



Walk the Talk

Radio for Agile Minds

<p>Shelley</p>	<p>It's that time of the month when we "Walk the Talk" and welcome Nick Anderson to the studio to help us check out if we do actually "Walk our own Talk"</p> <p>Nick is Senior Partner for Professional Development Services – The PDS Group and long time contributor to WGVU</p> <p>Over the last 20 years Nick has helped many household names like Turner Construction, Qwest Telecommunications and Royal Bank of Canada to impact bottom-line results through changing people's alignment within their organization, with their customer's and their partners.</p> <p>Each month Nick chooses a topic related to the business world in West Michigan focusing on the transitions this economy is going through</p> <p>Welcome....What have you chose for us this month?</p>
-----------------------	---

<p>Nick</p>	<p>This is the fifth in my series to help people assess how good their interactive skills are. This series is based on research of common commercial interactions that has led to many useful insights into how to create and manage effective meetings, deal with those who are most difficult to persuade – Low Reactors. This week I am focusing on those behaviors we use when controlling meetings.</p> <p>A lot of what we have covered in this series has been directly or indirectly, about meetings. In today’s program, is largely a summary. We will focus on those behaviors people who have the responsibility for running a meeting and reaching a successful outcome.</p>
<p>Shelley</p>	<p>Does this apply to all meetings, like in Not for Profits??</p>
<p>NICK</p>	<p>As long as the meeting has some desired outcome like deciding how we are going to cope with rising demand and failing donations through to problem solving why attendance is falling. Essentially, the commonality is problem solving and decision making not just exchanging information</p>
<p>SHELLEY</p>	<p>Why do you say “not just exchanging information?”</p>
<p>NICK</p>	<p>Good point. The first thing participants’ ratings change negatively is when a meeting has a high</p>

level of GI is **Time Wasting**. It happens when everyone in the meeting wants to add yet another reason, anecdote or opinion as to why an initiative should or should not be pursued. All of which tend not to help the decision making process

There are now so many better ways of reporting things like progress or lack thereof, including email, sharepoint etc. You should not encourage people to have weekly meetings, say, only having to wait your turn to report back. This "hub and spoke" meeting is boring, as you have to wait for 10 other colleagues report to the "boss" and hear them being questioned. This is why you should have "one on ones"

Chairing vs. Managing

In most situations the person running the meeting has two competing roles;

1. Chairing – The ideal chair is an important role, concerned solely with the efficient and fair conduct of the meeting. The perfect chair is not interested not in the **content**, but in the the **process** by which the meeting operates
2. Managing – in the real world though the chair is either the most senior manager present or the person who has called the meeting. In either case he or she has considerable interest in the content and is rarely, if ever, neutral.

	<p>These two roles are not easily compatible. For example, many chairs have a continuous incentive to manipulate the process of the meeting in order to influence the content and therefore its outcome.</p> <p>Shelley, how often have you been in meetings with the feeling that you are not being really engaged for your input but merely your support for the chair's per project?</p>
<p>Shelley</p>	<p>Lions, Chamber, WGVU – give examples - 😊😊</p> <p>Too many to mention? Give an example of a neutral chair you know --then – So, are you saying that if we are chairing a meeting we should be neutral?</p>
<p>NICK</p>	<p>Well, in most situations the Chair's preferences, views or pet projects are known. So, even if they strive for neutrality and focus on process, it can make others feel suspicious..ADD...Their neutrality may therefore be counter productive.</p>
<p>Shelley</p>	<p>So, I am sure your have a research finding or two on how skilled chairs perform this balancing act😊?</p>
<p>Nick</p>	<p>Indeed...and an important distinction to draw at this stage is differentiating the wider skills of managing meetings from the narrower skills of chairing. As a starting point, the basic behaviors of chairing are worth focusing on.</p>

	<p>Research Study</p> <p>Sample: 31 Chairs</p> <p>Chosen on the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. People rated their meetings as fair and efficient 2. Had at least five years experience of chairing 3. Chosen from 47 who met the first two criteria. <p>Finding skilled chairs behavior differed significantly from participants.</p> <p>Proposing</p> <p>Same vol but very different type.</p> <p>Content Props – 1.8% vs. 11.1%</p> <p>Procedural Prop - 9.6% vs. 2.4%</p> <p>Total – 11.5% vs., 13.5%</p> <p>Example</p> <p>PP – “I suggest we only spend 10mins on this item” vs.</p> <p>PP – “I propose that we take item 6 next”</p>
<p>Shelley</p>	<p>OK, so that’s Proposing– where to next...</p>

<p>Nick</p>	<p>Building – Define – Type different</p> <p>Chairs tended to use building to integrate different people’s ideas, For Example</p> <p>“John has suggested we reduce the workload in Accounts. Bob says he has spare capacity. Are there some people who could be used at high work load times like month and year end?”</p> <p>In contrast, Chairs used only about 1/3rd of others supporting behavior – Define. Hardly surprising and supports people not issues like “Louise is right to bring this up”</p> <p>Similarly – disagreeing was low.</p>
<p>Shelley</p>	<p>We looked last time at Testing Understanding and Summarizing in meetings...I would have thought a lot of these two are used by skilled Chairs...is that right?</p>
<p>Nick</p>	<p>Good point! That research was carried out to correlate the number of misunderstandings and misinterpretations that occurred after the meeting with the amount of TU &SUM during the meeting In all 49 Meetings were so observed in those 297 participants.</p> <p>On those low in TU & SUM there were significantly more errors and omissions in people’s accounts of the principle decisions agreed to in the</p>

	<p>meeting. As meetings differ in length the researchers took TU & SUM as a percentage total meeting behavior.</p> <p>The findings are rather disturbing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <2.5% - TU SUM Average 4.3 errors or omissions • >10%+ U SUM – Average 1.2 errors or omissions <p>Good Chairs – TU 15.2% vs. 3.1% and SUM 11.5% vs. 0.7%</p> <p>Also, SI – neutrality? 29.3% vs. 16.3%</p> <p>GI – 21.7% vs. 39.4%</p>
Shelley	So, How can people use this Chairperson Profile?
Nick	<p>Training or for your own use...</p> <p>Is this chairperson biased? Like Content Proposals High. Others Shelley?</p>
Shelley	High in Disagreeing – say why?
Nick	Also D/A and GI high. Next question, Is the Chair controlling the meetings' direction? What do you would be low?
Shelley	Procedural Proposals – why?



Nick	Also SI, S/O & BI more later program, Lastly Is this chair controlling the clarity and structure of the meeting? TU & SM Controlling Participation & Involvement – comment on Bias.
Shelley	Tip of the Month
Nick	Most of our concepts of the chairing function is based on 19 th C debating practice. Look at a more productive view managing resources to get outcomes, monitor this process by the use of controls. Delegates and rotate roles Note takes -= SUM