From Launch to Landing

The Leadership Architecture Behind Sustainable Enterprise Change

By Jenna Bossaer | Basecamp Innovation

There is a version of change leadership that looks like authority. The person at the top issues the direction, the organization aligns, and the transformation proceeds on schedule.

That version does not exist in practice.

What actually happens in complex enterprise change is messier, slower, and far more relational than any project plan accounts for. Most change fails the same way: it launches, but it does not land. People get crushed under the weight of initiative after initiative, and nobody builds the scaffolding to make any of it sustainable. The organizations that navigate change well are not the ones with the most compelling vision documents. They are the ones with leaders who understand that moving a system requires moving the people inside it first.

That is what this piece is about: the architecture of change leadership in high-stakes, high-complexity environments. Not the theory of it. The practical reality of how it works, where it breaks, and what makes it hold.

Change Management vs. Change Leadership

These two terms get used interchangeably, and that is a problem.

Change management is structural. It is the processes, timelines, communication plans, and governance scaffolding that keep a transformation organized. It matters. But it is a container, not a driver. And a container without the right support structure just holds things in place until someone stops paying attention.

Change leadership is what fills that container. It is the relational and emotional work of helping people move from where they are to where the organization needs to go. It is the difference between a rollout that happens and a transformation that sticks. Between “we launched it” and “it landed.”

In complex environments—ones with multiple professional identities, competing priorities, and long institutional histories—change leadership is where everything either accelerates or stalls. Technical competence gets you in the room. Relational credibility is what gets people to follow.

The most effective change leaders I have worked with do not lead with authority. They lead with trust. And trust is built through thousands of small interactions, not one big announcement.

Ronald Heifetz draws a parallel distinction in his foundational work on adaptive leadership. Technical challenges have known solutions and can be managed with existing expertise. Adaptive challenges are different. They require people to change their values, beliefs, and the way they actually work (Heifetz, 1994). Change management handles the technical side. Change leadership is the adaptive work—the human work. And the skills required for each are fundamentally different. Leaders who are excellent at managing complexity sometimes plateau here, not because they lack intelligence or commitment, but because they have not made the shift from directing to influencing.

The Skill Architecture of Change Leadership

Brian Golden describes a three-tier leadership hierarchy in his work on complex institutional change that names what most organizations feel but struggle to articulate: the relationship between technical credibility, interpersonal skill, and the ability to think systemically about the whole organization (Golden, 2006).

Skill Tier	What It Is	Why It Matters for Change
Conceptual Skills	The ability to see the organization as a whole system and reconfigure it to meet new demands.	Provides the 'why' that transcends silos. Without this, change stays local and fragmented.
Interpersonal Skills	Active listening, negotiation, conflict resolution, and the ability to convert direction into personal commitment.	This is where resistance softens. People follow leaders who make them feel heard, not leaders who make them feel managed.
Technical Expertise	Deep domain knowledge in the core work of the organization.	Earns the initial right to lead. Professional credibility opens doors that a title alone cannot.

The practical implication is that leaders who rise through deep technical expertise often carry a significant trust advantage. A clinician who moves into leadership carries credibility that a purely administrative leader has to work harder to establish. That credibility is real currency in a change process, and it is worth protecting.

What I observe in practice is that the transition from strong interpersonal skills to genuine conceptual thinking is where many talented leaders get stuck. It requires a shift from solving problems within the system to redesigning the system itself. That is a fundamentally different cognitive and relational challenge, and it is the threshold that separates leaders who manage change from leaders who architect it.

Reading the Room: Planned vs. Unplanned Change

One of the most consistent failure modes in change leadership is applying the wrong strategy to the context. Treating a crisis like a strategic initiative, or treating a long-term transformation with crisis-mode urgency.

Beer and Nohria's research found that most enterprise transformations fail for a predictable reason: organizations either chase short-term economic results at the expense of their people, or they invest in culture and capability but never tie it back to performance (Beer & Nohria, 2000). The organizations that got it right held both in tension at the same time. That is the scaffolding work—not just picking a direction, but building the support structures so the direction holds under pressure.

	Planned Change	Unplanned Change
What Triggers It	A gap between current and desired performance that leadership chooses to close.	An external shock: crisis, regulatory change, market disruption, leadership upheaval.
Primary Leadership Task	Align a central vision with stakeholder values. Build the narrative. Sequence the work with care.	Stabilize. Keep the collective together. Push decision authority to those closest to the problem.
Where Leaders Go Wrong	Moving too fast, skipping joint diagnosis, presenting finished plans for rubber-stamping.	Trying to control and centralize when the situation demands distributed judgment and rapid experimentation.

The cost of misapplication runs in both directions, but the more insidious failure is the one that happens after a crisis ends. When a major disruption hit, one mid-sized organization did what most did: leadership made fast, top-down decisions with limited information, and people accepted it because the urgency was real. But when the disruption passed, the operating rhythm never shifted back. Reactive protocol became lived culture. Everything stayed urgent. Leaders who had learned to escalate kept escalating. People stopped trusting that the work they started on Monday would still matter by Wednesday. Someone would say yes to a request, and two months later they were still trying to circle back because the next emergency had already walked through the door. The organization never returned to proactive work—not because people did not want to, but because no one signaled stability and a different mode of operating was now required. When everything is treated as urgent, nothing can be treated as strategic. And organizations that never leave firefighting mode eventually lose the leaders capable of building anything beyond the next response.

The diagnostic question is not what kind of change do I want this to be. It is what kind of change is this actually, and what does that require from me as a leader right now?

Building the Partnerships That Move Things

Large-scale enterprise change does not happen because one leader decided it should. It happens because enough trusted voices, across enough levels of the organization, decided together that it needed to.

That partnership does not assemble itself. It has to be deliberately built. This is scaffolding work, not project management. And one of the core pitfalls I see organizations fall into is creating echo chambers around decision-making. If the same ten people are always making the decisions and never including the people doing the work, they are missing ninety percent of the impact.

Stage 1: Build the Guiding Partnership, Not Just a Committee

Kotter identified this kind of partnership as one of the most frequently underbuilt elements of any change effort (Kotter, 1996). Getting out from behind your desk and assembling a real working group is the starting point. Done early, a guiding partnership acts as a recruitment engine—using existing professional networks to extend influence into parts of the organization the formal leadership structure cannot reach. You need ambassadors embedded in every function and every level, not just representation at the top.

Stage 2: Diagnose Together Before You Solve Anything

The fastest way to kill stakeholder buy-in is to show up with a finished plan. People can tell when a “consultation” is actually a presentation in disguise. Joint diagnosis requires genuine openness to what stakeholders identify as the problem—not just validation of the problem leadership already decided to solve. When people co-identify the issue, they are already halfway toward owning the solution.

The difference between performative and genuine diagnosis is visible to everyone except the people performing it. Like in many organizations, engagement surveys at one company went out every year like clockwork. Leadership tracked completion rates because participation was on their scorecard. The data itself was treated as background noise—anonymous, easily dismissed, rarely acted on—and the whole organization knew it. Why answer a survey when nothing changes after you give your opinion? What changed the dynamic was pairing the survey with voluntary focus groups. Real people, from every level, sat in a room together and walked through the results. They expanded on what the numbers could not capture. At the end of the session, there were no pledges from a podium, no promises leadership could not keep, no action items to follow up on. People left having been heard. They were not given excuses, just an outlet. When people walk away with understanding rather than solutioning, they carry the diagnosis

with them. And people who helped name the problem are far more likely to help carry what comes next.

Stage 3: Remove the Structural Barriers to the New Direction

Change that requires people to fight the organization's own systems in order to do the right thing will not be sustainable. Galbraith's Star Model makes this concrete: strategy, structure, processes, rewards, and people practices all have to reinforce one another for any organizational design to hold (Galbraith, 2001). If the new direction conflicts with how work is currently organized, what gets measured, or what gets rewarded, the existing structure wins every time.

What often gets described as resistance is, in reality, structural contradiction. People are not pushing back because they reject the future state. They are reacting rationally to a system sending mixed signals. Leaders say one thing, measures reward another, workloads stay the same, and the effort quietly collapses under the weight of its own inconsistency. Organizational redesign is not a secondary task in a transformation. It is a core leadership responsibility. Change only becomes credible when the system begins to prove it.

Stage 4: Build the Feedback Loops That Make Change Stick

Without visible evidence that the new way is working, people default to old patterns—not because they are resistant, but because the system stops confirming that the change is real. Information systems that track progress, combined with visible recognition of movement in the right direction, close the loop between intent and sustained performance. This is where appreciation and recognition become a strategic tool rather than a courtesy.

It is also where most organizations drop the ball. A mid-sized organization invested months rolling out a new people management platform. The project plan was solid. Managers were trained. The implementation team hit every milestone. Then the platform went live, and the implementation team moved on to the next project. No one was assigned to field the day-to-day questions that inevitably followed. A manager running their first performance review on the new system had no one to call. People who did not have time to work through training materials just wanted fast answers, and there was no one there to give them. Within weeks, workarounds appeared. Within months, usage quietly dropped. Managers reverted to the way they had always done things—not because they rejected the new platform, but because the organization stopped reinforcing that it mattered. Six months later, the initiative still appeared in the annual report as a completed success. That gap—between what leadership believes was delivered and what people actually experience—is where reinforcement fails. And it is where most organizations stop paying attention and dedicating resources.

Landing change requires staying in the work long enough for the system to normalize it. The scaffolding cannot come down before anyone has learned to stand on their own.

Political Intelligence: The Leadership Skill Nobody Wants to Name

In organizational contexts, “political” is almost always used as uncomplimentary language. It has been for me. Being political in an organization was never something I wanted to be. In interviews, when I was inevitably asked about my greatest weakness, lacking political desire was always the answer I gave. Cutting my teeth in HR, organizational politics showed up most often as toxic, self-serving, or performative. But throughout my career I have learned—mostly the hard way—that navigating enterprise change without political intelligence is like trying to read a room with the lights off. You are operating without information you actually need.

Political intelligence, done ethically, is about understanding where real influence lives in an organization, how decisions actually get made, and how to build momentum through people rather than around them.

Target the Almost Committed First

Hard-line resistance is rarely where a change effort is won or lost. The group that matters most is the people who are undecided—the fence-sitters. Securing their support creates visible momentum that shifts the broader equation. That momentum itself becomes persuasive to the people who were watching to see which way things were moving before they committed.

Knowing who to focus on in a pivotal meeting does not come from reading the room in the moment. It comes from the hundred conversations that happened before anyone sat down. It comes from learning that a communications manager cares deeply about the organization’s brand reflecting its actual values. That a sales leader wants their team to have real time with customers instead of being buried in internal process. That the executive assistant taking notes in every meeting is using outdated tools and could be freed up to contribute at a completely different level. You know these things because you have built rapport without attaching an agenda to it. You have shown up consistently, listened to what people actually care about, and never treated a conversation as a transaction. That is what political intelligence looks like in practice. It is not a skill you pull out of your pocket when it serves you most. It is a relationship pattern built on greater purpose. And when the moment comes to move something forward, you already know which levers connect to which values—not because you mapped a stakeholder grid, but because you bothered to learn what the people around you are trying to solve.

Test Before You Launch

Before taking a significant change initiative to the full organization, test the messaging and the approach with small groups. Not to manipulate the outcome, but to find out what lands and what does not while there is still room to adjust. The feedback from those early conversations will almost always improve the approach.

Frame the Work as a Challenge Worth Showing Up For

People engage with things that feel meaningful and challenging. A change initiative framed as an administrative requirement will get compliance at best. The same initiative framed as a genuine challenge that requires collective effort and expertise can generate real energy. The framing is not spin. It is about helping people see their own stake in the outcome.

The ethical guardrail through all of this is transparency. Political intelligence in service of the organization's real goals and the people inside it is legitimate leadership practice. Political intelligence in service of personal advancement, or used to exclude people who should have a voice, is something else entirely. That line has to be drawn clearly and held consistently.

The Micro Work That Holds the Macro Strategy Together

Systemic change is built from individual conversations. This is something I come back to constantly in my work. The strategy might exist at an organizational level, but it lives or dies in the daily interactions between leaders and the people they are trying to bring along. You can build the most elegant change architecture in the world, and it will collapse if the people inside it do not trust the people asking them to change.

The foundational principles of interpersonal influence—genuine interest in others, active listening, making people feel that their contribution matters—have stood the test of time (Carnegie, 1936). They are often dismissed as too simple for enterprise-level work. But they describe something that explains a great deal of leadership failure in complex change: people disengage when they do not feel heard, when they sense their contribution is not valued, or when they feel like decisions are being made about them without them.

Macro strategy sets the direction and builds the architecture. Micro behavior is what makes people trust you enough to follow the direction and engage with the architecture. Neither works without the other. A leader with a brilliant systemic vision who treats people instrumentally will hit a ceiling. A leader who is exceptionally skilled interpersonally but cannot think beyond their immediate team will plateau at a different one. The range that complex institutional change actually requires spans both.

Sustainable change is not a mandate to be tolerated. It is not another initiative to survive. It is a movement people choose to be part of—because the scaffolding is strong enough to hold it up, and the relationships are real enough to bring it to life.

References

Beer, M. & Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review, 78*(3), 133–141.

Carnegie, D. (1936). *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. Simon & Schuster.

Galbraith, J.R. (2001). *Designing Organizations: An Executive Guide to Strategy, Structure, and Process*. Jossey-Bass.

Golden, B.R. (2006). Transforming healthcare organizations. *Healthcare Quarterly, 10*(Special Issue), 10–19.

Heifetz, R.A. (1994). *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Harvard University Press.

Kotter, J.P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Harvard Business School Press.