

Case:

**MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE CASE STUDY –
FURTHER CHANGE AT GOSFIELD PARK**

Gosfield Park is a 2,500-hectare country estate in North Brentshire. The estate has been in the ownership of the Kennedy family since the fifteenth century. The present owner, Sebastian Gosfield and his younger brother, Patrick, manage an estate that comprises of:

* 20 cottages on the estate which are tenanted

* Two farms (both arable)

* One public house – 'The George'

Over the past twenty years the family has diversified into country leisure activities to maximise the potential of the estate. Gosfield Park has gained a good reputation as a regional showground and has, over the past few years, been successful in attracting major events such as:

- Opera in the Park events
- Jazz concerts
- Open air Shakespearean plays in the summer months
- National Orienteering competitions
- Veteran and Classic car shows
- National Clay Pigeon shooting competitions
- Regional dog shows

To attract such events the brothers constructed in 2012 an arena capable of taking 2,000 spectators. The brothers have also invested in indoor facilities that can cater for show-jumping events, dog agility competitions together with a range of country pursuit activities. The strategy has also been to attract the younger generation to country pursuits with a range of activities led by local clubs and societies (archery, country crafts, nature conservancy events such as wild bird conservation including the protection of rare birds of prey – hen and marsh harriers that are in danger in the area). Gosfield Park employs some 25 full time staff and a further 30 part-time staff throughout the year. Many of the full-time staff have been there for years and many see themselves as part of the extended 'Gosfield family'. Most people are called by their first names and the brothers regularly have a barbeque for friends and family of the estate workers together with their own family and friends. Everyone mixes well and the success of Gosfield Park has been mainly due to this close interaction and good working relations with its staff

and suppliers. The house and park with its amenities attracts some 100,000 visitors a year. The house runs events throughout the year which range from antiques fairs, murder mystery weekends, and private tours of the house and its gardens for small parties of guests. There is a farm shop and the visitors can purchase vegetables and other crops from the shop depending on the time of year. There is a restaurant that can seat 80 guests, as well as seasonal visitor attractions such as – The Easter Bunny Show, dining facilities for private groups and, of course, Christmas parties and New Year celebrations. Over the past six months Sebastian and Patrick have been considering further changes to add to the business to fully maximise the potential of the estate. Sebastian has been looking at introducing to part of the estate a country holiday complex similar to that introduced by Center Parcs in the UK some 40 years ago. A 500-hectare site has been earmarked on the southern part of the estate where 30 lodges would be built for guests and their families to relax and enjoy the range of indoor and outdoor activities that are to be planned. Embarking on this major investment programme would complement the existing estate's facilities. The family can fund most of the development required from their current business activities with only a small loan from the bank if required. The development of the estate has, in the past, not been without its critics. The previous change at the Park did not go as planned, with staff poorly engaged in the proposed change and (according to staff) little in the way of communication and consultation. Some jobs were lost last time and the consultants who were brought in to manage the change were criticised by the staff for their unwillingness to communicate adequately with them. Both Sebastian and Patrick are aware that previous change was not greeted with unanimous acceptance by the staff. The brothers have learnt that to make change work they need to take their workforce with them and not isolate them from the process. Kay Associates have again been brought in to plan for the change. The brothers know that success will depend on their experienced and close-knit workforce working closely with them to make the project successful. Previous change was not managed well. Sebastian and Patrick reflect on the way they handled the change before. They were intent on pushing the change through and did not fully grasp the people side of the change process, which they now understand to be crucial. However, there are still employees that remember those times and any subsequent change will obviously remind them of what occurred during the previous changes. Lessons must be learnt!

A meeting with the consultants (Kay Associates) has taken place and the brothers are convinced that the new development will be a welcome addition to the estate and means that additional staff would need to be employed to cater for the new development. Sebastian has emphasised to the consultants his staff's concern of the way the consultants handled the change. Both brothers want to see from the consultants a clear strategy for how to plan for the changes and to keep in their minds the concerns the staff had last time over how the consultants managed the change. A few days after the meeting with Kay Associates, the proposed development filters through to the existing staff. Many who had witnessed change at Gosfield are a little concerned given the turmoil and stress that they went through last time. In the George pub that evening some of the full-time staff meets to discuss the whispers on the grapevine about the so-called changes. Tom, the Farm Manager remarks that – "It's not a good start. We have not heard officially the news of the new development and as farm manager you would think I would have been asked for my input as some of the proposed land has currently been earmarked for tree planting. What does all this mean for the workforce and why is it that Sebastian and Patrick have not communicated any of this to the staff?" Ray, the Head Gardener remembers how the brothers left the changes last time to the consultants to manage. "The associates treated us badly – little communication, staff did not know if they had a job or not. We're not a factory or an office, we are a close-knit team, and we expected the changes to be discussed with us. We tried to do our jobs and had at the same time to cope with the changes that took place. We were all stressed. Sebastian and Patrick let the consultants deal with everything; no one would listen to our problems. Let's hope the changes this time are better managed. I know Sebastian and Patrick are trying to make a success of the estate, but major changes affecting what we do on the estate should require some input from the staff who have to do the job day in and day out."

<http://icm.education/documents/past-papers/2015%20Exam%20Series/June/Management%20of%20Change%20-%20Case%20Study.pdf>

How Change Mismanagement Created an Industry

by Harry Greene

Organizations do not change naturally as their business changes. The business changes while the organization remains static, building pressure for organization change. Eventually, there is reorganization upheaval that produces a new static organization, and another cycle of the change problem.

Over the past decade, many new business methods became popular, such as business process re-engineering, enterprise resource planning, and various methods of business transformation. Implementing these methods involved significant change.

With all this, most enterprises discovered a fundamental problem. They do not have a strong foundation for business change. Business change is a departure from the norm, they don't have the proper resources, management doesn't have the time, change objectives are not well understood, they have no change management capability, they need to reassign personnel to ad-hoc projects, etc.

The lack of a strong change foundation prompted enterprises to use business change consultants to implement change. Consultants can alleviate some problems, but they cannot provide the foundation for business change. Consultant implementation methods that concentrate on solution implementation and performance improvement aggravate the problem of change.

Enterprises ended up with common business change problems. Management and staff resisted the changes, many changes were never properly implemented or utilized, and it was difficult to see where they had really benefited from change.

Recognizing the problem, business change consultants developed a new line of services called "change management". But, the change management services did not address the fundamental problems of change mismanagement. The services addressed the symptoms of the problems in communications, behavior, outlook, etc. so that the fundamental problems remained for the next change.

So, enterprises added on additional change management services to solve the problems, or at least, some symptoms of the problems. Is this the answer, to create unnecessary problems and then hire consultants to alleviate the symptoms?

This is one of the issues that we are discussing at the Business Change Forum, in order to define problems with conventional methods and discover breakthroughs in enterprise management.

We only need change management services because we mismanage change. We mismanage change because of many factors.

- We do not have the proper change objective, since the objective is to implement change rather than to benefit from change.
- We implement the change solution rather than implementing methods that utilize the solution to gain benefits.
- We do not organize for change, change comes from abrupt reorganizations of the way we do things rather than continuously as part of the normal routine.
- We do not have a foundation for change, so change is managed by consultants with ad-hoc projects, improvement methodologies, lack of management support, no management of the return, and other problems that make success so elusive.

- We do not manage performance capital properly. Most capital is unidentified or administered to keep it operating, rather managed for change, improvement, and utilization to produce benefit.
- Development methods methodically create change management problems, since change is directed at improving user performance rather than enabling users to do new things they could not do before.
- We have no systematic way to develop the benefits of change and the return on change investments. We can only systematically develop the cost of change.

We cannot solve the change mismanagement problem until we make fundamental changes to business change.

- The most important thing is to organize for change. We need to eliminate re-organization and change automatically as what we are trying to do changes.
- We need to understand how we create value through change and manage change to produce the value.
- We need to structure our performance capital to be managed in utilization rather than mismanaged through administration.
- We need professionals to manage capital and change to our capital.
- We need management acceptance of change through goals and expectations.
- We need to follow a development method that includes people in the proper role, so that they benefit from development.
- We need to integrate and manage the utilization of performance capital in practice.
- We need to manage our own development as an enterprise and utilize consultants in partnership for successful change.

We need to develop each of the elements and capabilities as integral parts of our enterprise to reduce the enormous effort and cost of change mismanagement. Change mismanagement will continue until we structure the enterprise change foundation so that change is a natural part of the way we work.

http://www.businessperform.com/articles/changemanagement/change_mismanagement.html