

# Case Studies

*Execution leadership for nonprofits under pressure*

A premium overview of four operational transformation engagements drawn from senior executive work inside a complex, multi-entity nonprofit environment.

**5,000**

employee org

**350+**

Commercial/Residential  
properties

**4**

enterprise case studies

**30+ yrs**

leadership depth

## Signature insight

Most organizations believe they have a staffing or capacity problem. In reality, they are often facing a structural breakdown in systems, communication, and decision-making.

# Case Study 1 | Restoring Cross-Functional Execution to Protect HUD Funding

## Situation

A multi-entity behavioral health organization faced volatile NSPIRE inspection outcomes, with several housing projects failing or scoring below acceptable thresholds. The resulting exposure threatened HUD subsidy stability and raised pressure across departments.

## Executive diagnosis

**What leadership thought:** Leadership saw the problem as an accountability issue between Housing, Facilities, and Residential Services.

**What was actually happening:** The deeper issue was structural: teams lacked a shared understanding of inspection requirements, process handoffs, timing, and compliance dependencies.

## Intervention

- Facilitated process mapping across Housing and Residential Services
- Convened joint working sessions between Housing and Facilities
- Established shared communication protocols and inspection notifications
- Used NSPIRE scoring trends to anchor decisions in performance rather than blame
- Reframed tension into shared ownership of compliance risk

## Results at a glance

<b>3 projects</b>	moved from failing to passing scores
<b>90%+</b>	earned on additional projects
<b>6 months</b>	to see measurable improvement

## Why it matters

Facilities became more proactive in pre-planning and participating in inspections, communication strengthened across teams, and subsidy risk was materially reduced as scores improved.



# Case Study 2 | Integrating Fragmented Operations into a Unified Enterprise Infrastructure

## Situation

Four corporate entities operated with separate facilities structures, inconsistent service models, and a patchwork of outdated or manual work order systems. Growth increased pressure while visibility, consistency, and operational control lagged behind.

## Executive diagnosis

**What leadership thought:** Leadership knew integration was necessary, but the challenge was perceived mainly as scale and coordination.

**What was actually happening:** The true barrier was missing integration architecture: no centralized intake, inconsistent workflows, no shared standards, and limited performance visibility.

## Intervention

- Consolidated operations into one unified facilities model
- Implemented a single work order system across entities
- Designed and launched a Work Control Center as the service hub
- Reorganized staff by region rather than legacy entity boundaries
- Created standardized reporting and customer visibility tools

## Results at a glance

<b>25%</b>	staff reduction through optimization and attrition
<b>7 days</b>	backlog, down from 30+ days
<b>1 model</b>	for intake, reporting, and on-call

## Why it matters

Leaders experienced stronger responsiveness, clearer visibility into requests, improved safety compliance, and a more resilient operating model that could absorb growth without returning to chaos.



# Case Study 3 | Stabilizing a High-Risk Service Line During Leadership Exit and Program Closures

## Situation

A long-tenured service line chief exited during an active restructuring period that included program closures and transitions to outside providers. The organization needed continuity, trust repair, and leadership stability under pressure.

## Executive diagnosis

**What leadership thought:** The immediate concern was keeping key leaders from leaving and preserving operations.

**What was actually happening:** The deeper issue was lack of continuity structure, compounded by fear, change fatigue, and a service line that still operated with a semi-independent identity.

## Intervention

- Took immediate ownership of closure communications and transition strategy
- Conducted individualized meetings with each Division Director
- Established biweekly leadership forums for shared alignment and issue-solving
- Maintained an in-person executive presence two days a week
- Provided clarity, support, and reframing during emotionally charged changes

## Results at a glance

<b>0</b>	leadership departures during the transition
<b>4 months</b>	to stabilize the service line
<b>20+</b>	program leaders beneath the director layer

## Why it matters

Programs were transitioned successfully, remaining services continued, leadership stability was preserved, and an overlooked internal leader was identified and elevated.



# Case Study 4 | Rebuilding Operational Infrastructure to Unlock Capacity and Visibility

## Situation

Facilities requests were arriving through calls, emails, spreadsheets, outdated systems, and informal on-site asks. Visibility was poor, duplicate effort was common, and the true workload of the department was largely invisible.

## Executive diagnosis

**What leadership thought:** Leadership understood integration was the mission, but did not have a mapped implementation plan and underestimated the complexity created by missing or inadequate systems.

**What was actually happening:** The core problem was not simply workload. It was the absence of unified intake, prioritization, visibility, and disciplined workflow management.

## Intervention

- Built a centralized Work Control Center to serve as the single intake point
- Standardized one email, one phone number, and one routing model
- Implemented common KPIs around turnaround time and workload visibility
- Created reporting tools for directors and internal customers
- Standardized best-practice workflows while preserving responsiveness

## Results at a glance

<b>Visibility</b>	into demand, work status, and quality
<b>Faster</b>	turnaround and cleaner assignment
<b>Capacity</b>	unlocked through smarter scheduling

## Why it matters

The organization gained clarity on real demand, improved timeliness and service quality, and distinguished true capacity issues from process dysfunction.

