



Organizational Development



Unterschiede

Program for effective cooperation with the Marc Minor - Institute for Systemic Leadership Culture

- Organizational development is primarily the development of an organization's culture.
- Culture is more than meaning well and being friendly. Living a culture means leading an organization professionally so that
 - Performance and well-being are not mutually exclusive.
 - Organizational development and personal life development are possible in an organic way.
 - The organization should consistently align itself with the core businesses in the relevant markets, core processes and core competencies.
- Good leadership culture can be developed. Culture development starts in the organization's 'power nucleus' - with the decision-makers, entrepreneurs, directors and CEOs.
- Important, complex projects will not succeed without integration and holding decision-makers accountable on a regular basis.
- 'Fish stinks from the head' - this phrase is quoted often and with a critical reference to management. I think this statement is not true. I have met mostly competent, capable, prudent, responsible leaders - with many questions that they have to answer. Managers do not have more or fewer weaknesses than other people. But in their multiplier functions, both strengths and weaknesses will have a more pronounced effect.
- I wonder if leaders and key players in organizations pay sufficient attention to the implementation of great ideas. I have found that entrepreneurs and top managers habitually fall prey to illusions, misconceptions and fallacies.
- In companies and organizations, we don't usually have a shortage of ideas, the deficits are in implementation.
- One should hear about 'the lusty enjoyment of power to set things in motion' at least on the executive floor - instead, I encounter 'hydroplaning': while executives are holding the steering wheel, the vehicle does not respond as desired.

- Many things seem plausible at the director/CEO level, but then turn out to be fallacious when incorporated into the organization's operations. This is then quickly blamed on inflexible die-hards or the deadwood in the middle.
- I would wish that promoting a journey to the Promised Land like a prayer mill would allow any director or entrepreneur to simply trust in the organization fixing it.
- Although not the only ones, charismatic people and 'cheerleaders' often say: 'I am in charge of the big picture, the strategic alignment. As for the rest, I've got my team for that.' In 1995, I would have agreed. Meanwhile, I think that successful motivation without a concept and participation (= leadership) as to how to proceed afterwards will not work. Leadership is not just motivation; it takes place in daily business, which is not very spectacular.
- Very rarely do charismatic people have a project structure that corresponds to the scope of their ideas. Commitment to building sustainable structures and processes are chronically considered a 'secondary priority.'
- Using internal HR people or external 'bypass' consultants to 'hoist' the organization's big topics into the organization - i.e. through staff positions - will not work. This is actually passing the buck.
- Internal/external consultants can have a significant impact on organizational development if they stick to providing their consulting to management instead of assuming proxy responsibility.
- We need **vertical culture development: working together with real colleagues, on real topics, and across hierarchies**. Where applicable, even across several hierarchy levels.
- Traditional continuing education is designed to be horizontal. It brings those together who are together anyway - even if everyone agrees that the sand in the works is caused by the top-down process. The ones that should get together are those who form a performance chain.

- At the Institute for Systemic Leadership Culture, we have been experimenting with company-internal leadership workshops for ten years: 'Commanders and subordinates' - senior and junior managers work together on their real issues - and steered to create a stark contrast to daily 'management as usual.'
- Our responsibility as consultants: We bring methods and concepts to the table that will allow and facilitate collaboration on day-to-day issues across hierarchies. We develop examples of what 'working together' might look like for the parties involved.
- **'Peer consulting' among real supervisors and colleagues** is not very spectacular, but highly effective. This is leadership dialog in action. Some insiders might think of peer consulting as an old hat. But when used systematically in a real power structure, it is anything but an 'old hat.'
- Example: In a private meeting, the sales manager consults with his immediate superior, the CEO, regarding an explosive issue. The meeting takes place before the eyes of observing colleagues. Organizational culture development takes place in the peer dialog itself, without it being discussed:
 - The CEO gets ideas for his problem.
 - Using a real-life example, it will be clarified in the dialog who has what responsibility in this case.
 - Different views emerge: Not grassroots democracy, but creative expansion of horizons for good leadership.
 - The managers in the vertical chain put their heads together, determining who needs to respond to what in which role so that the 'show will actually make it to the stage.'
 - The rest of the participants will then contribute their ideas regarding the private meeting they just witnessed. People are always surprised how different their hypotheses are (even though they all heard the same). We humans have our favorite spotlights. Not really a bad thing. But it can be a disadvantage if we habitually 'turn up' the same spotlight without thinking. Using the live example, we will then cultivate and improve 'professional intuition.'
 - Many issues are so complex that the best way to deal with them is through examples and the joint efforts of the people involved.

- Peer consulting also includes criticizing individuals in front of others (including superiors). I consider the rule 'Criticism? Yes please - but only as a two-way street' foolish. Criticism that is expressed well builds culture and promotes a sense of community. This aspect is (as of now) being overlooked completely.
- A recurring theme, picked from management dialogs in 2010: Accountability seems to be a major topic of our times. Matrix structures make it difficult to clarify accountabilities easily and once and for all. How does a waiter on the Titanic, who is responsible for setting the tables, react when he sees looming icebergs through the window?
- Everyone in the company is accountable FOR his or her partial perspective. If a person merely maximizes her/his own perspective, the result is silo thinking - the often quoted divisional egotisms. Organizations of the future need a culture where everybody feels accountable also WITH REGARD TO the whole. Moral appeals to broaden their view are not enough. We need 'creative accountability dialogs across hierarchies.'
- Internal HR directors or managers view the vertical work settings with a mix of respect and heightened anxiety: 'This style here, in our organization? A director gives another director - or even the chairman of the board - advice, with external guidance and peers looking on, and might then also be publicly criticized? Come back in 2030. We still consider discrete coaching in private as tutoring for weaklings that needs to be initiated in secret.' On a good day, I empathize - on a bad day, I smile warily and think, 'Wash me, but don't get me wet.' All mission statements say 'We want to communicate openly.'

■ **Widespread broad consulting on big issues? Do we reject that categorically at the Institute for Systemic Leadership Culture?**

- No. Of course we ask ourselves whether the conventional way of initiating the collaboration between an organization and a consulting system is effective. It usually starts with preliminary talks, followed by individual interviews, from which clever hypotheses are derived. Then all-encompassing measures will be offered and implemented. The competitive pitch will often be somewhere in-between.
- Apparently, collaboration is successful enough using this method - but often it will result in island solutions that are not connected. Meanwhile, management is rushing on to the next project.
- Our way: We start in the guts of the company; not through exploratory individual interviews followed by large consulting contracts, but through direct and regular live leadership workshops on real issues. Diagnostics and exploration will happen on the fly while working together. In this process, the nucleus of power gives rise to ideas, experiences, assessments, and clarity about accountabilities for the architectures and concepts of the large-scale projects. The key players will develop a multi-layered, common professional understanding. If that doesn't happen? Well, that would be disappointing, but still better than a hyped kickoff from 'the fire into the frying pan.'
- Management will be responsible for the rollouts of the large wheels. That way, the main issues will not be passed on prematurely to (internal/external) consultants.
- The main issues we see at this point are change and merger processes, leadership development, managing and mentoring high potentials (including demographics issues) as well as projects with the goal of promoting values, such as 'we need more of a culture of disagreement.'
wie z.B. ‚wir brauchen mehr Streitkultur‘.
- After this 'different start' the consultants team from the Institute for Systemic Leadership Culture will then also gladly participate in a roll-out.

■ Fragments for ethical leadership - too moralistic?

- True managers stand behind their flaws and mistakes and do not blame others for them.
- A manager respects boundaries. A manager does not interfere in the employee's personal business. Phone calls, text messages and emails late at night and on the weekend are taboo - or at least highly exceptional.
- It is unethical not to assume responsibility for prioritizing, meaning just passing on the assignments.
- If a subordinate says that s/he can only carry 60% of the whole, this must be heard with a responsible ear. The manager will say which 40% to leave alone.
- Confrontational disagreements? Gladly. The manager says, 'You are a little weak in this area - I'll live with it (or not) - or will cut something from your salary.'
- 'I'm putting the ball in your court - but then don't ask me about it again' is unethical.
- A less obvious type of unethical behavior: exploiting young people's tendency to self-exploitation. It is important to protect young people from being put into boots too early that are too big for them. One becomes guilty of using up incentive systems.
- By the age of 40, they'll have experienced everything without maturity. They are deprived of an appropriate development of meaning. (That's the Haute Ecole of Ethics).

Sources:

- Many years of supervision experiences from my leadership workshops.
- Collections from different interviews with Dr. Bernd Schmid. He is the head of the Institute for Systemic Consulting in Wiesloch. <http://www.systemische-professionalitaet.de>