Shifting

A New Way to Look at Change

1

> Avoiding change failure starts with building and getting a commitment to an organizational why—the core belief underlying what the district and/or school is attempting to accomplish on behalf of those it serves.

THE BIG SHIFT

A LEADER'S STORY

"It was a miserable fail."

Dr. Karen Rue, former superintendent
Northwest ISD, Texas
**Now, Clinical Professor, K–12 Educational Leadership,
Baylor University**

In my first year in the district, I just shoved things down people's throats. I got there and evaluated the elementary reading program and realized there was something missing. I knew exactly what needed to happen, so I told people what needed to happen. I wanted them to begin with staff development on what a balanced reading program was. They'd never had that kind of PD. They also didn't understand all the program components, so I wanted to bring in professional development to address those two issues. What I didn't do was let people discover the issues themselves. I didn't set the stage. I didn't give them the time to do their own learning. I didn't start with a small ask, such as, "Would the principals get together with your key reading people at your elementary levels, with whomever, study what a balanced reading program is, and look at it in light of our own and make some recommendations about what we might need?" I can think

(Continued)

(Continued)

of a hundred ways I could've done it differently, but I didn't. I came in as the expert. I knew what we needed. I went about putting it in place.

And it was sabotaged. People went through the motions, but they never did it. I remember telling one of the people I worked with, "I'm smarter than this. I should've known this." It was a miserable fail.

Why Change Initiatives Fail

According to the Gallup Organization, upwards of 70 percent of all complex change initiatives fail annually (Leonard & Coltea, 2013). Interestingly, Gallup notes that roughly the *same* percentage of all U.S. employees feel disengaged from their work. Is that figure a mere coincidence (Schwantes, 2017)?

The literature is replete with stories about the one, three, five, seven, ten, or fifty reasons why proposed changes don't go as planned. Our assessment of those reasons, backed up by more than one hundred years of combined experience in business and education, has led us to focus on three, which we will examine throughout the book.

Yes, complex change initiatives also require attention to be paid to the more technical factors of skill acquisition, resources, timetables, infrastructure, and the change plan itself, but we believe that change success ultimately rests as much or more on human nature and behavior.

Many of you reading this narrative are probably familiar with the model of change that Professor Tim Knoster shared back in 1991. It's a clear and simple model of what can derail change efforts and negatively impact culture. There, Knoster showed that if certain change factors weren't addressed, the result in the organization could be confusion, sabotage, anxiety, resistance, and frustration—all *human* implications (Moesby, 2004). We can only conclude that the 70 percent of organizations that experience change

MAKING SENSE OF IT

Words matter, and we use three terms throughout with specific meanings: *outcome*, *impact*, and *organizational why*.

Outcome: The result of a single change event (e.g., As a result of revising the building schedule, teachers are now meeting and engaging in collaborative planning twice a week).

Impact: The overall benefits that serve a population, such as students, as a result of a series of cohesive changes (e.g., Through effective collaborative planning and instruction around solving complex and real-world problems, students' engagement and achievement have increased).

Organizational Why: The core belief underlying what impact the district and/or school seeks to have relative to those it serves (e.g., To succeed in a rapidly changing world, students need to be increasingly challenged to [1] demonstrate their ability to use their knowledge and skills in new and unrehearsed ways to solve complex, real-world problems and [2] justify their answers).

failure did not address those potential implications either adequately or accurately and, as a result, suffered a commensurate negative impact on staff.

Thus, two questions need to be thoroughly examined, which we will start to do here and then more fully examine in subsequent chapters:

- Who is leading the change effort, and do they view themselves as a *valued* leader of any change that works toward the organizational why?
- Who is executing the change effort, and do they view themselves as a *valued* contributor to the why behind the change?

The word *valued* is particularly important in both of these questions. As neuroscience researcher Dr. Melissa Hughes observed in a vlog post, "When we see ourselves as a vital part of the work, that's when our engagement grows. This is when we know that what we do really matters and that our colleagues value our contributions." In short, a major component of change success is the engagement of the people leading and executing the change (Hughes, 2019).

"Houston, we have a problem." (Actually, we have three of them.)

Let's look at the three factors of change failure in greater depth.

WHY CHANGE INITIATIVES FAIL

1. **Neglecting the WHY:** Failure to agree on the organizational why—the core belief underlying the overall impact the district and/or school seeks to have relative to those it serves—and to cohesively tie any changes and their desired outcomes to that *why*.

2. **Neglecting the WHO:** Failure to assess and develop the mindset, talents, and behaviors that leaders and staff need to bring about changes and their desired outcomes; to focus as much or more on the people leading and executing the change than on the specific change itself.

3. **Neglecting the WHAT:** Failure to acknowledge what people are already doing well in the school or district as it assesses conditions that speak to the need for additional change; to see change as cultural—a cohesive set of proactive actions that people undertake to serve their *why*.

When we step back and look at these three factors, our cautionary note to leaders is

"Ignore at your peril the people charged with leading or implementing the change."

LEADERSHIP SPOTLIGHT

Change initiatives fail overwhelmingly because of what is not known or taken into consideration relative to the people charged with leading and making the change happen.

In his 2016 book, *Thank You for Being Late*, three-time Pulitzer Prize winner Thomas Friedman reflected back to 2004 when his bestseller, *The World Is Flat*, was published. He was surprised to discover that what are today commonplace technologies were absent from the index. "Facebook didn't even exist, Twitter was still a sound, the cloud was still in the sky, 4G was a parking space, 'applications' were what you sent to colleges, LinkedIn was barely known and most people thought it was a prison, Big Data was a good name for a rap star, and Skype, for most people was a typographical error" (Friedman, 2016, p. 25).

The changes that Friedman notes are only those we've experienced in technology and social media over the past decade. We could easily identify a similar list of changes in politics, international relations, economics, society, and, as we will do momentarily, in education.

At least three problems that require major shifts in how we approach, develop, and lead change have compounded our ability to effectively navigate those changes in education. We introduce these shifts here and then more fully develop them throughout the book.

Problem 1: The Why—We Haven't Always Agreed on the Outcomes or the Impact We Want to Have

As the educational reform advocate, Sir Ken Robinson, noted in an animated video (see Link 1.1),

LEADER VOICES

Focus on the Why

Listen to part of our interview with **Jonathan Adams**, assistant principal at the International School in Luxembourg, where he describes his work to clearly articulate the why behind a literacy initiative and ensure that those implementing the change viewed themselves as valued contributors. (Listen via the QR code at the end of this chapter, or click on Link 1.2 at www.shiftingforimpact.com.)

We're trying to meet the future by what we did in the past. The current system of education was designed and conceived and structured for a different age. Education is modeled on the interests of industrialization and in the image of it. Schools are organized around factory lines—ringing bells, separate facilities, specialized and separate subjects—all-in-all, a production line mentality. It's all about standardization. (RSA Animate, 2010)

Evan Robb, principal of Johnson Williams Middle School in Berryville, Virginia, echoed this point in our interview: "You can search for pictures of an elementary classroom from the 1920s or the 1950s, and some of those classrooms don't look much different from classrooms today. But if you did a search and looked up factories from then they would be radically different from what we see today. I talk to my staff about the fact that businesses are beholden to a bottom line—they have to change with the times, or they go out of business—but education hasn't been that way."

In short, as educators, we've largely gone about our business as we have since the dawn of the industrial age. We haven't always pushed ourselves away from our desks to take a hard look at the why behind contemporary education. We're often so mired in tasks and putting out the proverbial fires that we've lost the focus on what we're trying to accomplish—the real outcomes we're after and the impact we want to have. One school district leadership team gives us a view into this problem.

"At the End of the Day, It's About . . ."

At their leadership workshop retreat, the group of twenty-plus administrators stood in silence, reviewing the 8.5" × 11" pieces of paper taped to the wall. Each paper represented an individual administrator's response to the challenge from the workshop facilitators: "Identify the impact you want this district to have."

- "Safety for all students"
- "Improved test scores"
- "Critical thinking and problem solving"
- "Fluency in math and literacy"
- "Social and emotional skills"
- "Student perseverance; grit"

- "Respect for self, others and community"
- "Ability to get into college"

The list went on with some duplication, and a heated discussion followed: "At the end of the day, it's about . . ."

- " . . . keeping kids secure and safe!"
- " . . . performance on high-stakes assessments because property values reflect them!"
- " . . . providing equity of opportunity!"
- " . . . ensuring that all kids have basic math and reading skills!"
- " . . . developing kids who can think and solve problems!"

It's not that any of the suggested impact statements are wrong; they're actually all important. But at the end of the day, it was clear there was no agreement on how they rolled up to a larger, more encompassing statement on the impact the district really wanted to have on behalf of its students and the community.

The Bottom Line—This lack of agreement on what we really want for students as the result of what we do—the *consequences* of our actions—always signals another problem: a misalignment with the instructional tools and approaches we're taking to educate them—the *curriculum* of our actions. If we don't know where we want to wind up, we're likely to be flailing, trying a little bit of this and a little bit of that to see what works. How could we expect otherwise? To paraphrase what the Cheshire Cat said to Alice: "If you don't know where you're going, any road will take you there."

Shift 1: Change How We Look at Purpose

In 1998, Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe introduced their Understanding by Design framework for developing curriculum. The framework was revolutionary because it sought to move educators' thinking way beyond the traditional goals and objectives they had typically included in curriculum design. Those goals and objectives, according to Wiggins and McTighe, tended to focus on the coverage of discrete facts and skills. Instead, they urged educators to begin with the end in mind and answer the questions "What outcomes are we after?" and "What do we expect students to know and do?" (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

Most districts implementing this approach did so at the curriculum level. But what if this approach were first applied to the district-level philosophy? One district decided to find out. The Wethersfield School District in Wethersfield, Connecticut, is located just south of Hartford and serves approximately 3,600 students. In 2019, it was ranked 43 out of 120 school districts in Connecticut and in the top 20 percent of the "Best School Districts in America" (Niche, 2019). Yet with only 67 percent of its students proficient in reading and 57 percent proficient in math, it wanted better.

Ask a Deeper Question, Get a Deeper Answer—Like all school districts, Wethersfield had its publicly available board mission, beliefs, and vision statements. And like it is with most school districts, these statements were a collection of well-intentioned ideas.

- Students will acquire skills and knowledge for life-long learning, enabling them to compete in a global economy and

- Be prepared to continue their education at the postsecondary level and/or to enter a viable career field of their own choosing.

- The curricula of the Wethersfield schools should be designed, implemented, and assessed to enable all students to realize their full potential.

These statements spoke to the role that schools have historically been asked to play. But what happens if you look at educating students today through the lens of the ever-changing environment that Thomas Friedman spoke of previously and away from the age-old one that Sir Ken Robinson and Evan Robb warned against?

And that's exactly what Wethersfield did. Using Simon Sinek's Golden Circle model, which explains that people buy into the emotional core behind an idea—the *why*—before they buy into the idea itself (Sinek, 2009), Wethersfield set out to answer a series of new and provocative questions:

- **Why** do we approach education the way we do?
- **How** should we educate today's learners in light of our rapidly changing world?
- **What** do we want our learners to know and be able to do *now*?

The third question was perhaps most important. Wethersfield saw that most school districts were content with being largely aspirational when they used language such as "*Students will be prepared to . . .*" The demonstration of fluency in knowledge, skill, creativity, and so on was largely something to be done at a later time. *Now* was merely about acquiring the essential foundations.

With the context of the world changing at an unprecedented rate staring the district in the face, it knew it couldn't approach instruction as it had in the past. It couldn't just focus on providing the foundations for tomorrow because tomorrow is going to be here in the next thirty minutes. Instead, the district had to define the following:

- The skills and knowledge our students need to begin to demonstrate *now* as they confront new and unrehearsed problems.

- What we expect our students to be, to know, and be able to do when they walk across the stage to receive their diplomas.

- How we can best measure student progress.

Its *why* became

Develop students' use of 21st century skills such as problem solving and critical thinking, nurture their social and emotional character, and increase their civic awareness and behavior so they can successfully navigate in and contribute to an increasingly complex and interdependent world *now*.

In our interview, literacy specialist Mary Howard, EdD, who has worked with hundreds of districts across the country, underscores the importance of starting with the why. "When we start with the *what* and then move to the *how* [of change initiatives], we will always fall flat because we don't know what we stand for—we don't know the *why*."

Wethersfield went on to flesh out responses with board, staff, and community input in a flexible and dynamic plan of strategies and actions that will guide them over the next three to five years: *flexible* in that the document could be constantly revisited and adjusted and *dynamic* in that it is Wethersfield's attempt to be proactive about change, to create its future and the students it serves.

The Bottom Line—Why does starting with the why increase the likelihood of staff buying into a proposed change? In one word: neuroscience.

When leaders appeal first to the purpose and motivation behind a proposed change, they tap into the limbic system, that part of our brain that controls emotions, behaviors, memories, and arousal. When leaders tap into emotion, they increase the likelihood of establishing trust, and trust leads to supportive behavior and decision making.

School districts that have clearly defined their why—the impact they want to have on behalf of the population they serve—can look more critically at proposed changes. They can use their why as a healthy filter to ask, *Relative to everything we are already doing, how will changing in this way move us closer to achieving our desired impact?*

Problem 2: The Who— "Leadership" Is Still Viewed as a Title, Role, and Office

Let's go back to Dr. Karen Rue's "Leader's Story" at the beginning of the chapter. Karen's reflection acknowledges her then-mistaken belief of equating her responsibility as a leader with having to control all aspects of the change initiative. It's not surprising that she would since leaders are still conditioned in a variety of ways to believe that strong leaders make bold pronouncements and take bold actions. Leaders

- are usually given special attention in terms of their office location and furniture,

- are typically positioned at the top of the organizational chart,

- have titles (e.g., principal, superintendent, department head) that convey hierarchy and status,

- traditionally assume or are de facto granted the head of the table in meetings, and

- are believed to have all the answers, and even if they don't, most are compelled to act like they do.

MAKING SENSE OF IT

"Wait, wait, wait," you might be thinking. "Isn't the *why* just another name for mission and vision?" In our experience, no. Educational mission and vision statements tend to be

1. Expansive and inclusive—an extensive list of everything that is going on or could be going on in a district to the point that they tend to lack focus. As the old saw states, "If you stand for everything, you stand for nothing."

2. Aspirational—what students should be capable of doing after they *leave* the school, as opposed to what they should be capable of doing while *in* school.

3. Detached—they're written for the district and community; little effort, if any, is made to promote ownership and action at the individual level. (See Chapter 3: "The Why—Sharing a Clear, Agreed-Upon Purpose.")

Some of these points may seem trivial, but they reinforce the notion that leading is about authority, command, and control.

And if they are leading, others must be following.

This leader–follower paradigm becomes particularly dangerous when it comes to organizational change, and here's why. People are more likely to change if they are optimistic—feeling positive about the future. Optimism is, in part, driven by the sense of control one has, and the amount of control one feels is the result of the responsibility and ownership he or she is allowed to experience and exercise (Hecht, 2013).

Relative to change, staff who are encouraged to help shape the vision of change and the steps of its development are much more likely to commit to the change itself and feel ownership of it. Thus, the ability to influence a proposed change > drives ownership which > drives a sense of control which > drives optimism which > yields staff commitment.

Shift 2: Change to Look at Leadership as a Set of Desired Behaviors

In *Turn the Ship Around! A True Story of Turning Followers Into Leaders*, navy captain L. David Marquet (2013) tells the story of how his life changed forever in 1998 when he received a call from his superior. He was being reassigned to take command of the USS *Santa Fe*, at the time one of the most technologically modern nuclear attack submarines in the fleet. The call was unsettling for two reasons.

For the past year, Captain Marquet had trained to take command of the submarine USS *Olympia*. He was completely familiar with every aspect of that boat and felt confident in taking over its helm of leadership. The *Santa Fe*, however, was a completely different class of submarine, one with which Captain Marquet was, technically speaking, not at all familiar. His situation was analogous to saying that an eighteen-wheeler and a pickup truck are technically both trucks. It's true, but the differences between the two are vast.

And if that weren't challenging enough, the *Santa Fe* was *the* worst-performing submarine in the U.S. Navy, and it didn't take Captain Marquet very long to figure out why. It had a major people problem, starting with its prior leadership. Captain Marquet wrote, "Leadership in the Navy, and in most organizations, is about controlling people. It divides the work into two groups of people: leaders and followers" (Marquet, 2013, p. xxv). And leaders and crew aboard the *Santa Fe* were clearly emblematic of that relationship.

Don't Take Control, Give Control—Leaders and followers, as a work structure, functioned well when work was mostly about giving orders and pure execution during the early days of the industrial age assembly line: "*I tell; you do.*" But in the modern, technology-heavy age we live in today, Captain Marquet posited, work demands much more cognition and metacognition on the part of the workers.

> People who are treated as followers have the expectations of followers and act like followers. As followers, they have limited decision-making authority and little incentive to give the utmost of their intellect, energy, and passion. Those who take orders usually run at half speed, underutilizing their imagination and initiative. While this doesn't matter much rowing a [an ancient Greek or Roman war galley], it's everything for operating a nuclear-powered submarine. (Marquet, 2013, p. xxvi)

It only took a couple of dramatic incidents early in his tenure aboard the *Santa Fe* for Captain Marquet to realize the extreme shortcomings of the leader–follower model and to grasp why the boat was performing so poorly. For the technically sophisticated *Santa Fe* to operate as an effective weapon of war, Captain Marquet realized that he needed 130-plus *thinkers* on board, not just order-takers. And here's the key belief underlying his model: Each member of the crew inherently had the capacity to behave differently, to give differently. They were all capable of being creative thinkers; they'd just never been asked to be.

And, thus, the leader–leader model was born. As we see in Figure 1.1 Captain Marquet and his cadre of chief petty officers had to completely shift their leadership thinking and behavior away from what was a standard command-and-control, leader–follower protocol to new leader-generating behavior.

And so, too, did the sailors aboard the *Santa Fe* have to shift. They were required to voice their thinking, supply the rationale for their actions, solve problems without being told how, and break down the silo walls that had previously isolated one department from another.

LEADERSHIP SPOTLIGHT

Effective leaders don't direct the change; they focus on releasing the creative energy and thinking of the people who have to make the change happen. It's all about building the capacity of others.

Figure 1.1   Select Principles of the Leader–Leader Model

Leader–Follower: Don't Do This!	Leader–Leader: Do This!
Take control	**Give control**
Give orders	**Avoid giving orders**
Brief people	**Certify people's understanding**
Be questioning	**Be curious**
Protect information	**Share information**
Make inefficient processes efficient	**Cut steps and processes that don't add value**

Source: Adapted from Marquet (2013, p. 205).

"I intend to _____ because _____" became a standard phrase aboard ship. In short, they had to function as *thinking* leaders within their own sphere and as part of the larger team (Marquet, 2013).

Almost immediately, Captain Marquet noted a shift. Within a year—and certainly not without growing pains—the *Santa Fe* was well on its way to becoming the most operationally proficient submarine in the *entire* U.S. Navy. And it would continue to be long after Captain Marquet's departure—all because he released the inherent genius of his crew.

The Bottom Line—Change leadership—really all leadership—is about anything but authority and "command and control." It's about focusing as much or more on the people responsible for the change than on the change itself. It's about unleashing staff's optimism, and to do that, leaders need to unleash staff thinking and experimentation. Leadership, then, isn't a role; it's a set of behaviors.

Problem 3: The What—Changes Are Often Reactive Single Events, Not Proactive or Having Coherence

When we look at Figure 1.2—an undoubtedly incomplete yet lengthy list of macro changes (federal and state mandates) and micro changes (local choice and thought leader driven) initiated over the past few decades—we see the potential to look at change in education as a series of single and often disconnected constructs. We start something, do it for a time, and then move to "the next big idea." There's often no expressed coherence between this change and that change. We'll get at why that is so in a moment.

Recognizing the Power in Others

Listen to part of our interview with **Mike Oliver**, principal of Zaharis Elementary School, Mesa, Arizona, where he talks about realizing the importance of creating an environment where people can take risks and think creatively. (Listen via the QR code at the end of this chapter, or click on Link 1.3 at www.shiftingforimpact.com.)

Figure 1.2　Macro and Micro Changes in Education

Macro initiatives—federal and state mandates

- Common Core
- ESSA
- High-stakes assessments
- Next Generation Learning Standards
- No Child Left Behind
- Standards-based instruction

Micro initiatives—thought leader driven

- 1:1 computing
- Authentic learning
- Backwards design
- Climate and culture committees
- Coaching for performance
- Cooperative learning
- Critical thinking
- Differentiated instruction
- Flipped learning
- Formative assessments
- Game-based learning
- Growth mindset
- Instructional rounds
- Integrated thinking
- Mindfulness
- Personalized learning
- Professional learning committees
- Project-based learning
- Reading in the content area
- Response to intervention
- Restorative justice
- Rubric-based appraisals
- Social and emotional learning
- Standards-based grading
- STEM
- Student-centered learning
- Students as creator
- Visible learning

These changes all come from well-intentioned "thought leaders," many of whom labor *outside* of the school buildings and classrooms and, especially with the micro changes, recommend changing a narrow aspect of education defined by their particular interest. Because the impetus for change is coming from the outside, practitioners quickly find themselves in a position of being reactive rather than proactive to change. They are left to adapt and attempt to establish coherence—or not.

Practitioners are often whipsawed by these well-intentioned "supports," which leads skeptics and exhausted staff to view many changes as fads, fashions, initiatives, and, worst of all, panaceas. Michael Fullan and Joanne Quinn (2016) speak to this consequence when they argue against "initiative overload and fragmentation" in their book, *Coherence*.

The teacher educators with whom we spoke echoed this concern. To paraphrase their observations—and they understandably wanted to remain anonymous—"It seems like every year we try a 'new' educational initiative—something that someone read about or experienced at a conference. We never seem to stay with it, though, because there's always something new following on its heels. And our problems remain the same."

It's no wonder that educators become cynical about change and sit with their arms crossed as the latest change initiative is announced. They don't have to say it, but we know what they're thinking: *This too shall pass.* Dr. Mary Howard remarked in our interview, "You can't have a different program every year. You can't buy your way to change. We have to stop playing the initiative game."

Shift 3: Change How We Look at Change

The first task of leadership at this juncture is to do something totally counterintuitive in today's world of work, be it business or education, and that is to pause. Here's why. As Michael Bunting (2016) describes in his thoughtful book, *The Mindful Leader*,

> Architect, theorist, and inventor Buckminster Fuller once mused that 5000 years ago an invention or innovation that changed what he called "the critical path of humanity" came along about every 200 years. By AD 1 the interval had decreased to 50 years, and by AD 1000, 30 years. By the Renaissance, an invention that changed the nature of our world was emerging every three years; by the Industrial Revolution, it was happening every six months; and by the 1920s, Fuller estimated, the interval was down to 90 days. He called this extraordinary process "accelerating acceleration." Physicist Peter Russell suggests the interval between important new breakthroughs is now down to days, if not hours. (Bunting, 2016, p. 88)

Given this rapid pace of external change, school leaders need to be extraordinarily mindful of how change is currently managed and perceived internally. To do that, they must take stock of their current change culture relative to their organizational why. They must step off the moving sidewalk, the frenetic putting-out-the-fire management of the day to day and . . . pause. Pausing, author Kevin Cashman (2012) notes in *The Pause Principle*, "helps us focus our attention and our energy." And by doing that, leaders begin to ask better questions, listen better, synthesize, and challenge the status quo.

Reactive and transactional changes will be challenged to support the organizational why—if there is one—because staff will tend to see change initiatives as "the flavor of the month" and disconnected with everyone running from one side of the proverbial sinking boat to the other. Conversely, proactive and cohesive change initiatives will first be looked at through the lens of a critical question: "How is this proposed change legitimately related to other change activities we've undertaken or are considering in support of our organizational why?"

LEADERSHIP SPOTLIGHT

Pause for mindful metacognition: Reflect on what's happening around you; what's working and not working; what you're thinking, feeling, and learning; and how you're managing your emotions and relating to others.

With a shift toward such a culture, change becomes more internally driven and purposeful toward achieving the organizational why. It can still benefit from outside influencers, but it's not solely dependent on them for inspiration.

The Bottom Line—Leaders need to shift the impetus for change from outside the district or school to the inside. They do this by creating a culture that constantly looks for ways to sustain progress toward achieving their organizational why through a series of ongoing and coherent activities. And of critical importance, leaders need to create the expectation that all initiatives, decisions, and actions will be measured against their ability to support the desired impact the organization wants to have on behalf of those they serve.

Try This

1. Which of the principles of the leader–leader model do you consistently demonstrate?

2. Where do you still default to a leader–follower model?

3. Why would some leaders be reluctant to operate within the leader–leader model?

(For more on Captain Marquet's story, watch his illustrated talk *Inno-Versity Presents: "Greatness" by David Marquet*, which is available on YouTube and at Link 1.4 Captain Marquet Video.)

| online resources | Scan this QR code or visit the website at www.shiftingforimpact.com to access the links listed above. | |