Session 11

Team Challenges
Today

- Everest Simulation

   Depending on your interest we may skip these

- Team Dynamics Exercise
- NanoGene Case Discussion

Source: NCCS National Center for Charitable Statistics
Everest Simulation

Logistics

- Login & review the “Prepare” section
- Six Rounds
  - 10-minutes per round, leaders do the advance
  - 10 minute team huddle – what worked/didn’t
  - 10 minute class discussion
- Teams of 5
  - Leader, Physician, Environmentalist, Marathoner, Photographer
  - You can chat via the simulation or by voice
Everest Simulation

Remember

- Examine the data at each step carefully
- Some of the analysis require calculations
- Make sure you review your role and role specific information
- Get “into” your role.
  - Believe you are that person. What would they do?
- First two rounds are uneventful by design!
- Mistakes are costly
  - Return to base camp, get rescued or fail to reach the summit
  - Rescued climbers still have a critical role
- Midpoint survey is crucial to the debrief
  - Answer individually, be brutally honest
Everest Simulation
When You’re Done

- **Fill out all the surveys**
- **Discuss in your team**
  - Why didn’t you achieve all your goals?
  - How could you have enhanced your team effectiveness?
  - How could you have enhanced your personal effectiveness
What Did We Learn From Everest?

- Critical information in a startup is distributed asymmetrically
- Information in a startup needs to be shared
  - You all had a shared goal
  - You also have individual interests/goals
  - Team members had different information
  - You needed to share that information to succeed
- This is different than success in large companies
Psychological Safety

Lessons From Everest

• Psychological Safety is paramount
  – Comfort in asking questions, requesting clarification, asking about others views
  – Helpful when team members have conflicting goals
  – If it doesn’t exist personal agendas win
Leadership

Lessons From Everest

• Leadership promotes Psychological Safety
  – Leaders acknowledge they’re fallible
  – Leaders actively intervene in discussions to:
    » Encourage team to share information
    » Change framing of questions
  – Leaders at times choose the decision making process
  – Leaders may have to arbitrate
Team Dynamics Exercise

- **Purpose and Objectives**
- **Step #1:** Team Process Evaluation Sheet
- **Step #2:** Discussion of Two Basic Teamwork Concepts
- **Step #3:** Preparation for Team Exercise
- **Step #4:** Team Exercise on Your Own

This class exercise is adapted from *Managing the Small to Mid-Sized Company: Concepts and Cases* by Jim Collins and Bill Lazier, Irwin.
Exercise’s Objectives

1. Chance to learn and practice exactly how to improve the productivity and effectiveness of a team.

2. Reinforces the importance of teamwork in new ventures.
Step #1: “Team Process Evaluation Sheet”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There is a clear unity of purpose. There was free discussion of the objectives until members could commit themselves to them; the objectives are meaningful to each group member.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is low unity of purpose – little or no evidence that the group is widely committed to common objectives or that the objectives are meaningful to each member of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The group is self-conscious about its own operations. The group has taken time to explicitly discuss group process – how the group will function to achieve its objectives. The group has a clear, explicit, and mutually agreed-upon approach, mechanics, norms, expectations, rules, etc. Frequently, it will stop to examine how well it is doing or what may be interfering with its operation. Whatever the problem may be, it gets open discussion and a solution found.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The group tends to avoid discussion of its own maintenance. The group has taken little time to explicitly discuss group process – how the group will function to achieve its objectives. The group does not have a clear, mutually agreed-upon approach, mechanics, norms, expectations, rules, etc. There is often much discussion after a meeting, of what was wrong and why, but this is seldom discussed within the meeting itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The group has set clear and demanding performance goals for itself and has translated these performance goals into well-defined concrete milestones against which it measures itself. The group defines and achieves a continuous series of “small wins” along the way to larger goals.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The group has low or ambiguous performance goals for itself. It has not defined concrete milestones against which it measures itself. The group has not given itself the stimulus of a continuous series of “small wins” along the way to larger goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The atmosphere tends to be informal, comfortable, relaxed. There are no obvious tensions, a working atmosphere in which people are involved &amp; interested.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The atmosphere is likely to reflect either indifference (lots of side conversations, whispering, etc.), boredom, or tension. The group is not genuinely engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is a lot of discussion in which virtually everyone participates, but it remains pertinent to the purpose of the group. If discussion gets off track, someone will bring it back in short order. The members listen to each other. Every idea is given a hearing. People are not afraid of being foolish by putting forth a creative thought even if it seems extreme.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A few people tend to dominate. Sometimes their contributions are way off the point, but little is done by anyone in the group to keep the group clearly on track. People do not really listen to each other. Ideas are ignored or overridden. Conversations after group meetings reveal that people failed to express ideas or feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People are free in expressing their feelings as well as their ideas.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personal feelings are hidden. There is fear that these are too explosive if brought out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step #2: Two Ways to Improve Performance

- Symptoms
- Root Causes
  - Core Driving Forces
  - Type 1 Systematic Reasons: External
  - Type 2 Individual Reasons: Interpersonal
Example:
“The group never gets all of its work done because meetings start late and, once they do start, the group strays constantly from the tasks at hand.”

Systemic Causes?
1. The group meets at a time that makes it difficult for all members to arrive promptly.
2. The group doesn’t make any effort at the beginning of the meeting to create an agenda nor objectives.
3. No chair of the meeting is chosen to keep the group moving forward and finishing on time.

Individual Causes?
1. One of the members is chronically late, no matter what time the meeting officially starts.
2. One of the group members loves to stray off into unrelated topics during the meeting -- nobody feels comfortable saying “let’s get back to the task at hand.”
Step #3: Exercise Preparation

1. Circle the **three lowest scores** on your Group Process Evaluation Sheet
   Jot down what you think are the root cause or causes. Categorize each of them as either systemic or individual

2. If you have identified a **systemic** problem:
   Write down one suggestion that would improve the systemic functioning of your team

3. For each of your teammates, list one characteristic or action that is **helpful** to the group. List one that is **not helpful**

4. Write down one thing that you would **do differently or better** to improve the functionality of your group
Step #4: Create “Team Dynamics” Summary

Always Keep This In Mind Please ...

Is this going to be relevant and helpful to improving the functioning of our group?
NanoGene Case
NanoGene Questions

• Independent of the equity ownership issue, what are two risks associated with this founding team?

• How would these risks be reduced if Paige Miller joined the team?

• Although Susan Stone (the local venture capitalist) likes NanoGene's technology and business prospects, she seems concerned by the equity split among the founders.

• What consequences for NanoGene might she fear from the present even equity split?