

# CLOSING ISSUES FOR GROUPS WITH STRONG, MULTIPLE POLAR POSITIONS

## 11/16/11

---

### NEWEST TRG LEADERSHIP TOOL

"Practical Means for Dealing with Difficult Times"

This section of our site features business tools and planning considerations designed to assist leaders for whom "just keeping up" is not good enough. These notes focus on sequences of thought and action intended to enhance the positioning of your group, both on a long and short-term basis.

Each week additional sets of Tools on a wide array of business subjects will appear. Your input is requested as to which Tools might be of interest to you. Requests will NOT create any form of obligation on the Reader who makes the suggestion, but will help us understand which subjects are of general interest.

Please check back weekly to review the next tool. Visit our [LEADERSHIP TOOLS ARCHIVE](#) for previous tools.

## CLOSING ISSUES FOR GROUPS WITH STRONG, MULTIPLE POLAR POSITIONS

### SITUATION:

The common practice of attempting to solve complex, multi-sided issues through the use of full group "brainstorming" sessions involving all of the Entities can be inefficient at times, particularly when there are extreme/polar positions involved.

### EXAMPLES:

- Large Scale:
  - Over time, five companies that share a common software application have been fighting over the allocation of common or shared costs, with the largest for the companies wanting the solution to be  $1/x$  (where  $x$  is the count of companies, while the smaller members of the consortium want the answer to be an allocation based on either company size or a measure of usage.
- Small Scale:
  - Each year for several years the groups fought over the location of the following year's conference. They were unable to establish a set of business criteria that would have allowed the creation of a long-term schedule.

### THE ASSUMPTION:

If the most widely contrasting positions on small or mechanical functions cannot be brought to agreement promptly, then group consensus as broad scale direction and/or joint action is highly unlikely.

# CLOSING ISSUES FOR GROUPS WITH STRONG, MULTIPLE POLAR POSITIONS

## 11/16/11

---

Establishing a working consensus requires a series of deliberate efforts designed to set operating or working principles in place and then test them over time.

An important 'visitors' to ALL deliberations on the increase recur an understanding of the implication of "e-visitation" to ALL activities, occurring constantly with the ability to affect prospective outcomes. Setting principles in place to avoid related distractions are critical.

### APPROACH:

1. Select a set of individuals who represent each of the groups separately
2. Working one-on-one and in small group sessions, isolate the key components of all issues
3. Develop a prospective joint finding that clarifies the range of issues
4. Open a document laying out the full range of optional solutions
5. Mediate closure for each of the issue elements first, the full issues second
6. Establish a single written proposal acceptable to the small group
7. Present to the full group as a joint proposal with endorsement from all small group participants

### CLOSURE TESTS:

There are **many** viable paths to a successful conclusion, and many are false leads. Testing the validity of initial results at pre-agreed upon intervals can prove to be crucial to achieving a working solution.

### REALITY TESTING:

To be applied to strategies, principles or initiatives (preferably at pre-designated intervals and events).

- INTENTION:
  - Is this what we actually intend to do?
- PRACTICALITY:
  - Do we understand the effect/results of this principle or action?
  - Do we understand the resources required to adopt this principle or action?
- COMMITMENT:
  - Is the appropriate level of authority committed to this principle or action?
- CONFIRMATION:
  - Is this **STILL** what we actually intend to do?

### TESTS FOR COMPLETION:

Purpose: Even the best of solutions will remain only theory, until their effectiveness and applicability

# CLOSING ISSUES FOR GROUPS WITH STRONG, MULTIPLE POLAR POSITIONS

## 11/16/11

---

have been demonstrated.

To be applied to actions or strategies:

- Have we stated everything that we actually intend to do?
- Are there parallel actions being undertaken which have been left unstated?
- For every action stated is there:
  - An "owner"?
  - A schedule of completion?
  - A commitment to report result?
  - An agreement as to who will review the report?
  - A schedule for the review?

EXAMPLES:

- Large Scale
  - The three companies have agreed to lay out an annual cooperative plan for upcoming year by November 15th of each year
  - The companies have agreed to conduct an effectiveness review of the previous years common effort each year starting in the week after Labor Day
  - The companies have agreed to seek prompt mediation for all issues remaining open on October 15th
- Small Scale:
  - The writing of the plan for the annual conference will begin 18 months in advance each targeted date to allow six months for closer prior to the next conference

For additional information regarding CLOSING ISSUES FOR GROUPS WITH STRONG, MULTIPLE POLAR POSITIONS, please visit our [Contact Page](#) and send us an Email or simply call us directly during East Coast business hours on our toll free number 1.800.97-REGIS (1.800.977.3447).