

**TOM INGRAM &
ASSOCIATES, Inc.**

2031 Chestnut Rd.
Carrollton, TX 75007
972-394-5736
tom@tomingraminc.com
www.tomingraminc.com

Update from Robert Schaffer, December 2013, After 15 Years Implementing The Following Concepts

He remains puzzled -why so hard to sell with 100% success rate, e.g. \$95 mm payback from single 100 day project at Calpers?

Conclusion: Executive decision maker makeup issue – must find:

- **Impatient, motivated**, intolerant, willing to act (UCN)
- Believe their people can get to the **HIDDEN RESERVE**
- Willing to have faith that their people can get the big gain done

Embedding in Company DNA: Get initial small wins, then he has techniques for embedding – will discuss with me later

Fad / trend / rapid results in NorthEast, led by GE – did it fade? “NEVER WAS FASHIONALBLE, BIG WIDELY ADOPTED”

Rapid Results Training Outline

NUMBER ONE TRAINING ISSUE FOR EXECUTIVES IS DEMAND MAKING SKILLS, BASED ON ROBERT SCHAFFER’S HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW ARTICLE

Demand Making Harvard Business Review Article by Robert Schaffer (Top 10 Reprint Request...)

<http://www.tomingraminc.com/DemandMakingHBRRobertSchaffer2.pdf>

[May want to use pages 185-201 (of *High Impact Consulting* by Robert Schaffer) as a supplemental text to Harvard Business Review Article on Demand Making Training. This was written in 2002 and probably has significantly better communication of the key issues than the original article from the 1970s.]

Rapid Results Harvard Business Review Article by Robert Schaffer (Top 10 Reprint Request...)

<http://www.tomingraminc.com/RapidResultsHBRRobertSchaffer.pdf>

Extracted from *Rapid Results* by Schaffer & Ashkenas, Copyright 2005, John Wiley & Sons

TRAINING STEP 1: REVIEW APPLICABLE CASES FROM HBC MASTER

Problems with Big Bang Initiatives: “Bet your company feeling”

Great value in big goals, even if only partially achieved:

Problems with traditional strategic planning approach: Success rate of effectively executing major change from traditional process of big, strategic planning efforts – track record is spotty at best.

Problems with big-fix change projects:

- Advocated by those with an agenda – management consultants, academics/intellectuals, often internal staff groups seeking to build power and influence
- Desperately short on repeatable results
- Most of the management literature’s recommendations are suspect. Very few instances of consistently repeatable results from following the literatures’ recommendations

Mergers and Acquisitions – Special problems:

- Business Week 2002 reported that 61% of Acquirers destroyed value for their shareholders.
- 2003 Harvard Business Review article by Larry Selden and Geoffrey Colvin estimated the failure rate at 70-80%
- The business press commonly blames Merger & Acquisition problems on the follies of senior executives overly fascinated with doing deals. Some suggest that acquisitions might be more successful if deals were financed differently or if the rationale for mergers was more sound.
- Evidence emerging suggests that poor strategic fit and overpayment for acquired assets are less frequently the cause of failures. The greater cause is lack of proper implementation and management after the deal is done.
- In most cases the big decisions are made by a few people at the highest reaches of the organization. To those people, when the deal is closed it marks the end of a job well done. They declare victory and start to move on. **BUT MAKING THE MERGED ORGANIZATION ACTUALLY WORK IS THE JOB OF OTHER PEOPLE.**
- Sometimes senior managers simply go through the motions without sufficient commitment to really make the merged organization work.
- Stock price implications. Because many acquisitions fail to deliver the expected performance, stock price often falls for the acquirer after acquisition. Companies have also frequently assumed a lot of debt to finance the acquisition – resulting in significant investor anxiety. **TANGIBLE RESULTS EARLY IN THE GAME, SUPPORTING THE ROSY PROMISES, AS CAN BE PRODUCED BY RAPID RESULTS PROJECTS DO MUCH TO MINIMIZE THESE NEGATIVES.**
- Make sure to examine the MeadWestvaco case in detail – great lessons.
- Mergers and Acquisitions are among the most popular Big Bang / Big Fix strategies to improving corporations. Three key things can dramatically improve the probability of a successful outcome:
 - 1) A vision of what the organization should look like in 12-18 months after the merger
 - 2) A detailed plan for how that can be achieved
 - 3) A series of Rapid Results projects
- It is a good idea to start with a few smaller acquisitions to develop capacity before chasing the “Big One”

- The same approach can be applied to internal reorganizations, which are often similar to mergers and acquisitions

The Secrecy Objection: So, how have we been doing with our previous efforts where things were kept confidential and secret? This objection is regularly used as an excuse to not engage, fully disclose, air problems, reveal dirty laundry, etc. It is smoke and mirrors, as dozens and dozens of success stories demonstrate. Core essential issues can be successfully kept confidential, but the key point is that EXECUTION ABILITY IS THE COMPETITIVE DIFFERENTIATOR – NOT THE SECRET!!!

Management Skill Development while accomplishing big, rapid results, leading to long-term change

Public commitment to action and results by senior executives is essential component.

Demand-making skills – another essential component. Seven deadly sins of demand making from page 219.

1. Back away from expectations: “Okay folks, budget for your expenses year over year, but I’d sure like to see some reductions when we get into the new year.” (???)
2. Engage in charades: “I don’t know where we are going to get a 15% increase in sales, but I have to put it into my budget, so it is in yours.”
3. Accept See-Saw Trades: “Sure, boss, we can increase sales, but we will have to give deeper discounts to do it.”
4. Set Vague or distant goals: “By this time next year...want to see significant improvement in staff utilization...”
5. Don’t establish consequences: “Okay, so you screwed up. Just set goals you can reach next year.”
6. Set too many goals
7. Allow deflection to preparation and studies

Staff functions must become focused on producing tangible business results. See GlaxoSmithKline case where IT shifted to a mandatory 12-month payback for all projects. See also documentation on tangible outputs from HR in the Harvard Business Review article that describes the GE Capital model at HR’s effective role in large numbers of acquisitions. January 1998, *Making the Deal Real: How GE Capital Integrates Acquisitions*.

- Another aspect of staff work is effective collaboration with line management to produce results. See example of Zurich Financial Services, UK General Insurance Unit, page 225. Finance had been playing a traditional staff role, making recommendations for better cash management, but no decisive action resulted. Within three weeks of the Rapid Results initiative, a cash improvement action plan was put in place. Less than three months later, an additional \$1 Billion in internal cash was freed up within the company.

Short term / Long term tradeoff: The Rapid Results approach is unquestionably the best way to balance these two competing demands. Produce immediate, tangible results in the short term that lead to the right long term changes. It is important to remember that long term organization transformation is never a straight line – rather it is a process of successive approximations produced by the Rapid Results projects. It will not be clean, easy, or pretty.

Examples of Big Results produced when people had to get the job done:

- Page 17, Bayway Refinery, Linden, NJ. 2700 people were running the refinery and complaining of being understaffed. A spontaneous walkout occurred and nearly 2000 workers stopped working. 450 supervisors and engineers, who had been much of the target of management's criticism, kept the refinery running for four months while the dispute dragged on, PRODUCTIVITY TRIPLED AND VIRTUALLY NO PLANNING, NO PREPARATION AND NO INVESTMENTS.
- Apollo 13 mission
- Launch of the Nautilus as the first nuclear powered submarine, resulting in a near perfect first cruise without surfacing of ten-times the distance any other submarine had ever traveled under water and full commissioning as ready for operations within two days after the first cruise.
- Page 19, Mohawk Carpeting plant ceiling collapsed, damaging one production line. Within a week the other production line was ramped up and producing as much as both lines had been producing before the storm.
- We all know examples of fires, natural disasters, strikes and other circumstances where people simply had to perform – and they got the job done.

A Rapid Cycle Project is not a short-term “hurry up” attack. Big differences are that the short-term project cares only about the immediate result and no follow-up actions or long-term change takes place. The short-term “hurry up” attack also allows people to drop their other responsibilities simply to get the short-term emergency dealt with. Other attributes of the difference:

- The Rapid Cycle project has a definite beginning and end versus a vague timeframe for the short-term “hurry up”.
- Rapid Results projects have pin-pointed accountability versus “everyone hustling to solve the problem” – no clear accountability.
- Rapid Results projects use deliberate experimentation versus trying things out helter-skelter.
- Rapid Results projects are planned and disciplined versus trial and error.
- At the end, Rapid Results projects have poised the organization for the next phase of progress. Short-term “hurry up” projects go back and begin to pick up what got dropped along the way.

The Big Fix / Big Bang Solution: The organ transplant analogy works well here. Hundreds, if not thousands, micro connections need to work successfully in the organ transplant, otherwise the recipient rejects the transplant. Look at the failure rates of Big Bang / Big Fix change efforts and the root causes and you see enormous parallels of failed organ transplants.

Focus on Execution and Implementation as better cost benefit approaches than technology investment, acquisition, major marketing campaigns, reorganization, etc.

See Michael Hammer quote on page 55.

Why do more organizations not embrace the Rapid Results / Implementation / Execution focus?

- Hammer: The answer hinges on some unpleasant characteristics of contemporary corporate leadership. Business cultures often undervalue operations – cast it as low in status, boring, unglamorous. Many senior managers schooled in finance, strategy, deal making and marketing simply don't know much about operations – leaving it to the engineers.
- Senior managers lack confidence in their ability to effectively execute and implement. A SURPRISINGLY LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE REACH SENIOR MANAGEMENT

POSITIONS WITHOUT EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE IN GETTING THEIR TROOPS TO TACKLE VERY DIFFICULT CHALLENGES SUCCESSFULLY. (from page 56)

- When those managers face a tough goal many fail to stand up in plain sight and say to their people, "This is what we have to do...let's decide how...and by when." Instead they fall into preparations, studies THAT SIMPLY MUST be done before they decide how to move. They lack confidence in themselves and their people and believe they need major help from consultants.

Major Classes of Rapid Results Projects:

- Straight performance improvement
- Process redesign
- Model week or model month

Rapid Results project breakers – Will not work when:

- The main objective is to get buy-in of participants to decisions that have already been made.
- Management is not prepared to make immediate decisions and launch immediate action
- The objective is reduction of staff

Extracts from *The GE Work-Out* by Ulrich, Kerr, Ashkenas. McGraw Hill, 2002

Essential: Yes or No decisions required on the spot! Executives may be uncomfortable, but they did it anyway.

Development of Leadership Decision Making Skills:

- Forced leaders in front of employees at making quick decisions.
- Did not allow them to hide in offices, make decisions by fait accompli or avoid making tough decisions.
- This became part of the GE Company DNA!

Open Forum and public accountability, public record is crucial! See Major Sales Company case.

Why employee ideas are often not listened to:

- Managers and Executives are overloaded
- Getting approvals for money and action from above takes so long, most say, "why bother?"

People closest to the work know it best – Russ Acuff quote: "In the 1900 era, 90% of the time, the supervisor knew more about the work than the employee. Today that dynamic is completely reversed.

Fundamental Concept: When employees' ideas are solicited and put into action, unstoppable energy is released.

Excuses:

- "There is too much work." This is the ongoing excuse of organizations stuck in old ways.
- "Just one more way to cut headcount."

How Welch Removed managers' excuses for not getting started:

- Funded first year completely, so budget was no excuse.
- Kept it on the agenda, and asked for status.
- Allowed managers to replace the lead consultant ONLY ONCE!!! – See Major Sales Company case.

Business Unit Leader must run the concluding town meeting HIMSELF. Must make Yes or No decisions, according to the rules, e.g. 70% on the spot, 30% within 30 days, decisions and rationale presented back to the group.

Include overview of entire business in major sessions so everyone has the broader perspective and knows how they fit in. Need to include financial, strategic, major problems and opportunities, briefing on each major business unit and how it fits into the big picture. Often this will be the first time many people will have come to understand the greater picture.

Process Mapping and associated skills becomes an important tool.

- Process maps are a great tool to get people to look beyond their own department.

GE's ultimate mantra became, "speed, simplicity, self-confidence."

Critical lesson: The value of demanding a 30-50% improvement instead of settling for a 5% incremental improvement.

Not allowing people to fall down on their existing responsibilities reinforces the key concept of HIGH VALUE ACTIVITIES DRIVE OUT LOW VALUE ACTIVITIES.

RAMMPP Checklist for Rapid, low-hanging fruit, improvement to any process:

- Reports
- Approvals
- Meetings
- Measures
- Policies
- Practices

Clean sheet thinking – "If we were to enter this business today, how would we do it?"

The "Portfolio of Initiatives" 2X2 Matrix: Size of payback versus timeframe, magnitude and risk entered indicated by size of circle.

Improving Executive Decision Making:

- Objection? "We don't want to make decisions on the spot, with people looking."
- Response: "The fundamental concept here is that making decisions in this format, even if some are wrong, is better than the old way of doing business."
 - o "You certainly do not have to say yes to everything." A clear "no", with reasoning is far better than no decision, plus creates value by education people
 - o Recommendations that do not produce a yes or no create cynicism
- Removing decision making crutches: Time, analysis, staff opinions, deep consideration.
- ESSENTIAL for speed
- CONSULTANTS MAY WANT TO WITHDRAW IF DECISION MAKING RULES NOT ADHERED TO

Town Meeting Keys:

- Not just “present and decide”
- Debate, discussion and HAVE SENIOR MANAGERS MODEL FOR PEOPLE HOW DECISIONS SHOULD BE THOUGHT THROUGH!
- 70% Decisions on the Spot
- Remaining 30% given decisions within e.g. 30 days, but CRITICAL to have follow-up meeting / conference call to present decision and logic

Action / Planning meetings must take place immediately after Town Hall type decision making meetings.

Case Study of failed Work-Out attempt, page 48. A prominent GE partner came to Crotonville to learn how to do Work-Out.

- Organization was struggling with cost, quality and distribution issues. Many of its dominate market positions were eroding.
- Many “fiefdoms”
- Organization and people not willing to look at hard realities.
- Team unwilling to challenge the status quo, sacred cows, have conflict.
- Only one recommendation came from the entire session.
- The business unit leader could not make a decision to proceed.
- Dropped the Work-Out approach

Management fads are often used to mask the fact that senior executives really don’t know what to do to improve implementation and execution.

Objections:

- “We’ve already tried that – its one more flavor of the month.”

Business Unit Leader resistance, duck, dodge:

- Some don’t want to be put on the spot to make decisions
- Some aren’t qualified
- Expectation of running a Town Meeting is so high, no one feels up to the task
- Some solutions: Get them some coaching, small trials and small wins, TOP MANAGEMENT REQUIRES THEM TO DO IT ANYWAY.
- Recall the quote from Jack Welch’s books about “not settling for the management head fake.”

Town Hall Meeting Requirements:

- Sponsor / Business Unit Leader of Meeting:
 1. Not overbearing
 2. Listening
 3. Drawing out views
 4. Help people think things through
 5. Not just spouting opinions
 6. Make decisions
 7. Explain why some recommendations can not be adopted
 8. Must intervene when implementation teams encounter trouble

Objections:

- “No time / cost too high / can’t take people away from their jobs”
 1. Solutions
 - Focus on 10X paybacks only

- Work only issues with compelling results, e.g. reduce claims by 50%

“Express Work-Outs” – Good for initial small wins, a single plant, sales office, small division.

- Problem can be attacked in a single day

Key Agenda Issues:

- See page 66
- A business unit update by key executive – 30 minutes
- Overview, instructions to team, some training, warm-up exercise by facilitator – hour and a half
- Breakout sessions – teams go breakout rooms to work predefined major issues – two hours
- Lunch – working – everyone sits with people from other teams to share ideas and get input
- Work session continue – one and a half hours
- Town Meeting where each team presents recommendations and discusses – executive makes decisions – two and a half hours

Town Meeting Tips continued:

- Identify “helps, hindrances, bottlenecks”
- I find process flows very helpful
- Make sure breakout groups present to all so common problems become evident to all
 - IF SPONSOR CAN NOT MAKE THE TOWN MEETING, CONDUCT THE TOWN MEETING PORTION SEPARATELY, ASAP, WITH PEOPLE PRESENT, REGARDLESS OF THE COST. DO NOT ALLOW THE “I CAN’T BE THERE” DODGE.

Determining how many days required for sessions:

- Start with desired outcome
- Work backwards on what it will take to get there
- Determine who should be there

Recommendations must be “fully cooked” proposals:

- Implementation built in
- Risks, costs identified
- Paybacks identified
- 12-week or less implementation identified
- *** Volunteer owner responsible for the implementation must emerge
- *** Executive sponsor must have no excuse to avoid decision making

Implementation Follow Up Meetings:

- Must take place after Town Hall-type decision making sessions, e.g. meet every other week for “Breakfast of Champions” – executive sponsor meets with owners for each recommendation
- Track progress and issues
- Measure results

Emphasis is on fast. Best to just get on with it – don’t plan and diddle for six months!

Town Hall / Workshop session preparation:

- Frame up several issues / goals – must be specific

- Bring good people in to help
- Set big improvement goals
- Consolidate under overall goal
- Define breakout teams
- Prepare prep kit for participants
- Conduct prep conference calls – possibly multiple – with the boss present!
- Identify paybacks
- Note that sometimes specific goals / issues are not readily evident – distilling problems down to goals and issues is part of the working session
- BE PREPARED TO POSTPONE IF PARTICIPANTS FAIL TO DO THEIR PREPARATION
- SPONSOR ON BOARD, WILLING TO MAKE DECISIONS ON THE SPOT ACCORDING TO THE DECISION MAKING RULES
- Ideal length is two-three days
- Flow charts very helpful to frame up problems
- Cross department participation is essential

Town Hall Workshop Agenda Issues continued:

- Sponsor gives deep briefing on each key problem and the case for change
- Schedule remains flexible EXCEPT FOR THE LAST TWO HOURS WHERE DECISION MAKING MUST HAPPEN

Meeting Facilitation Rules:

- No sacred cows
- No turf
- No blaming
- No rank – all ideas will be heard
- No complaints – only constructive solutions – even if imperfect
- Must have experienced facilitator on each team

Town Hall Meeting Issues continued:

- Managers will often sit in on Town meetings – uninvited
- These are those that are often the most threatened – need an action plan to bring them up to speed, on board and either allay their fears or deal with their resistance

Follow up meetings / reviews:

- 30-, 60-, 90-day reviews are absolute minimums

Tackling Really Big Issues – might approach by:

- One-day Work-Out to frame up the problem and research assignments
- Give three weeks to research
- Have a two-day Work-Out to bring research together, recommendations and make decisions

Long Distance Work-Out:

- Initial two-day face-to-face with key managers
- Followed by 30 days of local team brainstorming / research / filters / recommendations. GE USED LOTUS NOTES!
- After 30 days, key managers meet face-to-face for another Work-Out to reduce to action
- Possible, though probably not best to conduct via video conference:

- Day 1 – Video conference with all people, going through the first part of Work-Out
- Day 2 – Local teams work up prioritized recommendations
- Day 3 – Town Hall Meeting convened via teleconference for decision making and action

Enforcing Values Behavior with Senior Executives – a watershed event for GE.

- See discussion on page 230-232.
- At annual GE officers meeting, 1992, Boca Raton, FL, Jack Welch dramatically removed several senior leaders of GE, including Business Unit heads who had achieved their numbers but were not exhibiting the GE values.
- Welch: “The problem was that some of our leaders were unwilling, or unable to abandon big company, big shot autocracy and embrace the values we were trying to grow...They made their short-term numbers...this was the toughest call...but they made their numbers without regard to values and often diminished the overall values effort of GE by grinding people down, squeezing them, stifling them. SOME OF THESE LEARNED TO CHANGE, MOST COULDN'T...THIS WAS A WATERSHED – THE ULTIMATE TEST OF OUR ABILITY TO ‘WALK THE TALK’, BUT IT HAD TO BE DONE IF WE WANTED GE PEOPLE TO BE OPEN, TO SPEAK UP, TO SHARE AND TO ACT BOLDLY OUTSIDE OF TRADITIONAL LINES OF AUTHORITY AND FUNCTIONAL BOXES.”
- Quote from one of the executives that was removed: “We had just wrapped up our numbers – they were outstanding – we were well over our targets – had achieved a real turnaround. Welch called – I was shocked when I was told I was being fired...Once he explained it to me, I could see his perspective...I know that I can be pretty rough on people. So what he did was probably the right thing, but I sure didn't see it coming.”

Remember that from Welch's books that GE used extensive employee surveys to determine whether the core values messages were getting through to the front line.

Excerpts from *High Impact Consulting* by Robert Schaffer, Jossey-Bass, 2002

Consultants become avoidance mechanisms for making demands. See case page 192-197.

- Root problem is often weak demand making
- Demanding and achieving high performance results is one of the most difficult of all management tasks – not surprising that avoidance techniques happen. Using the consultant can help the executive avoid public accountability for failing to achieve a specific result
- Using the consultant can help avoid executives having to deal decisively with people who fail to achieve results and reasonable demands.
- A common dodge of demand making is, “Let's get a consultant to look into it.” This results in endless studies, activities and preparations. Senior managers feel good, but decisive action and changing their own behavior does not result. Consultants (well meaning and otherwise) are often co-conspirators in the avoidance game. They are delighted to give client managers studies, programs, training and endless preparatory activities, that allow the managers to delay or avoid making sharp demands.
- Consultants often do not see that they are being used for delay and avoidance.
- The Big Bang / Big Fix project using consultants is attractive to executives who want to delay or avoid the unpleasant task of confronting people with demands and compelling performance.

- WHAT THE CONSULTANT SHOULD BE DOING:
 - Work together with senior executive to clarify project requirements and demands
 - Before the demands and project goals are finalized, bring the senior executive and the implementing people together to get input, discuss implementation, produce effective demands and project goals, timelines, requirements, accountability, etc.
 - KEY: THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE MUST MAKE THE DEMANDS ON HIS PEOPLE!!! The consultant can not make these demands and compel performance. If the consultant falls into this trap, the project outcome will be compromised.
 - Consultant can help the implementers as they begin to respond to senior client's issues and work through the demands.
 - Consultant can develop a process for ensuring that the senior executive's demands are followed up on and met.
 - CONSULTANTS SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THIS MAY BE A VERY SENSITIVE AREA FOR SENIOR MANAGERS. SOME ARE OPEN TO FEEDBACK ON THEIR DEMAND MAKING CAPABILITIES, BUT MANY FEEL THREATENED OR ATTACKED IF A CONSULTANT IMPLIES THEY HAVE SHORTCOMINGS.

Strategy Issues continued:

- One manager out of thirty does not know what strategic direction is needed for his unit. Twenty-nine out of thirty know what is needed, just can't get it done!

Examples of Big Results when people had to perform continued:

- From page 37, Health insurance claims examiners with low productivity increased their output by 50% WITHIN HOURS AND SIMULTANEOUSLY REDUCED THEIR ERROR RATE after being promised paid time off during an experiment to improve productivity.
- When the Tylenol poisonings happened in the 1980s, and Tylenol was temporarily out of business, they developed a triple-safety packaging system and restarted production within three months instead of the normal 12-18 months to develop such a system.

The Zest Factors:

- Focus on a few critical results
- Goals are clear, measurable, short-term
- Real sense of urgency – it must be done
- People see that success depends on them and they assume the responsibility
- People realize they must experiment / try something new to achieve their goals
- Public, visible accountability for results

Core Concept: Define results target first, THEN FIGURE OUT HOW TO DO IT!

Note that research, conceptual and strategic thinking are still needed.

Simple exercise for setting stretch goals: When discussing range of possible goals (timeframe, percent improvement, cost improvement, sales gain, etc.) fold a piece of paper and pass it around the group. Each person writes down a number that they believe could be achieved, without signing their name! By the time you get around to everyone, the range of realistic stretch goals will be obvious to all.

Remember organization breakdown structure has value to helping people understand who is responsible for what.

Organization Change Issues:

- Often an excuse or avoidance tactic because management does not really know how to solve the implementation and execution problems necessary to produce the needed result. Okay to view as necessary and useful outputs to support the Rapid Results projects, BUT MUST NOT BE ALLOWED AS DELAY TACTIC TO AVOID GETTING STARTED OR AVOID ACTION.

Positive, Truthful PR:

- A monthly or quarterly newsletter describing the projects undertaken and results achieved can be very useful

Traps and Mistakes:

- Clients diagnosis is wrong, but consultant does not have the courage to challenge it

Breaking IT Projects into 90-day results demands:

- e.g. Nortel case – set goal of reducing one category of inventory by X% within 90 days, without allowing stock-outs to increase
- example: Improving order to cash cycle time – Banctec failure – might have been accomplished if focused on reducing the order to cash cycle for a single class of orders instead of the Big Bang / Big Fix approach.
- See GlaxoSmithKline case – requiring IT projects to pay themselves back within 12 months
- See PNC Bank case on page 116. After years spent on specifications and detailed study for a new system, a Rapid Results executive jump started the process and demanded short-term results. The system plan was streamlined in the seven components and a small joint team was assigned to manage each one. Each team was required to select one of eight banks as a pilot bank and design a prototype solution for their component and install it within three months. This resulted in seven workable components within 90 days operating in a pilot bank. The next 90 day projects involved rolling out the new piloted systems to all banks. The whole system was installed in 18 months instead of the original three year timetable at a cost of \$19 million instead of the planned \$26 million. This success resulted in a new core deposit system being installed in short-term, rapid cycle increments. Even though the core deposit system affected virtually every transaction in the bank, and was seen as nothing less than a total integrated system change, it was still broken down into workable components and installed incrementally. See also page 114, actual dialogue with IT people where one was resisting rapid cycle projects and insisting on nine months or longer for project completion. Another person spoke up and said, “Let me explain an example of where we were able to get something done rapidly. In studying an inventory problem the users identified that six vital pieces of information needed to accompany any paperwork for an order and be plainly printed on anything shipped to the plant. It only took three days to implement.”