Today’s Session

Goals:

1. Understand one important model on basic brain science and the impact on change & leadership

2. Acknowledge how we must address the 2 "operating systems" at play in organizational change

3. Key mindsets and principles that can help leaders foster lasting change
• Introduce yourself – 5 mins total
• A time when a leader made it safe for you?
Operating system defined:

☑ Often described as “culture”

☑ Persistent behavior patterns; how people work, decide to deal with failures and breakdowns

☑ Unseen, implicit rules shape and govern behaviors of an organization

☑ These rules create unexamined boundaries for what can be done, or said, or even thought

☑ Without impact, only incremental change is possible.

☑ Efforts at the superficial transformational change fail miserably.

☑ As in any living system, it is the underlying place and conditions that behavior and thinking emerge.
Functional operating states require both aspects to be integrated

**OBJECTIVE**
- Behavior
- Measure and Metrics
- Systems
- Required Effort
- Priorities
- Accountability
- Programs and Process

**SUBJECTIVE**
- Intentions
- Interpretation/Meanings
- Culture
- Discretionary Effort
- Values
- Responsibility
- Commitment and Caring
THE RIDER
Logical
Acts on thought
Acts on analysis
Requires Direction
Clarity is key
Gets stuff done
Weak

THE ELEPHANT
Emotional
Acts on Passion
Acts on impulse
Requires moral purpose
Stories are key
Over thinker
Strong

Adapted from “Switch” Chip and Dan Heath
So what’s brain science got to do with change?
Recognizing Conflict | SCARF Model
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Adapted from David Rock’s work on the neuroscience of leadership
SCARF – A MODEL FOR COLLABORATING WITH AND INFLUENCING OTHERS

Status
Importance in relation to others

Certainty
Ability to predict the future

Autonomy
Perception of exerting control over one's environment

Relatedness
Feeling of security in relation to others – Whether someone is friend or foe

Fairness
Transparency and clear expectations / Reward from fairness

The perception of a potential or real reduction in status can generate a strong threat response.
The brain is constantly trying to predict the near future. Even a small amount of uncertainty generates an 'error' response.
The feeling of having a choice greatly influences the level of stress.
The sense of belonging to a group is important. Collaborating and sharing information are closely tied to the level of trust.
Unfair exchanges generate a strong threat response. Greater transparency, communication, and participation can have a positive impact.

Adapted from David Rock’s work on the neuroscience of leadership
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCARF Model</th>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Giving advice or instructions, offering feedback, performance reviews</td>
<td>Beating one’s own best time at a task or sporting activity, receiving positive feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Not knowing your boss’ expectation</td>
<td>Stating clear objectives at the start of a discussion, breaking projects down into small steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Being micromanaged</td>
<td>Allowing people to organise their workflow, working hours etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatedness</td>
<td>Meeting someone unknown, meeting from a different culture</td>
<td>Setting up mentoring or coaching systems at work, having a friend at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Lack of ground rules, expectations or objections</td>
<td>Transparency, doing volunteer work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from David Rock’s work on the neuroscience of leadership
Required Attitudes for Systems Thinking

1. A very deep and persistent commitment to ‘real learning.’

2. I have to be prepared to be wrong.

3. The need to triangulate. Listen for the “third story.”

Adapted from “The Fifth Discipline” – Peter Senge
Four Action Steps to Lead with the Brain in Mind

1. Cultivate Identity
2. Share Power
3. Routinize Learning
4. Normalize Contention and Conflict
4 Action Steps
Leading With the Brain in Mind

1. **Cultivate Identity**
   - Ask and listen for what people in your organization truly believe in
   - Leverage the existing beliefs (we’re a strong team, our organization has value, we work hard,
   - I’m part of an efficient agency) toward the new opportunity
   - Continually point towards each person’s role in the success of the whole organization
   - Use symbols, stories and actions that shift “turf” thinking
   - Celebrate people taking personal accountability for organizational success

2. **Share Power**
   - Celebrate people who persevere together to break through barriers
   - Reward and circulate examples of people exercising initiative and discretion
   - Publicly and privately reward all levels of staff for taking informed risks
   - Show courage in taking informed risks yourself
4 Action Steps
Leading With the Brain in Mind

3. Routinize Learning
- Identify and normalize “breakdowns” as part of progress – not mistakes to be punished!
- Make learning a priority for you, your senior staff and work to stamp out “not invented here” thinking
- Model and promote humility as key to organizational success; celebrate requests for help versus self-sufficiency

4. Normalize Contention & Conflict
- Promote and train people to consistently surface issues to unblock the system
- Courageously model candor is a matter of personal integrity
- Create systems and leaders that expedites quality resolution – not perfection
- Model, hire for and promote diversity of thinking as a cultivated value
Additional Tool - Organizational Self Assessment
(Page 7 in your handout packet)

**Organizational Self – Assessment**

```
POWER
Do employees believe they have both influence and agency to impact organizational performance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are staff resigned and cynical; or do they believe in a larger possibility and have conviction that they can make a difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDENTITY
Do team members source appropriate identity from their role in the organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what degree do team members define themselves narrowly by profession, working team or functional unit instead of the organization as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTENTION and CONFLICT
How competent are people to handle adversity and differences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I’m right there in the room but no one ever acknowledges me”!