Collaboration in a Competitive World:
From Tribal Conflict to International Joint Ventures
Fall Intensive – 19,20,21 September & 26,27,28 September 2014
Dr. Ken Ideus
Victoria Steps Quay, London TW8 0DX
Email: ken@i-deos.co.uk

Course Purpose

The emergence of the global economy has created a number of changes. Teams are distributed across the globe, are comprised of various nationalities and backgrounds. Products are being constructed from materials coming from multiple countries. This course addresses three related areas that can help us navigate this new territory: Collaboration, Trust and Multicultural Working. Business changes have increased the need for companies to work together, to collaborate in ways not thought of a few years ago. Staunch competitors now agree to work together to address complex business needs, sharing information, cost and business insight. While collaboration is becoming a byword, very few managers are actually skilled in bringing about true collaboration. If we want to make collaboration actually work, we need to break it down, understand it and find out what we need to do to get the benefits of real collaboration. Those results go well beyond what we might call simple co-operation. True, in-depth collaboration requires something else that is fundamental and that is trust. Trust provides the foundation for sustaining collaboration and building strong relationships. Trust, like collaboration, is often poorly understood and so building it is a bit like magic. This course addresses this by giving a very clear framework for trust and how to test levels of trust and what to do when it needs to be built. The last element, now a day to day issue in most organisations is how to understand and leverage multicultural working. This adds a complexity that can be understood through the use of cultural frameworks that we can use as a lens for looking at collaboration and trust.

All of the above apply, even more critically, when working in arenas such as developing countries where conflict and competition between factions, tribes and political groups often leads to physical conflict. The frames that work in business, work equally well in these difficult environments.

A second purpose of the course is to run it in such a way that the principles of collaboration, trust and multicultural working are experienced, hands on, as part of the learning process.

Learning Objectives

- To apply the foundations of collaboration in any multi-party context
- To apply a clear, tangible and operational model of trust in interpersonal and organizational settings
- To be able to describe the role of the facilitator in generating collaborative working relationships
- To be able to identify and describe the potential impact of cross cultural differences on projects that founded on the intent of collaboration
- To be able to apply one or more frameworks for mapping cultural differences, identifying those differences in specific circumstances involving multiple parties
- To apply a self assessment instrument to determine one's own cultural and personal preferences for working and relating to others, and to be able to identify and describe their potential impact on the role of facilitation
- To apply collaboration and multi-cultural frameworks in not only working with clients and colleagues but in working with other consultants working within the same projects

Required Reading Prior to Session 1 (19-21 September)

- *The Goals-Values Matrix: A Framework and Tool for Building Collaboration*, Ken Ideus in - *Building Better Teams: Strengthening Performance Within & Across Teams*, by Robert W. Barner & Charlotte P. Barner (Wiley; 2012)
- *The Trusted Advisor*, David H. Maister, Robert Galford and Charles W Green (Simon & Schuster; 2002) Read Chapters 8 and 9 prior to Session 1
- *Building Cross Cultural Competence: Building Wealth from Conflicting Values*. Charles Hampden-Turner and Fons Trompenaars (Yale University Press; 2000)
- Web readings: http://trustedadvisor.com/articles/trust-process-description-short-form Download pdf article.
- Case: *When Consultants and Clients Clash,* HBR Case by Idalene F. Kesner and Sally Fowler
- Case: *Managing changes in globalizing business: how to manage cross-cultural business partners,* Journal of Organizational Change Management

Required Actions Prior to Session 1 (19-21 September)

- Complete the online Trust Quotient Assessment prior to the first session. Bring results to the class: http://trustsuite.trustedadvisor.com/

Required Reading Prior to Session 2 (26-28 September)

- Read, for Background, –BBC profile found at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-14069082
- Case material as provided at Session 1 in preparation for Session 2 Simulation
- Chapters 11 and 15 of *Trusted Advisor*

Required Actions Prior to Session 2 (26-28 September)

- Complete: Intercultural Effectiveness Scale

Session 1 – 19-21 September: Collaboration, Trust and Crossing Cultures – Building Foundations

This first session of three days introduces in a very active way, using self assessment, cases, light simulation and small group work, foundation frameworks for collaboration, trust and working across cultures.

1st Topic: Collaboration

The basis for this topic is the collaboration framework presented in *Building Better Teams* that has been applied in situations ranging from international joint ventures to bringing volatile tribes together into collaborative working relationships. Being clear on what collaboration actually is, in a working sense is fundamental to creating true collaborative relationships. More than simply getting along and working together, collaboration requires alignment on at least two axes. We'll learn how to map where individuals, teams or organisations or factions are located in the resulting matrix and what to do if the alignment isn't optimum for the performance of the relationship.

2nd Topic: Trust

While alignment, based on the frame discussed in the first topic is crucial, alignment will not be sustainable if a foundation of trust isn't built. Trust is a very emotive and often elusive topic, but it doesn't have to be. For the topic of trust, we will introduce another tried and tested framework, depicted in *Trusted Advisor*, from the business environment. To personalize the trust frame, individuals will complete, then work with a short on-line survey to understand their own biases in the area of trust. Trust, according to the model used, has a number of clear dimensions, all of which can be measured and addressed.

3rd Topic: Collaborating Across Cultures

To add complexity to the world of collaboration, we introduce the concept of collaborating across cultures. Cultures are multi-dimensional and can add more than just a simple layer of complexity. To get a working knowledge of cultural differences, we will focus primarily on the framework created by Fons Trompenaars. Between sessions 1 and 2, students will complete the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale, a self-assessment, to get a further understanding of their own cultural leanings, how this might effect the working of their learning group, work between different groups and work with the simulation client.

With a concrete grasp of these topics, students will be ready to take on the case and simulation that is the focus of Session 2.

Session 2

Review
To remind ourselves of what was covered in Session 1, each of the four teams will be assigned to prepare a review of one of four topics (Collaboration, Trust, Cross Cultural Framework and Learning from the micro simulation/game) . These assignments will be made at the end of Session 1 to give teams time to think about and prepare for their assigned review session.

Simulation
Armed with the foundations created in Session 1, and the briefs provided for review between sessions 1 and 2 we're now ready to put our learning into practice. Session 2 puts everything, including self-assessment insights, into action via a simulation based on live events currently taking place in South Sudan. Working in teams, each team representing a consulting NGO, students will actively apply and learn from working with the concepts as they work to collaborate and create a working approach between organizations to assisting a client composed, itself, of conflicting parties.

Summary and Moving On
This closing module has each team summarizing the overall learning from the course. Lastly, each individual will be asked to identify an area in their personal, professional or community lives where they intend to put collaboration principles into practice.

Determination of Grades

Grading Scale & Rubrics

93-100 = A Exceptional	A superior / outstanding performance. Has mastered the concepts and adds unique contributes to class discussions.
90-92 = A- Excellent	A very good / admirable performance. Displays understanding in all areas of the class, and contributes successfully to class discussions.
87-89 = B+ Outstanding	Above average performance. A few insignificant flaws may appear, but overall has great application of the field.
83-86 = B Good	A generally satisfactory, intellectually adequate performance. Few significant flaws in performance.

80-82 = B- Adequate	A barely satisfactory performance. Contributes little to class discussions and lacks a clear understanding of concepts.
77-79 = C+ Not sufficient	An unacceptable performance. Unable to engage in class discussions and has little comprehension of theories.

Grading Components

1 Quality of Group Work (50%)

Grading of Group work will be based on two components:
- 25% of Group Work Grade. The quality of the review performed by the team of their assigned topic as part of the introduction to Session 2 as described earlier. Each of the four reviews should take approximately 20 minutes, including question time, and involve all members of the team. This grade will apply to all members of each particular team/group.
- 75% of Group Work Grade. This portion of the group work grade will be based on the quality of work the team does within the Session 2 Simulation. This grade will apply to all members of each particular team/group.

Grading Factors	Rubric for Group Work		
Review Session	1-7	8-15	16-25
	Very brief review with little involvement of the full team. Rote repeat of what was said in session 1. Very little creativity or imagination. Little evidence of team collaboration	A good review with most of the team involved. A few insights added to help clarify points.	A fun while accurate review, put into the words of the team inclusive of insights and observations. A fresh, and creative effort showing involvement of the full team.
Simulation	1-25	26-50	50-75
	While participating in	The group actively	The team actively

	the simulation, the team did not appear to be living the collaborative process in their work. Feedback and process was disjointed and the learning taken from the process appeared to be minimal.	participated in the simulation but got caught up in the process and lost sight of the models and frames they could apply to bring about collaboration with other teams and with the eventual client. The approach presented, was disjointed, missing critical elements of collaboration with other teams, lack of clarity on division of responsibilities and outcomes, leaving doubt about success in the actual circumstance.	engaged, not only in their group but across the teams, demonstrating, and working to demonstrate application of the concepts. The approach presented demonstrates working both across teams as well as with the client, is well structured and appears to have strong chances of success.

2 Individual Contributions (25%)

Grades for individual contributions will be based on the engagement and inputs to both plenary and small group work. While individual's have different styles of contribution and engagement, all are expected to be involved and add to the quality of discussion in plenary and the quality of work and commitment demonstrated in the teams.

Rubric for Individual Contribution			
Grading Factors			
In Plenary		In Group/Team Working	
1-25	26-50	1-25	26-50
Appears distracted, late for sessions, raises very few questions if any. Poor attendance record. Note: non-attendance for more than 5 hours will result in an "incomplete" grade overall.	Is attentive, on time, raises questions when unclear, shares insights and observations and may challenge the course leader on various points.	Shows up for group work but appears uninvolved, making few if any contributions. Takes a minimum role when participating in feedback to the plenaries.	Engaged, making contributions, shows enthusiasm for getting the group work done. Engages fully in the simulations and is seen as a "team player" carrying their weight with group work.

3 Summary Paper (25%)

This paper, written in the student's own words, should use a case to show an applied knowledge of the three primary concepts: Collaboration, Trust and Cross Cultural Working. The case may be one that is 1) created by the student, 2) a real current situation or 3) a published case chosen by the student for this purpose. The paper should be 5 to 7 pages in length and include the following:

- A description of the case and the parties involved
- An analysis of where the parties are placed at the onset (State A), and where desired (State B), in the Collaboration Frame, the Trust Framework as well as a cultural assessment based on use of the Tompenaars model.
- A suggested facilitative approach to moving the parties from State A to State B for Collaboration and Trust and one that incorporates Cross Cultural understanding and sensitivity. This approach may treat each issue separately or the student can choose and integrated approach which addresses more than one element simultaneously.

Rubric – Summary Paper			
Grading Components	**Grading Factors**		
Description of the Case	**1-5 Points**	**6 -10Points**	**11 -20 Points**
In this section you will provide a brief description of the case. This description should include the context, how the parties come to be in the shared context and any cultural issues that are at least apparent. This section = 20% of total grade for this assignment.	The background information is largely incomplete, providing only a cursory and vague description of the case. Example: " This case involves three parties brought together to solve a community development issue. There a two to three cultures represented.	The case contains some of the relevant detail on the parties and what they are meant to address, but lacks detail relating to cultural attributes of the parties, the specifics of what the parties together, need to deliver. Example: Example: This case concerns three parties that have been brought together to solve running tensions between ethnic groups, of which three are represented.	All relevant contextual background information on the parties and what they have been brought together to deliver is clear. Example: "This case involves an African American facilitator who has been brought in to generated a collaborative effort between local ethnic groups consisting of Hispanic, Korean and remnants of the Irish working class families that once dominated the neighborhood. The project is intended to deliver a multi-cultural exchange and education programme between the groups to increase understanding, reduce tension and generate joint community programmes and projects.
State A and State B	**1-10 Points**	**11-20 Points**	**21-40 Points**
In this section, you will provide a clear statement of the current situation (State A) and the	A statement vaguely describing the current state of relations between the groups without	State A is defined with tension points but fails to show why these might be sources of concern.	Both States A and B are clearly defined. State A includes insights as to what might happen if

implications of the cultural differences existing between the ethnic groups represented by the parties. The section will also include a clear statement of what State B would ideally look like. This section = 40% of total grade for this assignment.	specifying specific sources of tension. Cultural differences are discussed but in vague terms without clear reference to a model. State B, is likewise described in quite general terms such as "the groups will be working together and communicating better"	Cultural issues are defined but in a theoretical fashion without showing how these might cause issues in the community. State B is reasonably well defined, but we still don't see what specifically they will be doing differently.	things don't improve. The analysis of the cultural differences identified key points that may lead to misunderstanding and conflict if not addressed by the facilitator. In addition, the facilitator's possible cultural bias is addressed. State B gives clear examples of things the groups are now working on in a joint fashion, and what the joint working might look like.
Facilitative Approach	**1-10 Points**	**11 - 20 Points**	**21 -40 Points**
In this section you will provide a description of the approach the facilitator will take to bring about a collaborative space, develop trust and do so while taking cultural differences into account. This section = 40% of total grade for this assignment.	The approach is vague and doesn't indicate an understanding of the frames being applied. Actions and steps are vague and without clear purpose or direction. Cultural issues are loosely addressed but not identified in a way that tells us what the facilitator might actually do or work for.	The approach gives a general plan for how to bring the parties together, what would be discussed and how, what could be done to build the beginnings of trust. It doesn't however reference the frameworks and how they could be used by the facilitator to move the groups to a collaborative, trustful space. Cultural sensitivities are noted but not how the facilitator might incorporate these into her approach.	The approach takes us through a step by step plan to bring about a collaborative process including how trust will be built as part of it. The approach references specific aspects of both the Collaboration and Trust Frameworks. How the Facilitator will address or take into account cultural issues is also addressed in clear terms.

Academic Policies of Special Importance to Students

Academic Integrity and Ethical Conduct as an SMU Student

Students are reminded of the SMU Honor Code as referenced in the Student Handbook. Intellectual integrity and academic honesty are both the foundation and the goals for this program. Please reference and review the university policies on the responsibilities, policies, and penalties regarding academic honesty.
http://www.smu.edu/studentlife/PCL_05_HC.asp

Religious Observance

Religiously observant students wishing to be absent on holidays that require missing class should notify their professor in writing at the beginning of the term, and should discuss with them, in advance, acceptable ways of making up any work missed because of the absence.

Disability Accommodations: Students needing academic accommodations for a disability must first contact the Coordinator, Services for Students with Disabilities (214-768-4557) to verify the disability and establish eligibility for accommodations. They should then schedule an appointment with the professor to make appropriate arrangements.

Class Decorum

To foster a good learning environment for yourself and your fellow students we ask that you adhere to the following guidelines during class:
- Please turn off (or set on vibrate) all cell phones or pagers.
- Do not read newspapers, books for other classes, or other outside reading material during class.
- Walking into class late is disruptive as is leaving early. If you have to leave early, make arrangements before class begins, and then, when you leave, do so quietly.
- Professional respect and courtesy for your fellow students is imperative at all times

About the Instructor: Ken Ideus Ed.D

Dr Ideus' work in individual and organization development spans over 40 years of experience across a range of contexts including telecoms, energy, entertainment, air services and market research. Over the years, he has acquired extensive experience in Europe, the Middle East, the Asia Pacific, Central Asia, China, South America and Africa. Following a successful corporate career, culminating as global head of leadership development for BP in 1996, Ken founded Delta Partnership Ltd. of London, a network based consultancy providing organization development, change support and executive coaching services to a range of international clients. Working through his private practice, I-Deos Consulting since 2011, his work continues in the areas of strategic learning, business change, organization capability building, leadership coaching and authentic expression through Leader's Voice® (www.leadersvoice.co.uk). Ken has extensive experience in supporting transformation projects in various industrial and commercial sectors. His work on collaboration stemmed from studying over 15 international joint ventures in the energy sector then applying the resulting insights and principles with industry clients. He received his Doctorate in Education from Boston University, is a member of the International Futures Forum as well as NTL (National Training Laboratories) and served as chairperson of the International Programs Committee of the EFMD (European Foundation for Management Development). He has served as an adjunct faculty member at Imperial College London and is currently an adjunct with Southern Methodist University's Master's Programme in Dispute Resolution and recently joined the visiting faculty at Wits Business School, Centre for Leadership, in Johannesburg. His collaboration model, "Collaboration in a Competitive World" has been published as a practitioner's tool in the recently released *Building Better Teams* by Robert Barner and Charlotte Barner, published by Pfeiffer. His integrated frame for human development has served as the core for the recently released book "Finding Merlin", which depicts a roadmap for human development, by Kate Cowie, published by Marshall-Cavendish. Ken now resides in London. In November of 2013, Dr. Ideus was appointed as the first chancellor of Mikesi University in Western Equatoria, Southern Sudan, a private non-profit university he helped found in 2007.