**OCM Case Study 2**

You’re the OCM lead on a large-scale IT system development project for a large state department that recently shifted their software development from a traditional waterfall approach to an Agile development approach. There are more than 20,000 internal and external users of the current system that are impacted by this project. State users represent three different business units. At least one organization from each of California’s 58 counties are impacted. In addition to these state and county employees, users include Independent Researchers, Foster Youth, Foster Families, and Foster Home Facilities.

With so many users, identifying what was changing for each group was a large task. The system change for most county users was adequately defined, but only at a high-level because Agile involves an iterative approach to software development. The change for internal project resources who were attempting to use Agile principles for the first time was not well defined at all.

Your sponsor is the Project Leadership Team (PLT) and is divided among three groups from various state and county departments. Sponsorship has shifted significantly over the course of the project. Some sponsors are more engaged in the project than others. A few seem to be more focused on using their involvement in the project to further their career. There are a few names on the sponsor list that you don’t recognize; they don’t come to a lot of meetings. Still, the PLT has the power to make decisions; however, sometimes they seem to defer to other groups instead of making hard decisions.

County and state relations are historically strained. There is some mistrust between the two groups. While everyone agrees that the old system needs to be replaced, it’s hard to agree on what the new system will be. There have been many failed attempts in the past to replace this system, so county users don’t really believe that this time it’s really happening. No one can explain how this time is different, although there is a strong belief among leadership that the adoption of Agile principles will solve most of the historical issues. Having county representatives on the PLT helped but also created some coordination issues.

When the project switched from waterfall to Agile, you (the Change Management lead) were surprised. No one had included you in the conversations or decision. Sometimes, you aren’t brought into meetings until changes are about to be implemented. All the OCM plans were developed when the project was waterfall. Once the project shifted to Agile, instead of rewriting the plans and focusing on the implications of the change to Agile, you and your OCM team were assigned tasks that were OCM adjacent, at best. Everything seemed to be moving so fast and hectically that leadership prioritized the daily hurricane of activity over planning and OCM activities.

In the end, the switch to Agile failed to contain the scope, software was not delivered at the end of every sprint, and the state continued to spend on their contractor resources despite the lack of working software. Over budget and behind schedule, the project was put on pause for reevaluation.