

Champion Network Plan

Prepared for: OCM Lead & Project Lead | Initiative: [REDACTED] | Assessment Date: [REDACTED]

SECTION 1 — CHAMPION NETWORK DESIGN

A champion network is required for this initiative because five separate high-need conditions are active simultaneously: the change spans more than one department, spans 14 geographically dispersed contact center hubs plus six branch-service regions, resistance is already surfacing in early listening sessions, employees are more likely to trust peers than management on this specific topic, and colleagues will need ongoing encouragement to sustain new behavior well past go-live. This combination is Critical severity in the underlying risk model — at this complexity level, peer-level influence is not a nice-to-have, it is a primary determinant of whether adoption succeeds. The network is designed to accomplish two things: carry accurate information to colleagues before rumor does, and carry real resistance signals back to the OCM Lead before they surface as workaround behavior or a quality-score decline.

Network size calculation

Coverage floor: every natural team unit with High impact severity needs at least one champion — that means each of the 14 contact center hubs, each of the six branch-service regions, and each functional pod within the 350-person HR/People Org redeployment team (estimated at four pods) requires dedicated coverage, for a coverage floor of roughly 24 champions at minimum. Capacity cap: at this organization's scale (10,000+ affected employees), the applicable cap is 0.5% of the in-scope High-severity population — approximately 20,150 employees (19,800 Operations/Production + 350 HR/People Org) — yielding a ceiling of approximately 101 champions. The recommended network size for this initiative is 55–60 champions, weighted toward the dominant Operations/Production population: three champions per contact center hub ($14 \times 3 = 42$), two per branch-service region ($6 \times 2 = 12$), and one per HR/People Org redeployment pod (4). This sits well within the capacity ceiling while providing meaningfully more than the bare coverage floor, appropriate given the active resistance and psychological-safety flags.

Because a single high-impact group — Operations/Production — represents at least half of the in-scope population (94%), that group requires its own dedicated coverage track, planned by its internal hub and regional units rather than as a single group-level allocation. This is reflected in the per-hub and per-region weighting above rather than a flat allocation to "Operations/Production" as one line.

Business Area / Group	Impact	Champions	Ideal Champion Profile	Coverage Rationale
Operations/ Production — 14 Contact Center Hubs	High	42 (3/hub)	A credible middle — neither the most enthusiastic early adopter nor the most resistant colleague; someone peers bring real questions to	Largest population, highest resistance signal, geographically dispersed
Operations/ Production — 6 Branch-Service Regions	High	12 (2/region)	Same profile as above, adapted to a smaller, less centralized team structure	Same population type, distributed across branch network rather than centralized hubs
HR/People Org — Redeployment Pods	High	4 (1/pod, est.)	A colleague from within the redeploying team itself — credibility depends on being a peer living the transition, not an outside volunteer	Concentrated identity-disruption risk; peer credibility is the primary lever
Legal & Compliance	Medium	Optional	—	Medium severity; smaller, closer to project information already
Information Technology	Medium	Optional	—	Medium severity; smaller, closer to project information already

Recruitment proceeds through manager nomination — the fastest method and best aligned with the existing team structure at this scale. Several potential champions were already identified informally during the assessment: contact center team leads and early informal adopters in the Charlotte and Tempe hubs who piloted an earlier version of the tool informally, and branch service managers with high peer trust in the Denver and Columbus markets. These individuals are a starting candidate pool, not confirmed champions — they still require the full acceptance and onboarding sequence below; being identified is not the same as being recruited.

SECTION 2 — CHAMPION ONBOARDING PLAN

The Champion Onboarding Plan defines what champions need to know, what they are authorized to do, and how they are activated before the broader employee communication program launches.

2A. Champion Role Brief — Your Role as a Change Champion — What It Is and What It Is Not

What a champion IS: a trusted peer resource for your colleagues' questions, a two-way signal carrier who brings information to your team and brings your team's real concerns back to the OCM team, an early recipient of information so you're never caught off guard, and a visible but not pushy presence. What a champion IS NOT: a cheerleader — your credibility depends on honesty, not enthusiasm; a manager or authority figure — you have

no disciplinary relationship with your peers; expected to have all the answers — "I don't know, but I'll find out" is a complete and valid response.

2B. Champion Talking Points

Why this is happening: our contact volume has grown without matching staffing and a compliance exam flagged documentation gaps — [REDACTED] addresses both. Timeline: key milestones only, non-confidential. Training availability: per your hub's or region's cohort schedule. Where to send questions: the feedback inbox, your OCM Lead contact, and the living FAQ. What happens if something breaks post go-live: the support channel and champion network are both active from day one. "I don't agree with this change — what do I say?": you don't have to personally endorse this change to be a champion — you do need to represent it fairly. The most credible thing you can say to a skeptical colleague is: "I have my own questions too, but here's what I know and here's how to get answers." Will this AI replace us? Direct, honest answer: no one in the contact center or branch service population is losing their job because of this rollout — champions must not deflect this question. How does the AI make decisions? It drafts suggestions from patterns in past interactions and our policies; it doesn't make the final call — you do.

2D. Boundaries and Escalation — What Champions Are Not Authorized to Do — and What to Do Instead

Situation	What to Do
An employee asks about something confidential (individual redeployment placements, unreleased plans)	I can't speak to that specifically — the right person to ask is your manager or HR. I'll make sure the question gets to the OCM team.
An employee is visibly distressed or in crisis	Let's step away for a minute. Have you talked to your manager or HR? I'll make sure the OCM team knows this is coming up.
An employee becomes hostile or aggressive	I hear that you're frustrated. I'm not the right person to resolve this, but I'll make sure it gets to someone who can. — escalate immediately to the OCM Lead
A manager asks you to deliver messaging that contradicts what you've been told	Do not deliver it. Contact the OCM Lead before your next team interaction.
You're asked to report on specific individuals to management	Decline. Champion feedback is pattern-level, not individual-level surveillance. This boundary is non-negotiable.
You run out of answers	I don't know, but I'll find out by [specific day]. Bring the question to the weekly champion debrief.

SECTION 3 — CHAMPION OPERATING MODEL

The Champion Operating Model defines the ongoing structure, cadence, and governance that keeps the network functional and credible throughout the initiative.

Operating Element	Description	Cadence	Owner	Notes / Flags
Weekly Champion Debrief	30-minute standing meeting; OCM Lead presents milestones/FAQ updates, champions report what they're hearing	Weekly P2; bi-weekly P3	OCM Lead	
Signal Reporting	1-page pattern-level signal summary: top 3 questions, top 3 concerns, early adoption indicators, resistance patterns	Weekly	OCM Lead → Project Lead & Sponsor	No individual employee attribution, ever
FAQ Maintenance	Living FAQ updated as new questions surface; champions are the primary new-item source	Weekly	OCM Lead	
Champion Recognition	Public sponsor acknowledgment at milestones; personal OCM Lead thank-you at 30/90 days; named in close-out communication	At each milestone and close-out	OCM Lead / Sponsor	Draws from public recognition and team-based celebration methods
Network Governance	Replacement recruitment within 1 week of any departure; redesign escalation if signal quality is uniformly positive despite known resistance	Ongoing	OCM Lead	Champion performance is never formally assessed

The single most common reason champion networks fail is recruiting for enthusiasm rather than trust, then deploying champions as one-way messengers instead of two-way bridges — this network's manager-nomination process and explicit 'credible middle' profile guidance are designed specifically to avoid that failure mode. Success at 30 days looks like: champions attending every weekly debrief, feedback quality improving week over week rather than staying uniformly positive, and at least two to three new FAQ items surfacing from champion input weekly. If the network is not surfacing real signals by 30 days — feedback is uniformly positive despite known resistance, or debrief attendance is falling — the OCM Lead escalates to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for network redesign rather than assuming the silence means the problem has resolved itself.

Prepared by GOccelerate™ | [REDACTED] | Confidence: Very High (100%)

The GOccelerate People Risk Index (PRI) is a formative, expert-derived index of people and adoption risk across four dimensions — Leadership, Stakeholder, Capability, and Sustainment — grounded in established organizational change management practice. Dimension scores reflect equally weighted, normalized risk points assigned through expert judgment rather than statistically estimated weights. Baseline results derive from a structured intake completed by a single informant and reflect that respondent's knowledge of the organization at the time of assessment; the accompanying Data Confidence indicator reflects the completeness of the information provided. Risk bands are provisional and subject to recalibration as GOccelerate's outcome-validation program accumulates post-implementation adoption data.