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Among the maxims on Lord Naoshige’s wall, there was this one:

“Matters of great concern should be treated lightly.”

Master Ittei commented,

“Matters of small concern should be treated seriously.”

Yamamoto Tsunetomo, *Hagakure* (1716)
In the words of the ancients, one should make his decision within the space of seven breaths.

Yamamoto Tsunetomo, *Hagakure* (1716)
Your Decision
(within seven quick breaths and to be taken lightly)

Would you kindly vote simultaneously
... whether you want the first row
to leave the room?

☑ agreement

☐ have concerns but won't block consensus

☒ I don't agree and I won't accept this proposal
Vote consecutively or simultaneously?
In which context to vote (location, time)?
What kind of decision needs which level of consensus?
Which level of consensus is realistic for which group size?
What alternatives to consider?
How easy shall it be to block a decision?

Unanimous agreement
Unanimous consent
Unanimous agreement minus one vote or two votes
Unanimous consent minus one vote or two votes
Condorcet consensus
Super majority thresholds (90%, 80%, 75%, 2/3, 60% ...)
Simple majority
Executive committee decides
Person-in-charge decides

(see wikipedia “Consensus decision making”)
Two levels of a decision

Relationship between the decision makers

Subject matter of the decision
A bad decision
  ... is not implemented
    ... by everybody
      ... the same way
    ... leads to a different result than intended
      (is that necessarily bad?)
  ... divides the decision makers
  ... is supported by consent and not by agreement
  ... does not maximize overall satisfaction
How do you recognize a good decision?
# A Facilitator’s Perspective
Characteristics of Good/Bad Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Decision Making</th>
<th>Bad decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People were engaged, motivated, experience that they have participated</td>
<td>People do not show up for the meetings, avoid discussions, express themselves negatively or avoid addressing the subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group is even more united now – team spirit</td>
<td>The group is even more split, division, polarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions were made</td>
<td>Decisions are still pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months later people still respect and live by the decisions made</td>
<td>Decisions made are not being respected or followed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process of decision

• Preparation (more than one option)
• Detailed briefing
• Execution of the decision
• Never deviate from the taken decision (only in emergency circumstances)
• Debriefing (positive / negative points)
Execution of decisions

• Build an execution plan
• Follow your execution plan
• Don’t interrupt the execution plan
• Finish the execution plan
• Trust the execution plan
Consequences of decisions

• Convince concerned people of the decision
• Live with the result, don’t be afraid of
• Gain a positive feeling
• Failure is not the result of the decision as such, but of the circumstances
Lessons to learn

• Uncertainty and mistrust are big obstacles in a decision making process
• You have to be ready to repeat your plan multiple times
• Set up realistic time limits for ending discussions and taking decisions
• Expectations are often too optimistic
Bear in mind ...

THERE IS NO WORSE DECISION THAN

NO DECISION
A Facilitator’s Perspective
Awareness of the Conflict Ladder

Early warning signs?

No conflicts

Destructive
A Facilitator’s Perspective
What is ”Best Practice” in our Business?

• If we assume that the Conflict Ladder is relevant for our business too, what are the early warming signs we should be aware off?

• What is ”Best Practice” in our business – how do we ensure that we react rationally and avoid stepping up on the conflict ladder?
A Facilitator’s Perspective
Awareness of the Conflict Ladder

- We disagree
- We personalize. His/her fault
- We involve others, include colleges in the conflict
- We give up on dialogue
- Agree on maintaining the dialogue
- I wonder what his/her needs are?
- On what do we disagree?
- Involve a manager – or facilitator
- Involve lawyers
- Formal steps of hostility
A Facilitator’s Perspective
Adressing the Conflict Ladder ”Best Practices”

The Warning Signs:
• Less fun at work, less likely to meet and talk, less meetings, complaining, talking about the others rather than with the others, shifting from face to face communication to e-mails

Best Practice in Other Businesses
• Awareness of the serious risks for the business on the next steps
• It is good leadership and professional to act on what you see – in time
• Everyone has a responsability for reacting
Magnus Hallin

Decision Making

The importance of investing time to align the firm prior to decision making
The AWA Group

Board of Directors

- Management Team
  - CEO
    - HR
    - IT/Quality
    - Communications
  - Finance
    - BD
    - Sales
    - Central Office Support

- After Market Services
- AWA IPro
- AWA Strategy
- AWA Innovation

- Denmark
- South Sweden
- West Sweden
- East Sweden
- North Sweden
- Asia (Beijing & Hong Kong)
The importance of investing time to align the firm prior to decision making
Decision making framework

- Mission
- Vision and values
- Strategic plan
  (Based on common market outlook)
Said = Heard
Heard = Understood
Understood = Agreed
Agreed = Done
Done = Sustained
Said ≠ Heard
Heard ≠ Understood
Understood ≠ Agreed
Agreed ≠ Done
Done ≠ Sustained
A Facilitator’s Perspective
Characteristics of Good/Bad Processes

Decision making can impact group unity, positively and negatively
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One person</td>
<td>Fast, uncomplicated</td>
<td>Too fast, no dialogue</td>
<td>When dialogue does not create value</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise</td>
<td>Dialogue, solution created</td>
<td>Two camps, divides the group</td>
<td>When positions are polarized</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Fast, high quality with dialogue, clear outcome</td>
<td>May be too fast, <strong>winners and losers</strong></td>
<td>Trivial matters, and when division of group is acceptable</td>
<td>Half a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi voting</td>
<td>Systematic, objective, participative, feels good</td>
<td>Limits dialogue, real concerns may not surface</td>
<td>To prioritize a longer list of options</td>
<td>A day, preparation and half a day workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus building</td>
<td>Involvement and engagement, collaborative, systematic, commitment</td>
<td>Requires time and skills</td>
<td>When issues are important, when total buy-in matters</td>
<td>1-2 days preparation, and 1 day workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partly inspired by: Facilitating with Ease, Ingrid Bens, 2005, p. 94
A Facilitator’s Perspective
When do You Need Consensus Building?

• You should consider consensus building when:
  – You need to make decisions about important issues that will impact the entire group
  – Buy-in and ideas from all members are important

• Consensus building – the decision that everyone can commit to and that everyone can live with

• Allocate time and resources – upfront
Using the Past to Shape the Future

• Two and two – Share a great personal experience you have in relation to your company within the last year – what was good about it?

• Group work – What are we really good at? Our best clients, why do they prefer to work with us? What are we particularly good at? What are we really proud of? Where are we comparatively stronger than our competitors?
Shared visions on the Future
”Imagine you are in 2020 …”

• What are the top reasons we are respected for by our clients?

• What are the top three professional reasons you prefer to be a partner in our company?

• As workplace we function well above average in our business. What is it we are doing so well?
A Facilitator’s Perspective
Summary of the ”Need to Know”

• Dangerous not to make decisions
• Beware: We may tend not to want to decide, not even to meet
• Some types of decisions may be worth investing more time and resources:
  – When they are important for the whole group and group unity, and when buy-in and commitment matters

When you decide you need good decision making, how do you do it?
A Facilitator’s Perspective
Planning and Designing the Process

• Preparation, planning, coaching based interviews
• All meetings and workshops are prepared individually, taylor made
• Clear mandate – the right people involved
• Development of the structured, stepwise process to be used – transparency
• Groundrules for the meeting
# A Facilitators Perspective

## Behaviors that Helps Effective Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviours that Helps</th>
<th>Counter Productive Behaviours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We listen to the others’ ideas and point of views, acknowledge different point of views</td>
<td>Arguing against others’ ideas, arguing for your own ideas, arguing for winning the discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on others’ ideas</td>
<td>Promoting own ideas, pushing for predetermined ideas, shooting down others’ ideas and arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse first, describe pros and cons – decide later in the process</td>
<td>Deciding for or against as soon as suggestions come up, argue for own suggestions to ”winn the debate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to everyone, assume everyone can contribute to the decision making process</td>
<td>Not acknowledging idears of others, not assuming that everyone in the group can or will contribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We listen to each other to learn and understand</td>
<td>Shooting down any suggestions and alternatives in order to promote own suggestions and ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We understand and approve the steps in the decision making process</td>
<td>Lack of understanding of the process or not respecting the agenda or the facilitator’s mandate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Facilitator’s Perspective
Decision Making Workshops

• Solid preparation – Clear mandate, right people
• Using techniques that make people listen to each other
• Breaking the decision process up in steps, building blocks
• Plenty of dialogue and group work
• Appreciative Inquiry – Induces energy, gets people in solution mode
• Being transparent, explaining the process
• Ensuring that next steps and follow-up is agreed
Summary of the ”Need to Know”

• Dangerous not to make decisions
• Consensus building requires time and resources (and sometimes facilitation as well)
• Not affording this time and resources may come at horrible costs
Good Decision Making
Dialogue, Questions and Answers

• Please talk to the person(s) next to you about the take-aways from this session – What may be useful for you you? (3 minutes)

• Questions and answers in plenary
Thank you

Jens Lillebæk    lillebaek@sweco.dk
Magnus Hallin    magnus.hallin@awapatent.com
André Werner     andre.werner@tswpat.ch
Patrick Erk      erk@grunecker.de
A Facilitator’s Perspective – Agenda (1)
Getting the Team Ready – Inflight

- Welcome
- Setting the scene, mandate for the session, what it is we need to decide
- Levelling of expectations
- Presentation of the agenda, the plan or approach for reaching the decision. Intentions and purposes of the steps, in view of the expectations
- Agreement on the ground rules, appropriate shared norms for the discussions at the meeting
- Two and two: A good personal experience and example of ”good decision making process”? What happened? Why was it good?
A Facilitator’s Perspective – Agenda (2)
Main Steps in the Process

• Dialogue: What underlaying assumptions are important for us to understand?
• Group work: Desired Outcome – What will a good decision look like? What will be different?
• Present situation: Review of the facts describing the present situations and causes of the situation
• Group work: Brainstorm potential solutions using brainstorming techniques,
• Brainstorm and evaluate criterias to be used to sort out solutions
• Evaluate solutions against criterias
• Identify the solution that everyone can live with
A Facilitator’s Perspective – Agenda (3)
Agree on the Plan of Action and Follow Up

• Group work: Develop plan(s) of action
• Plenary: Enrich, comment, add – any ways we can make the plan stronger?
• Agreement on the plan(s) including how we will follow-up, on a time line, with indicators
• Group discussion: Challenge the plan. What could prevent us getting success we want? How will we mitigate?
• Next steps, how will we use the result(s) of today?
• Evaluation of today, results and the process
Good Decision Making
Dialogue, Questions and Answers

• Please talk to the person(s) next to you about the take-aways from this session – Are they usefull to you? (3 minutes)

• Questions and answers in plenary