

NEW-MANAGER TRANSITION CASE

Reset the working agreement with former peers

Original fictional development exercise. Use approved role boundaries and formal processes where required. It is not a personnel finding or a universal first-month timetable.

Starting condition

A former project coordinator becomes the team's manager. Colleagues continue agreeing assignments informally with the previous supervisor. Before calling that bypassing or resistance, the new manager asks the sponsor which assignments now belong to the role and whether the transition was actually communicated.

Stage	Worked action and evidence
Confirm the role	Sponsor confirms the manager's routine assignment authority and the matters still reserved for another role. Any remaining individual-contributor work is made explicit.
Listen to one example	Manager asks a colleague how the last assignment was agreed. The account is treated as evidence to check, not a motive to diagnose.
Explain the agreement	Manager states the confirmed route respectfully: which assignments they coordinate, where exceptions go and how colleagues will learn changes. No private exceptions for friends.
Try one routine	Team uses that route for one suitable ordinary assignment. The manager checks that the receiving person understands the result and the support available.
Review with sponsor	Examine what worked, what remained unclear and what the manager still needs to practise. One clear interaction does not establish complete management readiness.

Which boundary must the sponsor settle before practice?

What specific interaction will the manager rehearse?

What will the next ordinary example let the reviewer examine?

Read alongside: Role agreement, former peers and supported practice.

COACHING VERSUS DIRECTION

Choose the response that fits the actual need

Original fictional paired exercise for ordinary development work. Immediate risks, required instruction and formal concerns follow approved procedures and qualified support.

Situation	Useful manager response	Why this fits
A colleague has never been taught the approved report-preparation steps and cannot identify the required source.	Explain the approved steps, demonstrate appropriately and arrange supervised practice. Confirm access to the permitted source.	Exploratory questions cannot supply missing basic instruction. Do not disguise the required answer as a coaching puzzle.
A colleague knows the task and boundary but chose a confusing summary structure. A suitable example can be reviewed.	Agree a development discussion. Ask what the reader needed, which options were considered and how the next summary could be tested.	The colleague can examine a decision and choose a practice adjustment within actual authority.
A colleague's choice was shaped by two incompatible instructions.	Clarify the conflict with the responsible owner, then decide what practice is useful.	A manager's unresolved expectation should not be relabeled an employee coaching failure.

Worked closing agreement

For the second situation, the colleague will prepare an appropriate draft summary for the next comparable report. The manager confirms the intended reader and review point. Together they examine whether the required decision is clearer. Keep the development record proportionate and approved; the conversation does not authorize release outside the normal review route.

Is the missing condition knowledge, practice, authority or another issue?

Manager action required before the next attempt

Participant practice and review evidence

Read alongside: Selecting coaching, instruction and support.

CHANGE-ROLLOUT WORKED CASE

Carry a changed routine into ordinary work

Original fictional administrative example. The change is an already-authorized internal briefing-request routine. No technical system, employment or control change is prescribed.

Stage	Completed illustrative plan
Approved boundary	One department will use the agreed request record for routine internal briefings. Existing content approval and operating-capacity decisions stay with their authorized owners.
Affected work	Requester states purpose and required participants. Coordinator checks readiness. Capacity owner confirms the permitted time. The ongoing owner maintains the guidance.
Readiness	Affected roles can find the current record, explain the required input and use the exception route. Missing access or required approval remains open before a go decision.
Communication	State what changes, the effective point and where questions go. Ask each role to explain the next action. Receipt of the announcement does not establish understanding.
Practice	Walk through an ordinary request and one missing-input case in an appropriate setting. Record questions and take required changes through the proper owner.
Evidence	Track whether in-scope requests used the agreed routine and whether the receiving role had usable information. Keep definition, period and authorized pauses explicit.
Handover	Ongoing owner confirms guidance location, exception route and next review. Leave unresolved work assigned rather than describing a sent document as a completed handover.

Review decision

In a fictional first sample, four of six in-scope requests include the required record. Two need examination; the count alone does not explain why. If missing access caused one case, address that condition before interpreting adoption. Compare the operating question separately. Neither the count nor a before-and-after difference proves causation or financial value.

Read alongside: [Readiness, adoption and continuing ownership](#).