that recognizes BSM and/or KPI knowledge progression. Something as simple as a BSM qualification system that is able to track steps of progression for each individual employee, IST, etc., might inspire employees to quickly adopt, accept and apply BSM and/or KPIs.

5. Resource Allocation

Figure 15 summarizes survey respondent perceptions of DSCR resource allocation.




Figure 15. Resource Allocation Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

Overall, the element of Resource Allocation appears positive. Figure 16 below details some particular questions that yielded areas of concern.




Figure 16. Resource Allocation Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

The above three questions represented the most negative responses among the Resource Allocation questions. To affect positive change quickly, it would be of interest

to DSCR to confront these particular issues. A significant portion of the survey respondents indicated a perceived lack of available reference materials. Additionally, a significant population of the survey respondents indicated their displeasure with regard to the perceived qualification and quantity of BPA members. The BPA are of critical importance during the BSM rollout as employees are asked to adopt new job functions and transition to new information technology tools.

Recommendation: To improve the adoption, acceptance and application of BSM and KPIs, it is recommended that DSCR review the BPA concept. As recommended under Knowledge and Training, a more robust and continuous training pipeline that places more emphasis on practical application from a hands-on perspective is desired by employees and necessary to the expeditious implementation of change. Additionally, efforts should be made to improve the availability and applicability of reference materials such as handbooks, computer simulation or on-line help. Though it is understood that many of these materials are already available, it is recommended that they be reviewed, revised and/or supplemented to ensure they are providing the necessary information being requested by employees during the execution of their specific job functions.

6. Measurement

Figure 17 summarizes survey respondent perceptions of Measurement as it relates to KPIs.




Figure 17. Measurement (Metrics) Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

The overall summary indicates 49 percent of respondents understand the KPIs being used as a measurement tool. However, as discussed in Chapter V, leadership should try to identify whether or not the misunderstanding of Measurement is believed to be a result of “forced” training. If this is the case, then a perceived understanding of KPIs will actually have a negative effect on organizational climate and subsequently hurt leadership efforts in promoting employee adoption, acceptance and application of KPIs. Leadership must incorporate a climate in which employees want to understand KPIs vice being forced to understand KPIs. A perceived forced understanding will merely produce negative effects elsewhere within the organization counter to BSM initiatives. Figure 18 details specific questions that the researchers’ believe warrant attention.



Figure 18. Measurement (Metrics) Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

The four questions above constitute the majority of the negative responses depicted in Figure 17. Therefore, DSCR should focus their initial efforts as it relates to measurement in these specific areas. Furthermore, several themes emerged from the

analysis of employee open ended responses associated with KPIs. Survey respondents expressed their concern regarding the level of training, understanding and agreement among DSCR personnel/leadership pertaining to KPIs.

KPIs are an enigma to many employees including some in management. First, a significant number of respondents don't understand them. Second, a significant number of respondents do not agree that these are the correct metrics to use in order to determine DSCR mission accomplishment. Third, there is concern among respondents that their individual contribution toward DSCR goals can not be directly attributed to the KPIs. Finally, the respondents expressed a great deal of frustration in being told to use KPIs despite being held accountable for legacy metrics.

For the purpose of this project, the researchers are operating under the assumption that the KPIs are the correct metrics to measure DSCR success. Therefore, the researchers will address the first, third and fourth concerns.

Recommendation: Additional efforts must be placed in educating and training personnel to ensure that there is a clear understanding of the composition, relevance and meaning of KPIs. Employees must first understand how KPIs are conceived and, more importantly, how their individual and/or team's effort contribute to KPIs. Additionally, it may be beneficial to inform personnel on the origination of KPIs and how they came about. Though entities external to DSCR called for the implementation of KPIs, it would be helpful to inform employees about their point of origination to include rationale. Though employees may not agree with the rationale or the decision making process used to incorporate KPIs, they will at least gain a better understanding and possibly an appreciation for the intent. This subtle informative act could go a long way in gaining employee buy-in.

The inability to directly quantify individual performance in terms of KPI metrics is significantly hampering the ability of both employees and management to measure performance. The open ended question relating to desired metrics from an employee perspective revealed a theme that employees are interested in some form of customer

satisfaction measurement. Recommendations previously mentioned under the Alignment section in addition to employee desires for a customer satisfaction metric should be considered.

7. Communication

Figure 19 is a summary of survey respondent perceptions of Communication within DSCR which depicts a positive perception.




Figure 19. Communication Summary Graph (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

Figure 20 details the specific questions contributing to the majority of negative responses in Figure 19.




Figure 20. Communication Questions (from Kalp, Schemm & Strauss DSCR Questionnaire, 2006)

The three questions above represent the primary drivers contributing to the negative responses depicted in the communication element. From this, it can be concluded that there is a perception among respondents that communication within DSCR needs improvement. Efforts to improve actual or perceived communication deficiencies should focus on the following: ensuring that employees truly feel that their voice is meaningful and matters, adequately addressing personnel concerns regarding BSM, and ensuring communication efficiently and effectively flows both up and down the hierarchy. Even though the change within DLA and DSCR is a top-down directive, the success in achieving the desired outcome is dependent upon buy-in from lower levels of the hierarchy. Without a robust, open, continuous, meaningful and effective dialogue throughout the entire organization, the seeds of resistance will continue to be sowed. As John Kotter states in his book, Leading Change, “Without credible communication, and a lot of it, employees’ hearts and minds are never captured” (1996, p. 9).

Recommendation: Prior to getting employees to accept, adopt and apply KPIs, DSCR must eliminate the perception of ineffective and insincere communication. DSCR

should ensure every communication vehicle is used effectively and repetitively to drive home the intended message. Furthermore, the feedback loop from the work force must receive the proper attention. While some of the concerns of the work force might only be incorrect perceptions, they must be treated as reality and combated with the same level of intensity. This issue must be aggressively confronted. A trustworthy and effective pipeline of communication is essential to disseminating any message; especially when the content of the message itself is susceptible to resistance as is the case with KPIs.

Based on employee responses, DSCR needs to improve employee buy-in to successfully achieve organizational change aspirations. This can be accomplished by encouraging and developing a proactive and participating environment in which employees are given an opportunity to take ownership of the process. Literature states that employees must believe that they are contributing to the cause vice merely reacting to directives from above. Upon communicating and implementing employee ownership of the process, the work force will begin to actually listen to the message as compared to just hearing the message.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

A. SUMMARY

This study created an organizational change model that identified elements and principles necessary for promoting enterprise success within team-based entities in hierarchical organizations undergoing or planning to undergo change. The study formulated and tested hypothesized change model elements through applied research in the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) of the U.S. Department of Defense. By examining a hypothesized organizational change model, using regression analysis, we identified key principles and potential interventions for improving the change process at Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) as it relates to improving employee adoption, acceptance and application of Business Systems Modernization (BSM) Key Performance Indicator (KPI) initiatives. Validated change variables were incorporated into a Campaign Change model consisting of six phases.

Implementing change in any organization is extremely challenging. In particular, change within government organizations is difficult due to hierarchical management and firmly established cultures. The validated change model contained herein can be used as a specific guideline by DSCR leadership as well as a generalized model for other Department of Defense, governmental and public hierarchical organizations during the implementation of change. From this model, we were able to contribute to and substantiate existing organizational change theories.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

This research used computational analysis to support theories and methodologies necessary for implementing change within hierarchical organizations. The following topics are areas that should be considered for future research on this subject.

1. Compare Change In Hierarchical Public Organizations and Private Organizations

The change model developed in this research project used a public hierarchical organization for testing and validation. Applying and testing this model within a private

organization may expand the model's applicability and relevance. Conversely, applying and testing this model in a private organization may quash the model. The comparison between the model's application to hierarchical and private organizations may provide insight into the similarities and/or differences.

2. Analyze Hierarchical Organizations That Have Experienced Transformation Failure

This research studied a public hierarchical organization that is in the process of implementing change. Therefore, a determination regarding its success or failure cannot be ascertained at this time. An analysis of public hierarchical organizations that have completed change initiatives and failed to achieve desired outcomes may provide valuable lessons learned for organizations that have yet to implement change.

3. Analyze Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) That Do Not Have Hierarchical Command Structures

The organization examined in this research project was a government entity that utilized a hierarchical command structure. The application and testing of our proposed change model within not-for-profit NGOs with a decentralized command structure may provide insight into the similarities and differences between these two types of organizations. Though both organizations operate under a not-for-profit premise, it would be informative to identify the impact of hierarchical versus decentralized structures.

4. Evaluate the Composition and Appropriateness of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) Being Implemented within the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA)

This research project was conducted under the assumption that the KPIs being implemented at Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) and within DLA were the correct and appropriate metrics to measure the organizations performance. An analysis of established KPI metrics with the desired outcomes could determine whether or not KPIs are the correct measurement to determine the success of DSCR and DLA.

C. CONCLUSIONS

The general goal of this research project as embodied by its primary research question was to identify organizational change elements and principles necessary for

promoting enterprise success within hierarchical organizations. The specific goal of this research was to test and validate the theoretical change model and interpret its results to assist DSCR leadership in improving employee adoption, acceptance, and application of Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Business Systems Modernization (BSM) Key Performance Indicator (KPI) initiatives. By answering the specific research question, this study effectively answered the general research question. Answers to the general research question are contained in Chapter II and Chapter III and are summarized below:

- General Research Question: What organizational change elements and principles are necessary for promoting enterprise success within team-based entities in hierarchical organizations?

Based on the data collected and analyzed in this study, we propose that the following variables can be used to create a model that predicts desired outcomes within hierarchical organizations implementing change:

- Goal Congruence
- Training
- Communication (including Power/Politics and Cooperation/Coordination)
- Sense of Urgency
- Resource Allocation
- Leadership (including Vision)
- Measurement

Answers to the specific research question are contained in Chapter V and Chapter VI and are summarized below:

- How can Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR) improve employee adoption, acceptance, and application of Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Business Systems Modernization (BSM) Key Performance Indicator (KPI) initiatives?

Specific to DSCR's KPI desired outcome, predictor variables consisting of Sense of Urgency, Goal Congruence, and Leadership emerged as the primary determinants. R-squared for this model was .700, indicating that 70 percent of variance in outcomes can be predicted using these variables. Additionally, for DSCR's Organizational Climate desired outcome, predictor variables consisting of Resource Allocation, Communication,

Leadership, Measurement, and Goal Congruence emerged as the primary determinants. R-squared for this model was .642, indicating that 64 percent of variance in outcomes can be predicted using these variables.

By answering the specific research question, this study provides information and theory that should help DSCR as well as other hierarchical organizations with the challenging task of effectively implementing change. Understanding the relationship between predictor variables and desired outcomes produced by regression analysis in Table 3 and Table 4 improves the chance of effectively and efficiently implementing change.

Though the tenets of this model can be generally applied to most hierarchical organizations, it is important to understand that this model is neither all encompassing nor exclusive. Organizations should continue to review literature pertaining to organizational change and determine what theories, methodologies, concepts or models are most appropriate to its specific needs and desires. The incalculable amount of unique characteristics associated with individual organizations does not allow for the application of a single unvarying model. However, the basic elements of this model can be used as a foundation from which specific adaptations can be incorporated and applied within each individual organization.

APPENDIX A. DSCR SURVEY QUESTIONS

SurveyMonkey.com - Powerful tool for creating web surveys. Online survey software ma... Page 1 of 25

The screenshot shows the SurveyMonkey.com interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with links for Home, New Survey, My Surveys, List Management, My Account, and Help Center. The date is Tuesday, December 05, 2006. The main content area is titled 'Design Survey' and includes a dropdown menu for 'Show All Pages and Questions' with '<< Back' and 'Preview' buttons. Below this, there is a section for 'Theme' with a dropdown menu set to 'Blue Ice' and an 'Add' button. The survey title is 'DSCR BSM and KPI Implementation Questionnaire', with buttons for 'Edit Title', 'Edit Numbering', and 'Edit Logo'. A section titled '1. Participant Consent Form' is highlighted, with buttons for 'Add Page', 'Edit Page', 'Delete Page', 'Copy/Move', and 'Add Logic'. The text of the consent form is as follows:

1. Introduction. You are invited to participate in a study by three Naval Postgraduate School students of DSCR's BSM and KPI implementation process. With information gathered from you and other participants, we hope to discover insight on general principles needed to promote enterprise success within team based entities in hierarchical organizations. We ask you to read this form, and then click the "YES" button at the bottom of the page. By clicking "YES", you are indicating that you understand the information in this form and agree to be in the study.
2. Background Information. The Naval Postgraduate School Thesis Research Group, composed of LCDR Trent Kalp, LCDR Cory Schemm, and LCDR Jim Strauss, under the supervision of Professor Douglas Brook and Professor Deborah Gibbons, is conducting this study.
3. Procedures. If you agree to participate in this study, you will complete an online questionnaire regarding DSCR's BSM transformation process. It should take you approximately 30 minutes.
4. Risks and Benefits. This research involves no risks or discomforts greater than those encountered in your daily work routine. Participation in this study gives you an anonymous, confidential, outlet to voice your thoughts and concerns regarding the BSM change process. Your comments, along with those of your peers, will be consolidated into our thesis report. This report will be briefed to the Commander of DSCR and the DLA executive team. Additionally, an added benefit to you is the ability to contribute to current research in change management.
5. Compensation. No tangible reward will be given. A copy of the results will be available to you at the conclusion of this study.
6. Confidentiality. The records of this study will be kept confidential. No information will be publicly accessible which could identify you as a participant.

<http://www.surveymonkey.com/SurveySummary.asp?SID=2720971&Rnd=0.5671785>

12/5/2006

7. Voluntary Nature of the Study. If you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice.

8. Points of Contact. If you have any further questions or comments after the completion of the survey, you may contact the research supervisor, Dr. Deborah Gibbons, (831) 656-1842, degibbon@nps.edu

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Edit Logic

* 1. Statement of Consent: I have read the above information. I agree to participate in this study.

Yes

No

Add Question Add Page

2. Big Bang Edit Page Delete Page Copy/Move Add Logic

Please help us understand your feelings towards the "Big Bang" reorganization process.

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Edit Logic

* 2. Were you an employee of DSCR during the "Big Bang" reorganization process?

Yes No

Add Question Add Page

3. Big Bang Follow On Edit Page Delete Page Copy/Move Add Logic

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 3. The organizational restructuring following "Big-Bang" has evenly distributed the workload across DSCR employees.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 4. The right people were placed in the right position following "Big-Bang".

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 5. The organizational realignment following "big-bang" will better enable DSCR to support the war-fighter.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

* 6. I received training on how my job interacts with other positions within the post "Big Bang" organization.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

* 7. The training I received on my job interaction within the post "Big Bang" organization was effective.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

* 8. What was your job title prior to "Big Bang"?

4. Resource Allocation

Please help us understand your perceptions of the resources that have been allocated to you.

* 9. BSM software gives me the appropriate tools to accomplish my job.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 10. I have the reference materials necessary to accomplish my job.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 11. I have enough time in the work day to accomplish my job.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 12. BPA support is available to assist me when I have general BSM software questions.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 13. BPA support is available to assist me when I have specific job related software questions.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 14. BSM BPA support teams are adequately staffed.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 15. BSM BPA support teams have qualified people assigned to those positions.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	1	2	3	4	5
CAS	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Demand Planner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supply Planner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Product Specialist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Acquisition Specialist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*** 16. Please rate the workloads of the following jobs. (1 has the most, 5 has the least.)**

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

5. Employee Cooperation/Coordination [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please help us to understand the level of employee cooperation within DSCR.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
* 17. My co-workers are reluctant to share information with me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
* 18. I often seek help from my co-workers in the execution of my job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
* 19. I share my knowledge on BSM with my co-workers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

6. Power/Politics [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please help us understand how the recent changes have affected DSCR employees.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* **20. BSM change has increased my importance within the organization.**

Strongly Agree Agree Somewhat Agree Somewhat Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#)

* **21. Please rate the following positions in order of importance. (1 is the most important, 5 is the least)**

	1	2	3	4	5
CAS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Demand Planner	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Supply Planner	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Product Specialist	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Acquisition Specialist	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

7. Measurement/Metrics [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please help us to understand your level of comfort with the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) associated with BSM.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* **22. I was adequately trained on KPIs.**

Strongly Agree Agree Somewhat Agree Somewhat Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* **23. My co-workers understand KPIs.**

Strongly Agree Agree Somewhat Agree Somewhat Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* **24. My supervisor(s) understand KPIs.**

Strongly Agree Agree Somewhat Agree Somewhat Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

* 25. KPIs are the correct metric to measure DSCR success.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

* 26. I understand how my individual performance ties into KPIs.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

* 27. KPIs can measure individual performance.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

* 28. I understand why DLA is utilizing KPIs as a metric.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

* 29. If I have KPI related question, I would first go to:

* 30. A qualitative evaluation of my performance by my supervisor would be more effective than a quantitative (KPI) evaluation.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

8. Vision/Desired End State Edit Page Delete Page Copy/Move Add Logic

Please help us to understand your perception of why DSCR is implementing BSM.

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 31. I understand the vision of DSCR.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 32. Select the following phrase that most accurately describes the purpose of BSM.

- BSM will link the entire supply chain from customer to supplier.
- BSM has proven to be successful in the civilian sector and therefore will help the DLA.
- BSM was developed to keep DLA relevant during a time of government outsourcing.
- I do not know.

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 33. Select the following phrase that most accurately describes the purpose of BSM.

- BSM was a transformation initiative sponsored by DLA headquarters to meet DOD requirements for change.
- BSM moves DLA from a manager of supplies to a manager of supply chains.
- BSM is designed to give more work to DSCR to prevent it from being placed on the Base Realignment and Closure list.
- I do not know.

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 34. Select the following phrase that most accurately describes the purpose of BSM.

- BSM is the latest variation of DOD's Total Quality Management program.
- BSM leverages Lean Six Sigma concepts to increase DOD spare parts inventories.
- BSM allows DSCR to reduce inventory, reduce cycle times, improve customer service and operate on uniform policies, procedures, and metrics.
- I do not know.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

9. Goal Congruence [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please help us to understand how the BSM program elements and initiatives being implemented help align DSCR with their desired goal.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 35. BSM will improve material availability to the war-fighter.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 36. BSM will reduce customer wait time for the war-fighter.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 37. BSM will reduce cost to the war-fighter.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 38. BSM will improve database integrity.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 39. The desired end state of BSM is clearly defined.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic
* 40. Management is committed to the goals of BSM.			

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 41. There is agreement among DSCR employees regarding the goals of BSM.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 42. Management continues to support my efforts in learning more about BSM.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 43. Achieving the goals of BSM is a top priority to me.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 44. Management places great emphasis on achieving the KPIs associated with BSM.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 45. Management evaluates me on whether or not I am able to meet KPIs.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 46. I feel that meeting KPI goals are important to achieving the goals of

DSCR.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 47. Management uses legacy metrics to evaluate my individual performance.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 48. I use legacy metrics to evaluate my individual performance.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 49. Management uses KPIs to evaluate my individual performance.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 50. I use KPIs to evaluate my individual performance.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

10. Y variable: BSM/KPI [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please help us to understand your use of BSM and KPIs.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 51. I believe that BSM will work.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* **52. I am doing my part to ensure BSM is successful.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

* **53. BSM is here to stay.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

* **54. I am committed to making BSM work.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

* **55. Existing KPIs are here to stay.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

* **56. I have adopted KPIs as the new performance measurement.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

* **57. Achieving KPI metrics are more important than achieving legacy metrics.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 58. KPIs will soon be replaced by other metrics.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 59. Legacy metrics more accurately evaluate my performance.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 60. Legacy metrics more accurately evaluate DSCRs performance.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 61. BSM is necessary to achieving the goals of DSCR.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 62. Existing KPIs are the correct measurement to evaluate whether or not I am successfully fulfilling my job responsibilities.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

Add Question Add Page

Edit Delete Copy/Move Add Logic

* 63. KPIs directly relate to my individual job responsibilities.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

Add Question Add Page

11. Outcome Variable: Org Climate Edit Page Delete Page Copy/Move Add Logic

Please help us to understand your job satisfaction.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 64. Following BSM implementation, my job satisfaction has increased.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 65. Following BSM implementation, the job satisfaction of my co-workers has increased.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 66. The implementation of BSM has caused me to consider looking for employment elsewhere or to retire.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 67. The implementation of BSM has increased my opportunities for career advancement.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic		
* 68. DSCR management understands how the implementation of BSM affects morale.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Training [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please help us understand the training you have received.

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 69. I was adequately trained for my specific BSM job position prior to roll-out.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 70. I was adequately trained for my specific BSM job position during roll-out.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 71. I continue to be trained on my specific BSM job position following roll-out.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 72. I received training on KPIs.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 73. Those providing KPI training were knowledgeable on the subject.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 74. My supervisor received sufficient training for their specific BSM job.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*** 75. DSCR would be further along the BSM transformation process if we had better training.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

*** 76. Additional training is available for those that want to improve their individual skills within BSM.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

*** 77. BSM online help adequately answers my questions.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

*** 78. BSM Training materials adequately answers my questions.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

*** 79. My Supervisor adequately answers my BSM questions.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

*** 80. My Co-workers adequately answer my BSM questions.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 81. BSM BPA's adequately answer my BSM questions.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Communication

Please help us to understand your perception of communication within DSCR.

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 82. I trust the DSCR leadership.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 83. My supervisor is receptive to my inputs.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 84. Management keeps everyone adequately informed about why changes are occurring within DSCR.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>		
* 85. Management adequately addresses workforce concerns regarding the BSM changes taking place.					
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<input type="button" value="Edit"/>	<input type="button" value="Delete"/>	<input type="button" value="Copy/Move"/>	<input type="button" value="Add Logic"/>
-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	--

*** 86. My voice at DSCR matters.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

*** 87. Communication successfully flows both up and down the chain of command.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

*** 88. I have received meaningful feedback from DSCR leadership regarding the results of previous surveys.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

14. Sense of Urgency/Momentum

Please help us to understand the emphasis by management placed on BSM transformation.

*** 89. My supervisors are enthusiastic about implementing BSM.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

*** 90. Management frequently updates the workforce about the progress of BSM.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

*** 91. I feel enthusiastic about BSM.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic			
* 92. BSM change progress is celebrated at DSCR.						
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic			
* 93. BSM transition must happen quickly.						
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic			
* 94. My personal BSM progress is recognized by management.						
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic			
* 95. BSM is important to DSCRs mission.						
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic			
* 96. My supervisor believes that BSM is important to DSCRs mission.						
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

Edit	Delete	Copy/Move	Add Logic			
* 97. BSM change agents help the workforce understand why BSM change is important.						
Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* **98. DSCR is making good progress toward implementing BSM.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* **99. DSCR employees are making good progress understanding BSM.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* **100. I feel that BSM is unnecessary.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

15. Incentives [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please help us to understand the role of incentives at DSCR.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* **101. The current incentives positively influence my job performance.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* **102. I would pursue incentives tied to BSM proficiency.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------------	-------------------	----------	-------------------

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

103. Please rate the following incentives. (1 is most important, 5 is the least.)

	1	2	3	4	5
Money	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Promotions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Recognition	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Time Off	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mission Accomplishment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

16. Employee Comments [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please share your personal feelings and opinions on the following topics.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

104. Tell us one personal incentive you would add to improve the BSM change process.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

105. DSCR could improve the BSM training by:

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

106. In my opinion, the three most significant metrics to measure DSCRs success are:

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#)

107. In my opinion, the three most significant metrics to measure my individual job accomplishment are:

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#)

108. Please share any additional comments you have regarding BSM transformation.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#)

109. Please share any additional comments you have regarding KPIs.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

17. Military Background [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please answer the following questions pertaining to your background.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Edit Logic](#)

* 110. Do you have any prior military experience?

Yes No

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

18. Military Background Follow On [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 111. How many years of military service did you complete?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 112. What was the highest military rank you achieved?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

19. General Background [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please answer the following questions pertaining to your background.

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 113. What is the highest level of education you completed?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 114. What is your current job title?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 115. How long have you been in your current BSM position?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

* 116. How many years have you worked at DSCR?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)
* 117. What is your current pay grade?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)
* 118. Did you ever hold the position of BSM change agent?
Yes No

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)
* 119. When did your IST begin BSM rollout?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)
* 120. What division do you work in?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[Edit](#) [Delete](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)
* 121. What is your age?

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

20. THANK YOU! [Edit Page](#) [Delete Page](#) [Copy/Move](#) [Add Logic](#)

Please click "DONE" appearing on the bottom of this page.
"Thank you very much for your time."

[Add Question](#) [Add Page](#)

[<< Back](#) [Preview](#)

[SurveyMonkey is Hiring!](#) | [Privacy Statement](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Logout](#)

Copyright ©1999-2006 SurveyMonkey.com. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of SurveyMonkey.com.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX B. DSCR SURVEY ANSWERS

Results Summary Show All Pages and Questions Export... View

Filter Results

To analyze a subset of your data, you can create one or more filters.

Add Filter...

Total: 180

Visible: 180

Share Results

Your results can be shared with others, without giving access to your account.


Configure...

Status: Enabled

Reports: Summary and Detail

1. Participant Consent Form

1. Statement of Consent: I have read the above information. I agree to participate in this study.



2. Big Bang

2. Were you an employee of DSCR during the "Big Bang" reorganization process?









3. Big Bang Follow On

3. The organizational restructuring following "Big-Bang" has evenly distributed the workload across DSCR employees.









Somewhat Agree		18.6%	30
Somewhat Disagree		11.2%	18
Disagree		30.4%	49
Strongly Disagree		24.2%	39
Total Respondents			161
(skipped this question)			20

4. The right people were placed in the right position following "Big-Bang".

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		0.6%	1
Agree		9.9%	16
Somewhat Agree		24.2%	39
Somewhat Disagree		18.6%	30
Disagree		28%	45
Strongly Disagree		18.6%	30
Total Respondents			161
(skipped this question)			20

5. The organizational realignment following "big-bang" will better enable DSCR to support the war-fighter.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		1.2%	2
Agree		19.9%	32
Somewhat Agree		30.4%	49
Somewhat Disagree		14.3%	23
Disagree		23.6%	38
Strongly Disagree		10.6%	17
Total Respondents			161
(skipped this question)			20

6. I received training on how my job interacts with other positions within the post "Big Bang" organization.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		2.5%	4
Agree		27.3%	44
Somewhat Agree		37.3%	60

Somewhat Disagree		13%	21
Disagree		11.2%	18
Strongly Disagree		8.7%	14
Total Respondents			161
(skipped this question)			20

7. The training I received on my job interaction within the post "Big Bang" organization was effective.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		2.5%	4
Agree		11.8%	19
Somewhat Agree		33.5%	54
Somewhat Disagree		18.6%	30
Disagree		19.3%	31
Strongly Disagree		14.3%	23
Total Respondents			161
(skipped this question)			20


8. What was your job title prior to "Big Bang"?

		Response Percent	Response Total
Item Manager		8.7%	14
QA		26.7%	43
Buyer		28.6%	46
Supervisor		8.7%	14
Branch Deputy/Branch Head		3.7%	6
Administrative Support		8.1%	13
Division Level Management and Above		3.1%	5
<input type="button" value="View"/> Other (please specify)		12.4%	20
Total Respondents			161
(skipped this question)			20


4. Resource Allocation

9. BSM software gives me the appropriate tools to accomplish my job.


		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		1.2%	2



10. I have the reference materials necessary to accomplish my job.



11. I have enough time in the work day to accomplish my job.









12. BPA support is available to assist me when I have general BSM software questions.









Somewhat Disagree		14.2%	23
Disagree		8.6%	14
Strongly Disagree		9.9%	16
Total Respondents			162
(skipped this question)			18

13. BPA support is available to assist me when I have specific job related software questions.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		1.9%	3
Agree		25.3%	41
Somewhat Agree		40.1%	65
Somewhat Disagree		16%	26
Disagree		6.2%	10
Strongly Disagree		10.5%	17
Total Respondents			162
(skipped this question)			18

14. BSM BPA support teams are adequately staffed.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		3.1%	5
Agree		16%	26
Somewhat Agree		36.4%	59
Somewhat Disagree		19.8%	32
Disagree		14.8%	24
Strongly Disagree		9.9%	16
Total Respondents			162
(skipped this question)			18

15. BSM BPA support teams have qualified people assigned to those positions.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		1.2%	2
Agree		11.1%	18
Somewhat Agree		42%	68
Somewhat Disagree		21.6%	35
Disagree		12.3%	20

Strongly Disagree		11.7%	19
		Total Respondents	162
		(skipped this question)	18

16. Please rate the workloads of the following jobs. (1 has the most, 5 has the least.)

	1	2	3	4	5	Response Average
CAS	7% (11)	17% (27)	21% (34)	22% (36)	33% (53)	3.58
Demand Planner	7% (11)	9% (15)	14% (22)	35% (55)	35% (55)	3.81
Supply Planner	15% (24)	31% (50)	32% (51)	14% (23)	7% (11)	2.67
Product Specialist	18% (29)	19% (31)	30% (48)	19% (31)	13% (20)	2.89
Acquisiton Specialist	53% (85)	22% (36)	4% (6)	9% (14)	12% (19)	2.04
				Total Respondents		162
				(skipped this question)		18

5. Employee Cooperation/Coordination

17. My co-workers are reluctant to share information with me.


	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	2.5%	4
Agree	1.9%	3
Somewhat Agree	10%	16
Somewhat Disagree	11.9%	19
Disagree	43.1%	69
Strongly Disagree	30.6%	49
Total Respondents		160
(skipped this question)		20

18. I often seek help from my co-workers in the execution of my job.

	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	27.5%	44
Agree	37.5%	60
Somewhat Agree	21.9%	35
Somewhat Disagree	7.5%	12
Disagree	5%	8
Strongly Disagree	0.6%	1


Total Respondents 160
(skipped this question) 20

19. I share my knowledge on BSM with my co-workers.



6. Power/Politics

20. BSM change has increased my importance within the organization.




21. Please rate the following positions in order of importance. (1 is the most important, 5 is the least)

	1	2	3	4	5	Response Average
CAS	10% (16)	12% (19)	19% (30)	17% (27)	42% (68)	3.70
Demand Planner	10% (16)	10% (16)	12% (20)	39% (62)	29% (46)	3.66
Supply Planner	11% (18)	33% (53)	34% (54)	18% (28)	4% (7)	2.71
Product Specialist	14% (22)	29% (46)	24% (39)	19% (30)	14% (23)	2.91
Acquisition Specialist	55% (88)	16% (26)	11% (17)	8% (13)	10% (16)	2.02
Total Respondents						160


(skipped this question) 20

7. Measurement/Metrics


22. I was adequately trained on KPIs.



23. My co-workers understand KPIs.




24. My supervisor(s) understand KPIs.




(skipped this question) 21


25. KPIs are the correct metric to measure DSCR success.




26. I understand how my individual performance ties into KPIs.




27. KPIs can measure individual performance.




28. I understand why DLA is utilizing KPIs as a metric.



29. If I have KPI related question, I would first go to:



30. A qualitative evaluation of my performance by my supervisor would be more effective than a quantitative (KPI) evaluation.



8. Vision/Desired End State

31. I understand the vision of DSCR.

	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	12.1%	19
Agree	52.9%	83
Somewhat Agree	24.2%	38
Somewhat Disagree	2.5%	4
Disagree	4.5%	7
Strongly Disagree	3.8%	6
Total Respondents		157
(skipped this question)		23


32. Select the following phrase that most accurately describes the purpose of BSM.

	Response Percent	Response Total
BSM will link the entire supply chain from customer to supplier.	76.4%	120
BSM has proven to be successful in the civilian sector and therefore will help the DLA.	4.5%	7
BSM was developed to keep DLA relevant during a time of government outsourcing.	3.2%	5
I do not know.	15.9%	25
Total Respondents		157
(skipped this question)		23

33. Select the following phrase that most accurately describes the purpose of BSM.


	Response Percent	Response Total
BSM was a transformation initiative sponsored by DLA headquarters to meet DOD requirements for change.	44.6%	70
BSM moves DLA from a manager of supplies to a manager of supply chains.	42.7%	67
BSM is designed to give more work to DSCR to prevent it from being placed on the Base Realignment and Closure list.	0.6%	1
I do not know.	12.1%	19
Total Respondents		157
(skipped this question)		23

34. Select the following phrase that most accurately describes the purpose of BSM.




9. Goal Congruence


35. BSM will improve material availability to the war-fighter.




36. BSM will reduce customer wait time for the war-fighter.




37. BSM will reduce cost to the war-fighter.



38. BSM will improve database integrity.




39. The desired end state of BSM is clearly defined.




40. Management is committed to the goals of BSM.


Response Response



41. There is agreement among DSCR employees regarding the goals of BSM.




42. Management continues to support my efforts in learning more about BSM.




43. Achieving the goals of BSM is a top priority to me.






44. Management places great emphasis on achieving the KPIs associated with BSM.



45. Management evaluates me on whether or not I am able to meet KPIs.



46. I feel that meeting KPI goals are important to achieving the goals of DSCR.



Somewhat Disagree		16%	25
Disagree		8.3%	13
Strongly Disagree		4.5%	7
Total Respondents		156	
(skipped this question)			24

47. Management uses legacy metrics to evaluate my individual performance.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		3.2%	5
Agree		14.7%	23
Somewhat Agree		31.4%	49
Somewhat Disagree		25.6%	40
Disagree		20.5%	32
Strongly Disagree		4.5%	7
Total Respondents		156	
(skipped this question)			24

48. I use legacy metrics to evaluate my individual performance.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		1.3%	2
Agree		15.4%	24
Somewhat Agree		30.8%	48
Somewhat Disagree		19.2%	30
Disagree		28.2%	44
Strongly Disagree		5.1%	8
Total Respondents		156	
(skipped this question)			24

49. Management uses KPIs to evaluate my individual performance.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		0.6%	1
Agree		21.2%	33
Somewhat Agree		41%	64
Somewhat Disagree		23.7%	37
Disagree		10.9%	17


Strongly Disagree █

2.6% 4

Total Respondents 156


(skipped this question) 24

50. I use KPIs to evaluate my individual performance.



10. Y variable: BSM/KPI

51. I believe that BSM will work.



52. I am doing my part to ensure BSM is successful.



Strongly Disagree	0.7%	1
Total Respondents		153
(skipped this question)		27

53. BSM is here to stay.

	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	26.1%	40
Agree	37.3%	57
Somewhat Agree	21.6%	33
Somewhat Disagree	7.2%	11
Disagree	2.6%	4
Strongly Disagree	5.2%	8
Total Respondents		153
(skipped this question)		27

54. I am committed to making BSM work.


	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	17%	26
Agree	54.2%	83
Somewhat Agree	24.2%	37
Somewhat Disagree	2%	3
Disagree	2%	3
Strongly Disagree	0.7%	1
Total Respondents		153
(skipped this question)		27

55. Existing KPIs are here to stay.


	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	1.3%	2
Agree	24.2%	37
Somewhat Agree	43.8%	67
Somewhat Disagree	21.6%	33
Disagree	5.9%	9
Strongly Disagree	3.3%	5
Total Respondents		153

(skipped this question) 27


56. I have adopted KPIs as the new performance measurement.




57. Achieving KPI metrics are more important than achieving legacy metrics.




58. KPIs will soon be replaced by other metrics.




59. Legacy metrics more accurately evaluate my performance.




60. Legacy metrics more accurately evaluate DSCRs performance.




61. BSM is necessary to achieving the goals of DSCR.



62. Existing KPIs are the correct measurement to evaluate whether or not I am successfully fulfilling my job responsibilities.




63. KPIs directly relate to my individual job responsibilities.




11. Outcome Variable: Org Climate


64. Following BSM implementation, my job satisfaction has increased.




65. Following BSM implementation, the job satisfaction of my co-workers has increased.



66. The implementation of BSM has caused me to consider looking for employment elsewhere or to retire.



67. The implementation of BSM has increased my opportunities for career advancement.




68. DSCR management understands how the implementation of BSM affects morale.

Response	Response Percent	Response Total
----------	------------------	----------------




12. Training

69. I was adequately trained for my specific BSM job position prior to roll-out.




70. I was adequately trained for my specific BSM job position during roll-out.




71. I continue to be trained on my specific BSM job position following roll-out.


Response Percent **Response Total**



72. I received training on KPIs.



73. Those providing KPI training were knowledgeable on the subject.




74. My supervisor received sufficient training for their specific BSM job.









Somewhat Agree		34.4%	52
Somewhat Disagree		24.5%	37
Disagree		15.9%	24
Strongly Disagree		11.3%	17
Total Respondents			151
(skipped this question)			29

75. DSCR would be further along the BSM transformation process if we had better training.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		27.2%	41
Agree		26.5%	40
Somewhat Agree		28.5%	43
Somewhat Disagree		13.9%	21
Disagree		1.3%	2
Strongly Disagree		2.6%	4
Total Respondents			151
(skipped this question)			29

76. Additional training is available for those that want to improve their individual skills within BSM.







		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		2%	3
Agree		14.6%	22
Somewhat Agree		42.4%	64
Somewhat Disagree		17.9%	27
Disagree		15.2%	23
Strongly Disagree		7.9%	12
Total Respondents			151
(skipped this question)			29

77. BSM online help adequately answers my questions.







		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		0.7%	1
Agree		6%	9
Somewhat Agree		33.1%	50
Somewhat Disagree		25.2%	38

Disagree		19.9%	30
Strongly Disagree		15.2%	23
Total Respondents		151	
(skipped this question)			29

78. BSM Training materials adequately answers my questions.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		0.7%	1
Agree		5.3%	8
Somewhat Agree		33.8%	51
Somewhat Disagree		23.8%	36
Disagree		17.9%	27
Strongly Disagree		18.5%	28
Total Respondents		151	
(skipped this question)			29

79. My Supervisor adequately answers my BSM questions.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		2%	3
Agree		15.9%	24
Somewhat Agree		43.7%	66
Somewhat Disagree		16.6%	25
Disagree		11.9%	18
Strongly Disagree		9.9%	15
Total Respondents		151	
(skipped this question)			29

80. My Co-workers adequately answer my BSM questions.

		Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree		2.6%	4
Agree		27.8%	42
Somewhat Agree		48.3%	73
Somewhat Disagree		15.2%	23
Disagree		3.3%	5

Strongly Disagree	2.6%	4
Total Respondents	151	
(skipped this question)		29

81. BSM BPA's adequately answer my BSM questions.

	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	2%	3
Agree	13.2%	20
Somewhat Agree	37.1%	56
Somewhat Disagree	23.2%	35
Disagree	12.6%	19
Strongly Disagree	11.9%	18
Total Respondents	151	
(skipped this question)		29

13. Communication

82. I trust the DSCR leadership.

	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	2.7%	4
Agree	26%	39
Somewhat Agree	33.3%	50
Somewhat Disagree	12.7%	19
Disagree	12%	18
Strongly Disagree	13.3%	20
Total Respondents	150	
(skipped this question)		30

83. My supervisor is receptive to my inputs.

	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	8.7%	13
Agree	50%	75
Somewhat Agree	28%	42
Somewhat Disagree	5.3%	8
Disagree	4%	6

Strongly Disagree	4%	6
Total Respondents		150
(skipped this question)		30

84. Management keeps everyone adequately informed about why changes are occurring within DSCR.

	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	2.7%	4
Agree	23.3%	35
Somewhat Agree	28.7%	43
Somewhat Disagree	19.3%	29
Disagree	13.3%	20
Strongly Disagree	12.7%	19
Total Respondents		150
(skipped this question)		30

85. Management adequately addresses workforce concerns regarding the BSM changes taking place.


	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	2.7%	4
Agree	14.7%	22
Somewhat Agree	30%	45
Somewhat Disagree	24.7%	37
Disagree	12%	18
Strongly Disagree	16%	24
Total Respondents		150
(skipped this question)		30

86. My voice at DSCR matters.


	Response Percent	Response Total
Strongly Agree	1.3%	2
Agree	14.7%	22
Somewhat Agree	27.3%	41
Somewhat Disagree	17.3%	26
Disagree	20%	30
Strongly Disagree	19.3%	29

Total Respondents 150
(skipped this question) 30

87. Communication successfully flows both up and down the chain of command.




88. I have received meaningful feedback from DSCR leadership regarding the results of previous surveys.




14. Sense of Urgency/Momentum

89. My supervisors are enthusiastic about implementing BSM.




Total Respondents 150
(skipped this question) 30


90. Management frequently updates the workforce about the progress of BSM.




91. I feel enthusiastic about BSM.




92. BSM change progress is celebrated at DSCR.




93. BSM transition must happen quickly.




94. My personal BSM progress is recognized by management.




95. BSM is important to DSCRs mission.




96. My supervisor believes that BSM is important to DSCRs mission.



97. BSM change agents help the workforce understand why BSM change is important.




98. DSCR is making good progress toward implementing BSM.




99. DSCR employees are making good progress understanding BSM.






100. I feel that BSM is unnecessary.








15. Incentives

101. The current incentives positively influence my job performance.



102. I would pursue incentives tied to BSM proficiency.



Agree		26.7%	40
Somewhat Agree		38.7%	58
Somewhat Disagree		16.7%	25
Disagree		6%	9
Strongly Disagree		6%	9
Total Respondents			150
(skipped this question)			30

103. Please rate the following incentives. (1 is most important, 5 is the least.)

	1	2	3	4	5	Response Average
Money	27% (40)	27% (41)	19% (28)	15% (23)	12% (18)	2.59
Promotions	19% (29)	35% (53)	21% (32)	16% (24)	8% (12)	2.58
Recognition	6% (9)	19% (29)	25% (37)	27% (41)	23% (34)	3.41
Time Off	9% (13)	10% (15)	20% (30)	33% (50)	28% (42)	3.62
Mission Accomplishment	39% (59)	8% (12)	15% (23)	8% (12)	29% (44)	2.80
Total Respondents						150
(skipped this question)						30

16. Employee Comments

104. Tell us one personal incentive you would add to improve the BSM change process.

[View](#) **Total Respondents** **80**
(skipped this question) 100

105. DSCR could improve the BSM training by:

[View](#) **Total Respondents** **98**
(skipped this question) 82

106. In my opinion, the three most significant metrics to measure DSCRs success are:

[View](#) **Total Respondents** **84**
(skipped this question) 96

107. In my opinion, the three most significant metrics to measure my individual job accomplishment are:

[View](#) **Total Respondents** **80**
(skipped this question) 100

108. Please share any additional comments you have regarding BSM transformation.



View **Total Respondents** **80**
 (skipped this question) 100

109. Please share any additional comments you have regarding KPIs.

View **Total Respondents** **58**
 (skipped this question) 122








17. Military Background

110. Do you have any prior military experience?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Yes 	46.8%	72
No 	53.2%	82
Total Respondents		154
(skipped this question)		26

18. Military Background Follow On

111. How many years of military service did you complete?

	Response Percent	Response Total
0 to 4 years 	12.5%	9
5 to 10 years 	12.5%	9
11 to 15 years 	11.1%	8
16 to 20 years 	19.4%	14
21-25 years 	34.7%	25
26 to 30 years 	8.3%	6
30 plus years 	1.4%	1
Total Respondents		72
(skipped this question)		108

112. What was the highest military rank you achieved?

	Response Percent	Response Total
E-1 to E-3 	1.4%	1

E-4 to E-6		41.7%	30
E-7 to E-9		48.6%	35
O1 to O3		0%	0
O4 to O6		8.3%	6
O7 to O10		0%	0
Total Respondents			72
(skipped this question)			108

19. General Background

113. What is the highest level of education you completed?

		Response Percent	Response Total
Some high school (1 to 3 years)		0%	0
High school graduate (4 years)		6%	9
Some college (1 to 3 years)		26.7%	40
Associates degree		12%	18
Bachelors degree		37.3%	56
Masters degree		18%	27
Doctorates degree		0%	0
Total Respondents			150
(skipped this question)			30

114. What is your current job title?

		Response Percent	Response Total
CAS		0%	0
Supply Planner		11.3%	17
Demand Planner		0%	0
Acquisition Specialist		37.3%	56
Product Specialist		23.3%	35
IST Supervisor		7.3%	11
Branch Deputy/Branch Head		4%	6
Administrative Support		3.3%	5
Division Level Management and Above		3.3%	5
<input type="button" value="View"/> Other (please specify)		10%	15
Total Respondents			150

(skipped this question) 30

115. How long have you been in your current BSM position?



(skipped this question) 30

116. How many years have you worked at DSCR?



(skipped this question) 30

117. What is your current pay grade?



O5	0.7%	1
O6	0.7%	1
Flag	0%	0
Total Respondents		150
(skipped this question)		30

118. Did you ever hold the position of BSM change agent?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Yes	6.7%	10
No	93.3%	140
Total Respondents		150
(skipped this question)		30





119. When did your IST begin BSM rollout?

	Response Percent	Response Total
February 2005	3.3%	5
May 2005	18%	27
August 2005	41.3%	62
May 2006	12%	18
July 2006	18.7%	28
August 2006	2.7%	4
View Other (please specify)	4%	6
Total Respondents		150
(skipped this question)		30

120. What division do you work in?

	Response Percent	Response Total
FAB	21.3%	32
FAD	50%	75
FAE	26.7%	40
View Other (please specify)	2%	3
Total Respondents		150
(skipped this question)		30

121. What is your age?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Under 30 	8.7%	13
31 - 49 	46.7%	70
50 - 62 	40.7%	61
62 and over 	4%	6
Total Respondents		150
(skipped this question)		30

[SurveyMonkey is Hiring!](#) | [Privacy Statement](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Logout](#)

Copyright ©1999-2006 SurveyMonkey.com. All Rights Reserved.
 No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of SurveyMonkey.com.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX C. OPEN-ENDED SURVEY RESPONSES (ANSWERS APPEAR EXACTLY AS ENTERED INTO QUESTIONNAIRE)

Tell us one personal incentive you would add to improve the BSM change process:

1. The entire BSM conversion was treated like a circus complete with trinkets and clowns; the clowns were the least effective employees (in Legacy) being promoted into BSM positions with Zero regard for their previous performance. The Training was broad-based versus task-specific; fifty percent of my co-workers have very little knowledge of the intricacies of BSM. This results in fumbling and searching for information instead of completing tasks. The system would be wonderful for a smaller business or perhaps even a larger business if that business did not have to be concerned with Critical Safety Issues, FAR, DFAR or the fact that our decisions affect human lives and the security of our country. The personal incentive I would have tried to achieve would have been to at the very least use the language of a LOGISTICIAN in lieu of a Wall Street Wonder Boy. It was comparable to teaching a young child English and then asking questions in French; even if you know the answer, the language barrier prevents a proper response. The three major systems in BSM (SAP, MANU and DPACS) each use different words for the same term (example, Material Number, Item Number and NIIN in the respective systems). The stories that came out of the area where BSM was being developed would shock even the longest-tenured Government employee. Examples: days and days of nothing to do; asking for solutions from people who were **BAFFLED BY THE LEGACY SYSTEM!** And the selection of Arthur Anderson/Accenture (under investigation and, ultimately, charge with Business Practice Violations) should have been an early indication of impending problems. They replaced the systems which had served excellently, SAMMS and the Technical systems and couldn't develop an improved version of the **ONLY** system which desperately needed replacing, DPACS!
2. Better monthly motivators not just yearly pay increases and awards
3. Live Telephone BPA help desk.
4. group 'celebrations' for successful meeting of goals/mission
5. Time off awards for proficiency levels.
6. All of the steps you need to do to complete a job is I believe un-necessary. It slow down your progress.
7. I think that it was more productive in the Legacy systems to measure and give credit for work actually performed in the system. There is a significant amount of manual effort required to make even the simplest 'automated' function happen in some instances. The acquisition specialist is not given credit for these manually forced

awards even though substantial effort is required to process them. We need a better way to capture and recognize these efforts as they occur. Allowing the specialist to count these towards their award goal would help.

8. Time off awards for exceeding monthly goals
9. I can only speak fro Technical. We are being overwhelmed with E-Mail type directions. This is being received from a vast amout of folks. Some tweaking the directions, some not. Tech need one POC to receive directions from. There should be one Specific Web site where the E-Mail directions are stored for refferal.
10. I would not implement a change until ALL the program errors were corrected and worked correctly. I would not make changes to programs that take us back 10 years of progress, just for the sake of change. As an example, PDREP was a great working program, self contained and would process work fast. We changed to SAP and now tripled the workload, and went back to hand written reports that we did ten years ago. Why change a system that works very well across ALL services to one that only one (DLA) can use.
11. gold stars
12. QAS 1910 need to be upgraded to GS-12 positions, because of their job requirements and workload. BSM change processes have increased our workload and responsibility to an unmanageable level. If this job does not get any better I will look for employment else were.
13. Meaningful OJT training
14. TO GO LIVE ONLY WHEN THE SYSTEM IS WORKING OPPOSE TO CONSTANT BAND-AID/WORK AROUNDS
15. More promotion opportunities for Supply Planners
16. Everything should be consistant.
17. The incentive of communication from high levels leadership that things will get better as far as predictability of the BSM System as far as planning mechanisms and PR generation.
18. I would add more Quality Step Increases for employees that go above and beyond during duties and for special circumstances that takes the employee's attention away from their daily duties (ie. urgent/highly visible orders, helping with others workloads, or acting in supervision roles).

19. Remove/revamp it... It is too difficult and cumbersome. We get updates to better use it or a different way to use it EVERY DAY!!! Too many changes to keep up with.
20. After the successful completion of the Roll-Out of all assigned NSN into BSM from Legacy for the Branch reward the team as a whole.
21. Make the systems faster/change the time on how often you have to enter your Pin Number. When we sign on in the morning we shouldnot have sign on again/unless we left our stations.
22. Until they are able to make BSM more user friendly, there will continue to be negative feedback. BSM did not improve the work process.
23. Please take the time to have a Process Improvement Team be the Trailblazers for new process implementations.
24. NONE. The question should have been ask prior to spending \$1B+ on this train wreck.
25. I think some recognition for performance, as well as some reprimand for those that are casuing more work for others is required. I need to know that someone knows I am doing everything possible to get my work pushed through, and I need management to be responsive when I tell them of a bottle-neck I come across and take the steps to correct the problem.
26. Honest and frequent communication between management and the employees regarding what is working and what is not working.
27. Bonuses for doing performing above and beyond.
28. THE WORKLOAD SHOULD BE DIVIDED EQUALLY. YOU SHOULD NOT BE OVERWHELMED WHEN YOU FIRST START.
29. I want a system that will allow the time to perform my job and increase my performance. Not the current system, processes and workarounds used to have BSM talk to another system. Processes used in my job take longer to process than previous systems used. I want a user customizable interface to show the data required to do my job, not a mirage of drill down screens to go through every time to find key information. THE PRODUCT DOES NOT ADEQUALITY REFLECT A USER'S INPUT. IF THERE WAS INPUT FROM A USER GROUP THEY DO NOT KNOW HOW TO MEET THE KPI'S OR WHAT IT TAKES TO PREFORM OUR FUNCTION. I AM DISAPPOINTED WITH THE PRODUCT.

30. It's hard for me to say. I do agree we needed an updated system, but SAP is a poor system. It slows us down instead of speeding things up. We're held to impossible metrics.
31. My supervisor recognizing that I have made a contribution and understanding the sacrifice incurred to do so. Especially with more and more task being given. Just let me know that you understand the implication and impact of every task that filters down from above.
32. Buyers receiving credit for manually processing purchase requests in BSM (workflows).
33. Keeping the workforce informed with the latest changes/revisions within BSM.
34. non bias recognition
35. Since supervision and management does not know what I do, how I do it, or how much I do....I can't imagine an incentive that would be meaningful. What would be important is to see a professional audit of my desk and performance as compared to others in business.
36. More recognition when milestones are met.
37. Joint recognition for QA/FA on reduction of backorders
38. Management being honest about the accuracy of BSM metrics.
39. Improve SAP screen.
40. gifts
41. MAKE IT USER FIENDLY, GET RID OF GERMANY TERMNOLOGLY AND USE STAND WINDOW INTERFACES.
42. When addressing a team concept the idea of giving just one person on a team recognition in the form of an a award is insulting. While that one person on that team may have done a some outstanding work it is hard to believe that 'only one' person performed when you look at the progress of the 'whole team', unless that person awarded all the prs, added all the nsn's to the corporate, performed all the technical evaluation and processed all the buys. To look at it this way you would see how this would be impossible. To come up with the same old lines of not enough money from one source and another source says there is award money only adds to the low morale and frustration and takes away the incentive of going above and beyond. It makes for a 'just enough' attitude which does not add to progression but ends up in regression or a stand still.

43. Assign more work to Clerks and Procurement Assistants (eg. Workflows, Unassigned Prs, Loading OAs)in order to allow the Buyer to be able to accomplish their goals.
44. I would like to see less clicking and having to go to so many screens to find things.
45. Explaining KPI's better to employees and let management realize that the concept is a good one, but that these metrics are always changing and a not the sole measuring tool for employee performance.
46. I would just like to understand and learn BSM. This is priority. I just thank God that I am contributing to the services.
47. information on how the system actions impact the other parts of the system from demand planning to post award.
48. A better traing program and to have other systems working within BSM fully tested before cutting off the current working system for a month and then turning on the new system that does not work.
49. Recognition for 'assists.' That is, for helping others learn the system. From a procurement perspective, it is still 'award, award, award.' Some of us who took to this mess spend half our days helping those less technologically proficient, only to be criticized for making fewer awards.
50. GIVING ALL INCENTIVE AWARD FOR GOOD EFFORTS.
51. More up to date training materials. When changes occur, they need to put all to all effected.
52. I would not implement any new system until it was ready to be fielded. BSM and SAP have too many daily bandaids. Things that we were taught 30 days ago or obsolete or have drastically changed. Look at the way BSM/SAP and the 339 / PDMI programs do not function together.
53. I would stop and fix the system before deploying anything else.
54. Do away with BSM and either have the entire program re-evaluated or buy another program that actually works with the type of items we manage with the age of aircraft we buy for.
55. I would establish all Technical information on one flexi edit page and the same for procurement information and NSN header data. This will prevent a person from looking in multi places to put together related information. It takes to long.

56. Some types of incentives for the support areas which were focused on improving their training skills/interaction skills.
57. On-the-job-training
58. More monetary awards. Management loves to say that BSM makes DLA more like the private sector. Well start handing out monetary awards like the private sector. Also, punishing poor performers would help immensely. This will probably never happen though. Poor performers are part of the culture here at DSCR. They seem to have a magical force field that keeps them around. Every one knows who they are, but no one wants to do any thing about it.
59. For Supply Planners there is little to no chance for promotion beyond the GS12 level. There needs to be some incentive as far as promotions go.
60. I would bring back cash incentives to improve the BSM change proces.
61. CHANGE AWARD. GIVEN TO THOSE WHO SERVE OTHERS AS MENTORS IN THE BSM PROCESS, THOSE WHO HAVE SHOWN SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS IN WORKLOAD MANAGEMENT AND THOSE WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TOWARDS CREATING A CHANGE FRIENDLY ENVIRONMENT BY FACILITATING AND ASSISTING WITH GUIDANCE.
62. If our voices were accurately heard - I think that would be incentive. If the commanders is coming to hear how we feel about BSM, most employees are coached to be positive and not allowed to speak negatively about BSM - of course management has a blurred vision of BSM.
63. AWARDS FOR WORKING UNDER THE STRESS OF A NEW SYSTEM AND GETTING YOUR JOB DONE. TIME OFF AWARDS
64. I am an Itern and all training aspects of DSCR are new and I don't feel comfortable answering.
65. There should be a better way to share information or the 'knowledge' across divisions other than emails... There should be ongoing training sessions internally for individuals to attend that are conducted on a more consistent basis.
66. Outline a complete mapping showing where all the data from legacy can now be found in BSM.

DSCR could improve the BSM training by:

1. Condensing it. We learn by doing. The training was inadequate but with such a big change, it could not be adequate. What we really needed was much better manuals to refer to when you are back at your desk working.
2. The Training was conducted to impress instead of to instruct. The sessions taught processes and business procedures which we will never use (i.e., our latest session was concerning Army MEDICAL! I work with Aircraft). Only a few of the instructors I encountered were very astute in the Legacy arena. Several were newcomers or people who had no knowledge of Logistics.
3. Get the trainers trained -- Or make BSM work so all is tied together correctly and working right. Have accesses to the things we need and not have to go through piles of garbage to get there.
4. Having experienced personnel working with the system to give the training.
5. teaching the 'little' things that would help make our jobs a little easier, 'tricks of the trade', show us where to look behind the information for additional information
6. Actually training employees rather than have them sit in a classroom for a week watching an instructor click through power point screens in programs they'll never use in the their jobs.
7. Making sure every one has equal amount of work.
8. The BPAs are only trained in one specific element of one function and do not understand how the elements overlap or even interrelate with each other. One will tell you to complete an action in a particular way that then completely disrupts subsequent actions. Example: BPA recommended that the terms and conditions of a contract be amended in the system to 'force' a purchase request to source. When questioned about the carelessness (not to mention borderline illegality)of the request, the BPA said that stuff doesn't matter, sourcing the PR does. What this action did (changing the minimums and maximums to make the PR source) is avoid the real problem and create countless new ones as PRs will now continue to source with quantities each that are not in agreement with the terms and conditions of an established contract causing the government to not only lose credibility with the contractor but also track of where we actually are within the original bounds of the contract if we haven't violated it beyond repair.
9. having agents that 'completely' understand the flow of requirements from start to end and how it affects the BSM/SAP system(s) along with FAR regulations for contracting issues.

10. Allowing trainers and BPAs to work in the system so they can intelligently talk about how the system works rather than spouting off uniform 'it should work like this' instructions. Giving hands on experience to new users
11. Having Qualified Instructors and presenting the material in a normal working senerio.
12. Have people that work in the program and know what they are doing, train the people. Don't tell everyone that you are not going to show them how to do their job, only how to use the program. People need to be show HOW to use the program to DO their job.
13. correcting the job aids. the majority of the job aids are WRONG. when a BPA shows you how to do something it's almost always different than what the job aid reads.
14. DSCR needs to provide QAS training, not point and click classes. DLA/DSCR has changed too much at one time. No one knows how to work in the BSM environment. There is no clear guidance and supervisors can not give any guidance, because they do not know how the system works either. QAS's are required to make decisions without clear guidance. Training is the key to making BSM work but it is clear to me that a system training plan was never implemented or developed. I have worked Training Development for 10 years and BSM Training is clearly the worst I have ever seen. We have been asked to keep the same workload but DLA has implemented a new 339 system, an new BidSet system, a new PQDR system, a new Cataloging system, new E-work place system, and none of the systems work. Deskbook is outdated and from the legal aspect a QAS is taking a great risk performing their daily functions
15. More indepth training that is broken down by job roles. For example, Post awards would have training sessions specific to their job roles instead of being mixed in with pre-award training. That would eliminate information overload and stop people from talking off their learning hat.
16. Specific OJT
17. more on the floor training cycles to study real time user access problems
18. HANDS ON BY ACTUALLY DOING A TASK. READING A BOOK IS NOT A TRAINING SCENARIO. GIVE THE TRAINEE A LIVE APPLICATION TO DO.
19. Offering more hands on training at individuals desk utilizing their own workload instead of hypotetical job.
20. More hand on experience.

21. Training on actual situations that are faced by buyers using BSM to award a PR or source a PR, rather than a general overview of the system that includes no job specific training.
22. Hiring BPAs that have had actual workloads of the material they are trying to teach. Training could also be improved if there were more information sharing sessions in lieu of information receiving sessions (the workforce's concerns should matter).
23. Fixing one problem/issue at a time...
24. Developing management level training aimed at understanding how BSM processes interrelate and how the KPIs actually are supported by each functional area.
25. More hands on.
26. Creating management training that is pertinent to what we actually do in a multifunctional position.
27. provide up to date inserts to JOB AIDS when changes are made.
28. Making sure systems work before impletation
29. having qualified personnel who understand the BSM concept. The trainers read out of a book and if you asked a question which would eventually apply to your work situation, they were stumped and couldn't tell you how to apply BSM to your job.
30. Starting over
31. Trainers should be on the floor with a workload so that they will know what a buyer is talking about in order to provide assistance. The people that are providing assistance to procurement have not had a workload for a long time and do not have the workloads we carry on a daily basis. Providing support when there isn't a workload is pretty useless. As buyers, we are trying to get out awards to support the service and the work doesn't stop just because we are learning a new system. Much of the frustration is working through the problems trying to get an award out. Information that was readily available before take three times the amount of time to find as did in the past.
32. Having more qualified trainers available.
33. Move away from the screen shot clicking and toward actual work processes using actual situations. Show the cause and effect of actions taken on a daily basis.
34. Using more active training in a live system instead of using screen shots

35. Updating training material. Having instructors that are more knowledgeable. I think the main problem has been that the training was too basic. Most everyone who was trained is a seasoned employee. We learned nothing more than simple navigation and basics without addressing real problems that we all faced as soon as we got to the floor. We had to troubleshoot on our own.
36. Adequate system documentation and accurate as well as relevant job aids would help immensely since most people felt that the actual training was inadequate.
37. Teaching more by using on line examples of exactly what is required on the floor to perform our job.
38. Having good solid training on the specific job being performed.
39. HAVING QUALIFIED TEACHERS THAT DON'T MIND ANSWERING YOUR QUESTIONS AND STOP MAKING YOU FEEL THAT YOU ARE INADEQUATE. THAT IS HOW I FELT IN BSM CLASS WHEN I ASKED A QUESTION. THEY MADE IT SOUND LIKE YOUR QUESTIONS DID NOT MAKE SENSE. WHETHER OR NOT THEY MADE SENSE OR NOT THEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN ANSWERED IN A SENSIBLE MANNER.
40. Spend more money on providing on the job training. Stop wasting time and money on the classroom training. Classroom training consisted of reading from a book and I can do that at my desk with an example that would not be a waste of time. IF YOU HAVE A 6th GRADE READING CAPABILITY YOU TO COULD BE 'DLA JOB READY'.
41. The initial training was important to get going, but it would be good to have another training about six months in to working BSM. Then, you have meaningful questions and the training would be more effective.
42. By testing the new releases and have complete and accurate training material, stop trying to impress people with releases (roll outs) before there have been tested.
43. Training the trainers. I get the impression that the BPAs that I have requested information from feel I should have known the answer to my question and why am I bothering them. Or, they don't know the answer themselves and try to bluff their way out of the question. I really think that BSM is here to stay and I support it wholeheartedly. However, training personnel and training materials made people dislike BSM. Training was just 'point and click'. That is no way to learn anything.
44. This question seems late since all items have rolled into BSM. I think having training closer to when we rolled into BSM would have been more beneficial.

45. BSM Training is in the past for me. Prior to roll-out the training I received did not prepare me for my everyday duties. BSM Training needs to include the ability to actually work in a 'LIVE' environment. BSM training needs to be more than learning how to point and click.
46. being able to work through a problem with a class and allow them to solve the same problem after the training is complete. No more 'point and click' demonstrations, all we are learning is how to use the mouse.
47. Refresher training on all roles to bring everyone updated on changes and how it may have impact their roles after roll-over.
48. individual on-site team training
49. The instructors don't know how to do the job. The training materials do not reflect the software we use. The instructors are 'smoke' artists. The instructors are give 'canned' answers to provide to student questions. You cannot take real work situations and work them through the training scenerio. BSM is changing so rapidly that the training is outdated before the training manuals come off the press. The training is fallacious.
50. Providing production related training rather than system navigation training. Show me how to process my work, not how to get in the system.
51. Providing adequate and thorough training in each discipline instead of a general overview. Train specifically to each discipline and then an overview of the other disciplines so you know how each affects/supports each other
52. Don't use a point and click for training. I can only speak about procurement training...needed more SAP training on the functions within SAP
53. Teaching actual skill sets required, not pointing and clicking
54. Training people in their specialties, i.e. buyers, tech, IM's, by using real life examples. Not the BS point and click classes where you can't make a mistake. Use OA's during the training so that all 3 positions know how to look them up and be able to read what they mean. Have all BPA's teaching the same thing and do things in a consistent manner so that we do our jobs in a consistent manner across the floor.
55. Current training is point and click, and you cannot select an incorrect answer, the system is flawed.
56. More emphasis on why, less emphasis on how. Much clicking (how) little understanding (why)

57. Extending the training time, and having hands on help after the Roll outs.
58. 25%
59. adding additional training once you leave the class room.
60. By providing better trained BPAs.
61. Continuing to refine existing training by offering more hands on mission related training per discipline or management level.
62. Training was adequate. No one is going to really understand the concept until they actually start doing it. All training does is give you an overview of what is suppose to happen. You don't see the clear picture until you do it and see it happens.
63. On the floor training.
64. Using specific examples of how to perform certain actions within the BSM, SAP system and how they relate to each other across the functional areas of procurement, finance, etc. Having been in BSM for awhile, we are learning this system by trail and error on day to day work basis. The systems are set up to work, but lots of the processes do not work when they are implemented. A good example of this is the workflow system. I think BSM is a huge system that can work, but at this stage in the processing, the system is not effecient. The beginning training was adequate, but now that BSM is operating there are issues that BPA's or trainers have no knowledge of because some of these errors were not supposed to have taken place and are showing up as with all systems. Changes are always being suggested and the workforce is told that those changes cannot be done or will take years to accomplish because this is a commercial system. I think the BSM training needs to be job specific now, such as a class on loading OA's into the system, what errors to look for, understanding what some of the new fields mean. I think also that the job aids that were done on the BSM help line need to be updated where parts have changed or been left out of the job aids from the beginning.
65. By actually training us, instead of fulfilling a requirement.
66. The people during the training need to know what they are teaching and have a working knowledge of the system. Just teaching point and click does not teach a new system to someone. I think most people need to know why, what,when and where you are clicking.
67. Putting truly experienced acquisition professionals in the BPA positions, not just people who can scam ASP for promotions. Too many BPA's have never worked complex buys, KO'd for small buyers, or supervised in a working environment. They don't know how to trouble-shoot.

68. In lieu of point and click have examples of doing a request from start to finish. From QA and supply review to procurement.
69. HAVING ONE ON ONE TRAINING CLASSES.
70. Training could be more up to date. Some type of live training system.
71. Have instructors teach how our jobs work within the BSM system instead of teaching how to point and click.
72. Providing better reference material. One large, well structured volume with detailed instructions is far better than several spiral bound books filled with powerpoint slides.
73. I was satisfied up until Oct 10th with the PDMI rollout. The training we received for that portion was worthless. If you are going to train someone, you have to have the materials and systems for them to use - we had materials, but no systems. Now even, most of us are lost and heavily relying on co-workers to share info on how to accomplish some of our new tasks/systems requirements.
74. Having qualified personnel that is proficient in using and working in BSM functions.
75. Using live training software with 'dummy' contracts, NSNs, etc. Using instructors that are actually knowledgeable about BSM. Not necessarily people that were in concept demo. So much has changed since concept demo that the trainers are completely out of touch with the job processes now. Make the current trainers return to the floor and actually use BSM as it is now. Having been in a job doesn't equate to being able to teach. Update the job aids, training aids, etc. A lot of my training no longer applies, but it was part of the curriculum.
76. I don't believe the training was the problem. I believe that we were the problem waiting until the last minute to receive the change.
77. ensuring the exercises are live examples which involve day to day events/challenges. Also, walking through 'DAY IN THE LIFE' examples for the core processes and the various management levels is an area of improvement for the BSM training.
78. Having actual problems from the DSCR work force.
79. Offering frequent refresher training - small groups
80. Giving realistic training using a live environment. Add components to illustrate what to do when the system does not do what it is supposed to do. For Supply Planners, there was no training related to Overprocurements, very little on how to process phased deliveries.

81. Implementing cell training with all persons involved training together as they work.
82. CREATING QUALITY CIRCLES AND INFORMATION SHARING SESSIONS AMONGST IST'S
83. Having people who actually do the work do the training. Most of the people doing the training have not been on the floor in years - the don't adequately know the needs of the worker bees.
84. HAND ON TRAINING SPECIFIC TO THE EXACT DUTIES WE HAVE TO PERFORM, NOT GENERALIZATIONS.
85. Because of 2.2.1 roll out there were no subject matter experts. Learn as you go.
86. Validating & Publishing the training manuals prior to launching a new BSM bolt on system i.e. PDMI - Tech Data Development & 339 Engineering Support. We have been unable to use both systems effectively for over 5 weeks and still counting. This is impacting the Product Specialist's ability to review/build and release P/Rs to procurement. It appears 'to me' that DLA ran out of R&D money for PDMI development and launched the system in order to use O&M money. (no facts to back it up just my opinion) PDMI is so screwed up I can't believe they launched it without locking down the business rules & training material.
87. Having the people that's doing the training better trained
88. Actually training. I'm not sure that the transfer of knowledge is actually taking place. Not everyone can train...
89. more accurate handouts for training.

In my opinion, the three most significant metrics to measure DSCRs success are:

1. material availability backorders PRs processed (on hand does not tell the story, we need awards or cancellations as needed)
2. Material Availability Unfilled Orders Purchase Requisitions on Hand
3. Back Orders, Availability of items and Timely deliveries
4. Supply Availability, B/O's,
5. customer satisfaction award goals delivery objectives

6. Supply availability Response time Cost effectiveness
7. 1. mission accomplish 2. Please and thank you 3. Understanding everyone doesn't work at the same pace.
8. We need to establish who is accountable for what are is responsible for and where the metrics in question will be briefed before determining the hierarchy as they should vary from the customer operations side to the supplier operations side. Customer ops should be responsible for backorders in all categories no matter what action needs to be taken. They should also work with their respective customers to determine what if any items will be the high priorities for the next year, not based on repetitive historic demand that might be tainted by SPRs or ONRRs but real true forecasted demands. Elevation and expedition of truly hot items such as AOGs, etc., not just whining customers with low priority PDM items that weren't previously included in the forecast listed above. Right now everything is a priority from CO and status requests in SO are through the roof which means nothing is a priority and even less is getting done. Supplier ops metrics are simpler and easier to measure, PRS over ALT of record, PRs on hand and how they are affected by Manugistics popping out multiple/duplicate PRs that continue to roll the same figures into each subsequent PR, contract delinquencies, an are that was completely overlooked in the BSM Design, Build and Test area. (If we ever get this part right the CO side will have much fewer backorders.)
9. Backorders High Frequency/SMS Requirements over ALT
10. Supply availability Age of backorders ALT
11. This will never happen based on the worklaod distribution.
12. How fast we can get the items to our coustomers. How well we can get the right part. That the right part is a good part.
13. fullfiling back orders. getting the part to the customer on time. right item.
14. In my opinion, the three most significant metrics to measure DSCRs success are; 1. Quality of the material received. 2. Material being at the right place at the right time 3. Having the reputation of providing the best material at the lowest price.
15. Back orders on hand, requisitions received, requisitions filled.
16. PRs OH B/O Aged PRs
17. meeting established goals time and delivery reduction elimination of lenthgy backorders

18. Order Fulfillment rate Backorders Number of Duplicate Orders
19. BACK ORDERS CUSTOMER STOCK AVAILABILITY FORECAST
20. 1-Material Availability 2-Awards 3-PRs>ALT
21. How long to make an award Customer Feedback Customer Satisfaction
22. On time delivery to the warfighter
23. none
24. Supply Availability, Backorder Reduction, and Customer Satisfaction
25. The three most significant are: -Decreased backorders -Material availability - Problems with material after award
26. 1. Job satisfaction 2. Promotion from performance. People are turning down promotions to retire. 3. Production.
27. Meeting Required Award Date, however, RAD is greatly impacted by outside influences, which need to be considered in the timeliness of awards Demand Plan input - currently lacking good input from the customer side. No Unfilled Orders for High Frequency items
28. Legacy would be PRs>ALT, MA, backorders BSM would be ATP, DPA and stockability
29. Business System Modernization Customer Relationship Management Supplier Relationship Management
30. Material Availability, Backorder lines, PR Awards
31. Dont know
32. How our customer see DSCR
33. Are we supporting the warfighters? Can employees manage the current workloads at the current level? Are changes being made to improve the procurement process?
34. 1. Improved employee morale 2. Allow for workers to get monetary awards for getting the good metrics just as upper management does. 3. Have the customers rate our efficiency
35. Attainment to Plan Demand Plan Accuracy PRs on hand

36. PRs past required award date Attainment to Plan Demand Plan Accuracy
37. Customer receiving items on time. Customer receiving the item @ lowest cost to taxpayers. Customer receiving the correct item in a useable condition everytime.
38. Metrics are for supervisory personnel. I think that DSCR could do better to have supervisors clearly define a job position and then make sure that the person filling the position has adequate training and the tools available to do the job.
39. On time Parts for the customer, right price, place and time. The system DLA uses should effectivly interface with the customer, contractor, depot and service. The system should work for the user not visa versa.
40. As far as our work, it's hard to measure a buyer, especially one who works mostly large buys. There are two many variables to say 'you're successful if you make this many awards.' It's ridiculous. It hurts morale. It generates hopelessness.
41. 1.Supply to the troops in the Field, in a timely manner. 2.Correct material. 3.DLA headquaters, providing the work force with a system designed for the Government not trying to use a commerical system.
42. Providing the right item every time. Reducing Back orders significantly Best price for the right item.
43. Amount of time doing tasks related to awarding PRs. Amount of time spent correcting system errors ie duplicate PRs. The amount of lost time ie putting awards on holdtables and adding changing OA agreements to manual and working PRs solicited automatically because OAs were placed on manual review. Then focus on reducing the latter two.
44. reduction of b/o additions to OAs reduction of ALT
45. performance awards satisfied customers
46. Customer Satisfaction (Military Service). Flight Crew Safety & Operational Readiness Factors (Accidents, Incidents, PQDRs). Employee Satisfaction.
47. All of the balance scorecard metrics are significant.
48. Backorder Reduction Prs>ALT of Record PRs on Hand
49. customer satisfaction in WHEN they receive their items and how much they paid; employee satisfaction to be motivated to make the first thing happen

50. Backlog of work. Customer Backorders. Morale of workforce.
51. The number of items that are actually received by the customer after the award has been counted as an award. Less emphasis on quantity, more emphasis on quality. The number of modifications issued to correct contracts that were awarded incorrectly. A record of system down times.
52. The customer's feedback. How many shipments made it to their final destination on time and to the correct destination. Obligated funds spent by end of the fiscal year.
53. Total mission of DSCR. How well trained each individual is to accomplish their job. Treat each individual with the same respect they expect for them self.
54. I have no idea
55. PARTS TO THE USER
56. ALT of record Having stock on hand Reducing lead time Customer satisfaction
57. Having the right part bought and sent to the field or warfighter on the ground or in the field. This system still has lots of kinks and tweaks that need to be done in order to operate efficiently. BSM operates, but is not efficient at this point in time. I'm not real sure what metrics we're are being measured against except ALT/and PLT for PR's. We are also being looked at from the Priority PR Report, but that has just begun. I think more explanation of what these measurements will be is necessary to have an idea what performance is expected from the individual employee.
58. Building and maintaining good communication with the customer. Building and maintaining good communication with the contactors. Building and maintaining good communications with the DCMA's
59. Customer satisfaction. Employee morale. Orgaizational saving and growth.
60. Customers Suppliers Services
61. Supply availability, Back Orders and successful awards (awards that take no DLA-caused modifications to complete).
62. WORK COMPLETED
63. BACKORDERS - not tracked by BSM. Over night this has disappeared. Why? ..no longer important? Priority of requirements. WORKFORCE satisfaction. Any system that is to be used by the workforce should be simple enough to be mastered in no more than a week.

64. none at this time.
65. Stock Availability Customer Support Contract Delinquency
66. Customer satisfaction Quality of work Knowledge of work force
67. How often is our high frequency (high/regularly demanded) items available. How long does a customer wait for support/parts. How often do we engage in long term contractual arrangements with our major suppliers and how successful are those long term contractual relationships.
68. Customer Satisfaction Right Price/Delivery Incentives
69. Awards Reducing Backorders Customer Satisfaction
70. 1. order fulfillment time 2. expenditures versus revenue 3. backorders on hand
71. Customer satisfaction Timeliness Correctness
72. MATERIAL AVAILABILITY LEAD TIME (FOR AWARD, DELIVERY)
QUALITY OF MATERIAL
73. 1. order fulfillment (material availability) 2. customer satisfaction 3. backorders
74. ALT (overall) - Number 1 ALT by specific job i.e. Procurement pre-award, Product Specialist, Supply Planner, CAS etc...) PLT (overall)
75. Our metrics are fine.
76. Deliverables on time Contract Awards Customer satisfaction
77. None

In my opinion, the three most significant metrics to measure my individual job accomplishment are:

1. Same as above, however, so many variables affect an individual's job accomplishment that the only true metrics that should ever be applied are: Dedication, Diligence, Attitude, Consistent Effort, and Process Performance once an employee is FULLY AND PROPERLY trained.
2. Not just awards, but solicitations and Long Term Contracts. So many times we do our work and the PR is cancelled close to award -- all that time is lost and doesn't

- count. How quickly we clear urgent and compelling requests and hot items. How quickly questions are answered.
3. workload management willingness to work with the team willingness to go above and beyond when required
 4. Award rate Solicitation rate Aging rate
 5. Completing assignment attitude Working well with co-workers
 6. Workload management of PRs on hand in branch, delinquency rates, improved processing of high SMCC/LTC items.
 7. amount of work processed (post & pre-award) Backorder reduction timeliness of actions (post & pre-award)
 8. # of awards per month ALT # of solicitations per month
 9. RSW Processed, Total SAP Actions Processed, Development of Technical Requirements.
 10. The QA field is too broad to define three main metrics to measure. There are just too many cross platform metrics that are outside of BSM to make any type of opinion on this issue. Sorry.
 11. Correct data prioritizing back orders average time to complete a task I have control over.
 12. I do not care about metrics to measure my job accomplishment. I work as hard as I can and try to do as much as I can with out making mistakes. Does it really matter if you release 100 RSW a week if 87 RSW are not right and we have to cancel contracts or provide further guidance on how to build the material? DLA is getting to many PQDR's because of a rush to contract something. More does not mean better.
 13. b/o on hand, b/o reduction,
 14. PRs OH Aged PRs B/O
 15. awards customer stafication professionalism
 16. % of Contracts that are comleted Production Rate Old PR's
 17. OUT PUT OF ALL TRANSACTIONS ACCOUNT BALANCES/WORLLOADS
OF COMPLAINTS

18. This is difficult since for a Supply Planner as most metrics really involve buyers and Post Awards personnel in regards to backorders, SOH, Del. KT's, etc.
19. How comfort I feel using BSM How fast will it take them to navigate the system
Will it benefit everyone
20. none
21. Award output Buyers'administrators response to the overwhelming number of problems created daily by the system.
22. Awarded PR's, Unsolicited Rate, and Percentage of Aging PR's in my workload
23. The three most significant are: -The amount and complexity of my workload -
Purchase requests awarded -Purchase requests solicited
24. 1. Performance 2. My DSCR customer satisfaction 3. Amount of work I put out.
25. Same
26. Key Performance Indicators Business System Modernization Customer
Satisfaction/Relationships
27. Dont know, everybody still in the learning curve
28. My job has changed so much that I don't know what metrics would measure my
accomplishments. I don't feel as if my job has any definite goals.
29. PR Awards, Backorders lines, Material Availability
30. Sit at my desk and see how many calls I take from users, ESA,contractors and calls
from people looking for help and information on item.
31. Can employee make awards? Can employee manage OAs? Can employee do all task
that are required?
32. PRs past required award date Attainment to Plan Buyer award rate
33. Same as above.
34. It is hard to single out any numerical driven KPI as a measure of an individual's job
accomplishment. There are too many aspects of my job as a supply planner that can
be negated by slow or no response from someone in the organization as well as issues
outside of the control of DLA.

35. Between the preaward work load which is both small and large buys, and the postaward work, I am not really sure what metrics to look at. When we factor in PR priority reports, high frequency lists, war room items, OA/PR reports... I generally don't know where to start and I certainly get no feeling of accomplishment.
36. Support to the contract and post award administrator. Support to customer. Support to the contractor.
37. 1. Common sense. 2. Knowledgeable supervisors. For example, an acquisition specialist supervisor should be supervising other acquisition specialists. Our jobs are very involved, and having a supervisor who only knows numbers and not reality promotes low morale and hopelessness. 3. Metrics devised based on the reality of the situation. Not all buys are the same.
38. 1. Work completed in a timely and correct manner.
39. Making sure that the right item is procured so the customer gets what he needs to meet mission requirements.
40. Know the type of commodities I am buying and how much effort it takes to make an award. For example it takes a lot more effort to award lubricating oil than buying a wiring harness. Yet both are measured strictly by numbers of awards. Note the amount of awards vs post award action for the award. Note amount of assistance provided to help other team members ie am I a team player.
41. -Working effectively (managing the PR's) -Working well with co workers - Understanding the training I have received since coming in through co op program and applying that training
42. Percent of awards completed within current Administrative Lead Time Percent of completion of additional assigned tasks within established suspense date. Percent of completion of administrative duties of assigned contracts.
43. performance awards satisfied customer
44. Customer Satisfaction (My fellow team members are my customers). Flight Crew Safety & Operational Readiness Factors (This is difficult to measure but the QA is the Safety conscience of the team where Customer Satisfaction is sometimes deminished for the sake of Flight Crew Safety). Employment citizenship factors.
45. Same as above.
46. Same as above.

47. As a buyer, remaining consistently productive in the quality and then quantity of work leaving my desk. Customer satisfaction coming from my awards. Contractor/government relationships - since I'm on an OEM team.
48. Quality of work produced. Total Production. Backlog of work.
49. Quality of my work. Separate rating categories for the complexity of tasks and taking into consideration the differences in work loads. Attitude towards my job to include customers and co-workers.
50. How I accomplish the job rather than the speed of getting the job done. Dependable.
51. I have no idea
52. GETTING PART TO THE USER
53. The many tasks I am assigned to do.
54. Completing my modifications on time and expeditiously. Awarding my large contracts in a timely manner. Providing great customer service to the warfighter
55. My helping co-workers with BSM issues and problems if I can. Awarding LTC's and large awards Working on projects and backlog to get the mission accomplished
56. Management of workload. Peer and co-worker interaction. Self-improvement initiatives.
57. -knowledge, -number of tasks performed correctly (not just the number of completed tasks), -and attitude
58. Supply availability, Back Orders and successful awards (awards that take no DLA-caused modifications to complete for the NSN's I work.
59. none at this time
60. Handling personnel issues mentoring my employees Meeting suspenses
61. Knowledge of job/role/resources Customer satisfaction Contractor satisfaction
62. How effectively and efficiently are people and processes managed. Goals for various metrics to actual metrics. Change management.
63. My dedication My diligence My accomplishments toward satisfying the customers

64. This is a difficult question. It is difficult to measure some types of job performance. We have a guy in my section that knows BSM extremely well. Thus, he is constantly bombarded with questions and often has to leave his desk to help other employees. Obviously, his award count is low and his workload is high, as he is always helping people. It's difficult to quantify his accomplishments. His award count may be low, but he's helped numerous people learn how to traverse through BSM
65. Ensure that my team succeeds overall in all three disciplines: procurement, supply, tech quality by doing what it takes to satisfy the customer needs timely.
66. 1. Workflow processing time 2. Accuracy of the TPIP 3. Backorders on hand
67. Production Precision Profits
68. DAYS IN PROCESS
69. 1. quality 2. customer satisfaction 3. quantity
70. ALT (my part of the ALT) PLT (my part of the PLT) PQDRs - customer complaints
71. I'm still waiting to see exactly what areas I should be focusing on daily under my new BSM role. I'm using legacy data to perform my role on a daily basis, so I can't sufficiently answer this question.
72. Processed workload Customer Satisfaction Additional Duties
73. None

Please share any additional comments you have regarding BSM transformation:

1. There are scores of 'pet projects' attached to BSM which have nothing to do with BSM. The folks in charge of these rice bowls saw a chance to make their project MANDATORY by attaching it to BSM. This made things much worse than they needed to be. HQ is now 'in charge' of things they do not understand. Again, it is the rice bowl issue. HQ personnel are often VERY skilled in their area but they do not see the impacts on other areas since they are not generalists as field folks must be.
2. Training should be simplified and delivered to our Supervisors or another qualified individual and then brought back to our Local sections and delivered to the end user. This is in direct contrast to the auditorium-style of lectures we constantly receive. Lectures are fine when dealing with substance-based courses but worthless when dealing with task-oriented subjects. The computer lab where we could practice our newly-learned processes never materialized. We were promised two weeks in a practice lab and never even saw the lab. When we completed our less-than-two-

weeks of classroom training (at roll-out), we were promised diligent accompaniment by a BPA for at least a couple weeks. I had a BPA at my desk for less than 15 minutes following the training. It was the worst example of the delivery and follow-up of a complex subject that I have ever witnessed!

3. It has been a night mare. The program is primitive at best. It is costing the government a lot more money -- the quantity we buy is smaller and so we pay more per item. The system is moving stock back and forth between locations and each time it moves it cost the government more money. It is ordering obsolete items. It shows Back Orders and demands and there are none. Duplicate Purchase Orders are driving everyone crazy. The one long in for all access was wonderful until you have to put that STUPID password in the system every 5 minutes -- 10 times. I understand the need for a new system but like most companies in america the cart was put before the horse and horses do a much better job at pulling rather than pushing!!!
4. The BPA trainers need more on-hands live training experience in the field of expertise. Procurement BPA personnel cannot understand the process of awarding contracts if they have not awarded a contract in five years. Things change daily. They are not as familiar with the procurment process and problems.
5. I am not happy with BSM. It has made my job more complicated, and added additional requirements to my job. The interface between SAP and DPACS needs to be improved. Finding required information in SAP needs to be improved. I need to be able to do in SAP, what I was able to do in SAMMS. The training needs to be more in depth and classes set up for pre-award, post award functions. I could go on but won't.
6. I think the BSM transition was handled poorly. The programs were not tested fully, the processes were not ironed out, the training was insufficient, and workload distribution was mishandled.
7. Needs lots of improvement
8. First of all, the system itself is not the problem. It is only doing what it was designed to do and is now so far from being a COTS program it is misleading to continue to call it that. There are some system limitations which could be overcome with the right people in place in the systems, DBT, KTT areas and in upper management. The unfortunate truth is that virtually no one above my immediate boss has the slightest idea of what is truly possible in this system. The occasional PAO opportunity 'fly-by' visit by the brass to one of the worker bees that are usually planned to reflect only the most positive of outcomes for these high ranking people who don't have time for the problems and work around the floor has to deal with every day do not count. There are elements to the system that are truly groundbreaking but they are unfortunately outweighed at the present time by all of the cumbersome drilling that must be done to get to the meat of even the most routine

process. This will eventually be fixed although most processes inherent to each of the disciplines has major issues that never seem to be a priority in the system change request queue. Probably the biggest issue with the BSM systems transformation is the fact that our upper management and even DLA HQ continues to request status based on inherently Legacy KPIs. They do not understand that most of the data that was pushed to mid-level folks in the past is no longer available and must instead be pulled from many areas, compiled and analyzed. HQ continues to make ridiculous decisions about the supply chains and how they are supposed to work only within the mother ICPs chain of command; actions that serve only to hamper and hinder the mission of the enterprise: support the warfighter.

9. Personally I have experienced negative BSM implementation. BPA don't know how the system works in accordance with FAR requirements and regulations on contracting. Thus 'work arounds' have become more common than the system working as required to complete the procurements. This is a time consuming case by case experience every time. Work arounds should 'not' be the norm. BSM/SAP should have incorporated how DSCR does business before implementation and roll-outs. The system is 'not' user friendly and requires more input on my part to complete the same task taking longer; however, the goals have not changed and everyone is expected to keep up. Manugistics (forecasting) has impacted my position by doubling my workload. The new forecasting system procures much more than the legacy system 'hands-on' system did and accordingly more \$\$ being spent resulting in funding restraints. We are buying more than we are selling. With the influx of workload and the push to meet DSCR goals, stress is high and moral is down. As a seasoned acquisition specialist (buyer) I feel more like I can no longer manage my desk than ever before. Change for the sake of change is not good; however, the government did need systems that talked to each other and better technology was required; however, BSM does not seem to meet the current needs of the government nor does it provide the outcome originally conveyed to the workforce. I agree a the old system either needed updating or a new system in place and uniformity across DLA centers was needed. I cannot agree that BSM SAP was the answer for my position and part I hold to support the warfighter in a timely manner.
10. Total Lack of understanding the impact. Dumping change faster than it can be absorbed.
11. DLA needs to remove PDREP, 339's from BSM and return them to their prior programs. Don't fix something that is not broken. If you want the information in BSM then updated the two systems to update BSM. This would have cost MUCH less to do. OH, that makes since and we can't have that.
12. This was the biggest mistake made in the history of dla. when bsm kicked in the focus on back orders went away from my view point. the focus was on the dollar value from what I understand. BSM kicked in that was not properly tested we had to figure things out as we went along. Now that PDMI has been initiated we are getting

nowhere. the system is horrible it was not tested properly before being implemented, we are basically the guinea pigs and are finding and reporting what is wrong with the system. If we were an actual business we would have gone out of business long ago.

13. BSM Transformation is a failure. Management does not want to admit that the system does not work. BSM is not user friendly and has increased workload to unmanageable levels while added undue stress on its operators. No one in the trenches likes the new systems and job performance, job satisfaction, morale is down to unbearable levels. If the person using the new systems hates it and does not understand how it works, how can it be helping the War fighter?
14. Additional training needed--not classroom/book
15. It is highly regrettable that we cannot better harness the capabilities of SAP. This program would not be as popular with For-Profit Firms if they experienced the performance we are experiencing. I believe that the major contributor to the ineffectiveness of SAP is DPACS. As a Buyer I should have One-Button access to any SAP function that I need. That is, access from my primary work screen in DPACS.
16. BSM TRANSITION WAS MUCH SMOOTHER THAN PDMI. PDMI IS CRIPPLING THE TECH FIELD WITH OUR DAILY PROCESSES.
17. BSM may have worked well for the Wal-Marts of the world, but I feel that it hinders the main goal here at DSCR-Getting parts to the troops in the field!!! You lose visibility of items, never knowing of customer directs (DVD) requirements until someone comes looking for status updates etc.
18. I believe the BPA positions are a big joke. They put these people in these positions paying them all that money, for what? They do not have the answers to many of the questions they receive from workers on the floor actually dealing with the BSM system everyday. I basically learn from trial and error. Many times, when I call a BPA, they tell me to try this, see what happens, and get back to them. They are not sure themselves. I have actually had BPAs come to me and ask me how I implemented something in the system and what was the result. Then, they take that information I gave them, and go spread it to other people like they knew it all along. I don't understand what their purpose is. Once, I talked to a BPA trying to get an understanding about something in the system. We both came to the conclusion that the BSM system (SAP) was calculating something wrong. I said that this needed to be corrected. The BPA said that, although, it was incorrect, it was not going to be corrected because that's just the way the system is and I had to learn to work around it.
19. Truly believe that the workload of the Acquisition folks has more than doubled with BSM. Many prior tasks or responsibilities now lie with the procurement folks.

20. BSM is a great system, but the tools for using the system have not been adequately explained. Planning is a mystery to all, even Supply planners. BSM, specifically manugistics, has created duplication of effort by constantly issuing duplicate PR's and overprocuring items.
21. Every possible scenerio involving the complex nature of our NSNs (special testing, special requirements) along with the volume of NSNs and people at total capacity should have been well thought out and researched before roll-outs took place. We spent more time playing catch-up and fix-it-up everytime a group rolled-out because each group brought its own set of problems that BSM nor the BPA were prepared for.
22. 1. Too much transition from old system to new. 2. BSM doesn't work as thought. New PQDR system is too difficult/time-consuming. 339 system doesn't appear to ever be right again... PQDR and 339 programs were very easy for EVERYONE at DLA to use!!!
23. BSM has many good aspects in it. It would have been a better process if the Management level training had been adequate. Management had tools, but didn't really understand what they were or how to draw on those tools to determine if the workforce was accomplishing their work goals.
24. DSCR leadership from the top down has worked hard to help the employees transition, fight the must have battles, and address concerns. The real frustrator is the appearance that HQs who now owns and controls more of our destiny seems to believe that we are just resistant to change. Someone needs to understand that we are asking more and more from our people and they are becoming more and more frustrated with the time it takes to even get the Must have changes in place. Its a little hard to sell a system where it is openly discussed that planning is not stable yet. How can you sell the rest with the core piece that will determine our success or failure is not stable??? The frustration that comes through on these surveys is people's passion to get the job done and support our customers.
25. As more experience is gained and understanding of BSM the employees are more receptive to the change to BSM and are able to see the benefits.
26. I've got to many comments, mostly negative, to convey. I will leave you with this though...it takes me 4 times longer to do my job now and after the learning curve it will only take me 3 times longer. It's to bad the software could not have been developed around our organization as opposed to the other way around.
27. BSM transformation was not thought out using common sense.
28. We spend alot of time answering reports that are inaccurate. Many hours are wasted because of all the different places you have to look for information to find out later the report is inaccurate. Seems to run a month behind.

29. The Outline agreement process for long term contracts is not well developed and is an impediment to success.
30. This system (BSM + SAP + Manugistics) is an ill conceived change which has slowed productivity to a near crawl. In the past, the slogan was 'Work Smart' to achieve productivity--today the slogan appears to be 'Add roadblocks to slow the inevitable train wreck down'.
31. I have noticed that everybody is extremely concerned with what everyone else is doing. If a team approach really is a goal, the work centers need to be re-organized. I think the 'Big-Bang' totally missed its goal. If I could turn to the tech sitting next to me and ask a question, it would be a lot more productive than having to send an e-mail or call someone with whom I have not developed repair.
32. A help desk would be nice. I have found the DSCR BSM Procurement help desk to be useless. They rarely respond to my emailed questions.
33. I am very stress at this time with BSM because I did not received sufficient training for BSM to perform my duties of my job adequately. I have worked for DOD for 25 years and this transition has been the worse I have experienced.
34. I THOUGHT MY JOB AS A SUPPLY PLANNER WOULD BE BETTER. NOW WHAT I HAVE BEEN A SUPPLY PLANNER FOR ALMOST A YEAR,I WILL NEVER DO ANOTHER JOB LIKE THIS. I WAS ASKED TO STEP UP TO THE PLATE AND TAKE ON MORE WORK AND NOW I AM BEING PENALIZED FOR NOT BEING ABLE TO KEEP UP WORK THAT WAS NEVER MIND IN THE FIRST PLACE.
35. Customers are not happy. Contractors are not happy. Employees are not happy. Management (top level) portrays a picture that I feel is distorted and misleading. If they would admit to the problems and have the software developers fix them. The price for BSM would imply top dollar software yet it operates like 'off the bottom shelf', discounted price, poorly supported, buy at your own risk, last years software without a warranty. I am tired of seeing an employee on the today and tomorrow singing BSM praise, they are intoxicated by the Admirals entourage and influence that comes with visiting them. Come on DLA employees tell them the truth if there is something wrong they need to know about it.
36. I feel we are stuck because of the costs and someone trying to get this system into place no matter how things were really working. Now we have to make a bad system work by taking longer to do the same things and even more stress than before. Although having knowledgeable supervisors who have a clue about what we do would help tremendously. We're people, not numbers.

37. 1. I feel SAP is not user friendly and does not aid the work force in accomplishing the mission in a timely and efficient manner. I believe DSCR should scrap SAP and have a system developed by a knowledgeable source i.e Microsoft, Hewlett Packard, or any other qualified computer designer of software.
38. BSM can work, but morale is so low because people are not getting the answers they need to make the system work. I don't believe that people on the floor were asked enough questions about the processes. I think more focus was placed on job roles.
39. I came from initial training straight to BSM via concept demo. We worked as a team and got things done. However once moving on the floor everyone seem to use legacy tools in the BSM world. Focusing on numbers and keeping us from awarding. The ESOC PRs completely controlled the amount of work and did not allow you to effectively control your own workload. herefore you started falling behind then every time you turn around is another spreadsheet to go thru and another worthless briefing to prepare which yeilds NOTHING new to the equation.
40. BSM transformation has been frustrating based on upper management does not want to understand the everyday processes have changed. Buyers cannot meet the previous goals established in Legacy working in BSM. BSM added additional steps to such as workflows.
41. Workforce afraid to share adequate information to accomplish job.
42. Business System Modernization is absolutely necessary. Just don't confuse the goal with the process. SAP is extremely inefficient and nonproductive. It wastes a tremendous amount of my time because of the inadequate nature of the software. IF the mission can be accomplished with this software then there are tremendous opportunities for productivity improvements provided the system can be changed. In the meantime, the inadequate software requires extra manpower not less manpower.
43. Had better production process training been provided the workforce would have made an smoother transition.
44. Rushing the proces. Not taking the time to effectively work outstanding SCRs. If the outstanding SCRs are not processed immediately, BSM has little chance of being successful.
45. BSM & PDMI were implemented before they were debugged. Too many bandaid fixes and work arounds. This masks the real problems with the system. BSM & PDMI are to complex and are not user friendly. BSM decision makers had not concept of how their decisions impacted the person who had to make the system work. Generally speaking BSM is 10 X harder to work in than SAMMS. Metrics are corrupt, they do not reflect the actual efforts expended. Business Warehouse data is without value, due to inaccuracy.

46. Realization by management that one size does not fit all. The transformation may have gone more smoothly if the workforce didn't have the feeling of being overwhelmed. So many new things dumped all at once. Had the process been instituted in smaller doses, the digestion may have been smoother. Management's expectation of business as usual was unrealistic. I personally, couldn't learn something new, continue working something old and produce on the same level.
47. It was very hard to find anyone who could help after leaving the class room.
48. I think that BSM would be a great tool but it still has a long way to go. Again, I reiterate the time consuming efforts that it takes to look things up in BSM. Having to move between so many screens, all the arrowing up and down. The lost time for when it times you out. Also having to complete something and having to go all the way back out just to get back to the same screen. That's ridiculous.
49. Job Aids need to be kept current.
50. Everything I do is very tedious and time consuming.
51. BSM is the wave of the future for DLA. I think that the concept is good, but many changes and tweaks to the system have to be done in order to make the system operate effeciently. We are further along than we were a year ago and as improvements are made to the system, I think BSM can work for DLA and the services, but the system has to be improved and the processes have to be improved to make DSCR more efficient. Ex. Reports that are supposed to be realtime reports are showing purchase requests, etc, information that is not current or up to date. These reporting issues take lots of look, relook and research to keep doing over and over again. Also, suggestions have been made to take these databases and make the reporting situations specific to the areas where they need to be worked, not center wide. When brought to immediate management attention, they try to let the BSM folks know that these reporting systems are not currently real time. Those types of issues need to be solved because a lot of the KPI metrics are based on the reports that are not accurate.
52. BSM was a huge mistake and upper management (HQ)will not admit they made a gross error in implementing it. We would have been better served by designing a new system from the ground up...software that would be designed for what we do. Spending billions of dollars on commercial software and tweaking it to make it work was a colossal waste of taxpayers' money
53. This transformation, was not well thought. It appears that coordination was not actually made with the people who actually did day to day work. BPA's are not really knowlwdgeable in day to day operations, since they are years removed from daily operation. Training has been horrible. This is the worst transformation period I have

ever been part of (Over 30 years Federal Government). Instructions and training is vague. We have to go in and figure what is working and what is not working. We have to develop procedures that work and pass on to peers, then inform supervisors, management and BPA's of how we process a specific function. It is not about incentives, it is about job performance. I know there would be transformation pains but this goes beyond that. What are the services to do? Someone needs to be held accountable. I just want to do a good job.

54. Costly system that after a few years of throwing money at it to improve it, we could have kept our system. They kept talking about the old system with having to put money into it to keep it running, but the new system is the same way. At least the old system was user friendly. The new system is not user friendly at all. You must have a job guide for everything you do.
55. Transformation was rushed to meet an arbitrary schedule with no regard for fixing those things that do not, to this day, work properly. We continue to do things wrong, knowingly. In the active-duty environment, a 'stand-down:' would have been ordered to fix the system before proceeding. And, the truth about the damage being done has yet to make it to the top.
56. BSM has several flaws at the moment, once these are fixed feel the workforce would be more efficient in their efforts. . slowness . duplication(s) . inaccurate reports from SAP . system locking up
57. The whole transformation was not well thought out. BSM is not a user friendly system and many commercial users have dropped BSM/SAP.
58. One major problem is the apparent use of the workforce as an 'in-house beta-testing group' for various BSM updates, releases, etc. AFTER going 'live', users are expected to report problems which in many cases manifest themselves immediately during the most basic tasks. This should all be taken care of prior to implementing a system update into a real-world environment. The delays caused by conducting business in this fashion will adversely impact DLA's standing in the eyes of the customer, as these delays inevitably transfer to the warfighter in the field.
59. Whom ever is responsible for approving some of these 'systems' ought to be put in front of the workforce and told why. As a QAS, we had two systems that were totally functional, user friendly, and effective. Now we have two replacement pieces of trash. They are not user friendly, cumbersome, more manual (in an automated sense) and we hate them.... It makes me dread sitting down at my desk to start a task.
60. With the Big Bang DSCR separated the Supply function into three different areas, pitting co-workers against each other. We are not allowed to know what the different functional area duties or job roles. We now appear to work for the retired military in lieu of working for the entire military and/or the Item Manager that now feels they

dicating what, when, how many and from whom by procure material from. We now have more list more hot items more war room listing and 2/3 the personnel to perform the functions.

61. Lots of money spent on the software, but more time & money should have been spent on trainers, technical writers for the job aids, training software. Because of the inadequacy of training, transition to the system is 'bumpier' than it should be. BPA's are slow to respond to questions and often don't know what to do. They say they will 'check on it' and don't follow-up. Help desk takes forever to respond to trouble tickets.
62. I think BMS will work in the long run. I'm not sure it was the best solution, as ERP's for big organizations rarely work, but at least it's an improvement. I do believe the roll out could have gone smoother with better formal training. In addition, more credit should go to the employees on the floor. Most of the learning was done on the fly, which is not unusual under this type of environment. Word of mouth training is what allowed most employees to survive the early days in the modern day Wild West otherwise known as BSM.
63. The transition to BSM is necessary, however I believe that a better software system could have been developed. Supposedly we are using COTS software, however it has had to be modified and tweaked to fit our uses. I believe that a software company should have been engaged to develop a package of software that delivered the same functionality of our Legacy system using similar interfaces, however written in a language that was easily changeable and adaptable. By the time that we finish modifying SAP, we will no longer be running a COTS software package it will be similar to Legacy in that DLA will be the only user of it. The training just plain sucked, telling me to point and click at something without being able to tell me why I am doing so is ludicrous and laughable. When students asked questions in our class on the second day, the instructors got mad and forbid the asking of questions. I spent two weeks in a classroom environment on training that could have been conducted on-line. Without the use of live environment it was useless. Seems like someone needed to punch a ticket that says we were all 'trained' regardless of whether or not the training was meaningful. When changes are made to job aids or procedures, there is no system to send these changes out to all users of that application, Job Aids are not updated in the on line help. About the only way that we find out about a change is when something doesn't work and a BPA is contacted. It seems to me that the information should flow when the change is made rather than after someone discovers that a process no longer works the same. The 799 phased delivery procedures are totally broken and creates 3 times the amount of work that it should, when this is pointed out to the BPA, she refers you to the job aid, or recites it to you, evidently she thinks it works correctly. However the job aid does not cover all the actions necessary to complete a phased delivery. Several of the Supply Planners under me are severely frustrated with the system and don't see a clear path that will make the situation any

better. Problem tickets are submitted, no response is given to the submitter. Problems don't get fixed in timely manner if and when they are fixed.

64. The transformation from legacy to BSM has and will continue to be a struggle because people are reluctant to change, however the evolution into BSM is needed to keep pace with the world in which we operate.
65. I BELIEVE SAP IS A GREAT ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING TOOL THAT ENABLES DLA TO HAVE REAL TIME INFORMATION. ON THE OTHER HAND I BELIEVE THAT LACK OF A FINALIZED AND TESTED PRODUCT IN COMBINATION WITH A TRAINING TEAM THAT ARE NOT SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO SOME FRUSTRATION ON THE FLOOR.
66. I truly like the system, it was time to change...
67. There are far too many questions that cannot be answered. There is too much control by 'sustainment. How can the so called 'best of the best' folks have spent so much time training and helping to develop this system and be so clueless? In order for BSM to really work the training has to be revamped ASAP. Please help the resolution specialist, their positions are so critical and they need help. Many of their instructors openly admitted to them on various occasions that they didn't fully understand the training modules. The resolution specialist need to be retrained first; and I'm not a resolution specialist.

Please share any additional comments you have regarding KPIs:

1. Having both legacy and BSM KPIs is not working. Customers care about backorders. How do we get those down and fast? All else is irrelevant.
2. KPIs will be of little true value in evaluating individual performance given that our reliance on others performance, which greatly affects the ultimate goal of supplying our Warfighters. A Supply Planner is no better than their Acquisition Specialist. A Technician is restricted by the diligence of the ESA or others when waiting for information. An Acquisition Specialist is dependent on the SP and Technician for info and requirements. And a CAS is only as good as a responsive SP and Post-awards person. The Demand Planner has veritably no effect on any of the others or themselves. So how can an individual be rated in a team sport? DSCR can be rated; my Division can be rated; even a particular Branch/Section can be rated by KPI Metrics. But the only fair way that an individual can be rated is by their Dedication, Diligence, Attitude, Consistent Effort, and Process Performance once an employee is FULLY AND PROPERLY trained.

3. If we were able to control the PRs and know what is old and what isn't we would be a lot better off. The old system had a Julian date and you knew you had about 90 days before you started to get hammered. The new system will leave PRs out in cyber space for 90 days and you start getting hammered before you even see the things. You can't see the ALT without doing a bunch of digging that you don't have time to do because you are too busy trying to find your information, logging into the systems and keeping everything going when the system isn't down. The system continually is down or screwed up and you can't work when that happens. Things are more labor intense and I don't see them improving anytime in the near future -- but the count keeps going on even though you no longer can control any of it. We are so busy cleaning up the system MESSES that who has time to get anything else done. Yes WE ARE MAKING IT WORK AT ALL COST!!!
4. The KPIs might work better if they reflected what management asks us to do on a regular basis, the focus of which changes every two weeks.
5. do not like it
6. KPIs by themselves are not the problem. The interpretation by management of how the KPIs are supposed to evaluate the performance is mired in the past and based on legacy figures taken from a system that was antiquated yet very familiar to the employees across the enterprise who knew how to make it hum. Given time and several quarters worth of BSM historical data, we will get back to the place where the new system is routine and we can point to the new normal data as the basis for performance objective setting. Until then we really need to do a better job of getting system savvy, competent and empathetic supervisors to the forefront of the performance movement to get the employees trained to the degree in the system they must be for us to succeed. The classes were unfortunately worthless, the BPAs limited, and the job aids not entirely effective. Once we get employees up to speed we should see great improvement but it may take years to realize the efficiencies we were accustomed to in Legacy.
7. KPI can have so many outside influences I don't feel they are the best way to evaluate a person's performance. Having been a supervisor for the government, many employees work hard and put out great amounts of work that the KPIs won't address. With KPIs it is almost impossible to have outstanding employees based on their performance.
8. KPI are not measured at the individual level.
9. The QA field is too broad to define three main metrics to measure. There are just too many cross platform metrics that are outside of BSM to make any type of opinion on this issue.
10. It is a joke.

11. Personally, as a Supply Planner who has been doing the job for well over a year, I would like to use the BSM metrics. I would love to be able to proactively work the stock outs/stock lows which I do believe in the long run, would keep us from having so many backorders. I would like to have the actual time to work the delinquent and multiple PR's more so that the contracting specialists wouldn't have have so many PR's to deal with. I would like to work more closely with the contracting administrator's with the delinquent KT's. At this time and this is not a complaint, just the truth, I am the only Supply Planner in my section so I spend a lot of time working on SES sheets for the Top 10 Backordered and Top 10 High Frequency backordered items that I have to brief every month. Of course, I also field a lot of requests for information/charts for War Rooms that may or may not be in the top 20 items I am already looking at. I get more e-mail everyday in BSM than I ever got in Legacy. This month, I have been fairly successful in cramming in the time to process workflows in between the work on the backorders above. I have only been in this desk for a couple of months so I am playing catch up too. I don't believe that Management has much of a choice about pushing backorders however, as this seems to be one of the top metrics that DSCR works to. The customer is 'king' as they should be if they are the ones keeping us afloat. Perhaps DSCR needs to let the customer know that we want to support them but in order for us to do this in a better manner than the past, they have to allow us a bit of grace period to shift focus to proactivity rather than continuously focusing on the 'already spilled milk' so to speak. We need teams or something to that affect to focus on nothing but backorders and let the floor focus on getting their jobs done. If we could get the backorders down, then the floor (Supply Planners) would eventually take this over by having proactively worked the reports they need to work. This is just my opinion for what it is worth.
12. Addtl training needed--not classroom/book
13. Employees and supervisors should be held accountable for meeting their KPI's. But before that happens, an adequate tool for disseminating information as to whether an employee or supervisor is meeting his or her KPI's needs to be developed.
14. It is understandable that any job and its employees' success or failure rate is measured by certain metrics; therefore, I understand the need for KPIs. However, I do not agree that my performance should be solely graded on 'key' duties when any job entails many duties that get overlooked and often taken for granted. What acquisition specialist would feel good knowing that they evaluated ten files in one day trying to make an award, when at the end of the day they got two awards out of ten files and the only thing that mattered to management was the two awards? Not the calls, emails, and/or faxes, tech write-ups, or cost reviews...just the two awards. KPIs don't tell the whole/true story...only the part that looks good on paper...numbers.
15. 1. Smoke and mirrors for a system that has fallen on it's face.

16. KPIs will play an important part in how we are measured, but the KPIs will need to evolve over the next year. There is still a desire to focus on things like number of PRs, yet we have not really addressed what is the correct level for PRs. We can say that Unfilled Orders are everyone's problem, but there is still finger pointing at times vice determining a methodology to accurately support the warfighter.
17. I don't believe we have any choice but to stay with legacy metrics until they get the BSM portions of ATP and DPA functioning properly. The bottom line is that we know we must get accurate forecast and award the right PRs in the right time frames in order to meet the customer's needs in a timely manner.
18. Helping all workers (Procurement/Supply Planner/Product Specialist) to understand the change from (Legacy Metrics)to BSM KPI's and how their individual performance effects the BSM metrics is a small challenge.
19. We spoke about KPI's for maybe 15 minutes in a meeting. I still don't know how I will be rated.
20. Demand Plan Accuracy needs to be fixed ASAP.
21. See above.
22. At my level, all I can worry about are the issues affecting my desk. The KPIs broken out the way they are do not give me the visibility I need to know whether or not I am helping achieve the over-all goals of DSCR.
23. GIVE ME THE RIGHT TOOLS and Management would not have to be concerned if DLA can make the KPI's. The numbers are not always relative to what actually happens. There are ways to inflate the numbers. I have heard it said, figures do not lie, but liars sure can figure so Boss what do you want depicted on your color chart.
24. More clarity needs to be made on what these are, refreshers or something via email or maybe in a procurement seminar....
25. KPI's may measure 15% of my total performance. How would you feel if your boss and your employer only recognized (could see or measure) 15% of what you do?
26. You can have a top notch team, but if the contractor(s) that you deal with are having issues, no matter how hard you work it will be difficult to improve KPIs.
27. Supporting the war fighter is what matters most and until ownership of backorders and aged PRs are taken seriously, the KPIs will not matter.
28. I don't even know what my KPI's are.

29. Wrong to compare the production and management of simple items to complex items. KPI does not consider the complexity or criticality of the item being worked. Light bulbs and packaged fluids are easier to manage than precision bearings, internal jet engine components, and aircraft structural components, yet all are measured with equal value.
30. KPI's can not be the only measure of achievements. There has to be some type of measurements on an individual basis.
31. KPI's can be a good indicator for partially evaluating employees, but I don't think that KPI's are the end result to judge a person's performance. I think that KPI's need to be explained at the employee level and management should review the KPI's and what the metrics are so that employees can try to meet or exceed the expectations and therefore, show in the KPI indicators. KPI's are also just a tool, the personal touch still needs to be involved in what your expectations in your job should be.
32. I don't believe they actually weight against work performance. Only in place to fulfill a requirement set by policy.
33. A lot of my tasks are not recieved through a system. We recieve a lot of tasks through e-mail, phone calls, and by walk up requests. I can spend a whole day completing these tasks and it seams that by pulling a report the tasks I had completed would not show up under a report and I would not be given credit for the work completed that day..
34. Until the system is more operational, throw them out the window. The numbers can't be any more accurate than the system is easy to work...
35. I don't even know what they are. That should have been one of my choices on the survey.
36. I can't remember the last time I heard something about KPI's.
37. Don't know enough right now.
38. Based on the KPI's many KEY areas are not being held fully accountable for their metrics. When will this happen?

APPENDIX D. EXCERPTS FROM DLA'S TRANSFORMATION ROADMAP

1. *Customer Relationship Management (CRM)* will transform DLA into a more customer-centric organization, providing DLA with the requisite processes, procedures, skills and tools to support customers in a more structured and collaborative way. DLA has been making progress in this area for years, but previous efforts have not been integrated and the approach to customer engagement has been fragmented. The CRM program brings a more cohesive, systematic and focused approach to customer interaction across the agency and is expected to enable a more consistent delivery of value to customers. Furthermore, DLA will increase the overall level of support and customer satisfaction by understanding and predicting customer needs. With an improved understanding of customer needs and a better means for sharing and using customer knowledge across the enterprise, DLA intends to be better positioned to work with suppliers to obtain required support, resulting in enhanced readiness for the war-fighter. The four main CRM goals are to: build a customer centric culture; customer retention and market expansion; create brand loyalty; and reduce cost-to-serve. The CRM strategy implements leading business practices for structured service, sales and marketing processes. Structured and standardized service processes are expected to help DLA provide timely and effective issue resolution and allow DLA to deliver on its customer commitments. A single enterprise-wide process will be established for defining, categorizing and managing customer issues from start to finish, resulting in the identification, capture, management and resolution of customer issues. Structured and standardized sales processes will be accomplished through the design and implementation of more effective account management processes and tools that will enable the creation, management and execution of joint enterprise account plans. These account plans will enable a more structured collaborative relationship with customers. DLA will also improve service to customers by designing, implementing and automating consistent enterprise sales processes and methodologies to drive ownership and reporting during the pursuit and execution of business opportunities. It is hoped that this will improve DLA's

ability to identify customer needs and engage the appropriate resources to pursue the right solution in response to those needs. Structured and standardized marketing processes will allow DLA to more effectively reach out to its customers to better understand their needs. Standardized processes will also provide improved means to convey to customers the collective capabilities of DLA, thereby helping DLA attract new customers while retaining existing customers. Through CRM, DLA expects to achieve the following:

- a. Increased knowledge of customer's needs.
- b. Easier customer access to DLA.
- c. More timely and accurate reporting on key customer metrics.
- d. Tailored solutions based on customer unique needs.
- e. Enhanced ability to improve readiness and customer satisfaction at a reduced cost.
- f. Increased ability to support DoD strategies of Focused Logistics.
- g. Increased effectiveness in managing customer expectations and agency investments.
- h. Enhanced collaboration through collecting and sharing information across the enterprise.
- i. Reduced customer complaints.

By implementing CRM, the agency will have a more systematic, focused approach to customer interaction across the enterprise and will be better positioned to meet customer expectations. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pgs 5-6)

2. *Supplier Relationship Management* (SRM) is a strategy to build two-way relationships with key suppliers as a way to evaluate and manage supplier capability and jointly solve problems. It is the overarching business philosophy DLA will incorporate in working with industry to improve support to the war-fighter. This is a critical element in the shift from managing supplies to managing suppliers. This strategy is critical to DLA achieving "the right item, at the right time, at the right price." SRM involves the entire enterprise and provides structure to the supplier facing tools being developed. There are several components to SRM to include: Vendor Managed Inventory, Tailored Vendor Relationships, Spend Analysis, Web-based Transactions, Performance Based Logistics, Prime Vendors, Strategic Material Sourcing, Strategic Supplier Alliances, Supply Chain Alliances and Supplier Collaboration.

Among these components, Tailored Vendor Relationships (TVR) and Supplier Collaboration are two that will provide technological capability to SRM. TVR will standardize the transactional processes for customers that have a direct relationship with the vendors. TVR will capture orders via Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) transactions from the customer. For customers lacking EDI capability, orders can be placed in the traditional manner. Supplier collaboration will provide suppliers with a method to review DLA's supply plans through the use of a commercial web-based tool. Supplier updates will be compared to DLA's supply plans providing DLA with more accurate insight into suppliers' capabilities and suppliers with more insight into DLA's needs. The enhanced relationships made possible through SRM will allow DLA to be more responsive to customer needs. These relationships are characterized by high trust, mutual respect, two-way communication, shared risks and rewards, and the ability to deal with differences constructively. The key is to build understanding with a high level of commitment within the partnership leading to a win-win for all parties involved. Supplier report cards will capture performance metrics for analysis that, in turn, will support DLA's Key Performance Indicators (KPI). The expected long-term benefits of SRM include:

- a. Reduced delivery times.
- b. Inventory savings.
- c. Reduced total ownership costs.
- d. Two-way communications with suppliers.
- e. Leveraged buying power across the enterprise.

In addition to quantitative metrics, SRM looks to implement a qualitative scorecard as a means to measure the more qualitative aspects of any given relationship. This will be a joint tool, as recommended by industry, to perform two-way evaluation in areas such as frequency of communication and level of flexibility. SRM is a pivotal change in DLA's business model. As such, it involves developing new skill sets, identifying improvement opportunities, managing supplier partnerships, and most critically, acting as the primary face to suppliers to ensure war-fighting readiness, as well as meet peacetime requirements. This is a paradigm shift from DLA's traditional transaction-based relationships. With emphasis placed on Workforce Transformation,

and commercial and government training programs, DLA plans to continue investment in its workforce capabilities to meet this challenge. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pgs 7-8)

3. *Business Systems Modernization* (BSM) is the most significant information technology and re-engineering effort in the Defense Logistics Agency today. It is DLA's program to replace the agency's 1960 vintage materiel management systems with commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software. BSM is an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Supply Chain Management system that will replace the agency's legacy systems in order to link the entire supply chain from customer to supplier. This major re-engineering effort crosses all agency supply chains to provide improved end-to-end materiel, financial and procurement management. BSM brings a commercially available business software solution that provides consistent and timely information for decision-making and performance measurement; automates and integrates business processes; produces and accesses data in a near real time environment; and shares common data across the enterprise. BSM is expected to move DLA from a manager of supplies to the much more desirable manager of supply chains. In order to implement the reengineered business process and maximize the benefits of BSM, DLA is creating a new organizational structure and a new job model which emphasizes distinct customer and supplier support by establishing customer facing and supplier facing organizations. Employees are trained for new jobs and placed in the new BSM organization with specific focus on either the customer or the suppliers. This represents an enormous cultural shift resulting in the need for a robust change management program to prepare employees and assess organizational change readiness at various stages of BSM implementation. BSM business functionality consists of five basic core processes that represent the key functions in supply chain management: Planning (both demand and supply); Procurement; Order Fulfillment; Financial Management; and Technical/Quality Management. Within these five core processes, BSM is expected to bring improved and/or new capabilities to the DLA employee to interact, support and meet the war-fighter's requirements. Critical functional improvements in capability include:

- a. Identifying future military service needs through collaboration and improved demand accuracy.
- b. Ensuring inventory is available when and where it is needed with optimized inventory levels and reduced response times.
- c. Paying vendors based on receipt through a single contract writing application with visibility of long-term contracts across the enterprise.
- d. Delivering quick-order turnaround and improved tracking and tracing of customer orders.
- e. Complying with Chief Financial Officer's standards and practices.
- f. Streamlining item introduction into the supply chain.
- g. Standardizing business process improvements across the enterprise.

Through these re-engineered processes and improved capabilities, DLA expects to reduce inventory, reduce cycle times, improve customer service and operate on uniform policies, procedures and metrics. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pg 9)

4. *Distribution Planning and Management Systems (DPMS)* uses a combination of COTS and government-off-the-shelf (GOTS) software for improved stock coordination, visibility and positioning. The result is a better management of product movement from vendors to DLA and customers and from distribution centers to customers. DPMS is expected to provide DLA with the means to collect and access continuous real-time information on the location, movement and status of equipment and supplies, and includes the ability to act on that information. DPMS supports DLA's commitments to fuse logistics and transportation information, improving Customer Wait Time (CWT) and Time Definite Delivery (TDD), providing rapid crises response through improved visibility, tracking and shifting of assets while in route, and delivering tailored wartime and peacetime logistics. This capability includes movement within the Continental United States (CONUS) and outside the Continental United States (OCONUS), including materiel being returned to stock or for demilitarization/disposal. This is expected to enable DLA to realize its goal of providing global end-to-end distribution management. DPMS is expected to provide the following capabilities:

- a. Optimize shipments using greater consolidation through cross-docking, multiple pick-ups and drop-offs.

- b. Better tracking and traceability of shipments.
- c. Produce advance shipping notices to customers, Consolidation Containerization Points (CCPs), Distribution Centers, and Ports of Embarkation (POE).
- d. Produce standard documentation such as linear and 2D bar-coded military shipping labels, bills of lading, and export shipping documentation that will expedite movement to customers.
- e. Real-time access for all military shipping addresses.

DLA's anticipated benefits from implementation of DPMS include:

- a. Material shipped to the right place at the right time.
- b. Reduction of frustrated freight.
- c. More efficient use of Dedicated Truck.
- d. Improved Customer Wait Time/Logistics Response Time.
- e. In-transit visibility of shipments.
- f. Real-time addressing.
- g. Reduction in transportation costs.
- h. Automated proof of shipments.
- i. Reduction of reorders due to "missing" shipments.

To meet the war-fighter's demands for timely service at a guaranteed low cost, DPMS has engaged electronic commerce strategies to automate consolidation, tracking, performance monitoring and freight payment processes. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pgs 11-12)

5. *Integrated Data Environment* (IDE) will replace the Department's Joint Total Asset Visibility capability and ensure the seamless sharing of data throughout DLA and between DLA and its customers, regardless of the information technologies or architecture the customers employ. The IDE will provide suppliers and consumers assured access to: supply chain management data; centrally managed metadata; authoritative sources of data; and centralized DoD logistics business rules. Specifically, the IDE program objectives support DLA's legacy, contemporary and emerging systems and business applications by providing the following:

- a. Facilitated information exchanged between DLA and trading partners (military services, defense agencies, federal agencies, allies and commercial trading partners) systems and databases which support business processes regardless of location, context or format in near real-time.
- b. Controlled access and retrieval of authoritative data, regardless of origin, supporting decision-making activities to optimize logistics processes.
- c. Data interoperability supported by logical development, logistics business rules, authoritative metadata and common data standards.

(The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pgs 12-13)

6. *Business Systems Modernization Energy* (BSM E) will replace the former system known as Fuels Automated System. BSM E is an information management system that supports DLA's current and expanding mission with timely and accurate information for decision-making in planning and executing energy management. Similar to BSM, BSM E uses COTS software to support the business functions of acquisition and contract management, supply management, facilities management, financial management and decision support for all offices. BSM E was developed in response to OUSD (AT&L) 1992 direction that DLA not only manage the wholesale fuel supplies, but also assume management of the retail level stocks for posts, camps and stations. The information systems available at the time did not have the hardware and software performance capacity required to accomplish this change. Another factor in the development of BSM E was the need to establish an integrated supply chain management system for fuels that could replace the fragmented processes and systems that were currently in place. With DLA fuel customer accounts increasing from 4,000 to 14,500 customers during the period FY00 to FY04, the move to BSM E was essential. BSM E expected benefits include:

- a. Increased fuel accountability for fuel transactions at all Defense Fuel Supply Points and retail point of sale data collection sites.
- b. Decreased data processing time through the use of modern automation techniques compatible with EDI standards.
- c. Integration of new fuel technology systems such as automatic tank gauges, automatic leak detection, and reporting systems into BSM E.

- d. A mechanism for specialized customer support through customized terminal interfaces which allow user-generated database queries on accounts.
- e. Use of telecommunications assets that promote real-time or near real-time data processing.
- f. Integration of COTS financial module.
- g. Development of an energy information management systems migration process for technical modernization of platforms and implementation of best business practices. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pgs 10-11)

7. *National Inventory Management Strategy* (NIMS) is DLA's initiative to extend consumable item supply chain responsibility from the wholesale level to the point of consumption. Through NIMS, DLA will transform itself from a manager of supplies to a manager of complete supply chains. Instead of merely a wholesale view, DLA will take supply management from factory to the end-user. The goal of NIMS is to merge wholesale and retail inventories into a national inventory that can be managed in an integrated fashion. By providing tailored inventory solutions for individual service logistic requirements, services can reduce excess inventory. A reduction in inventory levels will lower DoD inventory and holding costs without degradation to customer service and support. NIMS leverages the capabilities exhibited by both BSM and CRM. Without the appropriate systems upgrades and key communications with customers, NIMS would not be possible. Expected benefits of NIMS include:

- a. Greater control and visibility of the entire supply chain. This will help to improve forecasting, reduce backorders, and enhance investment decisions.
- b. Greater partnership with customers, resulting in improved customer support.
- c. Greater partnership with suppliers, to leverage commercial capabilities where they provide best value.
- d. Lower overall DoD inventory costs.
- e. Elimination of redundant inventories at retail/wholesale levels, allowing the services to reallocate investments to other purposes.
- f. Improved asset visibility by having a single inventory manager.

- g. Reduced wait times through increased stock issue effectiveness.

(The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pg 14)

8. *Global Stock Positioning* (GSP) is a strategy consisting of a portfolio of capabilities designed to ensure the right inventory is at the right locations at the right time for the least cost. The underlying goal of GSP is to achieve an efficient system structure that is responsive to the customer and allows DoD to significantly reduce levels of inventory and costs of operations while still maintaining war-fighter readiness. Stock positioning policies balance the tradeoffs between customer responsiveness, stock consolidation, and distribution and transportation costs. There are three basic premises upon which DLA's stock positioning policies are based:

- a. Materiel will be stocked only in the minimum number of distribution centers as deemed necessary.
- b. Materiel with well-defined or predictable demand patterns will be co-located with the customer.
- c. Materiel with special handling requirements and/or variable demand patterns will be centrally stocked.

By implementing GSP, DLA is attempting to ensure that the right inventory is at the right locations to meet war-fighter requirements. The expected results include reduced costs, reduced customer wait times, improved war-fighter readiness and a reduced logistics footprint. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pg 15)

9. *Executive Agent* (EA). The Director of DLA has been designated by the Deputy Secretary of Defense as the DoD Executive Agent for Subsistence, Bulk Fuels, Construction and Barrier Materiel, and Medical Materiel. As DoD EA, the Director of DLA is the focal point for providing continuous, sustainable and global end-to-end supply chain support as required by end-users. The DoD EA ensures effective support throughout operations by developing coordinated processes and support plans for transition from peacetime to wartime and/or contingency operations. EA builds upon and accelerates specific, ongoing military service, Combatant Commander (COCOM) and agency initiatives to meet the requirements of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR)

and the National Defense Strategy (NDS). Most importantly, EA helps provide improved, uninterrupted, efficient and effective support to the war-fighter. Some expected and derived benefits of assigning EA responsibility include:

- a. Improved support to the war-fighter and increased operational effectiveness.
- b. A standard definition of EA.
- c. A focal point to orchestrate the EA supply chains.
- d. Clarification of key roles and responsibilities.
- e. Up-front planning, full collaboration and coordination.
- f. Joint materiel management and requirements determination.
- g. Appropriate allocation of resources to complete the job.
- h. End-to-end supply chain performance measurement and reporting.
- i. Increased interoperability and materiel standardization.
- j. Optimal integration of commercial capabilities into military processes.

(The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pgs 16-17)

10. *Product Data Management Initiative* (PDMI) is DLA's strategy for transforming the agency's technical and quality business process and associated capabilities. The technical and quality business process is one of the five core business processes comprising DLA's overall BSM strategy. DLA's technical business processes are focused on identifying the "right item" to ensure customers get the correct part for their specific requirement in a timely, cost effective and reliable manner. The success and effectiveness of the technical business process in DLA and the ability to get the "right item" for its customers, is largely dependent upon the quality, accuracy, and completeness of the technical or product data concerning an item. Product data includes the written description, technical specifications and manuals, operating procedures, manuals, maintenance and support information, and the actual engineering drawings that are essential to designing, buying, using and maintaining items of supply to include weapon systems parts. DLA previously managed this data with limited automation, but primarily through manual processes and procedures which resulted in frequent interrupts and discontinuities. Automating and re-engineering these processes is expected to

provide a significant contribution to DLA's ongoing business transformation efforts. The PDMI program is focused on ensuring engineering correctness in the products which DLA buys and manages as well as ensuring the highest quality for these products. PDMI, when complete, is expected to deliver an enterprise-wide product data/product life cycle management and collaboration system. PDMI will deploy COTS software and reengineered business processes adapted from commercial best practices that provide:

- a. A single virtual workspace for all technical users.
- b. A standardized, enterprise-wide business process supporting all product and product data specialists and related staff.
- c. A fully automated, modernized, and reengineered set of technical business processes that will significantly contribute to and improve DLA's overall cross-function and cross-process responsiveness to its customers.
- d. Automated management of technical and product data used in support of DLA managed items.
- e. Technical business processes, including links to technical specifications, drawings, manuals and transaction data.
- f. Complete visibility into all product and technical data associated with DLA items, including the ability to provide this visibility to DLA's customers in coordination with the CRM initiative.
- g. A reliable ability to exchange documents and forms with service design activities.
- h. A reliable, robust and seamless interface with BSM's SAP application, which will enable true cross-process functional flows.
- i. A reliable, robust and wholly automated document management function to support both PDMI and the BSM suite of applications, including bidset and bill of materiel (BOM) support.
- j. A replacement for Joint Engineering Data Management Information and Control System (JEDMICS) based on contemporary technologies.
- k. A COTS and standards based application that will provide cost-effective sustainment and enhancement capabilities.

When integrated with the BSM suite of applications, Federal Logistics Information System (FLIS) and design activity applications, PDMI is expected to provide the technical user a transformed, seamless, real-time flow of data and information that will enable significant improvements in process and data visibility, process responsiveness, accuracy, and quality of results. These improvements will enhance

DLA's overall ability to respond to its customers and meet specific demands in a more timely and cost effective manner. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pgs 18-20)

11. *Workforce Transformation* (WT) is a portfolio of strategic initiatives addressing critical human resource issues facing DLA. The initiatives are designed to make DLA a more customer-focused, world-class, employer of choice. This initiative is important to ensure the DLA workforce is enabled and empowered to deliver logistics excellence. Specific initiatives include:

- a. **Competency Assessment and Management Tool (CAMT):** The goal of CAMT is to ensure DLA has the right knowledge and skills to accomplish its mission. This tool identifies the required competencies in a particular job series, assesses employee and supervisor skills, and provides a competencies gap analysis for employees and supervisors.
- b. **Enterprise Leader Development Program (ELDP):** ELDP is a comprehensive program for the entire agency in developing and improving leadership skills in employees at all levels. It also promotes competencies in DLA's potential leaders, those who have yet to be placed in leadership roles or supervisory positions, but who will be the leaders of "tomorrow." The foundation of the ELDP is the Leader Development guides. Each guide focuses on different leadership roles and includes a variety of feedback and relationship-based, experience-based and education-based activities to improve leadership. They provide tools and ideas to help employees create a development plan that is customized.
- c. **Climate Survey:** The DLA climate survey assesses overall employee morale and job satisfaction. It also evaluates several metrics related to the DLA Strategic Plan and Balanced Scorecard in order to provide feedback to leaders and managers to help improve the climate of their business areas. The intent is to improve the climate in DLA to assist in the transformation to a world-class organization.
- d. **Culture survey:** The culture survey is based on the Denison Culture Model. This model identifies the desired culture, compares DLA's results to other high-performing organizations, and then provides suggestions for improvements in areas that are scored low. The model identifies four organizational culture traits that have a significant impact on performance. A group of "Culture Champions" within DLA will work to improve common culture issues in the agency.
- e. **Multi-Source Feedback (MSF):** MSF is a process of providing anonymous, questionnaire-based feedback to each DLA supervisor on leadership behavior from his or her peers, employees and supervisor. This

tool is linked to the Denison Culture Model and is often referred to as 360 degree feedback. The intent of MSF is to improve leadership performance for supervisors by identifying specific areas where they need improvement.

- f. New Performance Appraisals: The new performance management system for DLA supervisors/managers is expected to enhance individual and organizational performance by setting clear expectations, providing managerial support, fostering open communications, and linking individual performance with organizational objectives.

The comprehensive array of initiatives generated by the human resources strategies are expected to benefit the entire DLA workforce and ensure that the mission and functions of DLA are accomplished. As a result, the ultimate (indirect) beneficiaries of the program are the nation's Armed Forces. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pgs 19-20)

12. *Reutilization Modernization Program (RMP)* is DLA's strategy to replace the current Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service Information Technology (DRMS IT) systems with a solution based on the best business practices and COTS software products. RMP is expected to fully integrate all IT for DRMS into the overall IT solution set for DLA. RMP will leverage the efforts currently underway with the agency such as BSM to incorporate DRMS information needs into the DLA end-state architecture. Specific goals of RMP include:

- a. Integrating with DoD supply chain systems, contributing to DoD's overall ability to provide asset visibility, and identifying and managing items that pose potential security risk.
- b. Enabling DRMS to become financially compliant.
- c. Supporting the enterprise architecture through the use of the Portfolio Management Process.
- d. Increasing data visibility within the DLA/DoD environment and increase reutilization of excess property.
- e. Enabling DRMS to continue business transformation to a customer-focused corporate culture.
- f. Collaborating with suppliers to obtain advanced property information for disposal decisions and to ensure appropriate reutilization of excess property in lieu of new buys.

- g. Providing proactive disposal planning services to include integration of disposal planning and reutilization of assets as part of a holistic logistics system.
- h. Linking DLA and DRMS Balanced Scorecard goals.
- i. Aligning with the Business Systems Modernization concept and DLA IT solutions.
- j. Providing robust analytical capabilities.

When deployed, RMP is expected to integrate DRMS business processes and information needs into the overall DLA IT solution to achieve an enterprise-wide business system. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pg 21)

13. *Base Realignment and Closure* (BRAC) initiatives are expected to provide DLA with additional resources by eliminating unnecessary infrastructure. These additional resources can be directly converted to DoD war-fighting resources. BRAC 2005 and future BRAC years, if applicable, will provide DLA with an opportunity to reshape infrastructure and optimize DLA's ability to support the war-fighter. (The Defense Logistics Agency, *Transformation Roadmap: Transformation in Support of the Future Force*, Fiscal Year 2006, pg 22)

APPENDIX E. FACTOR AND RELIABILITY ANALYSIS RESULTS

A. RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.830	48.586	48.586	5.830	48.586	48.586
2	1.742	14.518	63.104	1.742	14.518	63.104
3	1.046	8.717	71.820	1.046	8.717	71.820
4	0.696	5.800	77.620			
5	0.603	5.021	82.641			
6	0.518	4.321	86.961			
7	0.407	3.388	90.349			
8	0.305	2.545	92.894			
9	0.287	2.392	95.286			
10	0.262	2.184	97.470			
11	0.212	1.765	99.235			
12	0.092	0.765	100.000			

Component Matrix

	Component		
	1	2	3
3	0.646	0.509	0.267
4	0.648	0.492	0.324
5	0.649	0.552	0.223
9	0.679	0.290	-0.299
10	0.722	0.088	-0.420
11	0.716	0.156	-0.031
12	0.693	-0.552	0.281
13	0.705	-0.543	0.264
14	0.614	-0.277	0.149
15	0.765	-0.304	0.196
77	0.749	-0.220	-0.369
78	0.760	-0.060	-0.456

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.898	12

Table 5. Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Resource Allocation

B. TRAINING

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.318	48.787	48.787	7.318	48.787	48.787
2	1.331	8.877	57.663	1.331	8.877	57.663
3	1.097	7.315	64.978	1.097	7.315	64.978
4	0.960	6.400	71.378			
5	0.803	5.355	76.734			
6	0.703	4.689	81.422			
7	0.586	3.904	85.326			
8	0.508	3.390	88.716			
9	0.445	2.965	91.681			
10	0.320	2.135	93.816			
11	0.296	1.976	95.792			
12	0.236	1.571	97.363			
13	0.190	1.268	98.632			
14	0.130	0.864	99.495			
15	0.076	0.505	100.000			

Component Matrix

	Component		
	1	2	3
6	0.659	0.003	0.431
7	0.732	0.000	0.153
22	0.783	-0.370	-0.291
23	0.744	-0.387	-0.343
24	0.743	-0.281	-0.372
26	0.572	-0.448	0.303
69	0.757	0.375	-0.208
70	0.801	0.387	-0.188
71	0.531	0.307	0.401
72	0.685	-0.277	0.382
73	0.770	-0.200	0.167
74	0.787	0.204	-0.066
76	0.677	0.156	0.039
79	0.587	0.291	-0.184
81	0.567	0.336	0.050

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.923	15

Table 6. Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Training

C. COMMUNICATION

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5.322	59.134	59.134	5.322	59.134	59.134
2	0.800	8.890	68.024			
3	0.651	7.233	75.257			
4	0.625	6.942	82.198			
5	0.493	5.475	87.673			
6	0.353	3.923	91.596			
7	0.334	3.706	95.303			
8	0.249	2.772	98.074			
9	0.173	1.926	100.000			

Component Matrix

	Component
	1
82	0.864
83	0.676
84	0.820
85	0.780
86	0.829
87	0.895
88	0.726
90	0.715
39	0.558

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.910	9

Table 7. Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Communication

D. LEADERSHIP

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.603	65.082	65.082	2.603	65.082	65.082
2	0.690	17.250	82.333			
3	0.451	11.283	93.616			
4	0.255	6.384	100.000			

Component Matrix

	Component
	1
40	0.693
44	0.817
45	0.877
49	0.829

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.812	4

Table 8. Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Leadership and Vision

E. MEASUREMENT

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.117	70.582	70.582	2.117	70.582	70.582
2	0.559	18.650	89.232			
3	0.323	10.768	100.000			

Component Matrix

	Component
	1
27	0.775
62	0.864
63	0.878

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.781	3

Table 9. Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Measurement

F. GOAL CONGRUENCE

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.564	57.044	57.044	4.564	57.044	57.044
2	0.892	11.144	68.188			
3	0.820	10.247	78.435			
4	0.520	6.502	84.937			
5	0.497	6.214	91.151			
6	0.381	4.768	95.919			
7	0.206	2.579	98.498			
8	0.120	1.502	100.000			

Component Matrix

	Component
	1
35	0.869
36	0.902
37	0.873
38	0.791
41	0.644
42	0.599
46	0.653
50	0.640

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.890	8

Table 10. Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Goal Congruence

G. SENSE OF URGENCY

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.756	47.565	47.565	4.756	47.565	47.565
2	1.231	12.309	59.874	1.231	12.309	59.874
3	0.981	9.814	69.688			
4	0.654	6.545	76.233			
5	0.607	6.067	82.300			
6	0.539	5.391	87.691			
7	0.448	4.478	92.168			
8	0.353	3.525	95.694			
9	0.276	2.762	98.456			
10	0.154	1.544	100.000			

Component Matrix

	Component	
	1	2
89	0.695	0.191
91	0.806	-0.152
92	0.719	0.143
93	0.623	-0.341
95	0.775	-0.378
96	0.691	-0.036
97	0.555	0.601
98	0.741	0.242
99	0.633	0.397
100a	0.619	-0.560

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.874	10

Table 11. Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Sense of Urgency

H. KPI DESIRED OUTCOME

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.113	41.135	41.135	4.113	41.135	41.135
2	1.686	16.858	57.993	1.686	16.858	57.993
3	0.928	9.284	67.276			
4	0.773	7.729	75.005			
5	0.685	6.851	81.856			
6	0.568	5.676	87.532			
7	0.447	4.466	91.998			
8	0.338	3.384	95.382			
9	0.236	2.364	97.746			
10	0.225	2.254	100.000			

Component Matrix

	Component	
	1	2
25	0.572	0.399
43	0.599	-0.417
51	0.824	-0.048
52	0.536	-0.597
53	0.680	0.037
54	0.685	-0.558
55	0.538	0.546
56	0.581	0.545
57	0.579	0.289
61	0.752	-0.053

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.836	10

Table 12. Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for KPIs

I. ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESIRED OUTCOME

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	3.205	64.093	64.093	3.205	64.093	64.093
2	0.698	13.952	78.045			
3	0.617	12.349	90.393			
4	0.363	7.259	97.653			
5	0.117	2.347	100.000			

Component Matrix

	Component
	1
64	0.917
65	0.853
66a	0.669
67	0.860
68	0.670

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.834	5

Table 13. Factor and Reliability Analysis Results for Organizational Climate

APPENDIX F. REGRESSION ANALYSIS RESULTS

KPI Desired Outcome Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					Sig. F Change	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2
KPI Outcome	0.837	0.700	0.684	0.43582	0.700	44.667	7	134	0.000

ANOVA for KPI Desired Outcome Model

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
KPI Outcome	Regression	59.389	7	8.484	44.667	.000
	Residual	25.452	134	0.190		
	Total	84.841	141			

Coefficients for KPI Desired Outcome Model

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF	B	Std. Error
		KPI Outcome	(Constant)	0.19			0.202		0.94	0.349	-0.21	0.589	
	Resource Allocation	-0.073	0.07	-0.086	-1.054	0.294	-0.211	0.064	0.486	-0.091	-0.05	0.339	2.954
	Knowledge & Training	-0.112	0.072	-0.131	-1.564	0.12	-0.254	0.03	0.441	-0.134	-0.074	0.317	3.153
	Comm & Feedback	0.056	0.057	0.075	0.98	0.329	-0.057	0.169	0.653	0.084	0.046	0.386	2.587
	Leadership	0.151	0.049	0.169	3.056	0.003	0.053	0.248	0.326	0.255	0.145	0.734	1.362
	Metrics & Measurement	0.063	0.057	0.075	1.107	0.27	-0.05	0.177	0.532	0.095	0.052	0.486	2.058
	Goal Congruence	0.251	0.078	0.302	3.206	0.002	0.096	0.405	0.749	0.267	0.152	0.252	3.962
	Urgency & Momentum	0.498	0.075	0.547	6.633	0	0.349	0.646	0.785	0.497	0.314	0.329	3.04

Table 14. KPI Model OLS Regression Analysis Results

Org Climate Desired Outcome Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					Sig. F Change	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2
Org Climate	0.801	0.642	0.623	0.65139	0.642	34.076	7	133	0.000

ANOVA for Org Climate Desired Outcome Model

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Org Climate	Regression	101.210	7	14.459	34.076	0.000
	Residual	56.432	133	0.424		
	Total	157.642	140			

Coefficients for Org Climate Desired Outcome Model

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF	B	Std. Error
	Resource Allocation	0.276	0.104	0.236	2.648	0.009	0.070	0.482	0.629	0.224	0.137	0.339	2.954
	Knowledge & Training	-0.032	0.108	-0.028	-0.300	0.765	-0.245	0.180	0.493	-0.026	-0.016	0.317	3.153
	Comm & Feedback	0.392	0.086	0.381	4.568	0.000	0.222	0.561	0.707	0.368	0.237	0.386	2.587
	Leadership	-0.157	0.074	-0.128	-2.120	0.036	-0.303	-0.010	0.168	-0.181	-0.110	0.734	1.362
	Metrics & Measurement	-0.184	0.086	-0.160	-2.144	0.034	-0.354	-0.014	0.414	-0.183	-0.111	0.486	2.058
	Goal Congruence	0.502	0.117	0.442	4.277	0.000	0.270	0.734	0.719	0.348	0.222	0.252	3.962
	Urgency & Momentum	0.015	0.113	0.012	0.135	0.893	-0.207	0.238	0.648	0.012	0.007	0.329	3.040

Table 15. Organizational Climate Model OLS Regression Analysis Results

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Beckhard, R., & Harris, R. T. (1987). *Organizational transitions: Managing complex change* (2nd ed.). Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Bossidy, L., Charan, R., & Burck, C. (2002). *Execution: The discipline of getting things done* (1st ed.). New York: Crown Business.
- Boyett, J. H., & Boyett, J. T. (1998). *The guru guide: The best ideas of the top management thinkers*. New York: Wiley.
- Cameron, E., & Green, M. (2004). *Making sense of change management: A complete guide to the models, tools & techniques of organizational change*. London; Sterling, VA: Kogan Page.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Defense Logistics Agency. (2006). *DLA at a glance*. Retrieved November 26, 2006, from <http://www.dla.mil/DLA%20Brochure.pdf>.
- Defense Logistics Agency. (2006). *Transformation roadmap: Transformation in support of the future force, fiscal year 2006*. Retrieved December 1, 2006, from <http://www.dla.mil/library/DLATRANSROADMAP.pdf>.
- Harvard business review on change* (1998). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Ingram, J. A., & Monks, J. G. (1992). *Statistics for business and economics* (2nd Edition ed.). Orlando: Harcour Brace Jovanovich Inc.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2001). *The strategy-focused organization: How balanced scorecard companies thrive in the new business environment*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.
- Keen, Peter G. W. (1981). Information systems and organizational change. *Communications of the ACM*, 24, 24-33.
- Kent, R. A. (2001). *Data construction and data analysis for survey research*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.
- Montor, K. (1987). *Naval leadership: Voices of experience*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.

- Nadler, D., & Nadler, M. B. (1998). *Champions of change: How CEOs and their companies are mastering the skills of radical change* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Osterland, A. (2000). *Blaming ERP*. Retrieved September 22, 2006, from www.cfo.com.
- Patten, M. L. (2001). *Questionnaire research: A practical guide* (2d ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.
- SPSS. (2006). *How to get more value from your survey data*. Retrieved November 25, 2006, from www.spss.com.
- Thomas, A. (2004). *Research skills for management studies* (1st ed.). London; New York: Routledge.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. RDML Mark Heinrich
Director of Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR)
Richmond, Virginia
4. CAPT Sylvester Abramowicz
Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR)
Richmond, Virginia
5. CDR Clifford Noe
Defense Supply Center Richmond (DSCR)
Richmond, Virginia