Introduction to the Leadership Support Assessment Template

The Leadership Support Assessment serves as an internal working document for the OCM Practitioner to quickly and confidently identify and rank each leader’s relative level of support, level of influence, and priority level. By ranking leaders based on the relative order of priority levels, the OCM Practitioner may target Leadership Support activities to the individuals with the highest priority and thus, the greatest need for directed activities.

Instructions and descriptions are provided to help the reader understand each section’s purpose and how to complete it.

Template style conventions are as follows:

| Style | Convention |
| --- | --- |
| Normal text | Indicates placeholder text that can be used for any project. |
| [Instructional text in brackets] | [Indicates text that is be replaced/edited/deleted by the user] |
| *Example text in italics* | *Indicates text that might be replaced/edited/deleted by the user* |

As you complete the template, please remember to delete all instructional text (including this section) and update the following items, as applicable:

* title page
* version history
* table of contents
* headers
* footers

Update the document to a minor version (e.g., 1.1, 1.2) when minimal changes are made and a major version (e.g., 2.0, 3.0) when significant changes are made.

Leadership Support Assessment

[Once the OCM Practitioner has identified all executive leaders who have influence on the project, the Leadership Support Assessment should be completed in order to rank executive leaders based on an overall priority level for focusing OCM Leadership Support efforts.

In the table below, identify each executive (name and position) that has influence on the project. For each executive leader, identify the perceived level of support (with a score of 1 indicating a high level of support and a score of 5 indicating a low level of support) and level of influence (with a score of 1 indicating a low level of influence and a score of 5 indicating a high level of influence). Indicate the overall priority level by averaging the Level of Support and Level of Influence scores together. An overall priority score of 1 indicates the lowest priority level while a score of five indicates the highest priority level. Round calculations up when determining the Overall Priority.]

|  | Low | High |  | Low | High |  | Low | High |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Leadership Support Assessment - Level of Support - Low to High Arrow |  |  | Leadership Support Assessment - Level of Influence - Low to High Arrow |  |  | Leadership Support Assessment - Overall Priority - Low to High Arrow |
| Executive Name / Position | **Level of Support** |  | **Level of Influence** |  | **Overall Priority** |
| *Joe Smith /* *Chief Information Officer* | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |  | 1 2 3 4 5 |