

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

Note to reader: The articles in this document were annotated by Ann Forstchen (Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission) in support of the Blue Ribbon Panel Relevancy Working Group. They are organized by date of publication.

Executive Summary

- Fish and wildlife (hereafter wildlife) is shifting to people and habitat management
- It's all wildlife for all people (not just focus on game or non-game)
- State fish and wildlife agencies (SFWA) are broadening programs and activities to serve more citizens
- SFWAs funding sources are broadening beyond direct and sole support from license/permit sales – albeit it slowly (process can take 10+ years to implement)
 - License plates, foundations, sales tax, lottery, residential sales tax, etc.
- All SFWAs are addressing social, political and ecological changes and impacts – in their own way, at their own pace and in their unique social-political environments
- SFWAs need to acquire and apply insight from broad arena of conservation social sciences (see Bennett et al graphic)
- SFWA transformation is not about changing commission or board structure, selection process or function but is about changing individual staff thinking and actions that seek out, understand and serve more diverse stakeholders and all citizens
- Communication is key. Words matter (e.g., outdoors vs. outside). Communication strategy development is critical (why, when, by who, to whom, through what channels, how often)
- SFWAs face challenges that are adaptive, not technical – we can't engineer our way out of them
- SFWA change needs to be strategic to be successful
- Relevance of wildlife conservation (and thus relevance of SFWAs) is from the perspective and judgement of citizens not SFWAs
- SFWAs can learn how to be relevant from private sector successes and failures
- Successful change efforts focus on the work – corporate “fixes” (strategic plans, mission statements, marketing slogans, modifying formal structures and systems) don't change organizations; people change organizations
- Leadership commitment is essential for creating conditions ripe for change and breaking down obstacles
- Learning will be required
- Resources will need to be acquired or reprioritized
- Evaluation of progress is critical
- Leadership must walk the talk
- Recognize and accept that wildlife conservation is in the outdoor recreation business
- SFWAs need to better market conservation benefits to all citizens
- SFWAs need to focus on short-term but also long-term which is difficult in era of short-term political cycles and increasingly shorter tenure of SFWA directors
- Dedicated change agents are critical for success

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Shift in terminology reflects shift in SFWA focus (Clients (customers) → stakeholders → beneficiaries)
- Transformation/ SFWA relevancy is a journey not an event
- SFWA staff slowly are representing citizenry (don't hunt, trap, fish)
- Recent awareness and acceptance of public trust framework for wildlife management supports efforts for SFWA relevance
- Wildlife management is the guidance of decision-making processes and implementation of practices to purposefully influence interactions between people, wildlife and habitats to achieve impacts (benefits) valued by stakeholders (citizens)
- SFWA relevance is a means to wildlife conservation relevance
- SFWAs are moving to become bridging or platform organizations rather than being the sole provider of conservation benefits
- Principle role of SFWA is to provide benefits for people
- Peoples interests in wildlife and their management is changing; expectations for involvement in decision making has increased
- Delivery of conservation benefits includes reducing negative impacts from wildlife
- SFWAs struggle to work well in the political arena (missing skill set)
- Declining %s of participating in traditional outdoor recreation, coupled with increasingly diverse and urbanized society creates the need for SFWAs to adapt to changing societal context
- Need to overcome the historical SFWA financial dependence derived from hunting and fishing without alienating these traditional stakeholders
- Transformation of the actions and practices of SFWA should not diminish the importance of traditional stakeholders and their essential role in wildlife management
- Incremental and radical innovation may be needed depending on SFWA context
- Organizations that chiefly pursue existing competencies (those things we already know how to do) will suffer from obsolescence
- SFWAs need to hire for what they want to become, not what they are
- Deliberative transformative change can be initiated at multiple scales and be done gradually
- Transformation can be done BY you, or TO you
- Continued fragmentation of conservation interests (factions) is certain to result in conservation loss
- Under public trust framework, legislators and commissioners, to whom legislators have delegated specific authorities, are the primary trustees of the publics' wildlife; state wildlife agency professionals are trust managers; all citizens are beneficiaries of the trust
- SFWAs should continually scan social, economic and ecological sectors for emerging issues that could influence wildlife conservation
- SFWAs need to learn from each other
- SFWAs need to acknowledge NGOs and partners are legitimate part of conservation institution and have important and significant contributions to conservation
- SFWAs need to find common ground with NGOs and partners and leverage their resources but recognize their constraints
- Shift from wildlife population focus to conservation system focus

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Benefits desired from the wildlife trust may change over time and across generations; flexibility of management strategies is prudent
- Relevance means have a logical connection to or some bearing of importance for real world issues of social significance (e.g., the economy, job creation, energy development, transportation, health care, education, climate change) and being recognized as having such a connection
- Relevance alone is not sufficient, conservation and conservation agencies must be valued and supported
- *principles* of a relevant, valued and adaptive agency
 - Contemporary with respect to social values, needs, and interests
 - Wildlife-values focus (rather than wildlife-use focus)
 - External orientation—engage partners, understand stakeholders, form coalitions
 - Good governance (e.g., open, transparent, inclusive, and fair decision-making processes)
 - “Safe haven” work environment where opinions are freely expressed
 - Receptive to new perspectives and alternatives; risk taking within reason
 - Anticipatory, proactive, and responsive
 - Nimble and flexible
 - Evaluative and continually learning, improving
 - Accountable; proactively seeking feedback
 - Strong and broad scale partner relationships
 - Coupled social-ecological systems approach
- Some in the conservation community suggest part of the solution to wildlife management agency financial solvency is to convert the nonpaying consumers to paying customers
 - attempts to broaden agency funding through this type of conversion generally have not been successful
- Using a public trust framework for wildlife conservation eliminates the need to distinguish between consumers and customers
- SFWAs need to examine their thinking, terminology and behaviors as they shift from an economics-based focus on consumers, customer, clients, etc. to a more inclusive trust-based focus on “conservation beneficiaries” – these beneficiaries should recognize the benefits they receive from fish and wildlife management and they value and support conservation even if they don’t directly participate in outdoor wildlife-related activities
- Celebrate the rich conservation history over the past century, but recognize that leaning on our history, particularly regarding outdated organizations structure and how we relate to traditional social and cultural interests, may be a barrier for change
- SFWAs need to work on where they want to be in 20-50 years not just in the next budget or strategic planning cycle
- SFWAs need to bring stakeholder groups together by leveraging their common interests
- Shift from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future
- Ineffective leaders to make change happen
- Tools and resources are available to help SFWAs change
- Governance = the practices and procedures that determine how decisions are made and implemented and how responsibilities are exercised

Why Change Programs Don't Produce Change

Beer, M., R.A. Eisenstat, and B. Spector. 1990. *Harvard Business Review*. November – December. 158-166.

- Key to competitive success is to transform the way they function
- Shift from managerial authority, formal rules and procedures and narrow divisions of work → teams, sharing of info, delegating responsibility and accountability far down the chain. (hierarchical → task driven orgs) where what has to be done governs who works with whom and who leads
- Failing assumption: mission statements, corporate culture programs, training courses, quality circles, etc. will transform organizations
- Failing assumption: employee behavior is changed by altering a company's formal structure and systems
- Greatest obstacle to revitalization is that it comes through company-wide change programs, particularly when it comes from HR
- Formal organization structure and systems cannot lead a corporate renewal process
- Successful change efforts focus on the work itself
- Successful change efforts often led by unit leaders not senior leadership
- Successful change efforts focus on existing problem solving – ad hoc arrangements focus on interventions first (not culture) – can happen at multiple levels
- Leadership support/ commitment to problem solving is essential
- Most effective leaders recognize their limited power to mandate change
- Effective leaders defined their roles as creating a climate for change and then spreading the lessons of both successes and failure – provide general direction without insisting on specific solutions
- As lower-level change efforts succeed, leadership needs to embrace and support it by implementing structural and process changes to support it
- The most effective way to achieve enduring change at an organization is change based on task alignment, starting at organizations' periphery and moving toward corporate culture
- Change is about learning
- Senior leaders must learn from innovative approaches coming from younger unit managers closer to the action
- Suggest that the most effective way to change behavior is to put people into a new organizational context which impose new roles and responsibilities and relationships on them – forces new attitudes and behaviors
- Successful change = coordination, teamwork, high levels of commitment, new competencies – most change efforts address only one of these
- One-size fits all change programs take energy away from efforts to solve key business problems
- Companies avoid the short comings of programmatic change by concentrating on task assignment – reorganizing staff, roles, responsibilities and relationships to solve specific problems - easiest done in smaller units where goals and tasks are clearly defined
- 6 steps

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Mobilize commitment to change through joint diagnosis of clearly defined problem
- Develop a shared vision of how to organize and manage for success
- Foster consensus for new vision, competence to enact it and cohesion to move it along – management has to provide needed support & training and time to identify and acknowledge causalities of change
- Spread revitalization to all departments without pushing it from the top – resist the impulse that one successful approach will work for all
- Institutionalize revitalization through formal policies, systems and structures (once the new approach is entrenched, the right people are in place and the team organization is up and running
- Monitor and adjust strategies in response to problems in the revitalization process
- Purpose of change is to create an asset that did not exist before – a learning organization capable of adapting to a changing competitive environment – the organization has to know how to continually monitor its behaviors – to learn how to learn
- Teams are formed and reformed in response to new challenges
- Create long term capacity for continual adaptation and learning
- Ad hoc teams to address current relevant problems
- Role of top management
 - Create a climate for change
 - Use successfully revitalized units as models for entire company
 - Successful organizational models can serve as catalysts for change only if others are aware and encourages to learn from them
 - Develop career paths that encourage leadership development (Personal learning, leadership as criteria for promotion)
- If senior management don't apply change to themselves, whole process breaks down – need to adopt team behavior attitudes and skills demanded of staff
 - Promote attitudes and behaviors of all
 - Add to credibility of leaderships in support of change
 - Contribute to succession planning of same mind set

Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail

Kotter, J.P. March/April 1995. Harvard Business Review.

- Why do transformation efforts fail? Leaders typically fail to acknowledge that large-scale change can take years
- Successful change goes thru 8 distinct steps
- Transformation = to make fundamental changes in how business is conducted in order to cope with a new, more challenging market environment
- Error 1 – not establish a great enough sense of urgency
 - Senior managers underestimate how hard it can be to drive people out of their comfort zone

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Grossly overestimated how successful they have already been in increasing urgency
- Lack patience
- Become paralyzed by the downside possibilities if creating a sense of urgency = is to make the status quo seem more dangerous than launching into the unknown
- When is urgency rate high enough? when about 75% of upper managers are convinced that business as usual is totally unacceptable
- Error 2 – not creating a powerful enough guiding coalition
 - Successful coalition is always pretty powerful in terms of titles, information and expertise, reputations and relationships
 - In successful transformation, the leadership coalition grows over time
 - Leadership for 5-50 people come together and develop a shared commitment to excellent performance through renewal
 - Guiding team of 3-5, coalition of 20-50
 - Operates outside of normal hierarchy because it demands activity outside of formal boundaries, expectations and protocol
 - Need an organizer to get people together, help them develop a shared assessment of their company's problems and opportunities, and create a minimal level of trust and communication
 - Failure in this steps results from underestimating the difficulties of producing change and thus the importance of a powerful guiding coalition
 - Coalitions without strong leadership never achieve the power that is required
- Error 3 – lacking a vision
 - Successful transformations have a picture of the future that is relatively easy to communicate and appeals to customers, stakeholders and employees
 - Vision goes beyond the numbers found in 5-year plans – it helps clarify the direction in which and organization needs to move
 - A strategy for achieving the vision must also be developed
 - Without a sensible vision, a transformation effort can easily dissolve into a lot of confusing and incompatible projects that can take the organization in the wrong direction or nowhere at all
 - In failed transformation, you often find plenty of plans and directions and programs but no vision
 - If you can't communicate the vision in 5 minutes or less and get a reaction that signifies both understanding and interest – keep working on the vision
- Error 4 – under communicating the vision by a factor of 10
 - Transformation is impossible unless of 100s of people are willing to help
 - Employees will not make sacrifices, even if they are unhappy with the status quo unless they believe that useful changes is possible
 - Included messaging about the need, progress for transformation in all routine communication (and how it will achieve organizational mission)
 - Use all existing communications channels to broadcast the visions
 - Leaders have to “walk the talk: and demonstrate the desired behaviors

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Nothing undermines change more than behavior by important individuals that is inconsistent with their words
- Error 5 – not removing obstacles to the new vision
 - Consider real and perceived obstacles and work to remove both
 - Consider organizational structure, narrow job categories, compensation, performance appraisal systems, bosses who refuse to change, inconsistent processes
- Error 6 – not systematically planning for and creating short-term wins
 - Transformation takes time
 - Renewal efforts risk losing momentum if there are no short-term goals to meet and celebrate
 - Looks for ways to obtain clear performance improvements
 - Establish goals in yearly planning system, achieve the objectives, and reward the people involved
- Error 7 – declaring victory too soon
 - Until changes sink deeply into a company's culture (5-10 years), new approaches are fragile and subject to regression
 - Premature victory celebrations kill momentum and old traditions take over
 - Use the credibility of the short-term wins to tackle even bigger problems
- Error 8 – not anchoring changes in the company's culture
 - Change sticks when it becomes “the way we do business around here”
 - New behaviors are rooted in the social norms and shared values
 - Demonstrate how new approaches, behaviors and attitudes have improved performance (and communicate these widely)
 - Make sure next generation of top management personifies new approaches

Beyond Rhetoric: Facing the New Realities on Fish and Wildlife Management

Amend, S. and W. Gasson. 1996. Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.

- Despite a record of success going back a full century, we find ourselves harried by a host of special interests, constantly competing and conflicting
- We are faced with a fierce attack on our most hard-won victories like the ESA and CWA
- We feel sometimes out of sync with Americans, out of step with much of society
- The waning years of the 20th century are chaotic times for fish and wildlife management
- We care enough about the future of this business to talk somewhat directly about the things that need improving
- The theme of this conference is facing realities in resource management- but it's the realities in resource agency management that needs to be dealt with

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- In 1993 we said at this conference that unless agencies took on a concerted effort to increase their effectiveness there were troubled waters ahead
- We have failed to grasp the emerging realities of the 21st century – we have failed to recognize our role, or the role of fish and wildlife in the hearts and minds of Americans
- Fish and wildlife is a small business in society's terms – its important to recognize fish and wildlife are luxury items in the grand scheme of our civilization
- Just because we see ourselves as the leaders in fish and wildlife business it doesn't mean that others see us that way
- Many people who have a vital interest in fish and wildlife conservation see us as part of the problem, not the solution
- We are in competition with other businesses
- Fish and wildlife business has to realize that its part of a much larger business – the recreation business – which compete for time and money for other uses of leisure
- We've failed to deal with the social, economic and political realities of fish and wildlife conservation
- The truly big decisions facing resources managers are settled more on the basis of economic, social or political concerns rather than on biological or technical concerns. It is the social, economic and political issues that cause most of our agency disasters.
- We have failed to be effective in managing our own agencies
 - We don't specifically focus on the need for good management skills
 - We lack good internal agency management processes
 - We are terribly weak at evaluating what we do
 - We focus on activities rather than accomplishments
 - We don't allocate our fiscal and personnel resources to the top priorities
 - We don't accurately account for where and how we spend our resources
 - We aren't good at strategic thinking – we worry about the urgent, rather than the important
 - We continue to behave (as individuals and agencies) with the cavalier attitude of “we what the right things are...just give us the money and go away”
 - We don't manage process
 - We don't do very good public involvement
 - We are poor at communicating internally and worse communicating externally
 - We don't take advantage of the benefits of working together
 - We are absolutely terrible at dealing with change
- We have failed to gain adequate funding for fish and wildlife conservation
 - Funds from traditional sources are no longer adequate and demands and opportunities for products and services provided by SFWAs are not slowing down
 - We could cut programs back to the level of base funding or we could expand the base funding – many people are working hard to make this a reality but paradoxically many people in the same agency are working hard to make sure it doesn't happen because they don't want non-traditional users in their camp
- We have failed to be an effective political force

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- We have potential funding dilemmas on both ends – in the worst-case scenario we could lose our base funding, while at the other end of the spectrum most of our agencies are ill-prepared for a funding influx if the “teaming with wildlife” were to be funded tomorrow
- We have failed to take the political offensive
- We must mobilize the active support of our constituents
- We have failed to put our own house in order (siloed)
- We have failed to do effective marketing
- We are terrible at finding out what our customers want, providing it, and making it continually better
- We delude ourselves that the same adaptive skills that got us here will ensure our future
- SFWAs have not yet developed the strategic skills that will enable them to be effective in the future
- Consequences
 - Loss of authorities
 - Loss of agency credibility
- Organizations that are incapable or unwilling to learn and adapt will become extinct
- Solutions
 - Revolutionary changes are needed
 - We can do these things
 - McMullin (1993) provided benchmarks in his agency effectiveness study
 - Amend (1993) provided success stories we can learn from
 - Leadership development programs are growing
 - We are beginning to evaluate what we do and understand our roles
 - We are involving more people but still need to pursue diversity
 - We must recruit and keep not only the best biologist and game wardens but also the best social researchers, marketers, telecommunications experts, computer wizards and educators
 - We must involve society at large in wildlife conservation
 - We are starting to learn from the business sector
 - We are beginning to reward creativity and innovation
 - We are learning how to deal with change
- We must get beyond talking about developing the agencies of the future, we must be willing to let go of our past, drop our defenses, go beyond rhetoric and beyond our comfort zone.

Why Do Employees Resist Change?

Strebel, P. 1996. Harvard business Review.

- Change efforts success rates are as low as 50%, sometimes as low as 20%
- Managers and employees view change differently
- Change relies on individuals to change
- To staff, change is disruptive, intrusive and upsets balance

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Senior managers consistently misjudge effect of this gap on staff and on the efforts required to win acceptance of change
- Lack of alignment between senior management and practices and attitudes of lower level managers and subordinates = blocked change
- Lack of understanding of how change impacts individuals = blocked change
 - Draw attention to need for change and establish context for change
 - Initiate process for staff to help revise and thus buy into change
 - Lock in commitment with new informal and formal rules for new behaviors and practices
- Expect and prepare for causalities (those who won't change)
- Metrics and evaluation is critical to demonstrate progress
- Regular widespread communication re: change
- Need long-term view focus
- Discussion about change at all levels (objectives and consequences), town meetings
- Cultivate internal agents for change (specialness, stretch assignments, parks for extra innovative work, work outside normal structure, connection to something new and bigger, establish ownership of effort)
- Homogenous culture = implicit personal, psychological and social dimensions
- Non-homogenous = formal systems to ensure objectivity
- Unless personal impacts, expectations, and relationships are addressed in change efforts, they will likely fail because of employee resistance

From Clients To Stakeholders: A Philosophical Shift for Fish and Wildlife Management

Decker, D. J. C.C. Krueger, R.A. Baer, Jr., B. A. Knuth, M.E. Richmond. 1996. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*. 1(1): 70-82.

- Written 20 years ago, this article posits that change was afoot in wildlife management in North America, manifested as a fundamental philosophical shift among professional managers and policy makers about who are the beneficiaries of management and who should be considered in decision making: not just traditional clients who pay for and receive services of managers, but all stakeholders in fish and wildlife management
- Stakeholder = any citizen potentially affected by or having a vested interest (a stake) in an issue, program, action or decision leading to an action
- A stakeholder-focused approach recognizes a larger set of beneficiaries of management (including future generations) than the traditional concepts of constituents, clients, or customers
- Stakeholder-focused approach requires:
 - Identification of important stakeholders
 - Flexibility in methods for incorporating stakeholder input into decision
 - Development of a management philosophy strong enough to resist powerful special interests when broader public interests are in the balance
 - Development of ways to weigh stakeholder views on issues in decision-making

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Establishment of strategies for communication between managers and stakeholders and among stakeholders to encourage understanding and compromise
- A pervasive problem for management of “common” natural resources is recognizing the interests of numerous individuals and coordinating resource use by them to optimize value while simultaneously sustaining the resource which is becoming more challenging because of the diverse range of public interests, concerns, and use of fish and wildlife
- Increasing public expectation for citizen participation in management decision making
- The broadening view among managers about who are the beneficiaries of fish and wildlife management
- Increasingly people who have interests in fish and wildlife but are not anglers, hunters and trappers have communicated to policy makers and managers their desires to have their interests addressed
- Adoption of this new broadened perspective about whose interests and concerns should be considered and who should have input in fish and wildlife management decisions is a vital step in keeping the profession in a viable, central role in conservation
- Authors encourage the wildlife management profession to adopt and use the term “stakeholder” to refer to the beneficiaries of fish and wildlife management
- Stakeholder = those individuals and groups who may be affected by or can affect fish and wildlife management decisions and programs
- Fish and wildlife managers must use judgement about which stakes and stakeholders to emphasize in decision-making processes
- Prior to 1970, people of primary concern to the wildlife management profession were anglers, hunters and trappers – they fit the traditional definition of a constituency – a group of people who authorize or support the efforts of others to act on their behalf
- Conventional vocabulary also referred to angler, hunters and trappers as “clients” – people who pay for professional or expert services
- Constituents and clients reflect a special relationship between wildlife manager and the recognized direct beneficiaries of their work
- Because the professional managers had few constituencies to serve, an accurate understanding of their wants and needs was easy to maintain. Thus, most decisions could be made about management objectives without systematic studies of users or comprehensive citizen participation processes
- The client-manager system functioned well for many years because it embraced a mutually shared, narrow set of values regarding fish and wildlife.
- This close-knit and functional relationship was the working model in most states until the early 1970s when some managers began to consider other groups and vested interests, especially those focused on wildlife
- The concept of “constituent” no longer worked because growing numbers of people interest in resource management were not supporters of the *status quo*
- The concept of “client” was obsolete because not all those interested in management paid for it, nor did all those who paid for management receive a service
- The concept of “user” did not apply because not all those interested in fish and wildlife management personally used the resource

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Growing numbers of non-consumers sought to have fish and wildlife resources protected for their own recreational, environmental, ecological, or humane/animal rights interests. Landowners, farmers, and people with these other interests, were for the most part not regarded as potential beneficiaries of fish and wildlife management
- 1970s and 1980s – period of heightened interest in environmental issues – accompanied by creation of many local, state and national environmental groups that sought consideration in management and policy decisions
- During 1970s more people were seeking a greater part in governmental decisions at all levels – new era of citizen participation in government
- Dr. Steve Kellert’s work in early 1980s documented the broad set of beliefs and attitudes held about wildlife in addition to valuing wildlife for recreational use
- Wildlife managers were faced with new problems of responding to a greater variety of interests and concerns
- Increasingly, graduating wildlife professionals were not sharing the traditional values that motivated their predecessors
- In new stakeholder-focused approach, managers seek to include all people who may be affected by a management decisions--not just those who make their views known to managers
- Representation by an organized group is not a requirement for having one’s interests considered in a management decision
- Fish and wildlife professionals, especially governmental agency employees, have special “trusteeship” responsibility for the future and therefore responsibility for ensuring that all of tomorrow’s citizens (not just future anglers and hunters) are considered stakeholders in today’s management decisions
- The manager’s responsibility in the stakeholder-focused approach (i.e., ensuring that interests and concerns of all significant stakeholders are considered in management decisions) is substantially greater than in the client-manager or constituency-managers systems
- Stakeholder-focused approach indicates that fish and wildlife management has the capacity to be adaptive and dynamic in recognizing new needs and changing to improve effectiveness, and reflects a capacity to deal with diverse current and future needs
- Many people drawn to fish and wildlife management careers are responding to the full spectrum of current and future societal needs for management of fish and wildlife on a sustainable basis
- These changes reflect a maturation process in the wildlife management professional as it has responded to broader societal changes
- The future of fish and wildlife management depends on the manager’s responsiveness to the full spectrum of society’s values without falling victim to the special interests politics or a few stakeholder groups
- Managers need to create a vision for the future and develop long-range goals that keep them on track when special interest politics attempts to derail their efforts
- The stakeholder-focused approach suggests that a partnership of professional managers and a diverse body of stakeholder work together to identify management goals and solutions to problems
- Communication and trust between managers and stakeholders will be critically important

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Stakeholder approach is desirable in modern fish and wildlife management because
 - it considers the broad range of interest that exists now and is open to others that may be expressed in the future
 - the inclusive nature can result in more segments of the public understanding and supporting management decisions
 - wildlife resources controlled and managed as common property ought to reflect the reasonable views of as many segments of the public as possible without greatly favoring any particular “client”, “constituent”, or “special interests”
- Keys to implementing a stakeholder-focused approach
 - expanding the manager’s view of who is substantially affected by fish and wildlife management and therefore is a stakeholder in management decisions and actions
 - identifying and understanding stakeholder views
 - seeking compromise between competing demands (stakes) when appropriate (i.e., without risking the long-term integrity or sustainability of wildlife resources
 - improving communication between managers and stakeholders

Human Dimensions of Wildlife Management: Knowledge for Agency Survival in the 21st Century

Decker, D.J. and J.W. Enck. 1996. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*. 1(2): 60-71.

- The nature and rate of changes in people’s beliefs and attitudes about human-environment relations and especially people-wildlife interactions contribute greatly to the challenge of contemporary wildlife management
- Human dimensions (HD) = understanding and clarifying stakeholders’ perspectives on wildlife management programs and issues, and systematically incorporating such insight into decision making
- HD is a chest of social science tools, human behavioral understandings, and public involvement processes that yield better information for management decision making and better and more broadly accepted management decisions
- HD helps management agencies make decisions that are more responsive to various stakeholders in management without abrogating their professional roles
- Most state agencies recognize the need for more HD; they use different models on how to acquire HD information (e.g., contracting externally, build in-house expertise, partnerships with academia)
- Agency concerns define HD needs for wildlife management
 - identify and understand diverse (and many new) stakeholders
 - understand the forces affecting traditional stakeholder participation in wildlife activities
 - assess the best ways to involve stakeholders in or to obtain their input for management decision making
 - figure out how to incorporate disparate stakeholder preferences into management decision making

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Definition of wildlife management = the science and art of making decisions and taking actions to manipulate the structure, dynamics, and relations of populations, habitat and people to achieve specific human objectives by means of the wildlife resources (from Giles)
- Principal role of state wildlife agencies is to provide benefits for people
- Fundamental value of HD inquiry is to develop an understanding of people who stand to benefit from or be negatively affected by management decisions and actions
- Number of stakeholders has grown over past few decades resulting in a demand for agencies to understand the beliefs, attitudes and behaviors of these new stakeholders
- Understanding the needs and desires of their diverse stakeholder's may be the most critical kind of knowledge needed for agencies to survive in 21st century
- In addition to understand stakeholder view at a particular time, understanding what causes them to change their views
- If agencies are to work effectively in the dynamic public-opinion arena that influences wildlife management politics – following fads or ignoring major shifts will be detrimental to keeping strong public support
- Understanding why people begin, continue and terminate their hunting activity has been a topic of considerable HD research
- Understanding motivations for participation in “nontraditional” activity will become increasingly important as people who enjoy wildlife in this way become a larger proportion of the beneficiaries of wildlife management
- Expectations for public input and involvement in management decision making have been growing for the last 20 years
- HD inquiry can play 2 important roles – provision of unbiased information about stakeholders on an issue and evaluation of the public participation process itself
- HD research and management experience can provide important insight about weighting stakeholder input based on size of the stakeholder population, nature of the stake in the issue (e.g., economic, sociocultural, etc.) and the intensity of interest
- HD should not serve as surrogate citizen referenda such that what the majority wants, they get
- HD inquiry is
 - exploring human dimensions problems and monitoring human attitudes and behaviors
 - Synthesizing human dimensions with other bodies of knowledge regarding human behavior
 - Applying HD knowledge in management and evaluating outcomes
- Monitoring of human attitudes and behaviors becomes important in identifying changes of management significance and designing mitigation measures when needed
- Tracking public attitudes about controversial wildlife management programs has helped agencies predict public reaction to management decisions

Human Dimensions of Living with Wildlife- A Management Challenge for the 21st Century

Decker, D.J. and L. C. Chase. 1997. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*. 25(4): 788-795.

- Problems addressed by wildlife management have changed dramatically during the 20th century.
- Urgent and growing demand to reduce conflicts between people and wildlife
- Developing strategies to integrate informed stakeholder input and involvement in decision making is one of the greatest challenges facing wildlife management
- Interest in HD of wildlife management has grown steadily from the 1960s
- Different stakeholders have different expectations of their interactions with wildlife and based on these, they develop different acceptance capacities that cannot be met simultaneously at the same place and time
- People-wildlife interaction problems can be considered solved only when the stakeholders involved believe them to be solved
- To manage people-wildlife interactions successfully, stakeholders must be considered throughout all phases of management
- Stakeholders' beliefs are changeable as they gain information and experience with the situation; stakeholders' beliefs and attitudes are not static – so assumptions about these traits need to be reassessed periodically
- Stakeholders are more likely to consider a public issue resolved when they have had a voice in the decision-making process
- The intent and extent of stakeholder input and involvement in management has been a paradigm shift in wildlife management
- 5 types of approaches that characterize the ways wildlife managers tend to address public input and involvement – authoritative, passive-receptive, inquisitive, transaction and co-managerial
- HD knowledge aids decision making but seldom reveals what *should* be done in a particular situation
- Wildlife managers must avoid temptation to use only stakeholder preferences as the basis for decisions
- Surveys and polls should not become in effect surrogate referenda – it devalues professional judgment and responsibility
- There is no single technique to solve people-wildlife problems
- Wildlife managers' experiences are key ingredients for success
- It is essential to initiate and manage stakeholder involvement in wildlife management from situation analysis through implementation and evaluation, and continuing through subsequent adaptive iterations of the management process.
- Development and application should include
 - determining management objectives and selecting management actions that involve stakeholders in an inquiry or process that discovers and applies stakeholder weights in decisions
 - involving stakeholders in evaluating management action implementation and resulting outcomes

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography
July 2018

- using ongoing stakeholder input for adaptive management

A How-To Guide on Broadening Agency Constituencies

Kolus, C., D. Zimmerman, V. Ebert, and D. Guynn. 1999. USFWS/Colorado State University Report. 29pp.

- A cooperative project between the USFWS (Management Assistance Team) and Colorado State University - examined how state fish and wildlife agencies can broaden their base of support
- Provides a high-level review of changing demographics in US
- Pre - Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA)
- 7 programs reviewed to determine how agencies can reach more audiences and gather public support and/or obtain alternative funding (Great Outdoors Colorado Trust Fund; Illinois Department of Natural Resources Conservation Congress and Conservation 2000; Missouri's Conservation Tax (1/8 of 1%); Virginias' House Bill 38 (2% of the 4.5% sales tax on hunting fish and wildlife-related equipment); Arizona's Heritage Fund (lottery funds for AZ F&G); Arkansas's Conservation Tax (1/8 of 1% sales tax))
- Recommendations:
 - Develop good relationships
 - Consider a multi-agency program
 - Encourage internal staff and board or commission involvement
 - Follow a written plan
 - Beware of the law
 - Solicit input in the development phase
 - Solicit the support of your state government
 - Involve non-agency individuals or organizations
 - Use supporting documentation
 - Draft legislative language carefully
 - Develop messages wisely
 - Use your existing contacts
 - Choose communication channels carefully
 - Don't take traditional constituents for granted
 - Reach out to urban areas
 - Don't ignore the opposition
 - Plan ahead for implementation
 - Don't forget your supporters
 - Provide visible, statewide results
 - Don't put it off, start now
- To grow and survive in a changing world, any business or industry must be adaptable; fish and wildlife agencies are no different
- The successful agencies will embrace change and help their constituents do the same

The Essence of Wildlife Management

Riley, S.J., D.J. Decker, L.H. Carpenter, J.F. Organ, W.F. Siemer, Mattfeld and G.R. Parsons. 2002. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*. 30(2): 585-93.

- Decision making in public wildlife management in the 20th century was grounded in 2 precepts
 - sufficiency of biology and expert authority (but the authors believe these are being supplanted by new precepts that reflect a need for integration of multiple disciplines in management)
 - the desire among diverse stakeholders to participate in decision making
- Essay discusses an emerging paradigm of wildlife management based on multidisciplinary integration and participatory management
- Authors offer a core concept of the essence of contemporary public wildlife management
- The value of biological knowledge for wildlife management is not in question but it is insufficient
- The array of stakeholders in wildlife management has diversified and their expectations for involvement in decisions has increased
- Stakeholders are becoming a central component of contemporary wildlife management
- Wildlife management is the guidance of decision-making processes and implementation of practices to purposefully influence interactions between people, wildlife and habitats to achieve impacts valued by stakeholders
- The focus on impacts creates a natural bridge for management to serve administration of wildlife resources as a public trust
- Management of all wildlife for all people is not practical or possible - focusing resources on impacts (both positive and negative) can be a way to transition to a new manageable way of managing public trust resources

Adaptive Impact Management: An Integrative Approach to Wildlife Management

Riley, S.J., W.F. Siemer, D.J. Decker, L.H. Carpenter, J.F. Organ, L.T. Berchielli. 2003. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*. 8: 81-95.

- The wildlife profession must develop management programs acceptable to a large and growing array of stakeholders that often have competing stakes in wildlife management
- Wildlife managers are responding to these and other changes in the management environment by adopting approaches that integrate biological and human dimensions and broaden stakeholder involvement in management
- As part of this shift in management, a reorientation toward *impacts* of human-wildlife interactions has been suggested
- Impacts are significant positive and negative effects, defined in terms of human values, that result from events of interactions involving wildlife individuals; populations; habitats

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

and communities; wildlife management interventions; and stakeholder interactions with respect to wildlife

- These effects may be positive or negative, large or small, but to be considered an impact they must be important to stakeholders
- Authors propose Adaptive Impact Management (AIM) – builds on strength of adaptive environmental assessment and management
- Central assumption of AIM is integrating knowledge from multiple disciplines and engaging important impacts on which to focus management
- Contemporary wildlife management approach is recognizing change is inevitable and uncertainty and unpredictability are inherent in resource management
- Much literature on adaptive management – but most are missing identification and inclusion of human values
- New focus on impacts and stakeholder involvement will lead to management of what really matters to society, and improvement in shared learning among scientists, managers and stakeholders
- Identification of management goals and objectives in terms of impacts requires early and continuous stakeholder involvement
- The AIM process includes
 - situational analysis (decision framing)
 - objective setting
 - model development
 - identification and selections of alternatives
 - management interventions
 - monitoring, and adjustment of models and management
- By focusing on impacts, AIM is expected to have several advantages over current adaptive management approaches
 - increased relevancy of wildlife management to society
 - greater stakeholder satisfaction
 - managers more apt and capable of embracing change and uncertainty rather than avoiding it
 - learning becomes a motivator as well as a product
- The inclusion of stakeholders in the development and refinement of AIM models, as well as in implementation and evaluation of management interventions, should put wildlife management in a favorable political light
- AIM will help managers stay agile in an ever-changing management environment
- Future effectiveness of wildlife professionals may depend on their ability to discover and adopt new ways to facilitate stakeholder involvement in impact-oriented management
- Increased stakeholder involvement in decision may help professional managers maintain, rather than lose leadership in wildlife management

Why Are Public Values Toward Wildlife Changing?

Manfredo, M.J., T.L. Teel, A.D. Bright. 2003. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*. 8:287- 306.

- Based on study – Wildlife Values in the West – a WAFWA supported research project

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Wildlife professionals generally agree that public values toward wildlife changed dramatically over the latter half of the 20th century
- There has been a gradual shift away from traditional wildlife values that emphasize the use and management of wildlife for human benefit and becoming more protection-oriented with respect to wildlife
- This trend is one of the most influential factors shaping wildlife management today
- Value orientations are part of an individual's hierarchical belief structure and provide the foundation for an individual's attitudes and norms, which in turn guide their behavior
- Authors provide a review on value shift theory and post-materialistic values (those beyond basic human material needs (security, shelter, food) that gained momentum following World War II
- Propose that value and value-orientation shift has in part been driven by urbanization
- Hypothesize that utilitarian wildlife values are associated with rural lifestyles and higher levels of residential stability
- 6 states (AK, AZ, CO, ID, ND, SD) surveyed to assess materialistic/post-materialistic values, wildlife-value orientations, attitudes toward selected management actions, participation in wildlife-related recreation activities and sociodemographic characteristics
- Overall response rate was 35% (n= 3216)
- 4 categories identified – materialistic utilitarians, mixed utilitarians, post-materialistic utilitarians, neutral/protectionists
- Prevailing wildlife-value orientations among the 6 states was toward wildlife use
- Data provided on which behaviors, recreation participation, sociodemographic categories aligned with wildlife-value orientations

Securing Alternative Funding for Wildlife Management: Insight from Agency Leaders

Jacobson, C.A., D.J. Decker, L.H. Carpenter. 2007. *Journal of Wildlife Management*. 71(6):2106-2113.

- The social and political dynamics of wildlife management are changing markedly due to considerable societal transformations
- Population growth, changes in societal demographics, suburban sprawl, development and resource extraction, and patterns of participation in outdoor recreations are having profound impact on our natural resources
- These changes influence society's interest, concerns, and experiences regarding wildlife and subsequently, the expectations placed on state fish and wildlife management agencies
- Growing expectations and resulting additional duties for state wildlife agencies, the increasing costs of resources necessary to perform these duties, and a general decline in hunting license sales, have left many states with substantial budget shortfalls
- As traditional funding becomes inadequate, most states have sought alternative funding (e.g., state general funds, tax check offs, foundations)
- In addition to the creation or expansion of programs, agencies using new and general funding will likely need to be more accountable to a larger and more diverse constituency

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Challenge will be for agencies to overcome a historical dependency on funds derived from hunting and trapping without alienating traditional constituencies
- Paper provides a framework to understand agencies response to pressure to secure alternative funding, how agencies have responded to these pressures and suggest implications for different responses for agencies
- Review of organizational responses to pressures for reform from literature
- Authors conducted qualitative interviews with leaders from 24 state agencies - lack of adequate and consistent funding was considered by many to be the predominant factor impacting their agencies – other factors identified were political, staff shortage, societal and ecological
- Some leaders were concerned their agencies were ill-prepared to address the “increasing and changing needs of society”
- Finding alternative funding was a necessity, it was also associated with concerns regarding implications for the future - “we have a balancing act to be true to ourselves professionally but also true to the increase and changing interest of the public”
- Campaigns to secure funding from nontraditional sources were described as difficult for a variety of reasons, including lack of support from policy makers and the public
- Many of the alternative mechanisms (e.g., tax check offs, license plates, and foundations) have been used with varying degrees of success in terms of funds generated
- Some leaders noted that although they had to accept nontraditional funding, they wanted to maintain a distinction between traditional and nontraditional funding sources and the programs and activities that each supports – this illustrates efforts to balance the interests of traditional and nontraditional stakeholders and perhaps, pacify traditional constituents that may be threatened by the introduction of a new funding source
- Authors found little evidence that agencies avoided pressures to secure alternative funding but noted some leaders thought they had been ineffective in their efforts and that environmental factors needed to change before their agencies could make significant changes
- Reasons for not pursuing alternative funding included
 - state limitations on growth and hiring
 - lack of political and public support
 - failure of past efforts
 - hope that reliable and consistent federal funding sources would become available
- Although most leaders said they had pursued some type of alternative funding, they were focusing primarily on increasing revenue for traditional sources (e.g., raise fees, increase hunter recruitment efforts) because it was considered less politically charged than other approaches
- Some leaders thought that hunters should no longer be subjected to fee increases to support management that benefits all citizens
- Authors found evidence of innovative adoption (adopting a new idea or behaviors in that organizational field)
- Some leaders perceived that their ability to seek and use alternative funding was constrained by environmental factors beyond their control
- Agency leaders recognized the need to find new funding sources, but differed in their perceptions of how they responded to pressure to do so

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Most leaders indicated they had made some changes, many that other states had tried
- Leaders believed their agencies were constrained by their environments, either internal or external, so they were unable to make strategic choices about funding options – this emphasizes the importance of understanding the influences of exogenous forces on organizational behavior
- State wildlife agencies may not be able to impact the broad political or economic climate, but they may be able to increase understanding and support for new funding among their traditional constituents, potential new constituents, policy makers, and the general public
- Leaders stressed the importance of building coalitions of diverse constituents and how these partnerships had facilitated their efforts to fund and use alternative funding
- Expanding organizational boundaries will be beneficial and necessary for agencies in terms of political support of obtaining funding and accountability after funding is secured
- Agencies will need to secure consistent alternative funding mechanisms to sustain their capacity to provide diverse conservation and management services that benefit a broader cross section of society
- Increasing understanding about the need for alternative funding, assuaging concerns about implications of alternative funding (e.g., giving voice to nontraditional stakeholders, sharing policy influence with new stakeholders), and establishing diverse partnership's may reduce resistance and even generate support for pursuing new funding sources

Governance of State Wildlife Management: Reform and Revive or Resist and Retrench?

Jacobson, C. A., and D. J. Decker. 2008. *Society of Natural Resources* 20: 441-448.

- Governance of state wildlife management has been under scrutiny with respect to its ability to change to reflect the values, norms, and cultural beliefs of contemporary society
- Paper reviews the existing model of governance for state fish and wildlife agencies; outlines concerns about this model in light of a changing social context; discusses alternative approaches; and offers considerations for how governance could be reformed to meet societal needs
- Elected officials enact broad laws for wildlife management but in most states, an appointed board or commission interprets such laws by adopting policies and setting specific regulations that are implemented by state wildlife agencies
- Policy making bodies normally host regular public meetings and adhere to public participation requirements
- When the board/commission structure emerged (100+ years ago), they were a reform measure to isolate state fish and wildlife agencies from political influence and to ensure that stakeholder interests were represented in the wildlife policy making process
- Today demographic and socioeconomic forces such as population movement, aging, economic growth, and changing patterns of participation in outdoor recreation have resulted in new, diverse and interested stakeholders with growing expectations for state wildlife management

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- As traditional funding for state wildlife agencies becomes inadequate because of increasing demands and higher costs of wildlife management, most states are seeking alternative funding
- Success in finding new sources of funding typically results in expectations for increased accountability to a broader stakeholder constituency
- The challenge is to how to expand constituencies in terms of funding and services offered without alienating traditional stakeholders
- Additionally, nonconsumptive wildlife interest groups believe that bias is inherent in the state wildlife management governance structure
- Practice of wildlife management was originally designed to serve the needs and interests of consumptive users and this bias impact public perception and support for wildlife agencies and policy makers
- Social pressure for wildlife management reform – 24 states have provisions for ballot initiatives, nearly all have had wildlife related initiatives and nearly all sought to prohibit certain means of hunting or trapping
- Wildlife professionals have concerns about “wildlife management by ballot” because they believe such measures are based on public opinions versus scientific judgments
- Some believe that ballot initiatives indicate fundamental flaws in the normal processes of the state wildlife management institution. They suggest the current norm of exclusive and rigid institutional culture results in wildlife regulations and policies unreflective of contemporary needs and interests of society with respect to wildlife management
- Concerns about the ability of agency governance structures to address contemporary natural resources issues has spurred a growing interest in the use of a more participatory decision-making approach
- Participatory democratic approaches are more successful when they have
 - a high degree of equality between members of the decision-making body
 - a consensus-based decision-making process is feasible
 - the group is fairly homogeneous; decision makers support the participatory process
- The utility of this participatory democratic approach is questionable because of the highly polarized, value-laden issues common in state wildlife management
- Some agencies have embraced a more deliberative approach evidenced by the increased use of citizen advisory groups
- A shift in governance structure for state wildlife management might be
 - adaptation of existing structure that improves representative memberships on boards and commissions
 - increased efforts via social science inquiry to understand beliefs and attitudes of various segments of stakeholders in management
 - developing meaningful participatory decision-making processes appropriate focused and scaled for specific issues and situations.
- As agencies seek nontraditional funding to support state wildlife conservation and management, a more broadly representative and flexible governance model will help establish relationships with and improve accountability to a broader stakeholder base that will have greater inclination to provide funding for wildlife management

Ensuring the Future of State wildlife Management: Understanding Challenges for Institutional Change

Jacobson, C.A. and D.J. Decker. 2006. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 34(2)531-536.

- Paper presents an analysis of reasons for the wildlife management profession to change which can help guide reform activities
- Declining numbers of traditional stakeholders, coupled with an increasingly diverse, interconnected and suburbanized society has created a need to better understand how state wildlife management agencies, policy making bodies, and allied organizations are adapting to a changing social context
- While longitudinal data about American wildlife values are lacking, numerous events indicate a shift in public perception of wildlife and wildlife management
- National campaigns for alternative funding sources for wildlife have been underway for over 25 years (TWW/CARA, sales tax, check-offs, license plates, etc.)
- Challenge: overcoming historical dependence on funds derived from hunting and trapping without alienating these traditional stakeholders
- Less obvious challenge but more difficult – broadening the culture of the wildlife profession to embrace a more diverse array of stakeholders
- How are state management agencies and policy makers adapting to this contextual shift?
- The wildlife profession needs to embrace the opportunity presented by the pivotal change we are in
- State wildlife management institution = the people, processes and rules, as well as the norms, values and behaviors associated with state wildlife management
- Changes in the social context within which wildlife is managed or governed has and will continue to drive reform of the state wildlife management institution
- Aldrich (1999) defines organizational transformation as a major change that occurs along 3 possible dimensions; goals, boundaries and activities. He also identified 2 elements of goal transformation: changing the breadth of organizational goals, and changes in the domain the organization serves
- Changes occurring in state wildlife management due to the availability of nontraditional funding sources such as State Wildlife Grants have and likely will continue to result in changes to state agency staff and programs
- Availability of alternative funding sources, with new expectations for their use, will drive transformation in goals, boundaries and activities of state wildlife management
- Do our governance structures need to be evaluated to ensure they are appropriate to address the complexities of wildlife management in contemporary society?
- Some observers have noted that wildlife management has been “captured” by consumptive interest groups and that the “iron triangle” between resource managers, traditional commodity users, and policy makers limits access of others in the decision-making process
- Transformation of the governance structures of state wildlife management should not diminish the importance of traditional stakeholders and their essential role in wildlife management
- Wildlife management has emerged in a social context that has changed over time – the institution, agencies and policies must evolve as well

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Many have called for reform of wildlife management to better reflect the values, norms and cultural beliefs of contemporary society
- If state wildlife organizations are to be proactive at addressing and benefiting from transformation, the wildlife professionals who populate those organizations will need to supply the necessary leadership toward that end – these are the individual who will be most affected by and aware of the growing gap between the state wildlife management and the norms, values and cultural beliefs of society, whose wildlife resource they manage in trust

Organizational Ambidexterity: Antecedents, Outcomes and Moderators

Raisch, S. and J. Birkinshaw. 2008. Journal of Management.

- Successful firms are ambidextrous – aligned and efficient in their management of today's business demands while simultaneously adaptive to changes in the environment.
- Long-term survival and success depend on an organization's ability to engage in enough exploitation of existing competencies to ensure the organization's current viability and to engage in enough exploration to ensure future viability
- Incremental innovations (designed to meet the needs of existing customers are exploitive)
- Radical innovations (designed to meet the needs of emergent customers are explorative)
- Doing both can create tensions
- Successful organizations emphasize exploitation and alignment during periods of evolutionary change but also pursue radical transformation and exploration in periods of revolutionary change
- Scholars suggest that mechanistic structures which rely on standardization, centralization and hierarchy support efficiency whereas organic structures with their high levels of decentralization and autonomy support flexibility and that organizations require both organic structure to create innovations and mechanistic structures to implement and deploy them
- Ambidexterity = firm's ability to operate complex organizations designs that provide for short-term efficiency and long-term innovation
- An organization that engages exclusively in exploration will suffer from the fact it never gains the returns of its knowledge
- An organization that chiefly pursues exploitation (existing competencies) will suffer from obsolescence
- A preponderance of exploitation may enhance short-term performance but can result in a competence trap and not be able to effectively respond adequately to environmental changes
- Organizational ambidexterity is a key driver of long-term performance

Culture Change Drivers in the Public Sector

Somerville, K.A and L. Dyke. 2008. International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management.

- Organizations have to change to stay alive

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Culture changes is one of the most difficult types of change for an organization to undertake
- Nothing less than radical cultural change is required in order to enhance the effectiveness of most public service organizations
- Culture is manifested at
 - Visible organizational structure and processes
 - Espoused values, such as strategies, goals and philosophies
 - Underlying assumptions – the taken-for-granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts and feelings
- Public sector faces same forces for changes as private sector but with the added force of turnover of government leaders
- Change management, not historically a key competency of the public sector is now a necessity
- Change drivers – vision, leadership, human resources, communication and enabling changes in structure and processes
- Vision – developing a clear picture of desired end state of change initiative
- Leaders can facilitate change by their actions and behaviors
- HR – recruiting and selecting new employees can facilitate changes in the attitudes and value held by employees and be a source of new cultural values
- Communication is an important means of increasing staff's understanding of and commitment to a change initiative (content, frequency and channels are important considerations)
- The more modifications to organizational structure and processes that are made to support the change initiative, the greater the cultural changes
- High levels of leadership turnover are detrimental to cultural changes – may contribute to a perceived lack of leadership commitment to change and may heighten resistance to change since public services often believe that they simply wait out leaders who they distrust or don't agree with
- Since major change initiatives are almost always met controversy and resistance and public sectors organizations typically hold deep culture which are difficult to change, leadership teams needs to play a significant role in reducing resistance to change – to increasing by placing a revolving door on the executive suite
- By identifying appropriate drivers of change, management can better focus their resources and energy related to change initiatives
- Changing an organizational culture is enormously complex, consumes considerable organizational resources and is very time consuming. However, changing an organization's culture may be the decisive factor in improving the organizations service.

Transforming Your Organization

McGuire, J. B., C.J. Palus, W. Pasmor, G.B. Rhodes. 2009. Center for Creative Leadership.

- Companies have no choice but to change
- Shift in focus from development of the individual heroic leader to leadership as a collective activity is very important

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Recent study of 4 most important skills/capabilities needed by organizations in the future – leading people, strategic planning, inspiring commitment and managing changes – also important are focusing on flexibility, collaboration, crossing boundaries and collective leadership
- Change leadership isn't simple because
 - Bigger minds are needed to keep pace with rapidly changing realities
 - Change require new mindsets, not just new skills
 - Hidden assumption and beliefs must be unearthed
 - Organizational change requires leaders to change (Change the culture, change yourself)
 - It takes a new kind of hard work
- Goal of culture change is to purposefully and actively build capacity for new ways of working (and new thinking, beliefs, tools and processes)
- Most workplace leaders don't have “transforming organizational culture” on their to-do lists – and they don't know where to start
- Slow down to power up is a key principle for leading change
 - Give time and attention to beliefs that underlie behaviors and decision
 - Slow down action, conversations and decision making to focus on addressing challenges at the root level
 - Focus on learning
 - Reflect on assumptions
 - Understand problems clearly
 - Consider possibility of multiple right answers
 - Integrate perspectives of others
- Culture change is not a short-term process – it will take a few years
 - Discover your culture and capabilities
 - ID and understand drivers and core capabilities for your industry
 - Craft a leadership strategy – implicit and explicit choices about leadership, beliefs, practices and it's people and systems
 - Transform the executive team – don't pawn the work off to others – no one else can create change for the executive team
 - Take time out for learning – learn to ask more “why” and “what if” questions
 - Establish action development teams (implementation teams) that work across boundaries
 - Align talent processes – hire for what you want to become, not who you used to be
- Collaboration and interdependence is a way to successfully adapt and operate in complex situations

Resilience Thinking – Integrating Resilience, Adaptability and Transformability

Folke, C. S. Carpenter, B. Walker, M. Scheffer, T. Chapin, J. Rockstrom. *Ecology and Society*. 2010.

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Resilience = capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while undergoing change so as to still essentially retain the same function, structure, identity and feedbacks
- Transformability = the capacity to transform the stability landscape itself in order to become a different kind of system to create a fundamentally new system when ecological, economic or social structures make the existing system untenable
- Social-ecological resilience (SES) is about people and nature as interdependent systems
- Social; change is essential for SES resilience
- Transformational change involves a change in the nature of the stability landscape, introducing new variables and losing others – can be a deliberate or forced process
- Transformational change often involve shifts in perception and meaning, social network configurations, patterns of interactions among actors, including leadership and political power relations, and associated organizational and institutional arrangements
- Deliberate transformational change can be initiated at multiple scales and done gradually
- Forced transformation is likely to occur at a scale larger than the organization and beyond the influence of the local actors (transformation can be done to you or by you)
- Transformation phases
 - Being prepared or even preparing the social-ecological systems for change
 - Navigating the transition by making use of a crisis as a window of opportunity for change
 - Building resilience of the new social-ecological regime
- Transformations do not take place in a vacuum but draw on resilience from multiple scales
- Transformation involves novelty and innovation
- Deliberate transformation involves breaking down the resilience of the old and building the resilience of the new

Expanding Scope and Depth of Influence: Broadening the Beneficiaries of State Fish and Wildlife Agencies' Conservation Activities

Goad, D. 2010. *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. 130-132.

- Historic role of state wildlife agencies – what is our basic core mission?
- Essentially all AFWAs have same mission – wisely manage all the fish and wildlife resources of the state while providing maximum enjoyment for the people.
- Is our mission specific to hunters and anglers, those that buy our licenses and permits and have been our primary funding source?
- Or is that a narrow view, no longer sufficient for our agencies to remain relevant and vital to the citizens of our state?
- Early years of conservation work championed by Roosevelt, Grinnell, Pinchot, etc. focused in restoring wildlife populations, funded solely by hunters and anglers.
- Those staffing the SFWAs were much like the folks we have been working for- hunters and anglers

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- The cultures of our agencies largely reflect the cultures of the people who buy the licenses we offer.
- This has been a source of strength for our work because our values and those of our traditional stakeholders have been virtually the same.
- But times are changing rapidly and subsequently the interests in wildlife conservation and management and expectations for SFWAs are increasing.
- It is a time to make a major assessment of how we are doing in the eyes of a broader set of stakeholders.
 - Are they benefiting from our conservation efforts to the extent they should or could?
 - Are our individual values and agencies cultures blinding us to new opportunities to serve more people, to be more relevant and vital?
- These are difficult questions to consider, but if we do not find a way to change our culture to better reflect that of society, we will be marginalizing our chances for securing alternative funding
- That means we will be hindering our ability to continue our role as leaders of fish and wildlife conservation
- Most of us realize there is a growing disconnect between much of what our agencies do and the interests of citizens in our states
- It's easy to be complacent because we (employees) are part of the traditional constituency so we may have difficulty assessing the interests and demands of those who are not
- Any expansion of goals will require extra work as well as moving away from our comfort zones
- And some make convincing arguments that change is unnecessary or benefits from management desired by those who do not fund conservation are undeserved
- Arkansas Game and Fish successfully secured additional funding after a process of 3 tries with the legislature and 12 years. Only got it passed when reached out beyond traditional stakeholders.
- Partnered with State Parks and Tours, Department of Natural Heritage and Keep Arkansas Beautiful to get 1/8th of 1% of sales tax.
- Started citizen surveys about interests and needs – identified new stakeholders
- Laid out how we would spend new monies, and how new stakeholders would be served
- Built nature centers, expanded education division, added nongame biologists
- Became the “cash cow” for conservation partners
- Still need to work on identity recognition – but are doing so from a position of strength
- A positive image is ours to develop
- Have a responsibility to fulfill our public trust role with high standards and effectiveness
- Accountability is often based on perception and perception is reality in a political sense – and despite all the science we can muster, SFWAs operate in a political environment that is consequential
- We have to stop thinking entirely like biologist and market our work to those who support it
- For SFWAs to flourish and provide the conservation services needed by current and future generations, we have to adapt

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography
July 2018

- That means many of have to engage in transformative change – expand our scope and depth, but do it strategically
- The days of doing conservation the way we think it should be done without being informed by and informing the public are over
- If we can truly change the way we think and communicate, if we can educate and understand the new stakeholders and meet their needs, we will all be able to secure the funding we need to be a better agency for tomorrow.

**A Conservation Institution for the 21st Century: Implications for
State Wildlife Agencies**

Jacobson, C. A, J. F. Organ, D. J. Decker, G. R. Batcheller, and L. Carpenter. 2010.
Journal of Wildlife Management 74: 203-209.

- PTD as foundation of conservation institution
- Conservation institution = enduring formal and informal rules, articulation of values and beliefs, and development of norms and related behavior patterns that sustain and constrain its activities
- Identifies ideal components of the institution
 - Broad-based funding
 - Trustee-based governance
 - Multidisciplinary science as the basis for recommendations from professional staff
 - Involvement of diverse stakeholders and partners
- Benefits of successful institutional reform = effective and sustained conservation
- To achieve this, a significant segment of society must value and demand conservation
- It will be necessary for large segments of society to develop an increased understanding and appreciation for coexistence of people and wildlife on a sustainable basis
- Reform of the institution to address the full swath of societal needs and concerns with respect to wildlife should lead to broad, active public support (not just tolerance) of the institution

**Transformation of State Fish and Wildlife Agencies: Ensuring the
Future of Conservation in a Rapidly Changing World**

**Decker, D. J., C. A. Jacobson, and J. F. Organ. (2011). Human Dimensions Research Unit
and Cornell Cooperative Extension, Department of Natural Resources, Cornell University.
Ithaca, NY.**

Provides practical advice for SFWA transformation

- People
 - Leadership is absolutely necessary but not sufficient.

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Change takes different kinds of players filling different kinds of roles
- Cultural change is at the roots of successful organizational transformation.
- Commitment to change is essential, but not everyone has to be on board before starting the change process.
- Processes
 - Capacity for change often requires forming collaborations and building partnerships.
 - Strategic vision and planning are vital to turn adversity into opportunity.
 - Strengthening communications and relationships is a must.
 - Stakeholder engagement and transparency are important to build trust.
 - Communicate the key message to staff, partners and stakeholders, old and new.
 - Build and maintain trust with an understanding that demonstrating credibility and accountability is a never-ending responsibility.
- Advice
 - Creating catalyzing events helps fuel transformative change.
 - Reach out to other agencies to avoid insularity in your approach to change.
 - Rely in inquiry over intuition whenever possible.
 - Be bold.
 - Develop a common vision and let it guide you.
 - Sustain relevance to a changing society
 - Seek innovative, context-specific funding solutions.
 - Launch a new fish and wildlife governance model that is stakeholder focused.
 - Approach transformative change as a process or journey, not an event.

It's Too Late for Incrementalism: Let's Transform to a New Approach For Fish and Wildlife Conservation in the 21st Century – An Essay

Decker, D. J. 2011. White paper for Discussion at National Council for Science and the Environment – Habitat Conservation Conference. Annapolis, MD.

- Essay about the linked questions what has our approach to conservation in the US accomplished to date and what changes are needed for the future of fish and wildlife in a rapidly changing world
- We need to consider whether the past is the best predictor of the future given the changing coupled socio-ecological systems
- Wildlife conservation in the US needs to transform quite rapidly from its splintered foci on target species that are of interest to particular stakeholders, who advocate narrowly defined objectives for species protection or recreational uses, to a galvanizing habitat and ecosystem services focus that is supported by a diverse set of stakeholders
- Interconnected components needing attention:
 - the wildlife management institution and associated professional culture that more often resists than leads the kind of transformative change needed to achieve wildlife conservation under current and anticipated conditions

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- governance of public-trust resources often lacks transparency, discipline, consistency of logic and ethical analysis, meaningful stakeholder engagement, consideration of the full range of values for wildlife and habitat etc. and is often based on the values of public servants, select stakeholder representatives, and conservation organization employees rather than the analyzed needs and expectations of all affected stakeholders
- stakeholder development that has enabled segmentation of stakeholders essentially into political interest groups that are often pitted one against another rather than as coalitions recognizing their common ground for broader conservation outcomes
- Focus of the past (basis for success in the past) was on species and focus on wildlife uses rather than broader wildlife values
- Continued fragmentation of conservation interests is certain to result in conservation loss
- More effort needs to be expended in cultivating habitat as the common ground for a powerful, coordinated national habitat emphasis in wildlife management of the 21st century
- Public interest in wildlife has been segmented into two groups: those that want to use wildlife in some way and those that want to protect wildlife from human use or disturbance
- We need to build higher levels of trust among state fish and wildlife agencies and between them and USFWS

The Role of State Wildlife Professionals Under the Public Trust Doctrine

Smith, C. A. 2011. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 75: 1539-1543.

- The Public Trust Doctrine (PTD) holds that certain natural resources, such as water, fish, and wildlife, are held in trust by government for the benefit of people
- Although the federal government has primary trust responsibility for migratory birds, marine mammals and endangered species, the majority of the PTD responsibility remains with state governments
- Effective trust-based governance depends on the trustees recognizing and fulfilling their role under the PTD
- It is critical for that wildlife professionals fully understand both the PTD and their roles and responsibilities under the PTD
- Legislators and commissioners, to whom legislators have delegated specific authorities, are the primary trustees of the public's wildlife
- State wildlife agency professionals are trust managers
- Under the PTD, ownership of wildlife is generally construed as being collectively vested in the public at large
- Through adoption of state constitutions, the citizens of each state have granted the power to enact laws that govern the taking of wildlife to the legislature (not to the executive or judiciary branch)

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- In most states, the legislature has created a citizen commission charged with oversight of the state agency and has delegated limited authorities such as regulating methods of take and allocation of wildlife harvest. While commissions serve as trustees, they do so subject to the oversight and will of the legislature.
- Trustees:
 - should be qualified, competent, impartial and assiduous to the interests of all trust beneficiaries
 - charged with a duty to preserve the assets of the trust in the long-term best interest of the beneficiaries
 - must be aware of the current value of the trust as well as the potential to increase the value of the trust through prudent management
 - must weigh the immediate needs and desires of the beneficiaries against the duty to sustain the trust
 - must resolve competing demands among the beneficiaries
 - must determine the amount of the corpus that should be distributed to the beneficiaries as well as the allocation of the benefits among beneficiaries – requires consideration of complex trade-offs and making policy-level decisions.
 - must weigh all of the biological, social, economic and political implications of their decisions
- Trust managers:
 - monitor and manage the corpus of the trust to attain the goals set by the trustees
 - report on the status of the trust to the trustees and beneficiaries
 - distribute the proceeds (benefits) consistent with the direction of the trustees
 - require knowledge and expertise in management of the trust assets
 - are accountable to the trustee, not the beneficiaries
 - charged with developing management options, defining trade-offs and making recommendations
 - provide trustees complete and balanced information about the values, needs and desires of the beneficiaries
- Policy-level decisions are predominantly made by elected and appointed officials; day-to-day management of the public's wildlife is conducted by state wildlife professionals
 - This is a deliberate construct to ensure that all the individuals setting policy are directly accountable to those affected by those policies

Adaptability: The New Competitive Advantage

Reeves, M and M. Deimler. Aug 2011. Boston Consulting Group.

- Traditional approaches to strategy though often seen as the answer to change and uncertainty – actually assume a relatively stable and predictable world
- Companies that thrive are quick to read and act on signals of change
- Work out how to experiment rapidly, frequently and economically – not only with products, process and strategies
- Build skills in managing complex multi-stakeholder systems in an increasingly interconnected world
- Ability to read and act on signals

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Antennae tuned to signals of change from external environment, decode the and quickly act and respond
- Rely on sophisticated customer relations management systems, analyze and use the data to detect trends and patterns
- Monitor and react in real time
- Ability to experiment
 - Use focus groups to explore ideas
 - Pilot test, evaluate and modify before large-scale launch - adaptive companies are very tolerant of experimental failures – it's only a failure if we fail to get the learning
- Ability to manage complex multi-company systems – signal detection and experimentation require a company to think beyond its own boundaries and work more closely and smartly with customers and suppliers
- - increasingly industry structure is better characterized as competing webs or ecosystems of codependent companies than as a handful of competitors producing similar goods and services and working on a stable, distant and transactional basis with their suppliers and customers
- Ability to mobilize
 - Adaptation is necessarily local in nature – successful then amplified and refined
 - Organizations create environments that encourage knowledge flow, diversity, autonomy, risk taking, sharing and flexibility
 - Strategy follows organization in adaptive companies
 - Flexible structure and dispersal of decision rights are powerful levers for increased adaptability – units that freely communicate and recombine according to the situation at hand
 - Use simple, generative rules to facilitate interaction, help people make trade-off is and set boundaries in with they can make decisions
- Challenges for big businesses
 - Need to balance managing for scale and efficiency with the diversity and flexibility needed for rapid learning and change
 - Watch the mavericks – what are the innovators doing? Will it work for us?
 - ID and address uncertainties that could significantly affect the company
 - Distinguish from false knowns (questionable but firmly held assumptions) from underexploited knowns (megatrend you may recognize but without acting with speed or emphasis) and the unknown unknowns
 - Put an initiative on every risk
 - Examine multiple alternatives
 - Require every change proposal to be accompanied by several alternatives
 - Surfaces more varied and powerful set of moves and legitimizes and fosters cognitive diversity of organizational flexibility
 - Increase clock speed – speed of adaptation is a function of the cycle time of decision-making – shorten the cycle time

**Seeking Common Ground for Collaborative Conservation:
Overcoming Barriers and Building Bridges to a Wildlife
Conservation Institution for “All Wildlife for All People”**

Decker, D.J., A. B. Forstchen, A.M. LeClaire-Mitchell, C.A. Jacobson. 2012. *Transactions of the 76th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. Printing/distribution pending.

- Results of a workshop at 2012 North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference (Atlanta)- focused on gathering and understanding perspectives from “outside the tent”
- Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), were invited to share their perspectives on how to work better collaboratively with state fish and wildlife agencies to broaden the state wildlife conservation institution and further their common conservation goals
- An NGO noted that it was critical to acknowledge that all partners’ needs were accepted as legitimate and the priorities of the conservation institution reflected broad goals that were clearly articulated
- A partnership representative reminded participants that all sectors have significant roles and potential contributions to make to advance conservation
- The need for quality habitat to sustain fish and wildlife was identified as an issue on which most organizations—traditional and nontraditional—can agree and address collaboratively
- State wildlife agencies need to work outside their comfort zones and explore nontraditional funding opportunities such as energy development and water management
- A timber company presented data on the shift of ownership of forested lands and suggested that the agencies need to better understand the implications of habitat ownership and urged them to broaden partnerships with industry because corporations own land (i.e., habitat), have resources, and often, have good financial reasons to find common ground with
- A private consultant suggested a shift in focus to habitats and ecosystems over single-species management and to build a shared vision of benefits from the management of wildlife and their habitats
- If agencies are to continue to play a leadership role they need to understand the perspectives and needs of partners and leverage the ability of NGOs to manage and allocate funding in ways that state agencies cannot
- Agencies need to be attractive partners by being forthright and transparent about risk, ensure continuity of commitment over time even as staff changes occur, and have “can do” attitudes
- A philanthropic organization described the spectrum of financial approaches foundations use, the constraints they work within, and how these approaches influence funding priorities and decisions
- Currently foundations see little opportunity for alignment with agencies whose focus and majority of funding comes from hunting license fees and where there appears to be strong pressure to produce an overabundance of hunted species and a concurrent diminution of predators

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Several questions were proposed for further consideration:
 - Can state wildlife agencies deliver strategic habitat protection outcomes as part of a larger landscape approach aimed at ensuring all fish and wildlife populations are ecologically sustainable?
 - Are state wildlife agencies willing to create new revenue streams, especially from people who simply enjoy watching wildlife or perhaps gain satisfaction and value from just knowing wildlife are thriving?
 - Are state agencies willing and able to receive private dollars that would be specifically restricted to achieving broader conservation outcomes?
 - Can private philanthropy be helpful in funding research that state wildlife agencies do not have the resources/expertise to conduct themselves?
 - Are agencies prepared to transition into organizations that are representative of society’s cultural and ethnic diversity and more accurately represent the changing attitudes towards wildlife and conservation?
- A long-term agency director emphasized the need for wildlife agencies to *conserve all wildlife for all people*, if they are to remain relevant in, let alone lead, conservation in the future
- Workshop speakers and participants identified scores of impediments to transformation of the Institution, specifically focusing on SFWA

Challenges in Collaborative Wildlife Conservation: Barriers and Solutions List

BARRIERS/CHALLENGES	SOLUTIONS
INTERNAL TO INSTITUTION	
Users-pay model	Broad-based funding/all wildlife for all people
Paralyzed by user-pay funding models	Innovative funding streams
Rigid organizational model	Flexible matrix
Narrow funding streams	Flexible allocation of funds to priorities
Confusion about priorities	Clear priorities
Traditional practices	Create new norm
Competition for resources	Magnify resources thru collaboration
Complexity of issue	Clearly articulated situational analysis
Focus on history of failures	Look ahead to creation of successes
Random acts of conservation	Aligned priorities
Population focus	Systems focus
Resistance to change	Adaptive management styles
Passive response to change	Proactive (scenario planning)/embrace change
Closed doors	Transparency
Species focus	Habitat focus
Species focus	Benefits of wildlife and habitats
Closed minds	Trusting relationships
Conventional practices	Creative thinking/ “can-do” attitude

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

RELATIONSHIPS	
Stereotyped perspectives of nontraditional stakeholders	Specific relationships
Ambivalent to stakeholder input	Inquisitive/seek stakeholder input
Top-down/"we know what's best for you"	Multi-way/identify desired impacts
Conflicting values	Common ground/win-win outcomes
Closed minds	Trusting relationships
Control (expert authority)	Co-management
Competition	Cooperation
Going it alone	Coalitions/partnerships/networks
Exclusivity/privileged stakeholders	Inclusivity/all wildlife for all people
Fidelity to the one who brought you to dance	Expand dance partners
Behind closed doors	Transparency
Stakeholder fatigue	Broader stakeholder engagement
Intuition and informants	Systematic inquiry to learn about stakeholders
Resistance to change	Adaptive management styles
Passive response to change	Proactive (scenario planning)/embrace change
Complexity of issue	Clearly articulated situational analysis
Perception	Inquiry to verify or refute assumptions
Paralyzed by user-pay funding models	Diversify and use innovative funding streams
Traditional	Create new norm
Captured policy/decision-making processes	Good governance, participatory, transparency
EXOGENOUS FORCES	
Polarized politics	Supportive governance/leadership
Captured policy/decision-making processes	Good governance, participatory, transparency
Changing demographics	Anticipating change
Disassociation with outdoors/nature	Engagement with nature/outdoors

Cultural Change That Sticks

Katzenbach, J.R., I. Steffen and C. Kronley. July/Aug 2012. Harvard Business Review.

- You can't trade your company's culture in as if it were a used car – it's a legacy that remains uniquely yours
- Cultural inclinations are well entrenched, for good or bad. But it's possible to draw on the positive aspects of culture, turning them to your advantage, and offset some of the negative aspects as you go.
- Visit staff, understand their perspective, and involve them in the planning
- Senior staff should seek out staff at all levels, - those who were well connected, sensitive to the company culture, and widely respected to get their input on the strategy as well as their views on both the design and execution of intended process changes
- Conversations like these can ID biggest problems but also significant cultural strengths
- Takes years to alter how people think, feel and behave

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Cultures do evolve over time – sometimes slipping backwards, sometimes progressing and the best you can do is work with and within them, rather than fight them
- 5 principles
 - Match strategy and culture – a strategy that is at odds with a company’s culture is doomed. Culture trumps strategy every time
 - Focus on a few critical shifts in behavior – “If we had the kind of culture we aspire to, in pursuit of the strategy we have chosen, what kinds of new behaviors would be common? And what ingrained behaviors would be gone?”
 - Honor the strengths of your existing culture – acknowledging the existing culture’s assets will make major change feel less like a top-down impositions and more like a shared evolution. Harness the cultural elements you want to support by explicitly acknowledging and supporting them, leverage staff who are already aligned with their strategy and desired culture
 - Integrate formal and informal interventions – most corporate leaders favor formal, rational moves and neglect the informal, more emotional side of the organization. They adjust reporting lines, decision rights, processes and IT systems at the outset but overlook informal mechanisms, such as networking, communities of interest, ad hoc conversations and peer interactions – whether formal or informal, interventions should do two things – reach people at an emotional level (invoking altruism, pride and how they feel about the work itself) and tap rational self-interest (providing money, positions, and external recognition to those who come on board).
 - Measure and monitor cultural evolution
 - Business performance – are key performance indicators improving?
 - Critical behaviors – have enough people at multiple levels started to exhibit the few behaviors that matter most?
 - Milestones – have specific intervention milestones been reached?
 - Underlying beliefs, feelings and mind-sets – are key cultural attitudes moving in the right direction (this area is usually the slowest to show improvement)
- Coherence among your culture, your strategic intent, and your performance priorities can make your whole organization more attractive to both employees and customers. Because deeply embedded cultures change slowly over time, working with and within the culture you have is the best approach.

Impact Management: An Approach to Fulfilling Public Trust Responsibilities of Wildlife Agencies

Decker, D.J., A.B. Forstchen, J.F. Organ, C.A. Smith, S.J. Riley, C.A. Jacobson, G.R. Batcheller, W.F. Siemer. 2013. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*.38: 2-8.

- Agencies fulfill responsibilities for state governance by managing the wildlife trust for benefits by citizens (all citizens since they are all legitimate beneficiaries of the trust including future generations)

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Agencies are better able to fulfill their public trust responsibilities if they are attentive to the full range of wild living resources within their geopolitical jurisdiction
- The authors suggest a wildlife management approach that enables agencies to be attentive to the broader suite of species that stakeholders are affected by or interested in – this focuses limited resources on the range of current or anticipated impacts and considers the cultural, economic and political, and ecological components of the management environment
- Wildlife agencies in the US exist in part to ensure that the wildlife trust is administered or cared for in a manner that yields sustained net positive value for current and future citizens –this includes reduction of negative impacts from wildlife
- All citizens (= all trust beneficiaries) have a significant role in defining the objectives or benefits sought from the trust
- Broad opportunity for input is standard for good governance (transparency, fairness, inclusiveness)
- Trustees, trust managers and beneficiaries all need to understand the suite of outcomes the trust is capable of producing
- Benefits desired (from wildlife trust) may change over time and across generations; flexibility of management strategies is prudent
- Need to build a framework to produce optimal net benefits for most potential beneficiaries rather than focus on maximizing population numbers
- Public wildlife trust is an obligation to manage for a suite of positive outcomes or benefits made possible by the existence of wildlife
- Important wildlife interactions or outcomes – those most significant to the people affected – either positive or negative – result in the most attention from trustees and trust managers
- Population of potential trust beneficiaries are increasing and the expected benefits broadening – agencies are responding by better understanding attitudes, opinions, and behaviors towards wildlife by using social science
- Historically work has focused on trust assets of interest, access to those assets and use of those assets
- Stakeholder definition = any person who significantly effects or is significantly affected by wildlife or wildlife management
- Public trust provides historical and contemporary foundation for state wildlife agencies
- Public trust also provides direction for agency relevance – a foundation for building an enduring philosophy and practice of public wildlife stewardship
- Public trust provides a legal and philosophical impetus to develop a set of principles that is more inclusive of all beneficiaries in developing objectives for trust management

On the Front Lines of Making Conservation Relevant and Valued: A Florida Case Study

Forstchen, A. B., and D. J. Decker. 2014. *Transactions of the 79th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. Printing pending.

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Themes of many national meetings have focused on wildlife management agencies need to be more relevant to society – but what does this really mean?
- Relevance means have a logical connection to or some bearing of importance for real world issues of social significance (e.g., the economy, job creation, energy development, transportation, health care, education, climate change) and being recognized as having such a connection
- Pursuit of relevance is leading some agencies to recognize that the traditional paradigm of wildlife management is inadequate
- Authors believe that agencies need to set the bar higher – from just being *relevant* to being *valued by society*
- The wildlife management system: people, landscape, wildlife populations, interactions between these components, and the formal and informal processes to management them- has changed
- The scale, complexity, and speed of development of wildlife issues and the diversity of perspectives on these issues has changed
- Authors challenge the conservation community to rethink how we frame “making conservation relevant to and valued by society”
- Public trust principles suggest that the beneficiaries of the public trust (fish and wildlife resources) are *all* citizens because wildlife are public resources held in trust for us all and all interests in wildlife should be considered, and no interest should be privileged over another
- As a practical matter, agencies need to prioritize activities to the needs of stakeholders – those affecting or being affected by wildlife and wildlife management in a significant way
- It follows then, that for wildlife management, societal relevance means relevance to the issues stakeholder hold dear that intersect with wildlife, and these issues tend to be health, safety, economic security, food security, ecologic integrity of the environment and pursuit of happiness
- Fish and wildlife and management of these resources intersect with important societal issues but the benefits of fish and wildlife are not being communicated in ways that help the public understand the roles of state wildlife management agencies
- Wildlife management is just as resistant to change as any institution
- Wildlife management paradigm = combination of professional values and norms; structures and processes; behaviors or professional towards each other and stakeholders; management practices; and professional rules, rewards, and sanctions
- Are agencies contributing to a perception of being irrelevant because they are overlaying the traditional paradigm of wildlife management on people who may not share our values, accept our assumptions or embrace our purposes?
- Are we missing opportunities for connecting with new and emerging stakeholder because we base interactions on where we want them to be with respect to our paradigm rather than where they are?
- The current or traditional wildlife management paradigm has focused on hunters, anglers and trappers – the stakeholders who paid for benefited directly from wildlife restoration successes of the 20th century relevancy to these beneficiaries of management has not been difficult to sustain.

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- This traditional paradigm has been sufficient until recently
- Management paradigms are hard to change because they have been shown to work in solving problems in the past
- Living in the past is risky because the social-ecological landscape is different and still changing
- The scope of conservation is sometimes global; the complexity and interdependencies of conservation issue have vastly increased; the number and diversity of stakeholders and potential stakeholders have dramatically expanded; and the practices we use don't always work like they used to
- The authors find the goal of being "relevant" inadequate
- Agencies need to be more than relevant, because one can be relevant to society but still inconsequential
- To be effective, agencies must be valued - defined as being important or beneficial; cherished.
- If valued, agencies will necessarily be relevant, but more importantly they will be recognized for positive and significant impacts
- Agencies need to be adaptable because of immigration and migration of human populations, and changes in people's experience, attitude, opinion, and behaviors towards fish and wildlife
- An adaptive organization is one that is able to detect positive or negative impacts to the organization and change itself to take advantages of opportunities or mitigate problems
- The authors offer *principles* of a relevant, valued and adaptive agency
 - Contemporary with respect to social values, needs, and interests
 - Wildlife-values focus (rather than wildlife-use focus)
 - External orientation—engage partners, understand stakeholders, form coalitions
 - Good governance (e.g., open, transparent, inclusive, and fair decision-making processes)
 - "Safe haven" work environment where opinions are freely expressed
 - Receptive to new perspectives and alternatives; risk taking within reason
 - Anticipatory, proactive, and responsive
 - Nimble and flexible
 - Evaluative and continually learning, improving
 - Accountable; proactively seeking feedback
 - Strong and broad scale partner relationships
 - Coupled social-ecological systems approach
- The authors suggest some *practices* that agencies can adopt that are consistence of an adaptive agency
 - Rely on human dimensions insight (from social science and stakeholder engagement)
 - Collaborate across disciplines
 - Exercise comprehensive, analytic, critical, and integrative thinking skills

 - Encourage free flow of information
 - Use interdependent units working in an integrated system
 - Promote productive dissidence
 - Seek professional training opportunities
 - Learn how to evaluate and do new things quickly
 - Build capacity to manage complex issues
 - Detect changes that may impact the agency (positive or negative)
 - Identify uncertainties and risks

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Produce recognized and valued benefits to a broad suite of stakeholders
- Adopt open, transparent, inclusive, and fair decision-making processes
- The outcomes of a relevant, valued and adaptive agency:
 - Find staff at all levels who seek out, understand, and embrace diverse stakeholder interests
 - Stakeholders would be informed and engaged with the agency and each other
 - Agencies and stakeholders would work together to design and implement actions to address conservation challenges
 - Dialogue among staff, stakeholders, and partners would be frequent, open, and transparent
 - Trust would build and be maintained between and among staff, stakeholders, and partners
 - All would trust the agency's decision-making processes to produce fair outcomes
 - Decisions would be supported and more durable because stakeholders were involved in the process
 - Society would recognize and appreciate the products, services, and benefits provided by the agencies and understand the linkages of fish and wildlife management to other important social issues
- The authors suggest a new fish and wildlife management paradigm - one that is more focused on people and providing the benefits they desire from fish and wildlife
- The value of an agency is measured by the benefits it generates that have purpose, meaning, and satisfy human needs and desires—whether tangible or intangible (i.e., including desire to avoid extinctions and biodiversity degradation, to conserve intact ecosystems, etc.).
- Agencies need to understand what is important to all segments of society - identify the intersections of fish and wildlife to issues such as health, safety, security, and happiness that are important to society
- Agencies will need to scan for and anticipate the impacts of changing social and ecological conditions and adapt their products and services over time to continue to provide valued benefits
- Agencies can work to increase their programmatic, operational, and adaptive capacities to become more adaptable and can produce products and provide benefits that are recognized and valued by a broader audience.

Converting Consumers to Customers: Why We Should Consider a Different Approach

Forstchen, A.B. and N. Wiley. 2015. *Transactions of the 80th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. Printing pending.

- Fish and wildlife agencies are struggling to address the growing needs and concerns of increasing numbers of people and their desired interactions with wildlife
- The broadening diversity of stakeholder has new and different interests in, and uses of, fish and wildlife
- Most in the conservation community would agree that all people benefit from fish and wildlife conservation or our management of them
- Some in the conservation community suggest part of the solution to wildlife management agency financial solvency is to convert the nonpaying consumers to paying customers
 - attempts to broaden agency funding through this type of conversion generally have not been successful

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- There has been external pressure for public agencies to “run more like a business” but using for-profit business terminology for a public natural resource management agency is challenging and leads to many questions such as what is our business? What is our business’s purpose? Who does our business serve? What products and services do we provide? How do we know if we have a successful business model?
- During the past decade state fish and wildlife agencies have been encouraged to transform to meet the challenges of unprecedented social change
- The Public Trust Doctrine (PTD) provides the legal foundations of state agencies and using the principles of the PTD can provide a different lens to look at the conservation “industry”
- Managing fish and wildlife under a public trust framework means agencies manage the trust resources (fish and wildlife) on behalf of all people and provide benefits from those resources to all people, now and for future generations
- Using a public trust approach eliminates the need to distinguish between consumers and customers
- Fish and wildlife conservation is not an economic or profit-based industry but a trust-based industry. Our conservation business model then becomes more defined as to its purpose – providing benefits to *all* citizens from the trust resources, not just engaged stakeholders
- So those other “business” related questions can be answered;
 - Who does our business serve? All citizens, now as well as future generations
 - What products and services do we provide? Those that citizens request of the trustee and that the trust assets can sustain over time
 - How do we know if we have a successful business model? We can use metrics of sustainable fish and wildlife populations and the satisfaction of the beneficiaries of the trust
- Like a business we have a number of “business or product lines” – recreation, wildlife protection, mitigation, research. Information and outreach, and law enforcement
- The conservation “industry” can borrow and apply applications from the non-profit arena to improve operational efficiencies such as fleet management, technology, communications, financial administration, and human resources management
- Just as for-profit businesses understand their customers, a trust-based organization needs to understand its beneficiaries, the benefits they want from the trust assets, and their organizations wildlife management ability and capacity to provide them
- The public trust approach provides direction to better understand the needs and concerns of all citizens relative to fish and wildlife and our management of them
- Agencies must be mindful and adaptive as they face current and future societal changes that are eroding traditional revenue sources
- In a “no-fee-increase” political environment, most states have picked the “low hanging fruit” (e.g., license plates, drivers’ license check off boxes, lottery or gaming revenues)
- There is on-going work at national level (Blue Ribbon Panel) to address alternative funding sources, but agencies also need to work within their own socio-political arenas at the state and local level to improve awareness of the wide variety of benefits that fish and wildlife resources provide citizens and seek support for conservation at all levels
- Agencies should:

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- examine our thinking, terminology and behaviors as we shift from an economics-based focus on consumers, customer, clients, etc. to a more inclusive trust-based focus on “conservation beneficiaries” – these beneficiaries should recognize the benefits they receive from fish and wildlife management and they value and support conservation even if they don’t directly participate in outdoor wildlife-related activities
- examine the current recruitment, retention and reengagement strategies with a public trust lens to reach all potential beneficiaries and garner their support
- engage more with the baby boomer generation who experienced the environmental movement of the 1960s, have more leisure time and expendable income, and are more likely to be politically active
- increase and improve engagement with local state and federal elected officials – and not just during budget decision-making sessions--and be explicit about how they can support conservation through their political actions and how those actions will result in direct and indirect benefits to their constituents
- engage more with large industry, energy development, academia, tourism councils, transportation, healthcare and economic development board – help them understand how healthy and abundant fish and wildlife contribute to the goals they want to achieve
- improve communications and understand who are we really reaching? Is it a two-way dialogue? Who are we missing?
- recognize it’s not just the public relations or outreach group’s job to communicate about conservation benefits – it’s everyone’s jobs.
- Reorienting an agency to focus on the people part of fish and wildlife management may be an uncomfortable shift, but changes in peoples experiences, attitudes, opinions and behaviors toward fish and wildlife during the past few decades leave little choice
- Celebrate the rich conservation history over the past century, but recognize that leaning on our history, particularly regarding outdated organizations structure and how we relate to traditional social and cultural interests, may be a barrier for change
- Pressures have increased for agencies to act more like a business, “get back to their core mission” and yet also to respond to increasing demands from the public trust beneficiaries with less resources
- The PTD provides a historical yet adaptable framework to understand and guide agency action as we work in an increasing complex social, political and ecological climate
- Conservation is a trust-based industry- providing benefits from fish and wildlife conservation to all current citizens and future generations
- Agencies need to
 - provide easily accessible mechanisms for citizens to learn about why fish and wildlife and their habits are relevant and important to them and to the other social issues they care about (e.g., economy, education, healthcare)
 - concentrate on where we want to be in 20 or 50 years not just in the next budget or strategic planning cycle
 - better understand and engage those beneficiaries who indirectly benefit from fish and wildlife and garner their support
 - increase awareness in an all citizens about how fish and wildlife conservation benefits their daily lives

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- bring stakeholder groups together by leveraging their common interests
- be open to changing products and services
- recognize that beneficiary needs and concerns will change over time
- find intersection of fish and wildlife conservation to other socially important issues that our beneficiaries care about
- help beneficiaries be knowledgeable and engaged partners in conservation
- embrace private sector practices that help us provide improved conservation benefits
- elevate the conversation from converting consumers into customers and focus on creating broad diverse engagement with all citizens so they all value and support conservation

The Dawn of System Leadership

Senge, P., H. Hamilton and J. Kania. 2015. Stanford Social Innovation Review.

- System leader = someone able to bring forth collective leadership
- Core capabilities of system leaders
- Profound commitment to health of the whole, radiates to nurture similar commitments in others
- Ability to see reality through the eyes of others very different from themselves, encourages others to be more open as well
- Build relationships based on deep listening
- Don't wait for a fully developed plan -freeing others to step ahead and learn by doing
- Strength of their ignorance gives them permission to ask obvious questions and embody an openness and commitment to their own learning and growth that infuses larger change efforts
- Ability to see the larger system – essential to building a shared understanding of complex problems – enables collaborating organizations to jointly develop solutions not evident to any of them individually and work for the health of the whole system
- Foster reflection and more generative conversations. Reflection = thinking about our thinking, ID and evaluate our assumptions, understand how our mental models may limit us, deep shared reflection is a critical step in enabling ability to hear a different perspective (essential doorway for building trust).
- Shift collective focus from reactive problem solving to co-creating the future – involves not just building inspiring visions but facing difficult truths about present reality and using the tension between vision and reality to inspire new approaches
- Gateways to becoming a systems leader
- Re-directing attention – seeing that problems “out there” are “in here”
- Continuing to do what we are currently doing (harder and smarter) is not likely to produce different outcomes
- We are part of the systems we seek to change – the fear, lack of trust, anger, sorrow, doubt, frustration also exist in us
- Our actions will not become more effective until we shift the nature of the awareness and thinking beyond the actions
- What affects the individual affects the actions
- 3 openings to transform systems (Otto Scharner and Katrin Kaufal)

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Opening the mind (challenge our assumptions)
- Opening the heart (be vulnerable and truly hear one another)
- Opening the will (to let go of pre-set goals and agenda and see what is really needed and possible)
- These match the blind spots of most change efforts – rigid assumptions and agendas, failure to see that transforming systems is ultimately about transforming relationships among the people who shape the systems
- Re-orienting strategy – creating the space for change and enabling collective intelligence and the wisdom to emerge
- Ineffective leaders try to *make* change happen
- Systems leaders focus on creating the conditions that can produce change and that can eventually cause change to be self-sustaining
- Systemic change needs more than data and information – it needs real intelligence and wisdom
- Complex non-linear systems exhibit counter intuitive behavior
- Wisdom = the ability to distinguish the short term from the long-term effects of an intervention
- Collective wisdom cannot be built into a plan created in advance and is not likely to come from leaders who seek to drive their pre-determined change agenda
- System leaders work to create the space where people living with the problem come together to tell the truth, think more deeply about what is really happening, explore options beyond popular thinking and search for higher leverage changes through progressive cycles of action, reflection and learning over time
- Systems leaders know there are no easy answer to complex problems
- Systems leaders cultivate the conditions where collective wisdom emerges over time through a ripening process that gradually brings about new ways of thinking, acting and being
- Systems leaders create space, engage people in genuine questions, convene around a clear intention with no hidden agenda
- Practice, practice, practice – all learning is doing, but the doing is inherently developmental
- Bringing together diverse stakeholders with little history of collaboration, different mental models and different and apparently competing aims is a high-risk undertaking – good intentions are not enough – skill is needed
- Systems thinkers never stop practicing how to help people see the larger systems obscured by established mental models, how to foster different conversation that gradually build genuine engagement and trust and how to sense emerging possibilities and help shift the collective focus from just reacting to problems to releasing creative collective creativity = practice is internal and external and requires discipline
- Tools are available
- Seeing the larger system – integrate the different mental models of multiple stakeholders to build a more comprehensive understanding (systems mapping)
- Fostering reflection and generative conversation – enable groups to slow down long enough to “try on” other perspectives – allow organizations and individuals to question, revise and sometimes release their embedded assumptions
- Peer shadowing and learning journeys – spend time to understand different perspectives

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Use ladder of inference to pay better attention to how their often unconscious assumptions shape their perspectives
- Shift from reacting to co-creating the future
- What do we really want to create? And what exists today?
- Gap creates tension and energy that systems leaders can use for change- use energy to transcend the us vs. them mentality (appreciative inquiry)
- Systems leaders never stop working at the fine art of getting the right people in the room
- System leader growth never ends = most useful in culture that foster's ongoing reflections and collaboration
- All change requires passionate advocates – be careful not to step in your own way
- Systems leaders cultivate ability to listen and willingness to inquire into different perspectives
- Operating within our comfort zone will never lead to engaging the range of actors that is needed for system change
- Systems leaders need to have strategy but learn to follow the energy when unexpected paths or opportunities arise
- Systems leaders don't do it alone and it happens under pressure and difficult settings

Governance Principles for Wildlife Conservation in the 21st Century

Decker, D. J., C.A. Smith, A.B. Forstchen, D. Hare, E. F. Pomeranz, C. Doyle-Capitman, K. Schuler, J.F. Organ. 2016. *Conservation Letters*.

- General disconnect of people from the environment indicates an uncertain future for conservation
- Leaders of the conservation institution (the entirety of customs, practices, organizations and agencies, policies and laws with respect to wildlife) need to rethink governance of wildlife resources
- Governance = the practices and procedures that determine how decisions are made and implemented and how responsibilities are exercised
- Conservation institution urgently needs to adopt a more effective, strategic approach to address contemporary social values relative to wildlife and changes in land use and ecological conditions
- New approach must be grounded on principles that encompass roles and responsibilities of all players – elected and appointed officials (trustees), conservation professionals in government (trust managers) and non-government entities, and citizens (beneficiaries)
- 10 Wildlife Governance Principles (WGP) are proposed, marrying two concepts of public trust thinking and good governance, in response to growing attention to public trusteeship of wildlife
- Public trust thinking = philosophical orientation towards natural resources
 - Wildlife resources are considered a natural endowment to be stewarded as an intergenerational inheritance, not suitable for exclusive private ownership, all citizens are beneficiaries, all beneficiaries' interests should receive fair consideration, trustees should not be unduly influenced by special interests, resource managers should avoid foreclosing on future generations ability to enjoy

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

and use the resource, and beneficiaries have an obligation to hold the trustees and trust managers accountable in their management of the trust assets

- Good governance = participatory, transparent and fair decision-making that incorporates diverse perspectives, future-looking, strategic decisions that consider likely cultural and social conditions, adaptive, effective, and efficient administrators, and citizens who hold administrators accountable

Wildlife Governance Principles

1. Wildlife governance will be adaptable and responsive to citizens' current needs and interests, while also being forward-looking to conserve options of future generations.
2. Wildlife governance will seek and incorporate multiple and diverse perspectives.
3. Wildlife governance will apply social and ecological science, citizens' knowledge, and trust administrators' judgment.
4. Wildlife governance will produce multiple, sustainable benefits for all beneficiaries.
5. Wildlife governance will ensure that trust administrators are responsible for maintaining trust resources and allocating benefits from the trust.
6. Wildlife governance will be publicly accessible and transparent.
7. Wildlife governance will ensure that trust administrators are publicly accountable.
8. Wildlife governance will include means for citizens to become informed and engaged in decision making.
9. Wildlife governance will include opportunities for trust administrators to meet their obligations in partnerships with non-governmental entities.
10. Wildlife governance will facilitate collaboration and coordination across ecological, jurisdictional and ownership boundaries.

- WGs accentuate the necessity for wildlife trust administrators to be cognizant of the many values and benefits people associate with wildlife
- Implementation should result in fair, inclusive and transparent decision making
- WGs provide a framework to consider multiple perspectives and address conservation challenges that span social and ecological boundaries
- Adoption of WGs will require modernizing political and stakeholder engagement processes and increase use of social science
- WGs are *guidelines* for behaviors, processes and decisions that embody public trust thinking and good governance expectations but are not prescriptive and can be applied within an organizations socio-political environment (An agency assessment tool has been developed to help agencies understand how well they are aligned with the WGs and a workshop has been developed and tested in 4 states that helps agencies identify and focus on practices that need the most attention in their context.)

Purpose with the Power to Transform Your Organization

Carlisi, C., J. Hemerling, J. Kilmann, D. Meese, D. Shipman. 2017. Boston Consulting Group.

- Many organizations do a superficial job of articulating why they exist, settling for vision-setting exercises that lead to little more than catchy slogans and posters
- Even among organizations that articulate their purpose effectively, many are guilty of going no further
- Purpose is elemental to humans and human institutions – studies show purpose-driven organization perform better
- Amid overlapping transformations purpose becomes even more important, providing alignment, clarity, guidance and energy
- Transformation has become the status quo; at a given moment, an organization typically has several transformation efforts underway
- Purpose serves as that vital north star; illuminating a direction and linking and steering various transformation efforts in a way that is logical and accessible to everyone
- Mission (the what) vision (where we'll end up) purpose (why)
- Purpose is at the intersection of who we are and what societal need do we meet?
- 5 properties of purpose
 - Presence = is purpose, clear compelling and noticeable to customers and employees?
 - Strength - is purpose inspiring, reflect a real need in society? – relevant today and tomorrow? Resilient?
 - Alignment – reflect organizations roots, history & DNA? Do leaders believe in it?
 - Integration – are organizations decisions in harmony with its purpose? – does the organization “live” its purpose?
 - Advocacy- does the purpose elicit greater loyalty from employees and customers?
 -
- Realizing purpose with the power to transform
 - Discover – what do we aspire to be and do? What would world lose if we were gone tomorrow?
 - Articulate – craft a story in your own voice that resonates with employees and customers – use as a consistent message
 - Activate – enlist leaders at all levels to take actions to demonstrate purpose and embody it their words and deeds (walk the talk)
 - Embed – deepen and sustain purpose – embody it in everyday, use in recruitment, learning and development programs and performance management systems
- Leaders must continue to walk the talk, recognize and reward those who consistently live the purpose and stand in the way of those who don't
- Purpose can be powerful, but only if it's authentic and deeply embedded

Additional related literature

- McMullin, S. 1993. **Characteristics and Strategies of Effective State Fish and Wildlife Agencies.** Transactions of the 58th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. 206-210.
- Decker, D.J., R.E. Shanks, L.A. Nielsen and G.R. Parsons. 1991. **Ethical and Scientific Judgements in Management: Beware of Blurred Distinctions.** *Wildlife Society Bulletin.* 19(4): 523-527.
- Kotter, J. P. 1995. **Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail.** *Harvard Business Review* March-April. 59 -67
- Strebel, P. 1996. **Why Do Employees Resist Change?** *Harvard Business Review.* May-June 86 -93.
- Mangel, M. et al. 1996. **Principles for the Conservation of Wildlife Living Resources.** *Ecological Applications* 6(2): 338-362.
- Muth, R.M., D.A. Hamilton, J.F. Organ, D.J. Witter, M.E. Mather, and J.J. Daigle. 1998. **The Future of Wildlife and Fisheries Policy and Management: Assessing the Attitudes and Values of Wildlife and Fisheries Professionals.** *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.* 63:604-627.
- Organ, J.F. and E.K. Fritzell. 2000. **Trends in Consumptive Recreation and the Wildlife Profession.** *Wildlife Society Bulletin.* 28(4):780-787.
- Dietz, T., E. Ostrom, P.C. Stern. 2003. **The Struggle to Govern the Commons.** *Science.* 302:1907-1912.
- Mascia, M. B., J. P. Brosius, T. A. Dobson, B. C. Forbes, L. Horowitz, M. A. McKean, and N. J. Turner. 2003. **“Conservation and the Social Sciences.”** *Conservation Biology* 17(3): 649–50.
- Chase, L.C., D.J. Decker, T.B. Lauber. 2004. **Public Participation in Wildlife Management: What do Stakeholders Want?** *Society and Natural Resources.* 17: 629-639.
- Geist, V., and J.F. Organ. 2004. **The Public Trust Foundation of the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation.** *Northeast Wildlife.* 58:49-56.
- Decker, D.J., D.B. Raik, L.H. Carpenter, J.F. Organ, and T.M. Shusler. 2005. **Collaboration for Community-based Wildlife Management.** *Urban Ecosystems.* 8:227-236.

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Organ, J.F. 2006. **The Public Trust Foundation of Wildlife Conservation in North America.** *Proceedings of the 86th Annual Conference, Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.* 86:39-44.
- Enck, J.W., D.J. Decker, S.J. Riley, J.F. Organ, L.H. Carpenter, and W.F. Siemer. 2006. **Integrating Ecological and Human Dimensions in Adaptive Management of Wildlife-related Impacts.** *Wildlife Society Bulletin.* 34:698-705.
- Organ, J.F., D.J. Decker, L.H. Carpenter, W.F. Siemer, and S.J. Riley. 2006. **Thinking Like a Manager: Reflections on Wildlife Management.** Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, DC 106pp.
- Organ, J.F., and S.P. Mahoney. 2007. **The Future of Public Trust: The Legal Status of the Public Trust Doctrine.** *The Wildlife Professional* 1:18-22.
- Decker, D. J., W. F. Siemer, K. M. Leong, S. J. Riley, B. A. Rudolph, and L. H. Carpenter. 2009. **“Conclusion: What is Wildlife Management?”** *Wildlife and Society: The Science of Human Dimensions.* Eds. M. J. Manfredo, J. J. Vaske, P. J. Brown, D. J. Decker, and E. A. Duke. Washington, DC: Island Press. 350.
- Organ J.F. 2009. **Opening Comments: Making the North American Model More Relevant to More Americans.** *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.* 74: 25-26.
- Organ, J.F., and G.R. Batcheller. 2009. **Reviving the Public Trust Doctrine as a Foundation for Wildlife Management in North America.** Chapter 13, pages 161-171 in M.J. Manfredo, J.J. Vaske, P.J. Brown, D.J. Decker, and E.A. Duke, Eds., *Wildlife and Society: The Science of Human Dimensions.* Island Press, Washington, D.C., 350pp.
- Batcheller, G.R., M.C. Bambery, L. Bies, T. Decker, S. Dyke, D. Guynn, M. McEnroe, M. O’Brien, J.F. Organ, S.J. Riley, and G. Roehm. 2010. **The Public Trust Doctrine: Implications for Wildlife Management in the United States and Canada.** Technical Review 10-01, The Wildlife Society, Bethesda, MD, USA.
- Organ, J.F., and G.R. Batcheller. 2010. **Toward the State Wildlife Management Institution of the Future: Key Elements.** *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.* 75: 139-142
- Lockwood, M., J. Davidson, A. Curtis, E. Stratford, R. Griffith. 2010. **Governance Principles for Natural Resource Management.** *Society and Natural Resources.* 23: 986-1001.
- Decker, D.J., S.J. Riley, J.F. Organ, W.F. Siemer and L.H. Carpenter. 2011. **Applying Impact Management: A Practitioner’s Guide.** Human Dimensions Research Unit and Cornell Cooperative Extension, Department of Natural Resources, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY. 119 pp.

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

- Organ, J.F., D.J. Decker, S.J. Riley, J.E. McDonald, Jr., and S.P. Mahoney. 2012. ***Adaptive Management in Wildlife Conservation***. Pages 43-54 In N. Silvy, ed., *The Wildlife Society Techniques Manual*, 7th edition, Vol. II. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, USA.
- Martin, J., W. W. Taylor, and K. M. Schlee. 2012. **Leadership in the Hurricane of Change**. *Fisheries*. 37 (7): 325-328.
- Forstchen, A. B., and N. Wiley. 2013. **“Constraints to Delivering the Public Trust – A State Agency Perspective.”** *Transactions of the 78th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. 6-34.
- Organ, J.F. 2013. **The Changing Landscapes of Wildlife Conservation: Fragmentation and Human Values, the Policy Perspective**. *Fair Chase*. Summer p.8-9.
- Organ, J.F. 2013. **The Wildlife Professional**. Pages 24-33 in P. Krausman and J. Cain, eds. *Wildlife Management and Conservation: Contemporary Principles and Practices*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, USA.
- Decker, D.J., A. B. Forstchen, E.F. Pomeranz, C.A. Smith, S.J. Riley, C.A. Jacobson, J.F. Organ, G.R. Batcheller. 2014. **Stakeholder Engagement in Wildlife Management: Does the Public Trust Doctrine Imply Limits?** *Journal of Wildlife Management*.79:174-179.
- Forstchen, A.B. and C.A. Smith. 2014. **“The Essential Role of Human Dimensions and Stakeholder Participation in States’ Fulfillment of Public Trust Responsibilities.”** *Human Dimensions of Wildlife – Special Issue: Public Trust Philosophy for Fish and Wildlife Management and Implications for Human Dimensions*. 19: 417-426.
- Decker, D. J., A. B. Forstchen, C. A. Jacobson, C. A. Smith, J. F. Organ, and D. Hare. 2014. **“What Does it Mean to Manage Wildlife as if Public Trust Really Matters?”** *Transactions of the 78th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. 46–53.
- Forstchen, A.B., D.J. Decker and D. Hare. 2016. **Genesis of Wildlife Governance Principles**. *Transactions of the 81st North American and Natural Resources Conference*. Submitted 3/31/16.
- Organ, J. F. and C.A Smith. 2016. **Public Trust Responsibilities and Wildlife Governance Principles**. *Transactions of the 81st North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. Submitted 3/31/16.
- Kretser, H., M. Schiavone, and C.A. Smith. 2016. **Applying Wildlife Governance Principles: Opportunities and Limitations**. *Transactions of the 81st North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. Submitted 3/31/16.
- Forstchen, A.B. and N. Wiley. 2016. **Implementation of Wildlife Governance Principles in a State Agency**. *Transactions of the 81st North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. Submitted 3/31/16.

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Transformation: An annotated bibliography

July 2018

Lederle, P., S.J. Riley, and M. Cross. 2016. **Increasing Capacity for Conservation: Do the Wildlife Governance Principles Enhance or Hinder Partnerships?** *Transactions of the 81st North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. Submitted 3/31/16.

Jacobson, C.A. 2016. **Adoption and Diffusion of Wildlife Governance Principles to Promote a More Effective Paradigm.** *Transactions of the 81st North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. Submitted 3/31/16.

Hare, D., D.J. Decker, C.A. Smith, A.B. Forstchen and C.A. Jacobson. 2016. **Public Trust Thinking: Challenges and Solutions.** Submitted, in revision.