Transcript | How to Make Better Decisions

1
00:00:01.840 --> 00:00:26.330
Doug Hodgson: Hi, everyone. Hello! Good afternoon. Good morning. Wherever you are dialing into this event from. I'm just gonna give everybody a moment to filter through from the kind of backstage area before we get started in earnest. But I hope everyone is having a good day, and I can see our number of people in the room is ticking up, so I will get started. Hello! It's

2
00:00:26.450 --> 00:00:49.459
Doug Hodgson: very nice to be here today. Welcome to this event on how to make better decisions. My name is Doug Hodgson. I'm an event planner here at apolitical as ever at all our apolitical events. We like to hear who is in the room with us, so it'd be great to hear from you all post in the chat, if you can, where you're joining us from, and what organization you work for and points to the brave 1st poster on that one.

3
00:00:49.590 --> 00:01:08.310
Doug Hodgson: Today, we're going to be talking about one of the most integral elements of governments, and something that I am sure you all engage with every single day. It's decision making over the next hour we're going to be discussing how you can make your choices and the means by which you arrive at them, more considered, faster, and ultimately more effective

4
00:01:08.670 --> 00:01:31.620
Doug Hodgson: for those who may be joining us for the 1st time. A big welcome to you. All apolitical is a network and a learning platform for government used by over a quarter of a million public servants and policymakers from over the 160 countries, and that is going to probably be shown in the chats when I open it up in a moment. It's our mission is to help build 21st century governments that work for people and the planet.

5
00:01:31.640 --> 00:02:00.009
Doug Hodgson: We do this by putting the best knowledge and skills at the fingertips of public servants around the around the world. Just like you. So I can see that my chat has gone wild immediately. Hello, Brian, thank you for saying Hello! 1st from Ontario. Hello, Jill! From Hmrc. In the Uk. Hello, Alison, from natural resources, Canada. And I'm seeing lots of Uk and Canada in the chat, which is very nice. Good morning from New York.

6
00:02:01.180 --> 00:02:07.803

Doug Hodgson: Hello, Gemma! From Bath and north, east northeast. Somerset. That's where I'm from in the world, which is very nice to have you here.

7
00:02:08.080 --> 00:02:31.990
Doug Hodgson: no matter where you're from. It's really nice to have you on this call. Thank you for participating in this event. It's going to be a really exciting dynamic conversation about decision making today. So looking forward to hearing your questions a bit later on. I want to extend a special welcome to those of you who are already in apolitical life in government community. If you're not in the Forum. Yet we really want to extend an invitation to you to join today's speakers

8
00:02:31.990 --> 00:02:34.410
Doug Hodgson: and your peers across the global public service.

9
00:02:34.410 --> 00:03:01.910
Doug Hodgson: It's fair to say in my experience that sometimes the best decisions that you make are the ones where you've consulted and learned from the collective wisdom of others and your peers. And that's the purpose of this community. So it's a place to discuss any questions that you might have about working in government. You might want to share ideas, success, stories, or practical advice around the world. You should see a link to the community that has just popped up at the bottom of your screen.

10
00:03:02.231 --> 00:03:08.700
Doug Hodgson: You will also find a link that my colleague is posting in the chat. Now, which will take you to the community page

11
00:03:09.370 --> 00:03:30.269
Doug Hodgson: I'm going to get through a quick technical notes. Before we get into today's conversation. This event is being recorded for on demand viewing on the Apolitical website, please don't record it yourself. Contact details for privacy concerns are in the apolitical homepage footer. Closed captions are available and can be toggled off in your screen settings.

12
00:03:30.794 --> 00:03:54.180
Doug Hodgson: Fantastic. Let's get going. I want to start by hearing from you attendees first.st So we've got a couple of polls to get us started. The first, st and this should pop up on your screen. Automatically and let you vote. There it is. Which of the following do you find to be the greatest barrier to effective decision making in your organization.

13
00:03:54.860 --> 00:04:04.660
Doug Hodgson: Now, I'm gonna just give you a kind of moment of silence to answer that one and and let the let the answers roll in.

14
00:04:04.980 --> 00:04:08.059
Doug Hodgson: and then I will share the results in a second.

15
00:04:11.240 --> 00:04:13.220
Doug Hodgson: Okay, I can see that they're ticking up

16
00:04:16.230 --> 00:04:19.210
Doug Hodgson: interesting, interesting results already.

17
00:04:20.440 --> 00:04:22.389
Doug Hodgson: I'm going to share them now.

18
00:04:24.400 --> 00:04:25.430
Doug Hodgson: So

19
00:04:26.070 --> 00:04:34.929
Doug Hodgson: there is a kind of even split there that in in kind of tied 1st place, we've got conflicting stakeholder priorities and overly complex processes.

20
00:04:35.230 --> 00:04:46.970
Doug Hodgson: A close second is risk aversion, fear of failure. Some of you might want to kind of build your confidence around your approach. I'm hoping that we can do that. During today's conversation.

21
00:04:47.370 --> 00:05:09.689
Doug Hodgson: 13% of you are saying that you've got limited or unreliable data data is certainly important. We ran an event earlier today, all about building a data culture in government. So my data hat is still kind of on. So we can talk about that, too. A bit later. Second poll should be hitting your screens in a second. There it is.

22

00:05:09.860 --> 00:05:17.100
Doug Hodgson: How far do you agree with the following statement, I usually have enough time and space to think strategically about my work in government.

23
00:05:17.515 --> 00:05:22.400
Doug Hodgson: Again, I'll give you a moment. The answers are ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

24
00:05:22.876 --> 00:05:26.039
Doug Hodgson: This is just nice to get a snapshot from everybody

25
00:05:26.220 --> 00:05:28.899
Doug Hodgson: and speakers. I recommend that you take note.

26
00:05:34.000 --> 00:05:41.159
Doug Hodgson: Okay, okay, I'm surprised by this. So I'm just going to give it another second

27
00:05:43.430 --> 00:05:45.110
Doug Hodgson: and then we'll share them.

28
00:05:46.930 --> 00:05:49.170
Doug Hodgson: So what I'm seeing here is

29
00:05:50.520 --> 00:06:03.050
Doug Hodgson: 42% of you say I do have enough time and space to think strategically about my work in government. I'm happy to hear that thinking strategically is obviously incredibly important for making good decisions

30
00:06:03.380 --> 00:06:15.749
Doug Hodgson: kind of 22% are middling. Neither agree or disagree. I imagine this is a difficult question to answer. Consider like depending on where in the year you are, or what day you're answering it upon 28% of you

31
00:06:15.920 --> 00:06:21.130

Doug Hodgson: disagree, and some percent of you strongly disagree. So that's a pretty even spread.

32
00:06:21.696 --> 00:06:30.453
Doug Hodgson: Our final poll. And I'm going to ask you to post your answer to this one in the chat, if possible.

33
00:06:30.980 --> 00:06:46.079
Doug Hodgson: It is what single word describes your current team or departments approach to decision making. So this is a kind of thinking about not only yourself, but your peers. So I'm just going to wait for all of those answers to roll into the chat

34
00:06:48.880 --> 00:06:54.180
Doug Hodgson: siloed. Good one, Francine, that is interesting.

35
00:06:56.000 --> 00:07:03.599
Doug Hodgson: Rational from Luke hobbles from Emma. That's a good word. I like that. Collaborative from Paulo.

36
00:07:04.100 --> 00:07:07.570
Doug Hodgson: reactive from Michelle scattergun.

37
00:07:07.750 --> 00:07:09.589
Doug Hodgson: Messy flux

38
00:07:09.830 --> 00:07:27.225
Doug Hodgson: scrum. Okay? That's an interesting technique. I like that budget limited 2 words technically. But I'll allow it on this occasion. Okay, objectivity. So these are really interesting words ranging from the kind of more positively positive connotations, the more negative, proactive.

39
00:07:28.110 --> 00:07:52.339
Doug Hodgson: excellent. I'm happy to see some of these and some of the negative ones. I'm sure that by the end of this hour. Hopefully, we're going to have you giving some more feeling, more equipped to come back in the future with some some better words and better approaches

to making policy making to making decisions and and maybe policies. If you work in a policy role, that is enough. From me. So it's time for me to introduce our fantastic speakers for today.

40
00:07:52.884 --> 00:07:59.759
Doug Hodgson: We're fortunate to have 3 guests with us. Alexander Putio. Dr. Brooke struck, and Dr. Michelle Krieger

41
00:07:59.920 --> 00:08:20.339
Doug Hodgson: Michelle is a senior methods advisor at behavioral insights team Canada. She provides methodological support for mixed methods, evaluations and works across policy areas to apply behavioral insights to improve public decision making. Brooke is the founder and CEO of converge, through which he offers strategy, facilitation, services.

42
00:08:20.340 --> 00:08:38.079
Doug Hodgson: Previous to founding converge. He was the inaugural director of the Decision Lab, through which he's worked with public sector bodies, including the European Commission, the Us. National Science Foundation and the Government of Canada. Alexander works in the Department of Operational Support in the United Nations Secretariat.

43
00:08:38.080 --> 00:08:58.779
Doug Hodgson: He spent the past decade working with senior leaders in the UN Development system in improving their decision making in complex, organizational and operational settings. Welcome everybody. You can read our speakers full bios by visiting the resources tab at the bottom of your zoom screen and heading to the speakers section. If you want to find out a bit more

44
00:08:59.088 --> 00:09:09.269
Doug Hodgson: we're gonna kick off with an icebreaker, and as ever if you've been in a political event before, we invite everybody to share their answers as well in the chat. But

45
00:09:09.420 --> 00:09:29.229
Doug Hodgson: you'll have 30 seconds there or thereabouts guys to share your responses. So today is about decision making and making good decisions, I'm gonna turn that on on its head. And I'm gonna ask you what is the worst decision that you've ever made? And how did you come to make it? Which is a bit of a mean question. Brooke, you're on my screen. So I'm gonna I'm gonna come to you first.st

46

00:09:30.700 --> 00:09:40.542
Brooke Struck: Yeah. So thanks for giving us a a warm introduction, and thanks also for giving us a bit of a heads up about this question because it's a doozy

47
00:09:41.070 --> 00:09:52.949
Brooke Struck: I would say the worst decision. Well, actually, the worst decisions. Because I've made this bad decision more than once is seeing misalignment starting to take root in a team

48
00:09:53.120 --> 00:10:06.939
Brooke Struck: and deciding to have hope as a strategy that things would turn themselves around and prioritizing.

49
00:10:07.300 --> 00:10:27.089
Brooke Struck: you know, keeping the peace within teams and not having the courage to jump into productive conflict, to really address those growing misalignments. And ultimately, the longer I've let that run the harder it's been to try to bring things back later on. So the bad decision is not jumping early and not having that courage.

50
00:10:27.840 --> 00:10:38.909
Doug Hodgson: Excellent. Thank you, Brooke. That's honest. And and that's made me think that we're going to come to you for some of the confidence questions a bit later on. Should we have any Michelle you next? Please?

51
00:10:39.430 --> 00:10:44.460
Dr. Michelle Krieger: Thank you. So my my thinking on this was a bit

52
00:10:45.090 --> 00:11:07.319
Dr. Michelle Krieger: a bit less, a bit more reflective of my own life. So I think one of my least successful decisions. I was a much. I was a child and knew other children who all wanted dogs, and I had a friend. All they wanted was a dog, and I saved all of my money and bought them a dog.

53
00:11:07.990 --> 00:11:14.404
Dr. Michelle Krieger: which of, without understanding any of the ramifications or what that meant. And I just showed up with like a puppy.

54

00:11:14.930 --> 00:11:23.949
Dr. Michelle Krieger: and yeah it it. It wasn't wildly successful. And yeah. So I'll sort of ended there.

55
00:11:23.950 --> 00:11:35.549
Doug Hodgson: It's a very altruistic, almost romantic act. And and who wouldn't like a puppy, really? Come on, that's a good mistake in the grand scheme of things, I think.

56
00:11:36.330 --> 00:11:42.360
Doug Hodgson: excellent. Yeah, Alison is saying, you have a generous heart. I definitely agree, Alexander, over to you.

57
00:11:42.360 --> 00:12:10.219
Alexander Puutio: Indeed, more puppies to the world. That's a happy mistake. And hopefully it all worked out. And so, Doc, thank you and everyone. It's great great to be here with you. I'll continue on the personal line. So for me, one of the biggest mistakes in decision making I've made is avoiding a great decision because of emotional reasons. Having children, we started way too late. I have only 3 of them, and for the longest time in my life I felt like 0 is the zum

58
00:12:10.220 --> 00:12:30.750
Alexander Puutio: that I should go for, and once you have one, you realize I want all of them, and then Nature says it's too late, so that touches on something that I'm sure you'll hear from all 3 of us where there's a time for a decision you might not feel ready for it. But if you think of it not strategically, it's going to be one of the things I'll mention. Sometimes you also think about it emotionally, or you just throw yourself into these decisions. Some of them

59
00:12:30.750 --> 00:12:41.259
Alexander Puutio: feel horrible when you analyze them, but they are the greatest thing in your life when you jump into them. So this is exactly why decision making is hard. But that's Doug. My addition to this.

60
00:12:41.420 --> 00:12:52.470
Doug Hodgson: I love it. And yeah, that really getting getting to the kind of crux of the head V heart conundrum which doesn't just seem to impact decisions in your kind of professional life is

61
00:12:52.470 --> 00:13:15.950

Doug Hodgson: is my reflection on that. And I'm sure we'll come to that more later. Just so you're not alone, I mean, those were all very good ones. I was thinking that my biggest decision was taking some faulty investment advice from a friend during my student days, but I won't say any more about that now. I think that it's time that we go to some presentations. So each of our speakers have

62
00:13:16.427 --> 00:13:33.800
Doug Hodgson: the inenviable task of having to deliver a very quick lightning talk in 7 to 8 min. We've got 3 of them, so we'll we'll crack on immediately. Brooke, you're up first.st I'll give you a second to pull up your slide.

63
00:13:33.800 --> 00:13:34.140
Brooke Struck: Stuff.

64
00:13:34.140 --> 00:13:35.810
Doug Hodgson: Take it away when you're when you're ready.

65
00:13:36.230 --> 00:13:46.445
Brooke Struck: Yeah, thanks. And while I'm doing that, I will say I feel like I came up with the most boring and unheartfelt of all the bad decisions. So

66
00:13:47.240 --> 00:13:49.725
Brooke Struck: I'll have to give that some thought.

67
00:13:50.080 --> 00:13:51.560
Doug Hodgson: Anyway, you can share.

68
00:13:51.560 --> 00:13:52.490
Doug Hodgson: We're in the community.

69
00:13:52.490 --> 00:13:53.740
Brooke Struck: What I want to talk.

70
00:13:55.880 --> 00:13:57.340
Brooke Struck: Yeah, yeah, sure.

71
00:13:57.480 --> 00:14:14.939
Brooke Struck: So what I want to talk about is actually which decisions we decide to make and really thinking about problem framing. This actually has a long history in my work, and it is ultimately what led me to found converge and to focus on transformation rather than implementation.

72
00:14:15.000 --> 00:14:30.700
Brooke Struck: In my experience, implementation is usually quite strong, and when projects or programs or initiatives have failed. Often what I've seen is that the problem framing way way upstream was actually the major culprit in this. And so that's what I want to focus on with you today.

73
00:14:30.890 --> 00:15:00.750
Brooke Struck: And so there are a couple of things that I want to talk about. The 1st is that framing around inception, you know, when you're thinking about making a decision working to make sure that you are not just opting for the right option, or making the right choice, but actually answering the right question or solving the right problem. And so there are some provocations that I found really really effective in my work to help people to kind of like.

74
00:15:00.880 --> 00:15:07.930
Brooke Struck: come back down to earth and think about this and the 1st one there is. What if we change nothing at all?

75
00:15:08.340 --> 00:15:11.949
Brooke Struck: Where do we reasonably expect that we would end up?

76
00:15:12.150 --> 00:15:33.040
Brooke Struck: And one thing that I'll mention is that I usually do this as a team exercise. And so it's really interesting to see the range of different predictions that people give about where we might end up if we just stuck with the present course. So that's you know, to pick up on the head and heart elements that were already raised a moment ago

77
00:15:33.040 --> 00:15:45.690
Brooke Struck: like this is very much a head question. Where do we anticipate? Where do we predict we would go down the current trajectory. And then the second part is, what about that situation is not acceptable?

78
00:15:45.700 --> 00:16:00.449
Brooke Struck: Why is it not okay to end up in those places? And it's really important to frame that as what is not okay about this, and not just the binary question of is this okay or not? Because it's in exploring the shortcomings of where we think we're going, or

79
00:16:00.450 --> 00:16:23.710
Brooke Struck: perhaps where we are right now that we will understand the different facets of the problem that we want to cobble together, and how we want to prioritize those. So that for me is very much the heart piece. There is no objective fact of the matter about whether a situation down the road is okay or not, devoid of certain value judgments that we're bringing into things.

80
00:16:23.710 --> 00:16:34.730
Brooke Struck: I think often we try to over rationalize, especially strategy processes. We want them to be kind of hyper, rationalized and like, almost

81
00:16:35.090 --> 00:16:43.200
Brooke Struck: kind of aseptic in how calculated they are. But we can't get around the reality that values need to come into this. So

82
00:16:43.210 --> 00:17:02.490
Brooke Struck: having those questions in my back pocket has been helpful at the precipice of leaping into making a decision to make sure that we're really framing that up in the right way. There are also a few things from a behavioral perspective that I want to bring in here, and that's effectively covering off blind spots and building buy-in around the framing of a problem

83
00:17:02.490 --> 00:17:18.419
Brooke Struck: in terms of covering off blind spots. I find it really helpful to bring in different frameworks and taxonomies and these kinds of things to say, okay, you know, we've started to chart out what initially comes to mind for people in terms of what's not okay about this situation or where we might be going.

84
00:17:18.470 --> 00:17:47.020
Brooke Struck: Now that we've got those initial thoughts on the table. Let's flesh it out with something like a pestil framework. So there, you're going to get into the political, economic, social, technological, environmental, and legal aspects of a decision. And what we can do there is start to say, okay, when we were initially mapping it out. Now let's start to sort it into these

categories, and what we'll start to see is that there are certain blind spots. There are categories that we hadn't thought about before. Now let's actively push our minds into those directions. What are

85
00:17:47.020 --> 00:18:11.880
Brooke Struck: our predictions, and what are our value judgments about that? I also find it really important to do this as a team. That's especially about the buy-in aspect. When people feel that they've participated in framing a problem and participated in designing a solution, they feel much more of a sense of ownership over it, and so they are therefore much more like motivated to participate in being part of the solution rather than being part of a complacent mass that you need to drag along behind you.

86
00:18:13.240 --> 00:18:36.860
Brooke Struck: And in doing that it's important to involve leaders, of course, and also leaders without titles. Those are the people who are looked to in an organization, people that others see as influential voices, people who are aware of what's going on across the organization forming that team is really important to make sure that we have a good range of perspectives as well as kind of the

87
00:18:36.860 --> 00:19:03.680
Brooke Struck: small P political capital that we'll need to actually move forward with those things. So that's at the problem framing stage. And then there's a second piece, which is as we start to converge on a solution, and I realize I've skipped all the way over that process of how do we arrive at solutions? In the 1st place, you'll have to forgive me. 8 min is not actually all that much. So once you start converging on a solution, just using a couple of things to help pressure test that.

88
00:19:03.680 --> 00:19:31.229
Brooke Struck: And the 1st is, if we took this road, which other roads could we not take so often? There are these trade-offs, and I think, Michelle, you'll be talking about those trade-offs, right? So if we want to be thinking about breadth of engagement versus speed, like as we're converging on a solution saying, Okay, the solution that we're looking at is really leaning very hard in the speed direction. What is that going to preclude in terms of potential options?

89
00:19:31.250 --> 00:19:49.850
Brooke Struck: So that's what I talk about as strategic opportunity cost. And then there's just resource opportunity cost as we start to cost it out and say it's going to cost. You know, X number of dollars. It's going to take this Fte. And you know these materials. One of the questions I love to ask is, okay, put aside everything that we've been talking about.

90
00:19:49.920 --> 00:19:58.620
Brooke Struck: If I were willing to write you a blank check to do anything whatsoever that's within your power to do, and you had those resources to do it.

91
00:19:58.680 --> 00:20:18.670
Brooke Struck: How confident are you that what what solution we're talking about right now is actually the best use of these resources. And sometimes that turns up really interesting things where you know, we, we come back to a different discussion and say, Hold on. We've been. We've been really thinking about this wrong. There's actually a much bigger opportunity here that wasn't in our

92
00:20:18.670 --> 00:20:45.629
Brooke Struck: field of view, because we hadn't really come around to the perspective of how big we were thinking about this and sometimes how small we're thinking about it. Sometimes we have this kind of disequilibrium between the size of the perception of the problem. And then the resources that we have to work with. And we say, actually, these resources won't really move the needle on that problem very much. But with these resources that we have, there's actually another problem that we can tackle really well. And sometimes it's better to solve a different problem

93
00:20:45.630 --> 00:20:53.180
Brooke Struck: more effectively than to just start chipping away, but ultimately be ineffective on something that's too big.

94
00:20:53.920 --> 00:21:22.580
Brooke Struck: And the last thing is a pre-mortem exercise, which is a favorite of mine, and sadistically, clients of mine also find this the most enjoyable and cathartic part of many of my engagements. Basically, I'm sure you all know what a postmortem is. You know everything's gone terribly, and you sit around a table hanging your head and asking why or why things had to play out. The way that they have a pre-mortem is essentially the same thing, except you hold it before you've even started.

95
00:21:22.580 --> 00:21:29.419
Brooke Struck: And so this is very much like a creativity and narrative driven exercise. Where we say, let's imagine that we are all

96

00:21:30.400 --> 00:21:40.160
Brooke Struck: really excited about this solution, and 18 or 24, or 36 months down the road. Here we all are sitting at this table.

97
00:21:40.570 --> 00:21:49.030
Brooke Struck: and it is just total, Armageddon unfolding around us. Everything has gone terribly.

98
00:21:49.720 --> 00:21:52.990
Brooke Struck: Describe that Armageddon scenario to me.

99
00:21:53.180 --> 00:22:17.159
Brooke Struck: And again, we can start to fill that out with the framework of like, what are the political, you know, which political bombs are dropping? What are the economic implications of this, the social, technological, etc, and start to map out a whole bunch of scenarios that we wish to avoid, prioritize those, and then say, Okay, I want you to imagine that you're still in that same setting 18 months down the road, and you know.

100
00:22:17.280 --> 00:22:40.440
Brooke Struck: wring your hands and say, why, oh, why, if only I'd known something, you know, if only I'd known this was coming! There was something that happened in the 1st week or the 1st month of this project that was the canary in the coal mine, and at the time I did everything that I needed to do to discount it. I applied my strategy of hope rather than actually dealing with the problem.

101
00:22:40.530 --> 00:22:58.379
Brooke Struck: and because I didn't deal with it because I misreacted and discounted this early signal things just kept getting worse and worse, and as that snowball started to roll down the hill it picked up too much steam, and at a certain point it was just too late to stop this, or to really recover and and get the outcomes that we were looking for.

102
00:22:58.550 --> 00:23:22.479
Brooke Struck: The thing that's helpful about that. Is that essentially what we end up doing there is putting together our list of early indicators of risk that we're going to be monitoring as well as some of the kind of thresholds. If you think about a dashboard, it's like, what are the lights going to be, and what are the points beyond which those lights are going to start flashing red. That's what this exercise is about, and it helps us to make sure that we are ready

103
00:23:22.480 --> 00:23:32.910
Brooke Struck: to monitor the world around us and see how it's unfolding differently than we had anticipated, so that we can take corrective action early on.

104
00:23:34.960 --> 00:23:39.523
Brooke Struck: So there, I'm gonna I don't know if that was 8 min, but I'm just gonna call up there, and

105
00:23:39.980 --> 00:24:05.290
Doug Hodgson: Almost bang on Brooke. Thank you. That was fantastic, and a great way to kick us off, and I appreciate that we we force you to skip over the kind of verging on solutions elements. So I encourage everybody to get their questions into the chat. If you want to talk to Brooke around how you converge on on those solutions that he was talking about. Then let's cover it in Q&A. But let's switch things over to Michelle. You're up next.

106
00:24:05.803 --> 00:24:11.810
Doug Hodgson: I will give you a second to pull up. I know you got a slide as well. That looks great. Thanks, Michelle.

107
00:24:13.760 --> 00:24:22.102
Dr. Michelle Krieger: 1st it's the slide, then it's the unmute. Okay, alright. So that was, that was very interesting. Thank you.

108
00:24:23.020 --> 00:24:24.530
Dr. Michelle Krieger: for for that.

109
00:24:24.900 --> 00:24:39.500
Dr. Michelle Krieger: Brooke I and I I think this I think, as you mentioned I think this will follow. Well, because you mentioned I'll be talking about some of those trade offs and thinking through navigating more complex choice environments. So

110
00:24:40.768 --> 00:25:06.240
Dr. Michelle Krieger: at. So at the heart of any decision that we make is, you know, considering the issue. Thinking about what we know, what we don't know, weighing options and coming to some conclusion or recommendation about sort of the best path forward and I've highlighted

several trade offs that come up in public service very often, but I think it's important to note that trade-offs are present in

111
00:25:06.240 --> 00:25:17.640
Dr. Michelle Krieger: sort of all aspects of this process. So how we consider evidence which evidence we are paying more or less attention to what are the implications of, you know a versus B.

112
00:25:18.666 --> 00:25:28.413
Dr. Michelle Krieger: So what I'll do is I'll just quickly walk through some of the the key trade offs that I was thinking about when I was putting these strategies together, and then some ideas for

113
00:25:29.200 --> 00:25:36.040
Dr. Michelle Krieger: ways to sort of address, or think through some of these trade-offs within your within a public service context.

114
00:25:36.634 --> 00:26:02.890
Dr. Michelle Krieger: So the first, st I think, is the classic trade off, particularly in in fiscally constrained environments, or is is impact versus efficiency. So we want to make sure that everything we're doing has has an impact. And this this also includes all of like making sure our solutions are equitable. Balancing that with efficiency. So cost savings value for money are always at the forefront.

115
00:26:04.173 --> 00:26:27.190
Dr. Michelle Krieger: Short term versus long term decisions. I think this is is also pretty classic. Some of the tasks that we have to do in government are, you know, just necessitate long term planning. So transit transportation, infrastructure projects. But often. We're working in these shorter term environments because of the nature of our political systems.

116
00:26:27.668 --> 00:26:48.889
Dr. Michelle Krieger: And and I think the the last trade off that that's a little hard to navigate is government intervention versus policy impact. So basically, here. It's it's what is the role of what should the role of government be in in sort of daily life? Versus. We can be very effective if

117
00:26:49.410 --> 00:26:53.139
Dr. Michelle Krieger: we're willing to step in more or less in people's daily lives.

118
00:26:54.740 --> 00:27:13.139
Dr. Michelle Krieger: so I think, cross cutting a lot of how we navigate or approach. A lot of these risk is always at the forefront of government decision making. So I think in a risk, averse culture, it can be hard to tackle new problems and take novel approaches.

119
00:27:13.640 --> 00:27:15.312
Dr. Michelle Krieger: So I think,

120
00:27:17.350 --> 00:27:44.860
Dr. Michelle Krieger: one of the key pieces is to examine sort of what our inputs are at all stages of the process and and have a concerted effort to broaden, basically broaden our inputs. So often, the 1st thing we do when we start to gather evidence is to look at what is to do? Jurisdictional scan, what is everybody else doing? And because if we can point to another district and say, Well, it worked over there.

121
00:27:45.790 --> 00:27:57.611
Dr. Michelle Krieger: you know you can get more support for that. But I think that is the enemy of of innovation, and sometimes more innovative solutions. Things that have less evidence behind them, or

122
00:27:58.190 --> 00:28:02.469
Dr. Michelle Krieger: haven't been done, or might or might not work at all can be, can be a very hard sell.

123
00:28:02.830 --> 00:28:03.790
Dr. Michelle Krieger: So

124
00:28:03.910 --> 00:28:13.240
Dr. Michelle Krieger: when there is opportunity, either in how we early on, in how we sort of define the problem or in how we

125
00:28:13.350 --> 00:28:39.589
Dr. Michelle Krieger: look at our approaches, consider bringing in different streams of evidence. So can we start looking at qualitative approaches? Can we actually involve users? So bring in some of the solutions that are used more often in the, in the private sphere sort of user testing

and and piloting things. And consider those in in a public space. Can we? You know, what other information can can we look at?

126
00:28:41.990 --> 00:29:07.279
Dr. Michelle Krieger: I think part of this would be thinking about the role of continuous evaluation. Throughout the process. So how can we? You know, building in a series of like checks and balances opportunities to kind of get a pulse on. If what we're doing is is acceptable, is it working? And then really also turning that lens inward, so evaluating our our internal processes working as well.

127
00:29:08.881 --> 00:29:25.848
Dr. Michelle Krieger: I think, for short term long term. This is a very tricky A tricky issue. I also related to evaluation is building in opportunities for short term wins. So are there outcome indicators or

128
00:29:26.620 --> 00:29:47.590
Dr. Michelle Krieger: early early metrics that we can build into the solutions that we're designing or the decisions that we're approaching. That would allow us to to present short term wins. So maybe it's an easier sell to someone who is is going to be making the ultimate decision. If you can sort of demonstrate that that we will have short term wins in this longer term

129
00:29:47.840 --> 00:30:14.269
Dr. Michelle Krieger: longer term thing, we're trying to accomplish when we're sort of framing different answer options or trade offs up to decision makers and and things like that. Also you could. It goes back to framing. So making the longer term outcomes more salient, making them more concrete to people. Helping people really visualize what that looks like. I think if people can connect to it, it may be an easier sell in some ways.

130
00:30:14.700 --> 00:30:16.372
Dr. Michelle Krieger: And I think

131
00:30:17.160 --> 00:30:40.409
Dr. Michelle Krieger: when we're helping other people, senior leadership make better decisions. A key piece of this is how we, how we present information about the trade offs and different options, how we're making our recommendations. So consider, also how we're how we frame our our different options, the different inputs. So for example, highlighting

132

00:30:41.050 --> 00:31:02.989
Dr. Michelle Krieger: highlighting things in terms of gains, or can help people not downplay the risk, but have an appreciation for what success would look like. So, for example, instead of saying that this would. We're reducing something. Talk about it in terms of what we would gain. What the lives we could save to help shift people's perspectives.

133
00:31:04.560 --> 00:31:07.570
Dr. Michelle Krieger: I think I will sort of pause

134
00:31:07.750 --> 00:31:13.909
Dr. Michelle Krieger: there. On the on the sort of the topic of framing, I think, in in the interest of time

135
00:31:15.700 --> 00:31:16.430
Dr. Michelle Krieger: and then.

136
00:31:16.430 --> 00:31:33.521
Doug Hodgson: Thanks. Thanks, Michelle. That's that is I think we'll we'll hand it over to Alexander next, and we let's return to these questions in Q, and a. Like to encourage everybody to to get stuck in in in the Q&A box, if possible, to submit your questions. But

137
00:31:33.880 --> 00:31:47.560
Doug Hodgson: really interesting to talk about trade-offs, and it's such a integral question, especially in public service. And I appreciate your insight about like having to display short term gains. I think that that is.

138
00:31:47.720 --> 00:31:59.520
Doug Hodgson: that is something that is often lost in everybody's search for long termism, which is obviously laudable, but but short term gains matter as well, and helping getting things done.

139
00:31:59.520 --> 00:32:18.030
Doug Hodgson: So I really like that insight. Alexander, you are last, but no, by no means least. And full disclosure. Somebody pulled Alexander's offices fire alarm just before joining, so he is very kindly joined on his phone. I am going to pull up his slides for us.

140
00:32:18.620 --> 00:32:19.210

Doug Hodgson: and.

141
00:32:19.210 --> 00:32:27.160
Alexander Puutio: Thank you. So in terms of better decisions, indeed! Perhaps book, a home office, or something else for an important webinar.

142
00:32:27.300 --> 00:32:51.039
Alexander Puutio: Here we are. And, Doug, while you pull up the slide, you'll see it's my attempt to survive with the task I have here, which is, you know, speak! After 2 incredibly insightful interventions. It's always a challenge, and I'm happy to attempt my best version of trying to kind of summarize what you've heard from Brooke and Michelle, and I've learned quite a lot every time

143
00:32:51.040 --> 00:33:14.970
Alexander Puutio: you participate in these engagements, regardless of how long you've been in the world of decision making or reflection of it. There's something you always learn from someone, as if you just come here and listen, which I just looked at the bottom of my screen. 249 of you have. So that's the to take you through my very simplistic attempt at summarizing things. I also want to pitch this as a bit of an invitation.

144
00:33:14.980 --> 00:33:32.220
Alexander Puutio: So I have lived a life both examined and unexamined, and sometimes I reflect, sometimes I don't, and one of the best choices I made some time ago was start to think about choices. And really, that is the big invitation I want to leave with you as the summation of things. You've heard

145
00:33:32.220 --> 00:33:46.159
Alexander Puutio: 2 wonderful experts thus far, and you know they could have spoken for hours on any of the bullet points you just heard. There's boot camps, apolitical offers you all types of courses. There's or Sarah courses books upon books. You could pick

146
00:33:46.160 --> 00:34:05.200
Alexander Puutio: Adam Grant's think again, or Jonathan haids any book, and you'll you'll be in the wonderful world of of moral ethical decision making. There's supply chain making books. This is an endless buffet of things for you to dive into. So you know, I we told you the worst choice we made. So in this context, you know, obviously buttering up

147

00:34:05.200 --> 00:34:19.769
Alexander Puutio: Doug and everyone else a bit. I think my best choice, in addition to making the kids was to actually start reflecting on choices. Because that's once you actually take this and you'll see I have 2 other pictures for you here as the science and emotion, the science and feeling of of decision making.

148
00:34:19.770 --> 00:34:38.649
Alexander Puutio: Everything you do is going to get not necessarily optimized, but at least reflected. And there's a chance that you make indeed, better decisions. So we heard, you know, very tangible, technical. All of those things I validate fully, and we could, you know again, if we could have, maybe in the Q. And A. We will, you know. You'll hear Brooke tell examples of how this works, and it saves millions. Or

149
00:34:38.650 --> 00:34:57.770
Alexander Puutio: you know, Michelle will tell about an example of applying even one of these tidbits, and it saves a marriage, or makes you go a different route that fulfills you. So again, the best choice really is to approach this invitation with open curiosity. What does better decision making look like it doesn't make the best decision making. I know some people. Sometimes

150
00:34:57.770 --> 00:35:18.110
Alexander Puutio: I kind of get analysis, paralysis, or the fear of even starting, and many of you are. You know where you are, because maybe there's a bit of a perfectionist in you. I saw some of your titles, so you haven't exactly made poor decisions as you've climbed up the ladder to get where you are. But I invite you, I said truly to continue, it's not just this course. It's not just this webinar.

151
00:35:18.110 --> 00:35:32.659
Alexander Puutio: It's not just the books, but really, continuously reflect. And you saw that in the previous slide as well, taking on both the science and emotion. And so then, going back to the personal worth decision I made. So I'll tell you. There I was a bit of what Adam Grant and some other people call a logic bully.

152
00:35:32.700 --> 00:36:01.289
Alexander Puutio: Right? So sometimes you'll see very important decisions not being made or being made suboptimal to a future version of you reflecting back. So I said, now that I look back, I wish I would have done it earlier, but at the time it made logical sense to me, because I was thinking I was in the realm of science, and I was explaining these things to myself. And maybe you've done this once or twice in your life where it doesn't make rational sense, or the numbers

don't make it make sense, or you're missing a data point that it's just. You can't make that logical jump.

153
00:36:01.290 --> 00:36:22.480
Alexander Puutio: And sometimes that's exactly what we want to do. And oftentimes now we're in the public sphere. That's exactly what we have to do. We are stuck in the science, the rigor, the analysis. But again, we're all in the public sphere. So you know, sometimes the immediately obvious right thing to do doesn't arise from the science of it. It doesn't arise from the numbers of it.

154
00:36:22.480 --> 00:36:48.700
Alexander Puutio: It doesn't come from the missing number of X and Y, and I can't give you the exact details. But in one of the organizations where I supported the most senior leader there were life and death decisions deferred for months because of a certain number just not being there, and ultimately, 3 months later, the decision was made exactly like it was proposed 3 months earlier, but only after 3 staff members had died.

155
00:36:48.780 --> 00:36:58.100
Alexander Puutio: because the decision was not made and the decision was the exact same we proposed 3 months earlier could have been made. But just because we were stuck in the science of decision making.

156
00:36:58.390 --> 00:37:17.749
Alexander Puutio: And perhaps, you know, we've talked about risk aversion. And and you, many of you raised other reasons why decisions aren't making being made. And so, Doug, I'll go back to what you saw in the poll. We have time. Sometimes we're too strategic about it. Sometimes we are risk, averse and strategic. And that gets you to a point where you know, for example, in Michelle's slides, the trade-offs aren't being traded off.

157
00:37:17.790 --> 00:37:29.319
Alexander Puutio: So when we talk about trade-offs, let's go to the right for the last thing, and I know I'm standing between Q&A and someone's dinner here. So I'll be, you know, promptly concluding after this. But you know the trade-offs are meant to be traded off.

158
00:37:29.490 --> 00:37:48.839
Alexander Puutio: The trade-offs are not meant to just be listed, and you to analytically say, Well, if I do this, I do that if I do that I miss this. No, you do a trade off, and for you to be able to

pull the trigger on a trade-off. Emotion has to come in at some point with the kids, you know, with building a hospital for or with with jumping into AI. Whatever it is.

159
00:37:48.840 --> 00:38:14.929
Alexander Puutio: the emotions do never do not neglect them. They are such a pivotal part of decision making. And I said, I implore you to jump deeply into this indication and explore. If you feel like you've been in the strategy and the science part of it go into the emotions. If you feel like you've been in the emotion parts go into the AI of decision making the algorithms all of this. And just continue, you know, being obviously come to all of our webinars. These are wonderful things that a political host for us talk about. You know

160
00:38:14.930 --> 00:38:41.910
Alexander Puutio: your decisions openly with with your neighbors, with your boss, with your partners, and and start exploring and reflecting on where are you indexing? And and perhaps where do you need need the help in making a better decision? Sometimes we can't get ourselves unstuck. Sometimes you have to come to a webinar like this for one of us to unstuck ourselves whether it's you by talking, or you by listening so. Doug, that is my firebrand speech before the Q. And a.

161
00:38:42.500 --> 00:38:51.543
Doug Hodgson: Brilliant. Thank you, Alex, and that's I don't know. Just a really nice way to to round off this section of just really humanizing

162
00:38:52.260 --> 00:39:10.919
Doug Hodgson: decision making. It's a very human process, and and emotions are very important. I think every everybody that works in the in public service is motivated to some degree by emotion, because they want to do things for others. So yeah, thank you. I applaud you. There's lots of people applauding you in in the chat there.

163
00:39:11.230 --> 00:39:36.219
Doug Hodgson: for that aspect. So let's turn to Q. And a. Shortly. I encourage everybody to continue sharing your questions for our decision, making gurus. I'm going to say we had lots pre-submitted. I would like to get a mix of some live ones in there as well, if possible. Please share them in the Q. And a box that you'll see at the bottom of your screen rather than in the chat. It just makes them easier to kind

164
00:39:36.220 --> 00:40:04.429

Doug Hodgson: of track and keep track of which ones I have asked. I'll give you a moment to type up some questions whilst you're doing that. I want to remind or make some of you aware, perhaps for the 1st time, that we have a community. We have lots of communities on apolitical. I mentioned life in government earlier. We also have another one which is called long term governance and futures. Thinking some of you might already be members for those who aren't. This is a community for

165
00:40:04.430 --> 00:40:28.440
Doug Hodgson: it's collaboration. It's a space designed for apolitical members to connect with their peers in the global public service, to ask and answer questions on how to make things like a watertight, future-proof decision in governments. We do want some long term thinking, I think, that that will address a lot of problems that we see today. This community is all about that. It's about long term governance futures. Thinking again, it's in the chat. There is a link now that will take you to the page.

166
00:40:28.774 --> 00:40:40.659
Doug Hodgson: If you have any questions that we don't get to during this event, then I encourage you to join the community and post them in there, and we'll we'll get some excellent kind of crowdsourced answers for you hopefully.

167
00:40:41.980 --> 00:40:46.900
Doug Hodgson: I'm going to turn to Q. And a now, and there is a

168
00:40:47.190 --> 00:41:01.340
Doug Hodgson: great question to kick off from Gareth. Actually, I really like this one. What books I can ask, all of all of you this question. What books on the subject of decision making would you recommend.

169
00:41:01.850 --> 00:41:04.410
Doug Hodgson: Brooke? I'm going to come to you first.st

170
00:41:05.150 --> 00:41:12.949
Brooke Struck: Yeah, actually, one of the the books that I read recently that has really been influential in my thinking.

171
00:41:13.130 --> 00:41:15.950
Brooke Struck: I believe the title is how big things get done.

172
00:41:16.120 --> 00:41:40.079
Brooke Struck: and one of the major insights that came out of there that for me was revelatory was when we encounter during an implementation phase. When we encounter early delays, we often think that what we're getting from the world is information about our execution, information about our implementation, and we say we need to do something to fix the implementation, to get it to match the plan.

173
00:41:40.080 --> 00:41:50.899
Brooke Struck: And the author just flips that on its head and says, actually what you are most likely getting is information about the world showing you that the predictions or the estimates in your plan were off

174
00:41:50.920 --> 00:42:07.989
Brooke Struck: as in. If the 1st 2 steps of the project take you twice as long as they were supposed to. That's probably because your plan is kind of too small by a factor of 2, not because you are not executing hard enough. So that was a big one for me. I've got a long list of these things. I love books on decision making. But I'll stop there for now.

175
00:42:08.300 --> 00:42:34.129
Doug Hodgson: Nice one. Well, we'll ensure that we note these down and post links to them on the post event page, which is where you'll also find the recording for this session any other resources that are shared from this point onwards we'll note them down, so don't feel like you have to scribble, scribble away on your pen and paper if you're dialed in from the office, Michelle, I'm going to come to you next. Any books on this subject that have helped inform your thinking.

176
00:42:34.470 --> 00:42:54.489
Dr. Michelle Krieger: Yeah, this is less focused on decision making and more about applying evidence and research in like, team behavior change challenges. But I think it's a newer box. So behavior behavioral science in the wild is is really I I really enjoy it. I I'd recommend it. It's yeah.

177
00:42:55.140 --> 00:42:55.550
Doug Hodgson: Thanks.

178
00:42:55.550 --> 00:42:57.510
Dr. Michelle Krieger: Coming out of the University of Toronto.

179
00:42:58.090 --> 00:43:00.280
Doug Hodgson: Nice Alexander, you next.

180
00:43:00.280 --> 00:43:20.260
Alexander Puutio: Yes, oh, wonderful! So, in addition to the ones I just mentioned, anything by Kastenstein nudge you should everyone who's in modern bureaucracies, you I absolutely have to go and read about nudges and sludges and sludge audits. Then I would also invite you to reflect a little bit about on the private sector, so I found it

181
00:43:20.260 --> 00:43:44.769
Alexander Puutio: helpful to be dangerous in the language of the private sector while being in the service of the public sector. Right? So you don't absorb all the worst parts, but you know what they're doing. So, for example, Lisa Baudel killed a company. I invite everyone to read that a wonderful wonderful book. And then the best recommendation I've received ever is this simple sabotage field manual. It's a supposedly a CIA book.

182
00:43:45.054 --> 00:44:07.250
Alexander Puutio: It's it's a couple of dollars on Amazon, and it, for example, has this wonderful tidbit that if you're stuck in, the enemy has taken over your country and you're stuck under their administration. Try to hold as many meetings as possible, and make them as uneventful and unhelpful. So I was like, Oh, my God, this isn't this every meeting I've ever been to. How did my boss read? This is what is this where I am?

183
00:44:07.250 --> 00:44:16.170
Alexander Puutio: So I said, simple sabotage field manual. You're going to have a laugh once you go for it, and maybe reflect on how you attempt to make decisions and don't follow that manual. Perhaps.

184
00:44:16.330 --> 00:44:37.150
Doug Hodgson: I've never thought that we would be recommended a CIA manual as part of a kind of a political reading list. But there you are very good. Thank you for that. Some home reading for everyone. I'm going to ask this question, and I'll throw this out. If any of you have any strong feelings, just take them straight away. This one's from Khalid

185
00:44:37.150 --> 00:44:48.810

Doug Hodgson: and Khalid says, perhaps more about influencing. But what strategies or approaches have worked for the panel in convincing others of a risky decision that could be made, taking on risk.

186
00:44:49.202 --> 00:44:54.360
Doug Hodgson: and kind of managing upwards a confluence of the both. Anybody got any thoughts on this.

187
00:44:58.180 --> 00:45:02.646
Brooke Struck: Yeah, I'll I'll dive in there. One of the things that

188
00:45:03.390 --> 00:45:09.430
Brooke Struck: that I take very seriously is I no longer try to convince anyone of anything anymore.

189
00:45:10.029 --> 00:45:16.100
Brooke Struck: And you know part of that in terms of managing upward and getting people to take on more risk

190
00:45:16.140 --> 00:45:29.689
Brooke Struck: is asking them what it is that they're actually looking to achieve and what they're looking to accomplish and actually facilitating them through a process of helping them to understand what it is that they need coming out of a decision.

191
00:45:29.710 --> 00:45:48.199
Brooke Struck: So in that process I have an opportunity to learn more about what kinds of decisions they will actually say yes to. I have an opportunity to improve their decision making, because I'm providing this like scaffolding to help them be really clear about the choice that they're looking to make.

192
00:45:48.410 --> 00:46:08.429
Brooke Struck: And I also have the opportunity in that process to build a ton of buy-in behind the decision that ultimately gets made and what ends up happening in that process is that generally, if I'm sitting down at the table with somebody else who doesn't already agree with me, it's not that I'm

193

00:46:08.510 --> 00:46:33.589
Brooke Struck: kind of washing my, you know my decision, or my preferences, or my perspective over them. Nor is their perspective completely, you know, like washing over me. But actually we're arriving someplace in the middle, that someplace in the middle tends to be better than the starting point that either of us was coming from, and it's 1 that we can both get behind. So that's for the managing up piece, and just very quickly on risk

194
00:46:33.590 --> 00:46:52.020
Brooke Struck: exploring the dimensions of risk and like which risks people are willing to take on and which they're not, and why and how we humanly feel about risk and how we're going to kind of manage our mindset through the course of a risky action that's inside of the container of this kind of facilitation.

195
00:46:53.000 --> 00:46:54.020
Doug Hodgson: He broke.

196
00:46:54.526 --> 00:47:13.473
Doug Hodgson: I've got a couple of questions that have been pre-submitted here that I want to ask you, Michelle, on with with your hat on as a kind of behavioral psychologist or working with the behavioral insights team. There's 2 questions, and and they're not necessarily connected. But I'll give them both to you, and you can take on which which one you like more.

197
00:47:14.040 --> 00:47:42.619
Doug Hodgson: The 1st is, if the expected data is unavailable, does lateral thinking help. I imagine that you know, in your, in your, in your role at bit, that data is a pretty big thing. And so they're asking, what do you do. If the data is not available. There's another question which is on methods of public engagement, because I know that you work on public projects, that obviously decisions. Often when you're working in government need to get buy-in from the public, so

198
00:47:42.760 --> 00:47:44.749
Doug Hodgson: do any of those questions speak to you.

199
00:47:46.131 --> 00:47:50.459
Dr. Michelle Krieger: I think. We'll start with the data piece I think,

200
00:47:50.970 --> 00:48:13.480

Dr. Michelle Krieger: being a researcher, it's it's a little quicker to come to mind? So even so, so, data data is always the issue. If it's often data is unavailable or it doesn't contain what we need, or it's very messy or even if it's available, there could be issues with quality. I think the issue of

201
00:48:13.660 --> 00:48:28.729
Dr. Michelle Krieger: does the lateral data help? I think anything helps you answer sort of build evidence towards answering a question coming up with hypotheses or a potential path. Often, if evidence is not available.

202
00:48:29.160 --> 00:48:47.030
Dr. Michelle Krieger: we'll start to go broad, and sometimes we'll go broad to other jurisdictions that are similar, or are similar in key ways, to see if there's anything, any evidence that exists, or any. So it may not be data, but it could be some form of evidence that can help inform our thinking and our decisions.

203
00:48:47.090 --> 00:49:04.739
Dr. Michelle Krieger: The other piece is. Sometimes we'll do a leap to an area that's more related theoretically. So if we're looking at sort of building out career services and like, what's the what's the next move? How we provide this service to, you know with to the public?

204
00:49:05.160 --> 00:49:29.529
Dr. Michelle Krieger: are there other models of service delivery that operate in other arms of government that may have data that speak to a common theory of change or something that's core to the question that you're trying to answer or the decision you're trying to make? So we we definitely do do those leaps. But you know again, with with putting a lot of caveats to it, and explaining sort of where that so what's behind all of that thinking and making it very transparent.

205
00:49:30.940 --> 00:49:40.490
Doug Hodgson: Thanks, Michelle. Yeah, I think that maybe extrapolation is probably too strong a word. But but government is full of data. Make use of it kind of transfer.

206
00:49:41.170 --> 00:49:46.409
Doug Hodgson: impose it upon some other scenarios. Test. That hypothesis is nice. Nice advice.

207
00:49:47.900 --> 00:50:10.000

Doug Hodgson: this is a question that's got a few Upvotes. So I'm going to pose this one. And and Alex, I'm gonna send it to you because it kind of speaks to your presentation. It's from Dana Dana. I'm sorry if I've mispronounced your name, they say. How do you overcome fear of negative emotions to make the best decisions, kind of unleash yourself, get out of your own way.

208
00:50:10.000 --> 00:50:30.879
Alexander Puutio: I love that. Yes, I was. I was hoping I get that so you know, I'd say we flipped this immediately around. So the more you look at the psychology of decision making. And and the the more you think of your your brain and your organization as multiple sources of inputs that converge to through a filter into one decision, which is, you know.

209
00:50:30.880 --> 00:50:43.010
Alexander Puutio: But I'm sure Michelle and others could actually speak to you from a scientific perspective. But that's how you kind of can with a toy model, you know. Think of how a decision gets made. So the question really is, how do you leverage fear

210
00:50:43.110 --> 00:50:50.739
Alexander Puutio: in the decision making? How do you leverage the most fearful team member, the most fearful part of your brain in making a decision? You don't try to avoid it.

211
00:50:50.750 --> 00:51:06.540
Alexander Puutio: you leverage it, you harness it, you make sure you listen to it. You take it into account, and if you know that. Well, I'm overly fearful of big dogs, because I was, you know, bitten by, and then you also try to temper it. You say, well, this is no longer. You bring the science in, and you look at the data. Well, you know

212
00:51:06.540 --> 00:51:28.690
Alexander Puutio: Labradors can bite, but they usually never do, and I'm afraid of dogs because something happened to me. So I'm going to temper my fear, and you can do so. This is again silly example. But you can do something very analogous to your supervisor. So something horrible happened the last time they committed 5 million dollars to a big project. They're going to be fearful of that happening as we're humans, so you can then temper that. But you don't try to avoid that fear.

213
00:51:28.690 --> 00:51:32.049
Alexander Puutio: You can actually address it and say it is great that you are careful.

214
00:51:32.050 --> 00:51:51.550
Alexander Puutio: That's how we save taxpayers money. We are doing something serious, and we're not jumping into risks. We need to acknowledge the risks we need to be fearful of the worst case scenario happening, and then you address it. You own it, and you leverage that fear and say, how do we use that small feeling in your head that things might not go right to avoid things going wrong

215
00:51:51.550 --> 00:52:05.199
Alexander Puutio: right? So staying constantly vigorous about, you know your your continuous learning everything you saw in Brooke and Michelle's Bullet Point list. There you you use the fear instead of lose it, because if you lose it you become reckless.

216
00:52:05.310 --> 00:52:31.270
Alexander Puutio: And again, you're not like I love how Brooke you said it! You're not in the business of convincing anyone, you know ideally. You you lead them to the best decision, and you don't get anyone, or if even so, imagine if you got someone to be fearless, and so only without fear, they agree with you. It doesn't sound like a wonderful decision making process or a decision to make. So let's say, embrace it, learn to guide it, and look, know when to quiet it or temper it, but don't try to silence it.

217
00:52:32.740 --> 00:52:33.360
Doug Hodgson: Very wise.

218
00:52:33.360 --> 00:52:33.780
Brooke Struck: If I

219
00:52:33.990 --> 00:52:35.220
Doug Hodgson: Go, go for it, Brian.

220
00:52:35.220 --> 00:52:36.320
Brooke Struck: If I jump in there, Doug.

221
00:52:36.550 --> 00:52:58.500
Brooke Struck: there's actually a role that I love to create for people who are the naysayers, or the doubters, or the fearful ones in the group, and that is to make them responsible for basically leading the design of data collection. And one of the reasons for that is, you know, the folks.

222
00:52:59.350 --> 00:53:05.899
Brooke Struck: They send a very important social signal when the person who is most skeptical in the team

223
00:53:06.805 --> 00:53:25.919
Brooke Struck: gets to a point where they say, Okay, I, you know. And again, this is part of the facilitation process is unpacking their hesitancy, unpacking their concerns. To understand like, what are you worried is going to go wrong. And how could we figure out whether that thing is going to go wrong as quickly as possible.

224
00:53:26.460 --> 00:53:34.280
Brooke Struck: and putting that person in a position to basically define those early tests to de-risk a strategy. For example.

225
00:53:34.520 --> 00:53:50.300
Brooke Struck: when that person is in charge of designing the tests when that person is in charge of collecting the data and reporting back to the team about how that's going. It makes them feel like they are part of the team. It gives them a positive role to play.

226
00:53:50.430 --> 00:54:06.849
Brooke Struck: and when that person is satisfied it's a very strong social signal to the people around like, if that person, especially if it's a let's call it a chronic doubter. If that person is satisfied, everyone around is going to say, Well, if it passed muster with that person. It must be like that must be a good decision. This must be airtight.

227
00:54:08.240 --> 00:54:27.700
Doug Hodgson: Chronic delta is an excellent phrase. That's what I'm going to be taking home with me today. Don't be a chronic delta I've just seen. We've got maybe time for one more question. I want to throw this out to all 3 of you to get your takes on it. So there's a few things being submitted around decision paralysis.

228
00:54:27.820 --> 00:54:33.480
Doug Hodgson: And there's 2 kind of connected questions, which I'm going to try and roll into 1. 1st of all, someone's asked.

229

00:54:33.940 --> 00:54:41.239
Doug Hodgson: This is quite a novel question, I think. Can AI artificial intelligence help me? Get out of a decision? Paralysis loop?

230
00:54:42.620 --> 00:54:53.780
Doug Hodgson: and would you recommend using AI to help someone else get out of a decision paralysis loop. I'm not sure it's fairly novel. As I said.

231
00:54:54.430 --> 00:54:58.249
Doug Hodgson: I'm going to throw that out there and see. See if. See what you guys think.

232
00:55:01.700 --> 00:55:04.179
Doug Hodgson: Do any of you use AI in your work?

233
00:55:04.540 --> 00:55:05.809
Doug Hodgson: Have you seen it being used.

234
00:55:05.810 --> 00:55:15.549
Alexander Puutio: I was hoping for a moment for to hear Michelle, which is, I know, unfair to put her on the spot. I have some thoughts, but I really would want to hear my colleague.

235
00:55:15.700 --> 00:55:16.330
Dr. Michelle Krieger: On this.

236
00:55:17.170 --> 00:55:23.646
Dr. Michelle Krieger: Well, I will, I will happily oblige. So so I'm i i will come out and say I'm very

237
00:55:24.720 --> 00:55:36.469
Dr. Michelle Krieger: I don't want to say Luddite, but I I have more technological wariness towards everything in that sphere. So I I don't engage a lot with AI I

238
00:55:36.990 --> 00:55:44.953
Dr. Michelle Krieger: where I see so coming from that lens as the chronic doubter. I, where I see AI being the most helpful, is

239
00:55:46.210 --> 00:55:47.779
Dr. Michelle Krieger: like, if

240
00:55:48.290 --> 00:56:03.770
Dr. Michelle Krieger: like possibly I think anything you can do to get unstuck that may help things look a little more concrete as long as you, you know, layer on some some critical thinking on top of that. You know, if it's helpful, that's great. I I find often

241
00:56:04.550 --> 00:56:25.099
Dr. Michelle Krieger: when people are not coming at a problem completely new. So I think this, I think AI sort of works best when people are not full novices, when you sort of have some context or idea, and you're using it to sort of push to the next level, or like, really expand your thinking. So so that those are just my my general thoughts, and I'll pass it back to.

242
00:56:25.100 --> 00:56:25.430
Alexander Puutio: Yeah.

243
00:56:25.430 --> 00:56:26.080
Dr. Michelle Krieger: To, the.

244
00:56:26.250 --> 00:56:54.780
Doug Hodgson: You, Michelle. Alex, I know that you have some thoughts on this, but we I'm gonna wrap us up and ask that you post your responses to this in the life and government community afterwards. So make sure you all you attendees that want to know Alex's thoughts on this question of the, you know, Venn, diagram between AI and decision making go to the life and government community start a little debate or discussion in there after this event. But I'm going to start wrapping us up.

245
00:56:54.780 --> 00:57:18.979
Doug Hodgson: I'd like you to join me in giving a round of applause to Michelle, Alexander, and Brooke for their fantastic presentations and Q&A responses there, and thank you to everyone else. There's lots of emojis coming up there. Thank you, everybody for joining and investing in your learning. So a couple of things for you before you go, the team is going to pull up a very quick poll that is going to ask you how you felt about today's session. It's going to help us improve

246

00:57:18.990 --> 00:57:39.729
Doug Hodgson: continually improve our events. We really appreciate you taking the time just to submit a 1 to 10 ranking. How valuable you found today's hour. Whilst you're doing that, I have a piece of bonus content to share with you. So we've covered a lot of grounds today. I think you agree. But decision making we've discussed

247
00:57:39.740 --> 00:57:52.759
Doug Hodgson: it's a skill that needs to be sustained and practiced and and energized to improve upon so apolitical, have developed a free online course in partnerships with the UN innovation network on how to make better decisions.

248
00:57:52.780 --> 00:58:17.550
Doug Hodgson: It's a course that will help you dissect the decision, making process and determine what makes decisions so difficult. What makes some decisions more difficult than others? It will show you some tried and tested ways of making informed choices. Even when you don't have all the data or the answers at your fingertips, it's self paced so you can pick it up and pause it to fit around your work schedule. And once again it's completely free. My colleague has posted a link to this course

249
00:58:17.660 --> 00:58:31.370
Doug Hodgson: in our life and government community, so you'll be able to enroll yourself upon it if you navigate to that page. Now, there is a link in the chat that will take you there. So I hope that that's a bit of learning that you can take home along with that reading list

250
00:58:31.370 --> 00:58:54.259
Doug Hodgson: that we've developed and continue to improve upon your decision making skills outside of this event. That is all we have time for. We hope you found it helpful and want to say a huge thank you once again to everybody who's made today. Happen. Thank you for taking the time out of your busy days to invest in your learning. Keep an eye out for the email coming your way with the recording of today's session and the resources. And we hope to see you at another apolitical event very soon.

251
00:58:54.430 --> 00:58:55.809
Doug Hodgson: Have a great day. Everyone.