PATH
Department of Prevention, Assistance, Transition, and Health Access

Food Stamp Intensive Training

What Made FSIT Work?
100 Things We Did Right

prepared for
State of Vermont
Agency of Human Services
PATH Oversight and Project Committees

by

Entelechy, Inc.

April 28, 2018

ENTELECHY

Entelechy, Inc.
P.O. Box 221
Silver Lake, NH 03875 USA
1.800.376.8368
www.unlockit.com

Contents

100 Things We Did Right

Purpose of this Document

The following is a list of decisions and actions we took in the design, development, and delivery of *Food Stamp Intensive Training* (FSIT). The list is provided to help trainers and others as you create your training or outline your training needs.

ADDIE Overview

The list is segmented into the five phases of the ADDIE training development cycle, an industry standard:

- Analysis
- Design
- Development
- Implementation
- Evaluation

In addition, we included a section called "Other" to address contributing factors that don't fall into the ADDIE model.

Analysis

1. We began with a core team of stakeholders. Renee Richardson was in charge of the Food Stamp Program (FSP) and was concerned about the error rate; Martha Laing was in charge of the staff; Richard Moffi was in charge of training programs. These three were key and formed "The Oversight Committee."
2. Preliminary design considerations were outlined in a well-written, comprehensive, and flexible Request for Proposal (RFP).
3. The problem — payment errors — was easily quantified and identified. The reasons for the errors, while less objective, were still relatively easy to identify.
4. We encouraged everyone to give input into the training. Terry visited almost all of the District Offices (DO) to give an overview of the intended program. He invited input from all DO staff members. While some specific suggestions were made, many of the suggestions were general: "Make it fun." "Make it real." "Don't read to us." "No role plays." "Provide chocolate."
5. The project team — the ones who actually "did the work" — included the vendor and the following members:
   - Project lead – Overall responsibility for the success of the program.
   - Subject Matter Experts (SME) – One SME responsible for each of the four main modules (the final module, Best Practices, used specific SMEs for specific sections).
   - Policy and Quality Control – Experts from the FSP to ensure that the interpretation of policy was correct.
   - Training and Logistics – Responsible for identifying and booking training sites, AND communicating to the field, distribution of precourse training material, and enrollment.

6. FSIT was one of several tactics being simultaneously deployed to reduce FSP payment errors. Computer Assisted Training (CAT) was being developed to address the long-term training needs of new hires. Q-TIPs were communicated to staff monthly to focus on a specific area in FS payment accuracy. An “error buster team” was created to review cases that were found in error to see if there was a way to reverse the judgment — or lower the impact of the error.
7. The FS Chief sought ways to align FS policy with policy from other programs to reduce confusing and sometimes conflicting rules. In some cases, we needed to actually create rules.
8. The vendor/instructor solicited input and support from District Managers. Personally touching base with each was critical to gaining support and buy-in.
9. We delivered *Coaching for Performance* as a prelude to FSIT. *Coaching for Performance* provided the skills for effective employee development and ensured that upcoming FSIT would more likely have the sustained impact we were looking for. The class also provided yet another opportunity for managers and supervisors to provide input into FSIT.
10. Support for the program came from many different sources and in many different ways: FSP program management, local DO support, state office support, etc.
11. We were clear on the intended audience for this training. Participants with less than three months as an eligibility worker were not invited to attend the training. This target allowed for a fairly homogenous audience.
12. At the same time, the training was opened up to other departments within PATH — Fuel, Healthcare, etc. — since they interfaced with the FSP clients. Participants from these departments were told that this was training for eligibility workers and the discussions would remain focused on Food Stamps.

Design

13. Before each class, an inventory was used to overcome the expected reluctance by some participants — who have been doing this work for over 25 years! While realistic, the inventory was created to be difficult enough to stymie all but the most knowledgeable workers. The inventory virtually eliminated the “I don’t need to be here since I already know this stuff” attitude that we anticipated from some.
14. The inventory was anonymous and self-scoring since it was intended primarily as an “attitude adjustment” instrument. Had there been a need to “test out” or be more rigorous in our evaluation, the inventory may have been corrected in another way.
15. The student materials were designed to be easy to use and easy to reference. We created a Word® template to take advantage of Word’s styles and formatting tools. (Additionally, the template was a modification of one that we had used previously and whose bugs had been worked out.)
16. The facilitator guides were created using PowerPoint. This allowed us to have a single file for both the PowerPoint presentation (slide view) and the instructor notes (notes view). While the notes view in PowerPoint provides for a less powerful word processor, the capabilities were sufficient for our needs.

17. We created and provided the Oversight Committee a number of different PowerPoint and Word templates and asked them to select the look and feel that best represented the department and the training initiative. This “branding” ensured that FSIT stood out from other training. Additionally, the templates could be used for future training.
18. Examples and scenarios were used liberally to illustrate concepts and for participants to apply what they learned.
19. The materials used for the case examples were very realistic. Using the formatting capabilities of Word and Excel, we created fictitious paystubs, tax forms, and PATH forms. We created scenarios that were free from extraneous information, but included “noise,” which made participants apply their knowledge.
20. The examples for many of the scenarios came from the payment errors that had been made. We avoided “teaching facts” and, instead, taught policy in the context of situations and scenarios.
21. We avoided some of the less creative teaching/testing techniques such as word finds or crossword puzzles. (We DID include a word find puzzle in one of the modules to distract participants from looking ahead in their guides.)
22. While I am not usually a fan of “trinkets and give-aways,” it was clear that this group of participants was. Therefore, I searched for trinkets that would support the instruction AND be fun. We created three such give-aways:
    - Click pen with rotating messages. On each click, the text that appeared on the pen tube rotated. Each of the six messages was a tip related to income and wages (the module in which the pen was handed out).
    - Letter opener with shelter expenses tips.
    - Mouse pad with FSIT information and motivational message (**Payment Acc_racy – It Takes U!**) that ALSO served as a certificate of participation.
23. Decision-making was clearly defined. Kim — as project lead and as state office guru — would make final decisions if there were conflicts in interpretation in policy, or in focus of the content.

Development

24. Each module was designed and developed with three people: the SME provided content expertise and provided relevant examples; the project lead provided overall focus and accuracy (inviting QA input when necessary); the vendor (Entelechy) provided instructional design and development expertise (and the power of ignorance, which sometimes helped clarify confusing issues). This threesome could get a lot done AND was balanced to prevent missing major points, or being off the mark (or inaccurate).

25. One especially vexing dilemma was to identify a way to tell whether participants — ALL participants — were getting the concept being discussed. The fact that even one or two errors results in fairly significant error rates required that EVERYONE knew the policy in question. While the inventory would tell who got it and who didn't at the end of the class, we needed a mechanism to use throughout the training.

    We came up with the concept of "the flipframe." The flipframe is a photo holder that consists of 20-30 plastic sleeves into which you can insert photos. The sleeves flip over allowing you to see the next sleeve. While the majority of the sleeves were filled with relevant policy tidbits or motivational quotes, the last sleeve housed a blank white card. Participants used this last sleeve as a mini whiteboard on which they would record answers to questions posed by the instructor. Participants were asked to write their answers on the flipframe and turn their flipframes forward where only the instructor could see. Thus, no embarrassment in incorrect answers, 100% participation, and immediate feedback to the instructor (plus the added benefit participants gained by reading policy tidbits!).

26. The PowerPoint slides were created using a template. This reduced the thinking that was required AND ensured a consistent look and feel to the slides.

27. Graphics/clipart was carefully selected, or created to illustrate or support the concept. We did not use clipart or animation without a purpose.

28. In many cases, we used the custom animation feature of PowerPoint to demonstrate a sequence of events (such as determining the income period), or slowly revealing mathematical computations.

29. Training was developed using "the five content types" model. This model suggests that each content type — facts, procedures, processes, concepts, and principles — is best taught and evaluated a certain way. For example, teaching the procedure for calculating income is different than teaching the concept of what's included as income and what's not.

30. We created a style guide to ensure consistency and to avoid making the same decision over and over again. Decisions included:

    - Do we use periods after bulleted phrases?
    - Do the words in the slide headings/titles begin with a capital letter?
    - What's the format we use to cite policy?

31. During development, we saved often. We used a naming convention that allows you to easily track version numbers (and keep old versions just in case!). For example, we used the following convention for subsequent revisions of the Income and Wages Facilitator Guide (FG):

    - `Income and Wages FG 20031017.ppt`
    - `Income and Wages FG 20031101.ppt`
    - `Income and Wages FG 20031121.ppt`

    The first part (`Income and Wages`) was the name of the module; the second part (`FG`) was the type of file (FG=Facilitator Guide, PG=Participant Guide, Precourse); the third part (`20031121`) was the version date. This allowed me to easily track versions since only the date changed. Additionally, the versions are displayed in alphabetical/chronological order on Windows Explorer®, making it easy to identify the most recent version.

    When I opened a document to continue developing, I would change the version date on the cover and Save As — saving the file under a different name by changing the date in the file name.

32. We embedded fun activities and competition. Two favorite games were "Food Stamp Jeopardy" and "Food Stamp Feud." Prizes were awarded to teams and individuals. Additionally, we "spoofed" the prizes, since they were inexpensive trinkets.

33. In the case where a role play might help illustrate a skill (remember, overwhelming input indicated that we should NOT include role plays), we used instructor demonstrations OR videotaped scenarios. Participants evaluated the demonstration or videotape. While not as instructionally sound as actually DOING the skill, this was a close as we wanted to get to nasty role plays.

34. The project team members planned for and devoted a significant amount of time to the development process. Their input and feedback was key to the success of the training. The amount of time required for input and review should not be underestimated; a good rule of thumb: estimate the time required and double it.

35. The development cycle included specific phases and reviews:

    - Initial outline draft and review.
    - Initial facilitator guide draft and review (slides and FG).
    - Final facilitator guide draft and review (slides and FG) (Note that the FG was extremely comprehensive and included reference to activities and exercises in a nonexistent participant guide!)
    - Participant guide final and review (PG)
    - Walkthrough (all final materials)
    - Professional edit for readability, grammar, consistency, etc.
    - Implementation

36. For the reviews, each reviewer (usually the project lead and the SME) was provided an electronic copy of the materials and was told to print the files and make notes on the hardcopy. Reviewers were encouraged to be specific in their comments ("tell me what to say!") and then fax their annotated pages back to the developer. Occasionally the developer would contact the reviewer for clarification, but unnecessary communication was avoided due to the specificity of the comments.
37. As part of the review, we made sure to print the material, as sometimes what appears on the screen is NOT the way it prints! (Note: You can save a tree by reusing the paper and printing on the backside!)
38. We conducted a walkthrough of the training before going live. (A walkthrough is similar to a pilot delivery except that some basic activities — like participant introductions — are ignored; the time is focused on areas that may be tricky to deliver.) Specifically invited to attend were volunteers from the DOs and the state office who provided insight and feedback to the training. A key question was, "How will this information be received by field staff?" The walkthrough resulted in three key benefits:
    - Unclear policy information could be discussed and, if necessary, clarified by QC.
    - Training messages and activities could be honed, smoothing out potentially rough spots or eliminating unnecessary sections.
    - Buy-in was higher as we tried to include field personnel from a variety of offices.
39. The walkthrough was key in identifying holes and areas of possible confusion. We asked for volunteers from the various offices to come and critique — not just listen — to the new module. (Note that after delivering Module 1 and identifying the more challenging — but not belligerent — participants, we name requested those individuals to participate in subsequent walkthroughs; as the saying goes: keep your friends close and your "enemies" closer.) Often, I would stop delivery and poll the audience whether the message I just delivered was clear. (Note: Soliciting input requires a very thick skin, but pays HUGE dividends in the end!)
40. In the walkthrough, participants were given a set of materials that they annotated. The materials were collected after the walkthrough and changes to the training were made based on their feedback and notes. If their suggestions were questionable, I'd run the change by the project lead for approval.
41. While most of the participant materials were printed in black and white, we printed in color when it was appropriate — immigration identification samples, job aids, etc. Participants were very appreciative of the extra effort.
42. Participant materials were professionally printed giving a crisp clean look. This added to the credibility of the material — and the training.
43. We provided participants with a large three-ring binder with colored tabs (one tab for each module). Participants received these binders in the first module and brought their binders with them for subsequent modules. A single binder provides a central repository for FS information and makes for a handy reference back on the job.
44. All participant materials were professionally edited for grammar, readability, and consistency. This was done after the content review by the SME and project lead.

45. The facilitator guide included comprehensive directions, words to say, and exercise instructions. Nothing was left to chance for the initial instruction. Additionally, the comprehensive instructions enabled us to fine tune the instruction AND provided for easy maintenance.
46. When necessary — especially with dryer content — we added a fun activity. The key is to make the activity as relevant as possible. In *Household Composition*, for example, we created an audio CD with a compilation of songs. Each song (like *Immigrant Song* by Led Zeppelin) was related to a household composition topic (in this case, immigrants) and was used AFTER the topic was discussed. A snippet of the song was played and teams were given points if they could correctly guess the title and/or the artist. We played eight of the 16 songs throughout the module to add spice (relevance was at best questionable!) and gave away the CDs to the team with the highest score.

Implementation

47. The training was held local to participants to reduce the need for participants to drive far.
48. When possible (Modules 2, 3, and 4), we planned for half-day trainings (8:30-12:30). If we needed to use the full day (*Coaching for Performance* and Modules 1 and 5), we were VERY clear that the content required it! We never designed the training to fill a specific period of time.
49. We provided everything participants needed — calculators, pens, guides, etc.
50. The SME was present at each delivery to 1) support the messages that were being delivered by the vendor, 2) clarify messages/information, 3) identify "hot spots" that needed to be addressed by the State Office, and 4) give "field credibility" to the training.
51. At least two training sessions were held in each of the locations allowing half of a DO's staff to attend one day and the remaining to attend the next day.
52. Objectives and the agenda were clearly articulated and present through the training; people knew what to expect.
53. The training facilities were carefully selected. In one case, we switched locations because of noise.
54. Lecture — while required — was kept to a minimum. The instructor made liberal use of questions, examples, and illustrations.
55. When a mistake was made, I took responsibility for the error and humorously used "Fists of Fury" (Incredible Hulk toy sponge fists) to humorously beat myself up. I did not blame the SME or someone else since this would lower my credibility. In addition to using humor, I sincerely apologized as I knew that my misinformation might have resulted in a worker making an error.
56. If participants had questions that we (the SME and instructor) couldn't answer, they had the opportunity to write the question on a Q-Card, which was then submitted to the State Office for clarification. The Q-Card was useful for two reasons:
    a. It ensured that the question was written exactly as the participant wanted; there was no chance for misinterpretation.
    b. It relieved the instructor or SME from the onerous task/responsibility of documenting the questions — and undoubtedly prevented frivolous questions.

57. I set up the classroom the night before. This allowed me to sleep peacefully as I uncovered the inevitable problems — incorrect room setup, missing material, missing or non-working equipment, missing flipcharts, etc. — during the setup. One time I realized that I was missing name cards and quickly fashioned some more.
58. Hotels and conference centers are used to setting up conferences, not training classes. Typically, classes require more space. I reset the room in at least 85% of the deliveries moving tables, chairs, and equipment. Plan for the time required and TAKE the opportunity to move things around; it's YOUR room!
59. I arranged the participant settings with care (some would use the term "obsession"). I aligned and centered the materials; I placed pens, flipframes, markers, and anything else carefully and consistently. The effect may be subtle, but it conveyed the message, "I care. You're important." Additionally, taking time to set up gave me a chance to reflect on what I'm teaching.
60. Welcome participants. Because I set up the classroom the night before the training, I could greet and talk to participants as they came into the classroom.
61. Find friends. We included in the walkthrough workers and supervisors from as many of the 12 DOs as possible. I could include them when the discussion warranted. For example, when someone seemed stuck on a concept, I would call on a walkthrough participant and ask, "We struggled with this in the walkthrough. Do you remember how we resolved it?"
62. I became one of the PATH workers. I referred to "**our** error rate" and "the challenges **we** face as eligibility workers."
63. I projected an aura of credibility and confidence. Feedback forms continually reflected the sentiment, "I can't believe how much Terry knows about the FSP." The fact is, I knew a lot about ONLY what I was teaching. Yet, I projected confidence — confidence that was necessary for participants to believe what I was saying (which was sometimes contrary to what they knew). (Elsewhere I talk about the importance of the SME in being present during each delivery so I won't say more here EXCEPT that having the SME present gave ME the confidence I needed!)
64. Part of the design of each module — although I won't admit this publicly! — was to build in "participant work time" right up front. Having a time when participants are busy working (and me not talking) is calming. I walked around the room and reacquainted myself with everyone, recalling their names, and collecting my confidence. I do the same with other courses by having participants complete an inventory or interview their colleague.
65. Memorize the first part of the module. Participants form their first impressions of the training in the first few minutes. How you kick off a class is likely to indicate how the rest of the class will go. I memorized the instructions to the first five minutes of the module (and then built in some breathing room to regroup — see the element above).
66. Because the classes were delivered sequentially, the training became easier to instruct over time. However, I treated each delivery as new and unique in order to keep it fresh for participants.

67. I used self-disclosure to gain trust and empathy. Sometimes I shared something personal, but most often I shared what a beautiful area this is or what a great drive I had. My disclosure was ALWAYS positive and professional. I never shared a complaint, or a worry, or something negative. For example, instead of saying something like "This is my first delivery of this module and I hope it goes well…." I would share something like, "This module was so much fun putting it together because of the tricky exercises…."

68. I used humor (clean, self-deprecating) to make the class enjoyable.

69. Show pride in them, their jobs, their skills, and them. I would constantly mention how I enjoyed working with PATH, driving the nether regions of Vermont, and was amazed at their ability to do their jobs.

70. I called on God. Okay, maybe not "God" god, but the closest thing to it. Sometimes we would have a question that couldn't be answered by the SME or me. During a break, we would call the project lead and get an answer, which we shared with the group after the break. This increased our credibility significantly! (By the way, let God know that you may be calling!)

71. If someone asked a question and I didn't know the answer, I would defer to the SME for an answer. If I anticipated not knowing the answer while the participant was asking the question, I would give a nod to the SME to flag her that she was going to have to answer. Rarely — and only the first time — would I defer to a SME for a robust explanation to the class. If I couldn't explain it the first time, I would spend time with the SME after the training to learn how to explain it more clearly.

72. If I knew the answer to a question, but the answer was not in the materials (a source of credibility), I'd explain how I knew the answer — a question that was asked in another class, a question that came up in the walkthrough; etc.

73. We began and ended on time. Religiously.

74. We created teams of two or three participants working together to answer questions. This fostered discussion of individual thoughts and encouraged teamwork. When you want discussion (especially when viewpoints may vary), use small teams.

75. I talked to participants at break. I asked them how they thought the training was going. Sometimes, I would self-assess and focus the conversation: "Julie, I feel as if the conversations are getting bogged down in detail; what do YOU think?" I would then use the conversation when you return after break: "Julie and I were discussing how the conversations are slowing us down a bit so I'll try to pick things up."

76. I managed the classroom discussions both soliciting input and gently shutting down side conversations when appropriate (although sometimes not early enough!).

77. While there were few "disgruntled customers," I managed the few situations a) using humor, b) directly and privately confronting the participant, and/or c) only addressing repeat situations.

78. During the training, I continually monitored the audience looking for signs of boredom or confusion. I adjusted my pace based on what I saw.

79. I involved members of the class in helping administer the training. At the very least, I had someone in charge of the room thermostat and someone in charge signaling me when we needed a break. I publicized who these people were so that others in the class would talk to the "heat monitor" for example, if the room was too hot or too cold. This involved the class AND removed me from this non-training — but important — task.

80. The first delivery was followed with modifications (mostly small). We anticipated making changes (and actually looked for ways to fine-tune the training during the first delivery — don't look for reasons to keep the material the same, continually look instead for ways to make the training better). The SME was responsible for making notes in her facilitator guide, which we reviewed at the end of the day.

81. Over the course of delivering each module ten times, we identified areas that needed additional reinforcement or clarification. These "hot spots" were addressed in email and/or as precourse for the next module. For example, in the *Shelter Expenses* module, we indicated in the first two deliveries that we close the case if the requested verification was not provided. We then found out that we were in error and notified everyone immediately of the error, AND covered it as precourse in the following module.

82. In Minnesota where I'm from, we have a saying, "don't try to polish a turd." While the analogy is crude, I can't think of a better one to describe the occasional bomb that we made and our actions to eliminate — rather than polish — the piece of training. For example, we included three videotaped interviewing demonstrations in the *Shelter Expenses* module that, after the first delivery, were obviously missing the mark (they were too generic to be useful tools for shelter expense accuracy and too vague to be useful examples of interviewing skills.) We eliminated two of the three demonstrations in the second delivery and then eliminated the third and final demonstration in the third delivery. If the training isn't working, sometimes it doesn't pay to make it better; it's better to simply eliminate it.

83. At the same time, sometimes the training IS worth keeping, but needs to be made better. There was no example where this was clearer than when we used the famous (initially infamous) vehicle value worksheet. The worksheet formed a significant basis for the Resources module; unfortunately, the worksheet didn't work as well as anticipated during the first delivery. In fact, it bombed and confused as many people as it helped. Donna and I listened (although it was difficult to "hear" the constructive feedback amid the wailing and moaning), and made changes to the form THAT NIGHT in time for the next delivery the following day. The training the next day used a new and improved form, and received great feedback from participants.

Evaluation

84. As previously mentioned, a module walkthrough preceded live delivery of each module and was used to refine the training. One of the main areas of focus in the walkthrough was the inventory. Participants took the inventory and we corrected it aloud and together, making wording changes and clarifying the questions (or throwing out less relevant questions).

85. The inventory was administered twice during the class, once at the beginning of the training day and once at the end of the training day. The difference between the two administrations of the inventory effectively measured the learning (Level II) that took place in the training. While the inventory was collected at the end of the class, participants were given a version of the inventory with the correct answers.

86. Additionally, the inventory enabled the instructor to focus on especially troublesome spots. If a number of participants answered incorrectly (and especially if they selected the same incorrect answer), the instructor used the information in the next delivery to ensure that the information was clearer.
87. A feedback form was used to solicit input/feedback (Level I) from the participants. The form was distributed at the beginning of the class with instructions for the participants to complete the form throughout the day to ensure fresh insight. The feedback form included a place to comment about content as well as the instructional delivery, activities, environment, materials, and other elements. The feedback was compiled after each delivery and used to improve the subsequent deliveries of the training.
88. The feedback form was a unique color (bright pink) and not three-hole punched. This prevented participants from inadvertently putting the form in their three-ring binders.
89. After each delivery, we (the SME and instructor) did a self-assessment before reviewing the feedback forms to identify the strengths and areas for development. Subsequent deliveries benefited from this introspection.
90. The client (Oversight Committee) was made immediately aware of the results of the training. I provided the Oversight Committee with a compilation of the feedback and inventory and, if relevant, any changes that would be made to the delivery based on the feedback or on the inventory results. If I had an especially challenging student, I informed the Oversight Committee immediately. News — good and bad — came from me first! If I provided bad news, I suggested next steps.

Other

91. PATH recognized the value of the training. I'm sure the department could have spent less on the training. Yet, by paying an appropriate and reasonable amount, it guaranteed that the vendor (Entelechy) would keep PATH and FSIT a priority.
92. PATH paid invoices on time and without much reminding by the vendor. Vendor time was spent on designing, developing, and delivering effective training and NOT on tracking payment.
93. Entelechy provided monthly updates, which included a status report on development and delivery efforts, and a projection of next month's activities. These updates were emailed to all Oversight Committee members (who also received the financial update) and all Project Team members and kept everyone up to date on effort and issues.
94. The SMEs were recognized for volunteering a significant amount of time in the development and delivery of their respective module. I wrote letters of recommendation to the Deputy Commissioner recognizing their contributions (without whom this program could not have worked.)
95. Management follow-up is critical to the success of this — and any — training. Supervisors attended the training along with their employees. In all cases, the supervisors were open for learning and recognized their own lack of knowledge in certain areas. No one had an ego that undermined the training.

96. Having a project team with specified responsibilities (listed previously) was key. Having the RIGHT PEOPLE fill those roles was likewise key. Everyone on the team contributed in meaningful ways. Everyone was willing to listen, voice opinions, and defer to the expertise of others. Everyone was willing to do work (not just make suggestions).

97. Be nice. Learning happens when there's a connection made. The connection happens in many places and in many ways. Be friendly, but not buddy-buddy; you are the instructor. Be professional, but not standoffish. Be available and flexible, but do not sacrifice commitments to other projects due to poor planning on someone's part.

98. Don't be afraid to point out what's working. Summarize the successes for your clients or bosses. Give them words to use in supporting your efforts. (And, give them credit for having the insight and wisdom to have sponsored this project and selected you to manage such a successful project….)

99. Having a project lead such as Kim was critical. While Entelechy provided much of the direction for what needed to be done and when, it was the project lead who made it happen internally.

100. Support your vendor. Provide references or additional leads. Keeping the "good ones" close ensures that they are there for the next project. Entelechy received enthusiastic endorsement when it was requested AND was provided a lead to another department within the state government. THANK YOU!