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My Background

Dickson Consulting Services, LLC
Main Ingredients to Sustaining Lean!

100,000 participants surveyed…

The Epiphany…

Migrating from Manager to Style 4 Leadership

Team 1
Boss Makes Decisions With Little to No Input

Team 2
Boss Makes Decisions After Receiving Significant Input from Others

Team 3
Teams Make Decisions with Restrictions and Boss’s Oversight

Fully Empowered Teams Working Together to Achieve a Strategic Vision

Dictator
Manager Style 1

Team 2
Style 2

Team 3
Style 3

Collaborator
Style 4

Which leader appears to be the busiest (working ‘harder’)?
Which leader most likely gets recognized and promoted?

The “Hero Manager” destroys lean implementations!

Successful System-Level Lean Implementations

- Active pathway clearing
- Sidestep hierarchy
- Leadership ‘coalition of the willing’ networks
- Show progress
- Governance Committees
- Shared purpose
- Fast feedback
- Empathetic listening and respectful debate
- Vision/mission-driven; project charters and managers

Leadership ‘coalition of the willing’ networks
Sidestep Hierarchy

Active pathway clearing

Show progress

Governance Committees

Shared purpose

Leadership ‘coalition of the willing’ networks

Empathetic listening and respectful debate

Fast feedback

Vision/mission-driven; project charters and managers
Hierarchies and Networks

Hierarchies and Networks

- **Hierarchies** are **NOT** designed to pivot, innovate, react or change fast
  - Embraces *conformity* (status quo)
  - They *run* the business

- **Networks** do **NOT** replace hierarchies, yet they excel at tackling uncertainty and change
  - Embraces *constructive nonconformity*
  - They *change* the business

Our governance committees are intentional networks

Our Need For Networks…

It’s a Fan!

It’s a Wall!

It’s a Rope!

It’s a Spear!

It’s a Snake!

It’s a Tree!
Shared Purpose

- Active pathway clearing
- Sidestep hierarchy
- Leadership ‘coalition of the willing’ networks
- Show progress
- Governance Committees
- Shared purpose
- Empathetic listening and respectful debate
- Fast feedback
- Vision/mission-driven; project charters and managers
Vision/Mission Driven

Commissioner Josh Korns
District 1

Commissioner Mary Kuney
District 2

Commissioner Al French
District 3

2018 Spokane County Strategic Framework

Spokane County government is dedicated to enhancing and protecting the quality of life for all citizens through the pursuit of excellence in responsive, cost-effective and customer-driven services.
“How does this project align with the strategic priorities of the county?”
PM 101, 201 and PMP Bootcamp courses have been crucial for staff and culture development!
Fast Feedback

- Active pathway clearing
- Leadership ‘coalition of the willing’ networks
- Show progress
- Governance Committees
- Shared purpose
- Fast feedback
- Sidestep hierarchy
- Empathetic listening and respectful debate

Vision/mission-driven; project charters and managers

Leadership ‘coalition of the willing’ networks
Complex Organizations...

Feedback Frequency

Simple       Complicated       Complex

Organizational Structure
Leading Complex Organizations

Leadership’s role…

“A great leader looks into the mirror during times of failure and looks out of the window during times of success.”
Show Progress

- Active pathway clearing
- Leadership ‘coalition of the willing’ networks
- Show progress
- Governance Committees
- Shared purpose
- Empathetic listening and respectful debate
- Fast feedback
- Vision/mission-driven; project charters and managers
- Sidestep hierarchy
After The Lean Event…

Your plan

Reality
Regional Law and Justice
Project Progress Update

Spokane Regional Justice Project Dashboard

Project Sponsors
Regional Governance Workgroup
Spokane County
City of Spokane

Closed/Transitional Projects

- eSuite Municipal Court Information System Replacement
- Spokane Law And Justice Council (SRJC) Reestablished
- MacArthur Funding Phase II Funding Awarded
- Mental Health Division (5177) Program Launched
- SAFER Light Tool Launched
- MacArthur Funding Phase III Funding Application
- MacArthur Funding Phase II Complete

RCRC - Mental Health Crisis Stabilization Facility
Jail Conferencing
Reentry HUB Pathways
Odyssey Court Implementation
Jail Information System Replacement
Spokane EnVision Center Pilot
Risk Assessment Tool Pre-Trial and Probation
High Performance Courts
Integrated Response

Revision Date: Sept 2018
Jail Tracker Progress Update

Project Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>On Track</th>
<th>Cautionary</th>
<th>At Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Work Completed:**

1. Non-Detention Services (DS) Requirements Finalized - Feb., 2018
   - Includes Courts, Prosecutor, Law Enforcement, etc.
2. Legacy Data Migration - Sept. - Mar., 2018 (~95% complete)
   - Work is considered complete as testing can proceed, w/ minor elements remaining to be migrated from OMS to JailTracker to will be completed in the coming weeks.
3. **** June 13th, 2018 Go live Date Finalized ****

**In Flight & Up Next:**

1. Interface Build (x20) - Sept. - Mar., 2018 (~95% Complete)
   - Interface tuning a part of testing through April
2. System Configuration by Functional Area - Sept. - Jan., 2018
   - Rough configuration (~95% Complete)
   - Final configuration a part of testing - April - May, 2018
   - DS report build underway, Non-DS reporting to follow
4. Training Planning Underway
   - Curriculum, staff member and day/time class breakdown being generated - by 4/20

**Key Milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Key Milestones</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RFP Evaluation Completed</td>
<td>March, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contracting Completed</td>
<td>June, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project Kickoff</td>
<td>Sept., 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Data Mapping and Migration</td>
<td>Sept. - Mar., 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interface Build (x20)</td>
<td>Sept. - Mar., 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>System Configuration</td>
<td>Sept. - Mar., 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Nov. - May, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Change Mgmt. - Training, etc.</td>
<td>April - May, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Move to Production (Release 1)</td>
<td>June 13th, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Move to Production (Release 2)</td>
<td>Sept., 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Leadership Team**

| John McGrath | Becky Gehret | John Dickson |
| Mike Sparber | Steve Nelson | Ken Mohr     |
| Tim Christopherson | Aaron Lind |

**Statement of Work**

Project seeks to replace the current Offender Management System (OMS) and ancillary jail mgmt. systems included in the current contract with Global Tel Link (GTL). System is used for inmate mgmt. by Detention Services, as well as other Spokane Regional Criminal Justice Agencies.
Governance Committees!

- Active pathway clearing
- Sidestep hierarchy
- Leadership ‘coalition of the willing’ networks
- Show progress
- Governance Committees
- Fast feedback
- Shared purpose
- Empathetic listening and respectful debate
- Vision/mission-driven; project charters and managers
Governance Committee Responsibilities

- Sets direction
  - Executable scope and timeline
- Makes decisions
  - *Good* decision may not ultimately be the *right* decision
- Oversees project
  - Enables success
  - Curiosity is the key

Our Successful Governance Committees  (Video)

- Hierarchy allows and enables their existence
  - Complimentary strengths with networks
- Self-organized around a shared purpose
  - Project Manager and Charter
- Executive/senior leadership participants
  - No more than 7 members
  - Proxies *not* allowed
- No formal policies/procedures
  - Avoid hierarchical (management) tendencies!
- Forms and disbands fast
Leadership Engagement via Governance Committees

“If your leaders are responsible for certain aspects of the business where their performance is monitored by the results of a project, you can bet your bottom dollar that they’ll be more engaged in making it work.”

Nick Thompson, a leadership coach for Australian Help
Lean Leadership Engagement (Or Not…)

Tuckman's Team & Group Development Model

- Post Lean Event – Leadership Team?
- Post Lean Event – Participants

Effectiveness of Team

Performance of Team

Forming

Typical

Storming

Ideal

Norming

Performing
The Governance Committee Cycle...

- **UNCONSCIOUS INCOMPETENCE**
  - You are unaware of the skill and your lack of proficiency

- **UNCONSCIOUS COMPETENCE**
  - Performing the skill becomes automatic

- **CONSCIOUS INCOMPETENCE**
  - You are aware of the skill but not yet proficient

- **CONSCIOUS COMPETENCE**
  - You are able to use the skill, but only with effort

- **Approve Project Charter; establish meeting schedule (at least twice/month)**

- **Active listening and debate; progress monitored closely; pathways cleared**

- **Successes celebrated!; additional Governance Committee(s) willingly form**

- **Governance Committee formation; Leadership champion important; certified Project Manager**

- **Highest Stress Here!**
The Learning (Stress) Curve

- Unconscious Incompetence
- Conscious Incompetence
- Conscious Competence
- Unconscious Competence
Governance Committee Formation (2014)

Board of County Commissioners/Mayor/City Council

Approve funding requests in conjunction with County/City CAD RMS Project which are not funded through 911 Excise Tax or 1/10 of 1% Communication Tax

Governance Committee

- Composition:
  (1) County Commissioner; (BOCC representative)
  (2) City Administrator; and
  (3) County CEO
  (4) City CFO

- Responsibilities:
  (1) Approve Annual Budget for CAD RMS Project;
  (2) Assure CAD RMS Project completed on time; and
  (3) Resolve any conflicts with regard to implementation of CAD RMS Project.
  (4) Direct Report for Project Manager
  (5) Project Charter Adherence
  (6) Define long term Law IT Maintenance structure.
CAD/RMS Governance Model

Governance

Spokane CAD RMS Governance Committee

Oversight Core Team (LEIS Board)

- CAD Build Team
- RMS Build Team
- Mobile Build Team
- GIS Build Team
- Legacy Data Build Team
‘Hierarchy’ Communication Strategy

The chart below will be used to establish stakeholders and their levels of power and interest for use on the power/interest chart as part of the stakeholder analysis. 5 (higher) 1 (lower)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interest (1-5)</th>
<th>Power (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Shelly O’Quinn</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Marshall Farnell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Theresa Sanders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Gavin Cooley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>SCSO</td>
<td>Ozzie Knezovich</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Frank Straub</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>Lorlee Mizell</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>John Dickson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCSO</td>
<td>Bob Lincoln</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Jeff Tower</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Tim Schwering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Spokane County (TSD)</td>
<td>Beck Gehret</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below is the power/interest chart for CAD RMS Replacement Project stakeholders. Each letter represents a stakeholder in accordance with the key in the chart above.

The stakeholders analysis matrix will be used to capture stakeholder concerns, level of involvement, and management strategy based on the stakeholders analysis and power/interest matrix above. The stakeholders analysis matrix will be reviewed and updated throughout the project’s duration in order to capture any new concerns or stakeholder management strategy efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A – O’Quinn</td>
<td>Role to approve and resolve resource constraints, Identify governance transition once project is implemented</td>
<td>Key Player</td>
<td>Solicit stakeholder as member of steering committee and obtain feedback on project planning. Frequent communication and address concerns are imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C – Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D – Cooley</td>
<td>Oversight resource, contracting and financing</td>
<td>Keep Satisfied</td>
<td>Communicate resource requirements early and ensure resources are released back when no longer required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H – Dickson</td>
<td>Understand end use of implementation system(s), Product performance must meet or exceed current product</td>
<td>Keep Satisfied</td>
<td>Communicate awareness of needs and expectations. Ensure high communication with subordinate agency staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I – Gehret</td>
<td>Custodian department of implementation system(s), Ensuring proper handover of project to operations team</td>
<td>Key Player</td>
<td>Communicate requirements, performance specifications and obtain feedback on project requirements or any changes. Provide frequent status reports and updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J – Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – Schwering</td>
<td>Secondary representatives from end user agencies</td>
<td>Keep Informed</td>
<td>Allow technical staff to work with stakeholder to answer questions and address concerns and provide test results for validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L – Lincoln</td>
<td>Major Contributor of project funding and single element system users</td>
<td>Keep Informed</td>
<td>Communicate funding allocations and expectations in CAD &amp; GIS portion of implementation system(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M – Mizell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N – McCormick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O – O’Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P – Politicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q – Pensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R – Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S – Scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T – Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U – User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V – Vendor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W – Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X – Weber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y – Weinberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z – Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAD/RMS Project Results

2013: $6.0M Project

2014: Regional Governance Workgroup formed

2015: $2.9M Project

Local News

SUNDAY, DEC. 22, 2013
Spokane city-county dispatch systems outdated, sheriff says
By Mike Prager mkep@spokesman.com (509) 459-5406

Funding

Computer equipment used to dispatch law-enforcement officers in Spokane County is 20 to 25 years old.
Replacing that equipment with a 21st-century computer system cannot happen soon enough, as far as Sheriff Ozzie Knezovich is concerned.
Advanced digital capabilities have become a powerful weapon in modern policing, he said.
The sheriff in recent weeks has expressed impatience with the city of Spokane in reaching an agreement on replacing the aging system for dispatching and record-keeping.

“Our systems do not keep our community safe,” Knezovich said last week. “We need a system that works with us, not against us.”
Spokane police Chief Frank Straub said he agrees with Knezovich, but there are a number of details that need to be ironed out before a purchase is made.
The county has negotiated a $1 million discount with Motorola, the company that has been under contract to upgrade the county’s radio communication system under voter approval.
The county has $5 million lined up for the $6 million project, but county officials are waiting on the city of Spokane to kick in its $1 million share.

Spokane County Commission approves $2.9 million dispatch system upgrade

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 11, 2015
By Rachel Alexander rachela@spokesman.com (509) 459-5406

Spokane County law enforcement and residents may soon be able to access real-time data about crimes in progress, thanks to a dispatch system upgrade in the works.
Spokane County commissioners on Tuesday signed a $2.9 million contract with New World Systems to replace an aging city-county law enforcement dispatch and records management system at half the cost the county originally projected.
The upgrade is the product of several years of conversation about the need to replace a 20-year-old computer-aided dispatch system that police Chief Frank Straub said has been held together “with bubble gum and glue and Band-Aids.”
Regional Governance Committee
- Integrated Response
SECTION NO. 5: GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE.

There is established a Governance Committee ("Governance Committee"). The Governance Committee shall consist of (five) seven individuals to include a County Commissioner, a member of the Spokane City Council, the City Administrator, the County CEO, the City CFO, the County CFO and a (fifth) seventh member to be selected at large annually by the other four members and shall not be an elected official.

The Governance Committee shall review any objections to the sharing of costs between the PARTIES for the "purchase and implementation" cost items as well as "combined total annual maintenance" cost items as provided for in Section No.6.
Spokane Integrated Communications Center Project

Highly engaged emergency communications professionals are experienced at navigating sweeping changes. Spokane’s Emergency Call Receiving and Dispatch Teams are no exception. SCGI’s support will create clarity and alignment throughout the process enabling the skilled and effective workforce to continue to deliver services at high levels of excellence while navigating this integration project. SCGI’s support will facilitate movement through the following stages (following grey highlighted steps in graphic on page 6 below):

Principles of an Effective Integration Project:

Sequence: Throughout the Integration Project, the order in which decisions are made, and by whom, will impact the quality of the outcome. This project will follow this sequence wherever possible:

- Why: Why create an Integrated Regional Communications Center? (Values, long-term results, opportunities)
- What: What does the general organizational structure look like? (Integrated Entity, Governance, Approach to Funding, Timeline for integration)
- Who: Who will become the key decision makers (Board Members first, then Operational Advisory Groups, then Executive/Leadership Staff)
- How: How will we achieve objectives of integration? (Operational Integration Plan)

The 3Es of Fair Process:

Engagement means involving individuals in the decisions that affect them by asking for their input and allowing them to refute the merits of one another’s ideas and assumptions.

Explanation means that everyone involved and affected should understand why final decisions are made as they are. An explanation of the thinking that underlies decisions makes people confident that managers have considered their opinions and have made those decisions impartially in the overall interests of the organization.

Expectation Clarity requires that once a decision is made, behavioral expectations are stated clearly and tied to results.

Engagement of Stakeholders and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs):

The Integration Project will succeed based on the involvement of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) currently engaged in the operations and direction of the agencies in the combined communications center. The goal of the Integration Project is to ensure continuity of service and set the stage for continued improvements in service for all Stakeholders. Engagement by Stakeholders is essential and will be sought at every key decision point throughout the project.

Integrated Center Project Road Map

Decision-making Outline

(Note: Dates are targets. * indicates critical path decisions. While the roadmap below suggests linear work, many steps will occur concurrently. require concurrent progress)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Who Decides</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview/Discovery (Governance Construct)</td>
<td>Why an Integrated Regional Communications Center?</td>
<td>Governance Committee</td>
<td>June/July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to Integration: Resolution of Consent from County Commissioners and City of Spokane Mayor</td>
<td>Governance Committee; City, County Officials</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of Expected Results of Integrated Center</td>
<td>Governance Committee; 911 Board and Onsite Leadership</td>
<td>July, August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Key Stakeholder Feedback</td>
<td>Facilitated, to include PSL etc</td>
<td>July, August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documented Expectations of Stakeholders</td>
<td>Governance Committee</td>
<td>July, August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification/prioritization of barriers to successful integration</td>
<td>Governance Committee and other Stakeholders</td>
<td>July, August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of Key Advisory Groups, including participants for each step</td>
<td>Governance Committee</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of internal and stakeholder communications plan</td>
<td>Communications Liaison</td>
<td>July, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Stakeholder Communications

Integrating Emergency Response Communications

What is Interoperability?
Interoperability means computer and communication systems have the ability to connect and interact with one another readily and with reciprocity. In the context of emergency response communications, interoperability means that 911 Call Receivers, Law Enforcement, Emergency Medical Systems (EMS), and Fire all operate within a single organization—streamlining the process and decreasing the response time of emergency dispatches.

Today’s System
Since 2004, emergency dispatch services have been delivered from the Combined Communications Center Building, but each dispatch service area operates under and reports to separate organizations. Today’s system delivers services well within the confines of the current structure. With an integrated model, opportunity exists to achieve faster response times for the benefit of the public when they need it most.

Saving Lives. Faster.
Integrating our region’s emergency dispatch response communications allows services to be dispatched an estimated time savings for EMS and Fire response of 90 seconds faster than the current system. This benefit alone justifies the adoption of an interoperable model. When combined with additional organizational efficiencies, the adoption of an interoperable model is even more essential and necessary.

- Continual and coordinated improvements in levels of service
- More operational capacity through more efficient usage of tax dollars
- Leverage acquisition of the latest technology to further enhance services
- Improved coordination with emergency management and disaster preparedness, response and recovery

The Journey Towards Interoperability

1998
All Spokane County fire districts consolidated their communication systems into one: The Combined Communications Center.

2004
The Combined Communications Building was built with future interoperability in mind.

2008
The 1/10th Ballot Measure was passed to build an interoperable radio system.

October 2017
83% of Spokane County voters passed Proposition 1: 1/10th of 1% Sales Tax Renewal providing financial sustainability for improvements including integration through 2028.

Fall 2018
Emergency Service Communications in the Spokane Region will integrate to operate within a single organization to maximize current operations and prepare for future technology.

Positioned for the future
Integration is not only a step needed to keep our services up to date, it is crucial in positioning Spokane to utilize fast-approaching technologies. Our emergency service response must become integrated to utilize these coming technologies.

Delivering on Prop 1
Integrating our region’s emergency response communications is part of fulfilling the promise of Spokane County’s Proposition 1 which received 83% approval from voters in October 2017. Prop 1’s 1/10th renewal promised faster response in crisis and pledged to “Integrate Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) between Police, Sheriff, Fire and EMS.”

90 seconds saved
The estimated time an interoperable model will save with fire and medical dispatch compared to our current system.

85% of non-law enforcement calls are medical related
85% of non-law enforcement calls are medical related. Think about how much difference 90 seconds can make in the case of a stroke or heart attack.
Upon formation of our PDA, governance was handed off to the newly-created SPOCOM Board.
Culture of Lean Project Management and Governance

- Active pathway clearing
- Sidestep hierarchy
- Leadership ‘coalition of the willing’ networks
- Show progress
- Governance Committees
- Shared purpose
- Empathetic listening and respectful debate
- Fast feedback
- Vision/mission-driven; project charters and managers
Lean Project Governance – A Key to Senior Leadership Engagement!

John Dickson
Chief Operations Officer
Spokane County
jdickson@spokanecounty.org
(509) 477-5770