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**RULE 1**
**KNOW YOURSELF:**
Connecting Purpose and Planning

1. Develop or review mission
2. Develop or review case statement
3. Wish list and priorities
4. Project profile/planning worksheets
5. Look for partnership potential
6. Host community planning meeting
7. Establish partner roles/responsibilities
8. Develop project issue statement
9. Develop outcomes and evaluation
10. Develop program strategies & methods
11. Outline master proposal blueprint
12. Develop project budget
13. Finalize master proposal blueprint
14. Research for potential funders
15. Prescreen funders for mission match
16. Develop "A-list" of potential funders
17. "Who do you know who knows somebody?"
18. Begin building long-term relationship
19. Target request to "A-list" funders
20. Submit qualified request by deadline
21. Get funded – thank the funder!
22. Implement and manage project
23. Evaluate process and outcomes

**RULE 2**
**BUILD TRUE PARTNERSHIPS:**
Collaborating for Success

**RULE 3**
**PLAN, PLAN, PLAN – PLAN!**
Building Your Master Blueprint

**RULE 4**
**KNOW YOUR FUNDER:**
Research and Relationships

**RULE 5**
**CREATE A WINNING PROPOSAL:**
Putting It All Together – On Paper

**THE WINNING EDGE!**
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The Grantsmanship Game:
Playing to Win

By Maryn M. Boess
Maryn@GrantsMagic.org

One of the most popular workshops I offer is a two-day intensive program called “The Grantsmanship Game: Playing to Win.”

The title always catches some people off-guard.

Some folks are a bit troubled by the notion of comparing the hard work of managing a grants process with playing a game.

Shouldn’t we take grantseeking more seriously than that?

Isn’t grantseeking just the simple activity of filling in blanks on a funding application?

Does thinking of grantseeking as a “game” mean we’re in competition with each other?

Are we saying that we should be having more fun?

In my 26 years of working as an active grant professional – first as a program planner and proposal writer, more recently in my work as a trainer, coach and grantmaker – I have come to see clearly that grantsmanship is not an activity; it’s a strategic, systematic process.

I like to call the process “The Grantsmanship Game.” It’s all about managing the details of your organization’s grantseeking effort in a way that gives your proposals the winning edge – and helps them rise to the top when funders make their grant awards.

It’s a serious game, to be sure: The well-being of thousands of people can depend on the outcome.

But just like any game, it has several basic elements that you need to consider, and learn to work with, in order to win the game consistently.

In this article, we’ll offer a preview of what the Grantsmanship Game is all about.

“Unpacking” the Game

Basketball, checkers, Monopoly, hockey: Different games, yes – but they do share some important elements in common.

The Grantsmanship Game shares these elements as well. Here’s what you’ll find when you pull the cover off your Grantsmanship Game box:

A gameboard. The gameboard is the playing field, or operating environment, in which the game is conducted. The operating environment is always unique to the game being played: It’s pretty tough to play basketball on a checkerboard, or Monopoly in a hockey rink.

In the grantsmanship game, the operating environment includes your community, your constituents, the regulatory and legislative environment, the socioeconomic and political climate of your community, even the culture and values of your own organization. All of these factors will significantly and dramatically influence the shape of your grantseeking process – and the strategies that will help you be most successful.

Rules. All games have rules. These are the non-negotiable fundamental must-do’s and must-have’s of a particular game. If you want to play the game, you must agree to follow the rules. If you don’t follow the rules, either you never get into the game in the first place, or you find yourself “kicked off” the gameboard and out of the game completely. More about the five essential rules of the Grantsmanship Game later.
Moves, or squares. In many games, the players must make their way around the gameboard by moving through a sequence of squares, in some specified order. The same is true in the Grantsmanship Game. The moves or squares are the steps that players must take to make progress toward the end goal. In the grantsmanship game, the squares represent the tasks or activities that are important to a complete, rock-solid grants process. The moves don’t necessarily have to be made in one-after-another sequence – but no skipping allowed! If a “chance” card (see below) jumps you backward or forward, you must go back and make sure you take care of all the steps you might have missed.

“Chance” cards. Guess what – we don’t control everything! Monopoly has its “chance” cards – at any given moment in a game, you can draw a card that either propels you forward or sets you back unexpectedly.

Grantseekers know this is true in their game, as well. No matter how carefully we plan and how conscientiously we follow the moves, the unexpected can happen: A key staff person gets sick just before deadline; a major partner pulls out; another major source of funding comes through for you, completely out of the blue. When the Grantsmanship Game hands you a “chance” card like one of these, the layout of the gameboard makes it easier to figure out what you need to do to get back on track and back in the game.

A “winner’s” goal. Most games have a clear-cut starting point; not all have a clear-cut end. Monopoly is one example: The game can go on and on until there’s only one player left standing. The Grantsmanship Game is another example. It’s actually a cyclical game: Once you’re on the gameboard, you keep playing as long as you like, cycling through the same rules and the same steps over and over again, only with different corporate, foundation and government funders each time. The game is “won” each time the process succeeds in producing a solid grant proposal that reflects your organization’s very best efforts – one that represents your mission as a service organization, and at the same time connects with the philanthropic mission of the grantmaker.

Rules of the Game

The Grantsmanship Game is different every time it’s played, because the specifics of each funder’s priorities, needs and interests are different. But there are five basic rules that drive the game and keep you in control of the process. These are:

Rule 1: Know Yourself.

This rule speaks to the heart of the matter, which I call mission-driven grantsmanship. Success in grantseeking begins at the beginning: With a deeply held, common understanding of who you are as an organization, what you’re here to do in the world, and why it’s important. “Deeply held” means this understanding is the foundation of everything you do as an organization. “Common” means all the stakeholders are marching under the same
banner – program staff, administrative staff, board members, volunteers. Focus first on clearly, concisely and compellingly telling your organization’s story and articulating your mission, vision and values. Then and only then will you be prepared to share that story with potential funders.

**Rule 2: Build True Partnerships.**

A Federal program officer said it loud and clear a few years back: “Whether the funder requires it or not, if it ain’t a collaborative proposal, it ain’t gonna be competitive.” It’s all about leveraging. How can you work with other members of your community to share resources, responsibilities, risks and rewards? The emphasis here is on the word “true.” Funders aren’t fooled by a “partnership” that consists of a slapped-together list of names with no sense of commitment or shared vision behind it. The best partnerships begin before there’s money on the table, because two or three or four people from different organizations recognize an opportunity to work together for the greater good of each other – and the community at large.

**Rule 3: Plan, Plan, Plan – Plan!**

Did you know that only 20% of a successful grantseeking effort involves actually writing the proposal? The other 80% consists of – you guessed it – planning. A solid grant proposal is nothing more than a business plan, plain and simple. You wouldn’t go to a bank for a loan without a business plan in place; nor should you approach a prospective funder without a well-thought-out business plan. The planning should take place before you begin assembling a request for a particular funder. In other words, develop your own business plan first – then you can draw from it and tailor it to fit any grantmaker’s required form and format.

**Rule 4: Know Your Funder.**

Ah, at last – we’re getting down to the nitty-gritty. “Know Your Funder” speaks to the issue of doing your homework – of using the appropriate resources to identify your A-list of grantmakers most likely to be interested in what you have to offer, and then of finding out everything you can about who they are, what they’re looking for, and what they hope to achieve with their grantmaking – before you decide whether to submit a proposal. All other factors aside, the single most important reason funders choose to support a given request for funding is that what the applicant has to offer helps the funders achieve their own mission and purpose in the world. An additional word of wisdom: The best time to begin a relationship with a prospective funder is not two days before the proposal is due.

**Rule 5: Create a winning proposal.**

This is where it all comes together, at last. What is a “winning” proposal? Well, getting funded is a good indicator here – but there’s more to it than that. Whether or not a given proposal is chosen for funding depends on a lot of considerations that are outside the grantseeker’s direct control. For me, the definition of a “winning” proposal focuses on four qualities that we can control:  

1. It’s in on time. No ifs, ands, or buts. If there’s a deadline, and you don’t meet it, nothing else matters. End of subject.
2. It crosses all the t’s and dots all the i’s. Whatever instructions or qualifications the funder holds for the proposal, you’ve paid attention to each and every one of them. Otherwise you run the risk of becoming an “easy out,” as in: “Oops, look, we asked that proposals be submitted unbound, and this one’s stapled. Well, that’s one more proposal we won’t have to bother reading.”
3. The proposal clearly represents the front end of a well-thought-out business plan. This relates directly back to Rule #3 and calls on us to make sure all the questions have been answered, all the pieces are in place, and everything holds together and makes sense. Finally, the kicker:
4. Your proposal makes it very clear how supporting your proposal will help the funder further its own philanthropic mission. Guess what: Grantmakers need us – they can’t fulfill their philanthropic missions for creating change in the world without the programs and services that we offer. Our proposals succeed to the extent that we can demonstrate this all-important match with the funder’s own mission.
**The Rule of Common Sense**

There’s one other non-negotiable rule to success in the grantsmanship game – and that’s what I call the Rule of Common Sense. We mentioned this earlier, as part of our discovery of the Grantsmanship Game process, but it bears looking at again.

All other things being equal, we can rely on our own innate common sense – the same good thinking skills that have helped us be successful in other areas of our life – to guide us through much of the Grantsmanship Game’s murkier territories.

As you’re moving around the gameboard, ask yourself almost any question – for instance:

1. The page limits are so strict; should I eliminate headings and bulleted lists to save space?
2. I wonder if the funder would like to see a description of our partnership efforts, even if it isn’t required?
3. I don’t understand this instruction; what do they really want here?
4. We don’t fit their guidelines but they’re new in our community and doing a lot of local funding. Shouldn’t we send a proposal too?

Then ask yourself: *What would common sense dictate*? The answers will be, in this order:

1. How would you like it if you were the reviewer struggling through 300 proposals that were nothing but paragraph after paragraph of solid black unbroken text?
2. Sure, wouldn’t you?
3. Don’t guess or second-guess – call the funder and ask; and
4. Nope! (though you may want to begin a “feeling-them-out” relationship in case they open up their funding priorities).

See? That wasn’t so tough. Common sense wins, virtually every time. Hang on to yours, as tightly as you can. You’ll encounter plenty of fellow players along the way who will try to wrest your common sense from you, in the name of chasing the money. Don’t let them. Trust the good judgment that has brought you this far. It can take you all the way.

**A Final Word About “Fun”**

At the beginning of our “Grantsmanship Game” workshop, as a warm-up I often ask people what associations they can make between the words “grantsmanship” and “game.” Most of the answers are pretty predictable: They’ll come up with rules, and players; money (if they’re thinking about Monopoly); competition; and winning. Rarely, a lone voice will raise tremulously in the back of the room, as if almost embarrassed to speak out: “What about fun? I think working on grant proposals is fun. Am I crazy?”

Yes, you are – crazy like a fox. After all, enjoying what we do is what puts the zip in our work, keeps us coming back, keeps us wanting to do more, do better, stretch and grow. The great thing is, it works the other way around, too: The better we are at doing something, the more we’re likely to enjoy doing it.

And – guess what! The more we win, too.
GETTING STARTED

✓ Key Links:

- GrantsMagic U: u.GrantsMagic.org
- Webinar Facebook group: www.Facebook.com/groups/GrantsMyths2017

✓ What does “RFP” stand for?

✓ Maryn’s Biggest Lesson:

Even people who have been ______________________ for years ...

even those who have been very successful at it ... almost never

______________________________________________________.

Why not?

Because they’ve never

__________________________________________

NOTES:
What could it mean to be a 3-D thinker in the nonprofit world?
1. THE MYTH OF THE CYNICAL GRANT REVIEWER

• “It’s a _________________ process.”

• “It’s an _________________ process.”

• “An A+ proposal should beat out a _________________ – every time”

LET’S TAKE A PEEK INSIDE THE “BLACK BOX”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Approaches to Improving Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
What We Can’t Control ... and What We Can

What are some of the things we can’t control?

How do we get to the Finals Round?

And how do we make it successfully through all the qualifying rounds?

✓ A+ _______________________________
✓ A+ _______________________________
✓ A+ _______________________________
✓ A+ _______________________________
✓ A+ _______________________________
✓ A+ _______________________________

NOTES:
U.GrantsMagic.org

The Ultimate Grant Proposal Blueprint:

Your Step-By-Step Roadmap and Build-It-Yourself Toolkit for Crafting an A+ Grant Proposal – Every Time!

8-WEEK ONLINE, ON-DEMAND COURSE BEGINS JULY 10

NOTES:
2. THE MYTH OF THE WICKED STEPMOTHER

- “Grantmakers need a lot of detail in order to make an ________________, _______________ and ________________ decision.

- “Grantmakers love to ____________________ than we have to.”

YOU BE THE GRANTMAKER:

- Proposal A – p. 13
- Proposal B – p. 14

NOTES:

The 30-Second Rule, Part 1: *It only takes 30 seconds to ....*

The 30-Second Rule, Part 1: *It only takes 30 seconds to ....*
PROPOSAL A: The BEST Program

Proposal Summary:

The vision of this professional development project is to build a system of shared responsibilities between teacher leaders and administrators, providing a continuum of support for teachers and enhancing school effectiveness. Abel University’s BEST (Beginning Educator Support Team) program in collaboration with Educational Leadership and Policy Studies within the Mary Lou Gehringer College of Education, and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, will provide released teacher leaders and administrators in seven districts professional development in the facilitation of teacher induction, mentoring, standards-based professional development and content-based coaching. Through working sessions, teacher leaders and administrators will engage in goal-setting, creating a plan for implementing shared responsibilities.

Research suggests a direct correlation between quality professional development and quality teaching (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Through this university-district partnership model, the university equips teacher leaders and administrators to provide quality support and professional development. Teachers benefiting from this support and professional development gain the knowledge and strategies needed to effectively teach students and raise student achievement. The project will be evaluated through diverse measurements in the areas of professional development, teacher growth and student achievement. Following the grant period, the project will sustain through acquired support from both the university and districts.
PROPOSAL B: Helping Teachers Qualify

Project Summary

Increased student achievement in mathematics is a high priority for the state of Ohio, yet many middle grade teachers are not highly qualified as required by the No Child Left Behind Act. The intended outcomes of the Helping Teachers Qualify (HTQ) project are to improve middle school teacher knowledge of mathematics; increase the number of highly qualified teachers; and increase student achievement.

Thirty middle school teachers will study mathematics education during a 10-day summer institute each year, with two half-day Saturday workshops to support classroom implementation. Year 2 will build upon Year 1 content, and will develop leadership teams.

Primary partners are the Xanxes University College of Teacher Education and Leadership and the Department of Mathematical Sciences and Applied Computing; and two high-need K-12 school districts. Additional partners include two other high-need districts, two rural districts, two suburban districts and one private school.

School administrators will identify educational needs, observe classroom implementation, and participate in professional development. Teacher content knowledge will be measured through pre- and post-tests and formative assessments. Increased student achievement in mathematics will be compared between participants and non-participants. The Helping Teachers Qualify teacher leader program and administrative involvement will promote systemic change.
A “Fundable Project Concept”

- In writing
- Very brief – 1 to 2 pages
- Can be read in 2-3 minutes tops
- Preliminary plan
- Answers all the key planning questions
- The decision-maker’s response:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>THE ONE-PAGE GRANT PROPOSAL WORKSHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IN ONE SENTENCE, summarize your project idea. What will you do? When? With whom? Where? And why? In order to what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Who are you as an organization, and what are you all about? (What is your mission or purpose?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Describe the specific need or issue in your community that this proposed project will address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What specific changes do you intend to achieve in your community as a direct result of your work? What will success “look like”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>What are the major steps you will need to take to make these changes happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Who else has a vested interest in working with you as partners on this problem or opportunity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>What information, tools, data, etc., will you use to decide how well you met your success goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>What resources do you need to do this work? (Skills, labor, equipment, training, supplies, services, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Estimated total cost (if you had to pay for every–thing). How does this break down?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>What broad categories of community needs or opportunities does your project address?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **IN ONE SENTENCE, summarize your project idea. What will you do? When? With whom? Where? And why? In order to what?**

   By March 20--, Literacy Volunteers of “Our” County (WA) will train 50 new reading tutors to serve the rural communities to the west, working with volunteers recruited from local churches, to reduce the waiting list for literacy training in this underserved area.

2. **Who are you as an organization, and what are you all about? (What is your mission or purpose?)**

   Literacy Volunteers of “Our County” (WA) is a 35-year-old, volunteer-based 501c3 nonprofit whose mission is to empower adults with the ability to read and write, in order to achieve their full potential as individuals, as employees, as parents, and as members of the community at large.

3. **Describe the specific need or issue in your community that this proposed project will address.**

   According to a 2010 survey by Literacy Volunteers of America, one out of six adults cannot read or write at the basic sixth-grade level, leaving them vulnerable to problems with parenting, employment, health, safety and self-esteem. And in the rural western half of “Our County” alone there is a waiting list of 200 adults who want to learn to read.

4. **What specific changes do you intend to achieve in your community as a direct result of your work? What will success “look like”?**

   1. Train and successfully match 50 new volunteers.
   2. At least 75% of students will complete 6 months of tutoring.
   3. Reading skills will improve an average of 2 grade levels.
   4. At least 3 significant partnerships with local churches.
   5. Reduce waiting list by at least 40 individuals.

5. **What are the major steps you will need to take to make these changes happen?**

   1. Contract with master trainer.
   2. Training logistics: Materials, location, equipment.
   3. Marketing to recruit potential volunteer tutors.
   4. Conduct training.
   5. Match and track tutor/learner pairs for 6 months.
   6. Evaluate learner progress and program success.

6. **Who else has a vested interest in working with you as partners on this problem or opportunity?**

   Local churches
   Schools
   Libraries
   Service clubs--?

7. **What information, tools, data, etc. will you use to decide how well you met your success goals?**

   Pre- and post reading evaluations of learners
   Training logs of volunteer tutors

8. **What resources do you need to do this work? (Skills, labor, equipment, training, supplies, services, etc.)**

   Master trainer
   Training materials
   Audiovisual equipment
   Training site (+ refreshments?)

9. **Estimated total cost (if you had to pay for everything). How does this break down?**

   $25,000
   $500 per volunteer trained, matched and tracked

10. **What broad categories of community needs or opportunities does your project address?**

    Literacy    Parenting skills
    Reading    Workplace skills
    Adult education    Minority issues
    Rural    Church-affiliated
3. THE MYTH OF THE LAS VEGAS ATM MACHINE

• “If you’ve seen ____________________,
you’ve seen _____________________.

Who do we mean by “funders” or “grantmakers”?

The grantmaker: Friend or foe?

What grantmakers aren’t

The grantmaker’s mission:

“We give grants to ____________________ through your organization

in creating ____________________ in the community.”
What Grantmakers Really, Really Want Most of All in the Whole Wide World . . .

Grantmakers want to

and have

AND want you to . . .

YOUR JOB:

. . . is to demonstrate, clearly, concretely, and compellingly, that:

and that:
THE GOLDEN RULE OF GOOD WRITING:

REMEMBER THE 12-12-12 REVIEWER – AND . . .

1. Respect your reader’s mental energy!
2. Keep sentences short -- average 17-20 words; 35 words max.
3. Use simpler, more familiar language.
4. Avoid unnecessary words -- prune, prune, prune!
5. Get to the point -- say what you have to say, and say it clearly and directly.
6. Use concrete, energetic, vivid language.
7. Use terms your reader can identify with, to create vivid mental pictures.
8. Keep the human element clearly in the forefront.
9. Make use of variety in your language.
10. **BOTTOM LINE:**

   Write to ___________________ -- not to ____________________.

   Your writing should be *transparent* – that is, your writing should help the beauty and strength and power of your proposal to shine through purely, clearly, and compellingly. Nothing should stand between the reader and the great ideas you want to communicate.
Sometimes, looking at submitted proposals, you might surmise that there’s a rule somewhere in the grantseeking world that says, “When choosing between a simple and a more abstract term, always pick the more confusing one.”

Well, there isn’t such a rule. But if there were, the Systematic Proposal Buzz Phrase Synthesizer could make things easier for those who want to abide by the rule and/or appear erudite (big word meaning “smart”).

Using the tool couldn’t be simpler. Whenever you want to say absolutely nothing in an authoritative way, simply pick any three numbers from 0 through 9. Then find the corresponding word from each column. For example, 4-2-4 produces “functional outcomes-based programming”; 8-0-5 produces “compatible management intervention”; and so on – which should impress anyone untrained in detecting high-level abstractions and obfuscations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Integrated</td>
<td>0 Management</td>
<td>0 Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sustainable</td>
<td>1 Organizational</td>
<td>1 Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Facilitated</td>
<td>2 Outcomes-based</td>
<td>2 Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Longitudinal</td>
<td>3 Reciprocal</td>
<td>3 Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Functional</td>
<td>4 Collaborative</td>
<td>4 Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Responsive</td>
<td>5 Logistical</td>
<td>5 Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Optional</td>
<td>6 Transitional</td>
<td>6 Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Proactive</td>
<td>7 Strategic</td>
<td>7 Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Compatible</td>
<td>8 Multi-generational</td>
<td>8 Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Balanced</td>
<td>9 Policy</td>
<td>9 Contingency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EIGHT QUALITIES OF EXEMPLARY PROPOSALS

Reprinted with permission from Grant Making Basics: A Field Guide for Funders

1. ENERGY
The proposal bristles with enthusiasm, urgency, passion. It suggests a group of people who can barely contain their eagerness to begin working. As a reader, you find yourself inspired and excited by their plans.

2. EXPERTISE
The proposal’s authors know what they are talking about. Their plans reflect a deep understanding of the problem they are addressing. They are aware of similar efforts that have been undertaken in the past. Their theoretical knowledge is tempered by time-tested experience in the field. They inform their practice with solid theory and continue their own professional development despite the demands of their daily work.

3. COMMITMENT
The proposal reflects the organization’s genuine priorities rather than being one of many programs it is currently juggling. The grantseekers demonstrate their willingness to invest their own unrestricted resources in the project. Rather than moving on to a new endeavor in the near future, the organization is committed to continuing the project.

4. CLARITY
The proposal is clear about what the organization wants to do, why it is important and how it will be carried out and evaluated.

5. COLLABORATION
The grantseeker has formed alliances with other organizations to advance their mutual goals. The people served by the proposed project have participated in its planning. All involved parties appear more interested in getting results than carving out turf.

6. BENEFITS
The organization is less concerned with underwriting its own needs than improving society. The project’s goals are indisputably worth striving for and the target group is appropriate.

7. COMPREHENSIVENESS
The problem’s complexity is matched by the sophistication of its proposed solution. The grantseekers’ thinking reflects a comprehensive strategy, rather than a piecemeal approach.

8. EFFECTIVENESS
A well-designed, ongoing evaluation reflects the group’s commitment to getting results. The project has the potential for achieving a wider impact if it is replicated elsewhere in the future.
What is one action you can take within the next week or two that will give you a “quick win”?  

What is one action you can take that will give you “high leverage”?  
- When you’ll take (or complete) the action;  
- Who else will need to be involved;  
- Any resources (information, materials, etc.) you’ll need. 

How will you hold yourself accountable for completing these actions?  How will taking these actions enhance your professional and personal development? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action to take:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who else is involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources needed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action to take:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who else is involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources needed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>