Establishing a Model for Organizational Change in the Moorhead Fire Department

INTRODUCTION

Changing the way that organizations conduct business is the subject of many texts and an area of contention among experts. Organizational change is the process of realigning organizational systems and processes, or more simply put, changing the way that organizations conduct business. The human workforce is a key factor in achieving successful change. Organizational change may be derailed without the commitment of the human workforce to achieve the end goals. This report will address contemporary theories surrounding organizational change as they apply to the fire service with the end goal of developing a model for organizational change for the Moorhead Fire Department.

The Moorhead Fire Department has been instituting organizational change efforts for many years with mixed results. Failed change efforts have resulted in lost productivity, staff frustration and a failure to reach stated objectives. While many experts propose various models for change, the Moorhead Fire Department needs a hybrid change model to successfully institute organizational change.

This report will review the findings of various change experts and fire service leaders as outlined in two books, two trade publication articles and one government report. Through an analysis of a recently conducted survey, the needs of the members of
the Moorhead Fire Department (MFD) will then be taken into consideration before finally suggesting a solution to the problem.

METHODS

This research began with a study of *Leadership on the Line* by Ronald A. Heifetz and Marty Linsky. It was while working on another project out of this text that the idea of exploring a change model for the MFD was conceived.

After exploring the work of Heifetz and Linsky it was decided that additional literature review was warranted. Three internet searches were conducted to find additional material. Two of these were Google searches under the keywords “organizational change” and “fire service change model.” An additional search was conducted through the online card catalog of the Learning Research Center at the National Fire Academy.

After establishing a basis for implementing change, it was decided to explore the unique issues and needs of the MFD. A seven point anonymous questionnaire was developed and distributed to all employees on-duty over a two day period. The full results of the survey are found in Appendix A.

The survey results were analyzed to determine trends and indicators. These were compared and contrasted with recommendations for change models to assist in synthesizing a unique change model for the MFD.

RESULTS

Michael R. Waite discussed components of change in chapter two of his book *Fire Service Leadership: Theories and Practices*. He noted common barriers to change
in the fire service. Among them were tradition and the frequency with which leaders move from one organization to the next (Waite, 2008, p. 23). It could be difficult to maintain a consistent corporate direction and implement the changes required to move in that direction when leaders change, bringing unique and differing visions with them. Impatience on the part of leaders was also seen as a barrier. According to Waite, “It takes time to nurture and cultivate attitudes within organizations. Impatient leaders will not allow the process to come to fruition because they tend to give up too quickly and move on to something else” (2008, p. 23).

Waite also proposed methods of producing successful change. He felt that a firm foundation for change must be laid by establishing a clear vision, communicating the vision to the rest of the organization so it becomes a “shared vision”, which will then develop a common purpose (2008, p. 24-25). He continued by stating that change demands action-oriented leaders who will take charge and will commit the amount of time necessary for change to occur (Waite, 2008 p.24). Change requires persistence on the part of the leader, effective communications, a positive organizational climate and follow-up one to two years after the change initiative (Waite, 2008, p. 26-27).

Heifetz and Linsky also discussed pitfalls involving organizational change in their book, Leadership on the Line. They felt that the single most common failure in change was treating adaptive change efforts like technical problems (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 14). Leaders could easily apply step-by-step technical processes for change, ignoring the fact that attitudes, values and beliefs of the organization must change as well in the process. This was often accompanied by a sense of loss that must be managed or it will be resisted (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 93).
Heifetz and Linsky suggested several strategies to achieve change, including:

- creating enough stress to motivate change action (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 108),
- breaking the change down into smaller segments that can be more easily accomplished (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 119), and
- presenting a vision of the future after the change (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 122).

The people affected by the change must do the work to create ownership (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 128). Communications must be crystal clear (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 136-138) and issues must be dealt with only when people are ready (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 148). They also suggested that during the change process leaders must actively manage efforts to undermine the change (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002, p. 154-156).

The fire service is not immune to the pitfalls of organizational change efforts. In June of 2007 Ireland’s Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government (DEHLG) issued a report on the progress of their “Fire Services Change Programme.” This national initiative addressed four key areas where organizational change in the fire service would bring about positive results.

In the report they discussed key elements to making the changes successfully. The first element in their process involved a review of fire safety services in Ireland (DEHLG, 2007, p. 4). They acknowledged that problems must first be discovered, categorized and prioritized based upon impact. The next element in their process was to formally launch a change initiative (DEHLG, 2007, p. 4). Here issues to be addressed were finalized and publically presented. Then, a project structure was developed (DEHLG, 2007, p. 5). This involved identifying key stakeholders, appointing managers, steering groups and a project team to create the change plan. The last key element was
the development of a communications strategy (DEHLG, 2007, p. 5-6). This area was particularly important given the large number of people and organizations involved in a National change effort. Effective communications needed to occur during all stages of the change process. In fact, “The Project Team dedicated a considerable amount of time to implementing the Communications Strategy” (DEHLG, 2007, p. 6).

They also outlined a four step “Change Cycle” that the Fire Services Change Programme would utilize during the process (see Figure 1). It consisted of:

1. Setting objectives
2. Developing a process
3. Implementation

Les Karpluk discussed three theories surrounding change in an article published by “Firefighting in Canada Magazine,” on their web site. He began by identifying three pitfalls to change in the fire service. Karpluk observed that, “…many departments have progressed through a change process without clearly identifying the who, what, how and why, of the change process” (n.d.). A lack of proper planning would certainly present problems. In his second point he stated, “Change for the sake of change will only
frustrate and demoralize staff, which then creates barriers to effective change management for the future” (Karpluk, n.d.). It is normal for people to expect a good reason to change. Karpluk continued, “Fire Chiefs should not expect staff to initiate change in the department, rather, they should expect staff to report for duty and do their best during the change process” (n.d.). Many leaders expect all staff to be operating at their level of awareness within the organization. It should be remembered that the workers should be focusing on the work while the leaders steer the ship. This is natural.

Karpluk then outlined a three stage change model proposed by Kurt Lewin in 1950, Unfreeze, Change, Refreeze (n.d.). During the Unfreeze stage, the organizational values are identified and a new vision for the organization is created. Based on these factors, the Change stage would begin. Here the needed change is identified; plans would be developed and then communicated. Finally, during Refreeze, the new policies and processes would be established, and a reinforcement system of rewards and discipline would be instituted.

Karpluk suggested that Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) is important to organizations (n.d.). POS is the concept that people looking for healthy and creative things in the organization will find them, while people who think the organization is dysfunctional will find examples to prove them right as well. In essence, you find what you expect to find, based upon your current attitude. Develop positive attitudes in the workers, and they will envision and develop a positive organization.

Karpluk then built upon this to introduce a POS change model proposed by two writers for the Michigan Ross School of Business. This process involved five phases: Inquire, Best Practices, Envisioning the Future, Plan, and Commitment (Karpluk, n.d.).
During the Inquire phase a vital need for change is identified and personnel are engaged in information gathering. Next, Best Practices are identified both from within and outside of the organization. After analyzing the Best Practices, the organization would begin Envisioning the Future to create a shared vision or outcome. The Plan would then be developed, implemented, monitored, evaluated and regularly revised. All of this will bring about Commitment through active participation across the organization throughout the process.

Karpluke then wrapped up by stating, “Fire departments do not change because new systems or processes have been put into place. Change occurs because personnel have a say in the change process, understand the envisioned future and are allowed transition time (n.d.).”

Michael McCarty wrote an article on successfully leading organizational change that was found on the Ezine articles web site. In it he reviewed the eight steps for leading organizational change identified by John Kotter. (McCarty, n.d) The first was, create a sense of urgency. He felt that the organization needed to know its position in the marketplace and the consequences of being there. This would provide enough motivation for change to begin. The second step was to put together a guiding team. This was a group of leaders with power who can set the behavioral example during the process. The third step was to create visions and strategies. This resulted in, “building a “road map” and ‘trip plan” to others in the organization” (McCarty, n.d). The fourth step was communicating to achieve buy-in. Step five was empowering others to act. This would be the time to remove obstacles that would undermine the change and rewarding prudent risk taking to achieve change. Step six was to produce short-term wins. Breaking the
change down into small chunks that are achievable and rewarding early achievements would set the stage for future performance. Step seven was to build momentum. This relied on leveraging the short-term wins into continued adoption of new behaviors. The eighth step was to nurture the new culture by rewarding alignment with the organization after it changed.

McCarty felt that this process was good, but needed an additional component to build reliable results. He then looked at Daniel Goldman’s theory of Emotional Intelligence. McCarty stated that, “Emotional Intelligence (EI) refers to the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in yourself and others” (Mayer & Salovy, 1997) (McCarty, n.d). McCarty proposed that change agents need to be dynamic passionate individuals that are, “… inspirational, empathetic, charismatic, motivating, compelling, or enigmatic…” in their pursuit of mission and vision oriented change (McCarty, n.d). This would go beyond a good process or clear communications, into selling and championing the idea. McCarty concluded that, “Neither structure nor charisma alone will carry the day…” (n.d). He continued, “Both are vital to creating and maintaining effective organizational change” (McCarty, n.d).

Several of the above authors advocated empowering the individuals within the organization to participate and create ownership in the change process. It seemed natural to follow the same principal when developing a change model for the MFD. To that end, a seven point questionnaire was created and administered to all employees that worked over a two day period. Seventeen questionnaires were returned. The full results are included in Appendix A. The following questions were asked:
1. Have you seen the department or people within the department try to change things, but it didn’t work out?

1.a If so, what do you think went wrong?

2. Have you seen the department or people within the department successfully change things?

2.a If so, what went right?

3. What would it take for you to buy-in to the idea of a particular effort to change the way we do business?

4. What would it take for most of the department to buy-in to the idea of a particular effort to change the way we do business?

5. How do you think that Moorhead Fire should go about planning for change?

Sixteen of the seventeen respondents indicated that they have witnessed a failed change attempt. In the follow up question, 20 reasons were cited with some respondents listing more than one reason. A large number of reasons for failure were given, with no single problem being identified. Poor communications and a resistance to give up traditional operations were the top two answers with each accounting for 20% of the responses. Poor planning and a bad idea for change accounted for an additional 15% of responses each. The results are summarized in Figure 2.
Sixteen of the seventeen respondents indicated that they have witnessed a successful change attempt. In the follow up question, 19 reasons were cited with some respondents listing more than one reason. In this case, 53% of respondents indicated that a good base idea for change played the largest role in past success, this accounted for 47% of all answers given. Developing support for the idea and communicating well during change each accounted for an additional 16% of responses. The results are summarized in Figure 3.
Figure 3 – Summary of reasons for successful change efforts at the MFD.

All 17 respondents provided information about what it would take for them to buy-in to change efforts. Twenty-nine reasons were cited with many respondents listing more than one condition. Knowing that the net benefits justified the change effort was listed by 76% of respondents as at least one of the conditions they would need to buy-in to change. Additionally, 29% of the respondents indicated that they would need to know why the change was occurring and 18% needed clear communications about the change. The results are summarized in Figure 4.
Figure 4 – Summary of reasons that individuals would personally buy-in to a change effort at the MFD.

All 17 respondents provided information about what it would take for most of the department to buy-in to change efforts. Twenty-four reasons were cited with many respondents listing more than one condition. Just over 47% of respondents listed starting with a good idea as being a condition of obtaining general support for change. Good communications and education was listed by 24% of respondents while 18% thought it was not possible to gain broad support for change. The results are summarized in Figure 5.
All 17 respondents provided information about what it would take for most of the department to buy into change efforts. Thirty reasons were cited with many respondents listing more than one condition. A well developed planning process was listed by 71% of respondents as an important factor in planning change for the Moorhead Fire Department. Good communications was listed by 38% of respondents. Making sure that the net benefits justified the change and making sure the change plan was open to revision were each listed by 24% of respondents. The results are summarized in Figure 6.
One interesting revelation from the survey was the pre-existence of a change model for the MFD prior to conducting this study. One respondent suggested that we follow the change model that already existed and was posted on the department’s intranet site. Additional research confirmed the existence of this model as shown in Figure 7.

For a policy or procedure to be valid it must be formally adopted, communicated and consistently followed. The change model is not known to exist by many department personnel and is not used when change is being considered or implemented, thus negating it’s existence or usefulness.
DISCUSSION

The survey data from the MFD revealed some interesting trends. As shown in figure 8, three of the surveys dealt with how things went right or how to obtain buy-in. They all indicated that a good idea that showed the change was worthwhile (net benefits) was the largest key to success. A strong majority of individuals also thought that proper planning would be key to future success. A correlation may be drawn between proper planning and the selection of proper ideas, in that a successful comprehensive planning process should weed out bad ideas. Any change model adopted for the MFD should have a strong focus on proper planning.

While there was agreement on what to do right, there was no single overriding factor contributing to failure. Nor was there a correlation between what went right (53%
- good idea) and what went wrong (only 18% - bad idea). The problems may be more numerous or related to an unidentified factor. In any case, communications appeared consistently in all surveys, being a factor in the minds of between 18% and 38% of respondents. This should be addressed in the final change model as well.

Each of the change models evaluated had their own strengths and weaknesses. When placed side-by-side they are easier to compare (see Figure 9). The change models run in columns with the beginning of the planning process being at the top of the illustration and the end being at the bottom. The plans are synchronized so that if a person were to draw a horizontal line across the illustration, all plans will be at about the same location in their respective change process.
Figure 9 – A comparison of researched change models.

The Ireland DEHLG and Karpluk Lewin’s models are too simplistic to expect consistent results for an organization experiencing difficulty accomplishing successful change.

The Karpluk POS plan is also somewhat simplistic, particularly on the implementation end, but it does provide more detail leading up to the plan development. Planning was listed as a high need in the MFD survey. Picking the right idea for change was also ranked consistently high. Utilizing the “Best Practices” and “Envision the Future” steps should assist in selecting good ideas for change and build a better foundation for planning.

The McCarty model duplicates many of the steps contained in other models on the front end, but provides a more detailed list of implementation steps (from Empower
to Nurture) that would help ensure success. They should be added to the change model for MFD.

The existing MFD model contains a good base from which to form the new change model. It is important to identify the issues and stake holders. Those who are affected by any possible change should be involved to create ownership. It is also important to develop multiple solutions and select one to implement. It is at this point that the MFD may be experiencing some failure. If Karpluk’s Best Practices are examined while developing solutions, a better solution is likely to present itself. Consulting the department’s mission and vision statements will assure that the change is compatible with the organization. Adding Karpluk’s Envision the Future step will force an internal review to determine if the solution selected is truly a “good idea.”

It is at this point that a new change model is beginning to take shape and should be introduced graphically as well (see Figure 10). It can be noted from the change model diagram that the Best Practices and Envision the Future steps are actually sub-steps of the Develop Solutions & Choose One step. They are designed to more thoroughly explain and outline the subcomponents of that development process.

The next step, Develop a Plan is straight forward and necessary. The step that follows should be modified to strengthen the concept of communicating information based upon the MFD survey results. This step should now read, Communicate and Provide Training.
Implement the Plan is still a workable next step, but here is where the model branches out again to list sub-steps to ensure the success of the change plan. McCarty’s final four steps are added to outline how to successfully implement the plan.

The last two steps stay intact, but the routing options have changed slightly from the original as shown in figure 7. While feedback and evaluation may indicate a need to revise and redirect the implementation of the plan, it may also suggest that all is well or that the process is fatally flawed (based on a bad idea). In either of these cases, a second
redirect has been provided back to the beginning of the process where a new change evaluation process can occur or new problems can be explored.

Together, these additional steps, coupled with the old, possibly familiar steps, will create a more detailed change model that focuses on areas that the MFD is having problems with.

Organizational change is a process that carries with it both huge potential and many potential problems. Organizations can and must change as conditions around them change. As we have seen, there are many different approaches to organizational change. Each has its own benefits and weaknesses. They key to implementing a successful change process is identifying the needs of the organization and creating one effective plan that everyone can follow.

This new change model for the MFD should help focus efforts during the planning and implementation stages. Redirecting efforts in the identified deficient areas should increase the probability of successful change efforts, thereby reducing worker frustration and increasing productivity.
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**APPENDIX A – QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS**

**Organizational Change Questionnaire Results**

**May 2009**

17 Total Surveys

1. Have you seen the department or people within the department try to change things, but it didn’t work out?

   1. Yes
   2. Yes
   3. (no response) [yes]
   4. Yes
   5. yes.
   6. yes.
   7. (no response) [yes]
   8. yes.
   9. yes.
   10. yes
   11. (no response) [no]
   12. (no response) [yes]
   13. (no response) [yes]
   14. yes.
   15. (no response) [yes]
   16. yes.
   17. (no response) [yes]

1.a If so, what do you think went wrong?

   1. Didn’t I.D. the end result and purpose.
   2. It wasn’t explained before hand, giving positive and objective reasons for the change. Lack of communication.
   3. Someone was trying to move a piece of equipment. They didn’t tell other shifts that they moved it.
   4. Lack of communication and expectations.
5. Usually planning. Some ideas are implemented without thinking out what the possible outcomes may be.
6. There is a strong tradition to do tasks a certain way. There is usually resistance to anything in the Fire Department organizational culture.
7. The change wasn’t identified completely or it was a cultural change.
8. The drive over the top of LDH instead of backing up. People that have been here a while didn’t like the idea.
9. The lack of support from the dept or it’s membership.
10. Needed to sell the plan better and get key players on your side.
11. no.
12. many small somewhat minor things didn’t work out because it wasn’t pushed or followed through with all the way.
13. Safety vests: went wrong by not modifying what works and what didn’t work about it, like maybe not medicals in parking lots.
14. A bad idea. Changing something that was NOT broken just for the sake of a change.
15. Often times if change does not work the person started w/a bad idea so change would not be a good thing.
16. People are creatures of habit. They don’t like change because it disrupts their routine and their comfort level.
17. There have been many things that have been attempted to change this department over the 14 years I have been here. And when they didn’t work out, it was mainly due to not communicating the objectives of the new idea or plan. Also, it had to do with who brought the change forward. If it came from certain people, it was met with opposition out of spite. The other reason that change is hard in this department and this profession is because we all tend to hold on to our beliefs and traditions and want to remain in our comfort zone.

2. Have you seen the department or people within the department successfully change things?

   1. Seat belts and vests
   2. yes.
   3. (no response)
   4. yes.
   5. yes.
   6. (no response) [yes]
   7. (no response) [yes]
   8. yes.
   9. yes.
   10. yes.
   11. (no response) [no]
   12. (no response)
   13. (no response)
   14. yes.
15. (no response)
16. yes.
17. (no response)

2.a If so, what went right?

1. Just do it!
2. The change needed to be made. Change was for the betterment of the Dept.
3. (No response)
4. Clear expectations and open, rational discussion, and change for the right reasons, not for the sake of change.
5. Either the idea sold itself, or the end result sold itself by being a positive impact on how we operate.
6. The idea made sense, there was a clear directive that was backed up with consequences.
7. The future or idea at the future was shown to the department.
8. People stop at all stop signs & red lights. Everyone believed it was a good idea for everyone’s safety.
9. They developed support prior to starting the change.
10. Lottsa influence and charisma.
11. no.
12. Yes. Cannot give a great answer, but if anything is preached long enough, and is a reasonable request, people will change eventually.
13. Safety vests: the law is on the side of requiring change.
14. A good idea, that was researched and made sense.
15. Started with a good idea (a change for the better)
16. They had the majority on their side and it was the right time for a change. Timing is everything.
17. There have been many successful changes in the department recently, but started out not being implemented well. Changes that deal with safety are usually taken well because they seem to get more explanation on why the change is needed. Other changes came because people implemented the changes slowly over time as not to upset the group dynamic and made it more bearable to the effected personnel.

3. What would it take for you to buy-in to the idea of a particular effort to change the way we do business?

1. Make it clear and worth while, put effort in from the top and help do the actual work.
2. I would have to know why and how it would be accomplished. Also I would have to believe a change is needed.
3. If it were explained why we need this change and how it would affect the department.
4. Proven after a “test period” that is open to modification and revision to achieve a desired outcome.
5. The end result would need to be either more efficient and or cost effective than the old way.
6. To be educated and have a policy written that makes sense. Time is also a factor. Good habits usually take longer to develop than bad ones. If it’s equitably enforced with consequences and it’s a standard of practice it will be easier to achieve.
7. To show people what’s the change for them.
8. That it’s a good idea and makes sense not just a reason of it’s for safety.
9. To know why.
10. Sell it good, explain the long term plan and benefits.
11. As long as I believe in the idea, I’m willing to change.
12. Something that makes sense to me, and is a proven effort.
13. If an idea makes sense and will benefit the department and firefighters it should be easy. If it doesn’t make things easier it will be harder to change.
14. A better plan on how to do something. Explained as to why we would need to change something for the better.
15. If I feel the change is a good idea and needed it is EZ to “buy in”
16. Don’t be forceful with your ideas. People don’t like things crammed down their throats.
17. To get me to “buy-in” to a new change, allow me to ask questions about it and let me make suggestions so that I have some ownership in the idea. This makes things easier for all parties involved, because the change will either succeed or fail due to our ability to sell it to the rest of the group.

4. What would it take for most of the department to buy-in to the idea of a particular effort to change the way we do business?

1. Good ideas with results that are seen, felt and appreciated.
2. There has to be a enough of a reason for change, it has to have merit and common sense. Not one man’s pipe dream.
3. A good reason why and how this change would be a benefit to the department.
4. Leadership by example, reason for change.
5. Full understanding on why the Dept needs to change the way the Dept. is doing business previously.
6. Again, I believe it will take education, persistence, and consistent enforcement from the top down.
7. Apathy
8. I don’t even think it exists.
9. To answer why the needed changes and how you want me to be involved.
10. Explain how it will positively effect each person.
11. Educate the personnel on the subject and sell the idea.
12. The stars would have to align, There’s no way, in any organization to get most of the members to buy in to something new.
13. If it benefits the Firefighter they will probably buy into it.
14. See above answer. [A better plan on how to do something. Explained as to why we would need to change something for the better.]
15. The Dept. needs to think it is a good change.
16. Take time to plan out the change. Ask others for input, do research on other ideas to make sure, implement the change over time.
17. Each member needs a different incentive to “buy-in” to a new change. For some, it may be a reward system. “I will do this, if I can do that.” There is nothing wrong with that style every once in a while, but it can be abused. The best way is to get feedback from the effected personnel and explain the changes fully so that all persons feel that they have a responsibility in the change. Also let everyone know up front that this is a new change and it will be reviewed after a certain amount of time to see if it needs revision. This way it gives people the responsibility to make an honest effort to make things work and help with making things better in the future.

5. How do you think that Moorhead Fire should go about planning for change?

1. Identify what and why something needs to be changed.
2. Information is king. If change is merited, it will sell itself.
3. A well thought out plan should be presented to the Chief for his approval.
4. Actually use the change model on Firewire.
5. The strategic plan was a good 1st step. Looking ahead and deciding where you’d like your Dept to be and then planning out a successful path to get there. Fully inform the members on what the Big Picture and end result will be and explain the steps that will be needed to get there.
6. When we plan on changing a policy, procedure, or the method of a particular task we need to be realistic. We must emphasize the importance of the change. I don’t think we should try to change anything unless we have a well thought out plan. Concepts are great, but they need to remain concepts until a comprehensive informal assessment is completed and the benefits of the change are worth the efforts.
7. See the really long answer.
8. Through a clear drawn out process.
9. Develop priorities and goals. Develop the support and resources to accomplish the plan, and lastly just implement it.
10. Try to keep an open mind, and have the long term goals well spelled out.
11. I think that we should push to go ALS. It will secure positions for the future.
12. Give people reasonable time to research the change for themselves, and ease into it, welcoming any questions people may have. Possibly adjusting the changes slightly to people’s requests.
13. Have meetings about what is changing around the U.S. fire depts. And how or if Moorhead could be affected by those changes to stay ahead.
14. Have a plan in place that is going to work and try it out to see if it will work. Not be afraid to change back to original way if the new change doesn’t work or improve things.
15. Research, research, research to make sure that we are changing for the better.
16. Research other departments for ideas and how they do business. Modify them if needed to fit our dept.
17. This is something that we have been lacking, and if we took our own advice and tried not to reinvent every situation each time, changes would come easier.

APPENDIX B – OUTLINE

I. Introduction
   a. Develop a model for organizational change for the MFD
   b. Thesis –While many experts propose various models for change, the Moorhead Fire Department needs a hybrid change model to successfully institute organizational change.
   c. Background
   d. Report preview

II. Methods
   a. Research procedures
      i. Personal library
      ii. Search engines
      iii. Keywords
      iv. Questionnaires
   b. Research decisions

III. Results
   a. Fire Service Leadership: Theories and Practices
      i. Common barriers to change
      ii. Keys to successful change
      iii. Foundations for effective change
   b. Fire Services Change Programme
      i. Four factors necessary for success
      ii. The Change Cycle
   c. Modeling Behaviour: Managing Change in the Fire Hall
      i. Lewin’s change model
      ii. Positive Organizational Scholarship
      iii. Five phases of change
   d. Successfully Leading Organizational Change
      i. Eight steps for leading organizational change
      ii. Emotional Intelligence
   e. Leadership on the Line: Staying Alive Through the Dangers of Leading
      i. Factors in change failure
      ii. Factors in the success of change
   f. Moorhead Fire Department research
      i. Summarize information
      ii. Provide example, illustration, case study

IV. Discussion
a. The MFD needs to focus on planning and communications during change efforts.
b. Existing planning models do not work for the MFD
c. While many experts propose various models for change, the Moorhead Fire Department needs a hybrid change model to successfully institute organizational change.
d. This will reduce frustration and increase efficiency