

Including Cognitive Diversity: A Missing Link in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Brief Description

In this engaging, interactive, and dynamic presentation, you will dramatically improve your skills in addressing the missing link of cognitive diversity in your DEI efforts. Your employees have different cognitive patterns: some are optimistic while others are pessimistic, some like innovation while others prefer stability, some are skeptical while others are accepting. Any of these cognitive patterns has its strengths and weakness, yet recent research in cognitive neuroscience and behavioral economics shows that we show unconscious bias by hiring and promote people who have the same mental patterns as us. Such hiring and promotion not only undercut DEI but also gravely damage organizational performance, since you get employees who reinforce each other's weaknesses rather than compensating for them. Using case studies of solving such unconscious bias along with cutting-edge research, this talk will provide you with the critical take-aways needed to address cognitive diversity in DEI.

Learning objectives

- Assess where unconscious bias may be undercutting cognitive diversity in your organization
- Discover research-based best practices for addressing unconscious bias toward cognitive diversity
- Develop a plan to address any unconscious bias around cognitive diversity in your organization

Speaker Bios

Dr. Gleb Tsipursky

Dr. Gleb Tsipursky is on a mission to protect leaders from dangerous judgment errors known as cognitive biases. His expertise and passion is using pragmatic business experience and cutting-edge behavioral economics and cognitive neuroscience to develop the most effective and profitable decision-making strategies.

A best-selling author, he wrote *Never Go With Your Gut: How Pioneering Leaders Make the Best Decisions and Avoid Business Disasters* (Career Press, 2019), *The Truth Seeker's Handbook: A Science-Based Guide* (Intentional Insights, 2017), and *The Blindspots Between Us: How to Overcome Unconscious Cognitive Bias and Build Better Relationships* (New Harbinger, 2020). Dr. Tsipursky's cutting-edge thought leadership was featured in over 550 articles and 450 interviews in *Fast Company*, *CBS News*, *Time*, *Business Insider*, *Government Executive*, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, *Inc. Magazine*, and elsewhere. His expertise stems from over 20 years of consulting, coaching, speaking, and training experience as CEO of Disaster Avoidance Experts. Its hundreds of clients, mid-size and large companies and nonprofits, span North America, Europe, and Australia, and include Aflac, IBM, Honda, Wells Fargo, and the World Wildlife Fund. It also comes from his strong research and teaching background in behavioral economics and cognitive neuroscience with over 15 years in academia, including 7 years as a professor at the Ohio State University. He published dozens of peer-reviewed articles in academic journals such as *Behavior and Social Issues* and *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*.

He lives in Columbus, OH, and to avoid disaster in his personal life makes sure to spend ample time with his wife. Contact him at [Gleb\[at\]DisasterAvoidanceExperts\[dot\]com](mailto:Gleb[at]DisasterAvoidanceExperts[dot]com), follow him on Twitter [@gleb_tsipursky](https://twitter.com/gleb_tsipursky), Instagram [@dr_gleb_tsipursky](https://www.instagram.com/dr_gleb_tsipursky), and register for his free Wise Decision Maker Course <https://disasteravoidanceexperts.com/subscribe/>

Kelly Atkinson

Kelly Atkinson brings her strong organizational skills, knowledge of process efficiencies and true care for those she works for and with to her roles as Barnes & Thornburg's diversity and inclusion coordinator and the Columbus office administrator. Kelly is known for being able to see the big picture and for being able to get things done.

As diversity and inclusion coordinator, Kelly works with the firm's diversity, development and inclusion director and the diversity and inclusion committee to develop and execute new programs, events, and initiatives to promote the platform of talent sponsorship, full integration with the business, and culture. In managing the Columbus office, she provides oversight for operations, human resources, finance, information technology and marketing functions, while creating an inclusive culture where all employees feel respected and valued for who they are and what they bring to the firm.

While in graduate school, Kelly obtained her Lean Six Sigma Green Belt. Outside of the firm, Kelly proves her passion for Columbus as a Certified Tourism Ambassador, leads a weekly church home group, and her favorite pastime is cheering on her four kids on whatever field they are playing on. Professional and Community Involvement: Vice Chair, Columbus Metropolitan Club Board of Trustees; Chair, Columbus Metropolitan Club Diversity Committee; Columbus CEO Future 50 Class of 2020; Vice President, Columbus Chapter of the Association of Legal Administrators Diversity and Inclusion Committee; Past chair, Columbus Chapter of the Association of Legal Administrators

Notes

Assessment: Dangerous Judgment Errors in the Workplace

Prepared by Dr. Gleb Tsipursky
CEO, Disaster Avoidance Experts
DisasterAvoidanceExperts.com

Description: This assessment evaluates the impact of cognitive biases - the term behavioral economists use for typical judgment errors we make as human beings - in the workplace. It also provides guidance for next steps based on the results of the analysis.

Directions: Each question below refers to a problem that might occur in everyday professional situations. Your goal is to *indicate how often the problem occurred in your workplace in the past year*. The answer for each question will be in percentage terms out of all the possible times the problem might have occurred. If you are doing this assessment with a focus on a specific organizational department, team, or group, apply your evaluation only to that unit. ***Don't overthink it!*** Go with your initial impression, it doesn't have to be absolutely precise. Each question should take you 15-20 seconds.

Questionnaire

#	Question	Answer
1	___% of projects that missed the deadline or went over budget	%
2	___% of team conflicts that occurred because someone overestimated the effectiveness of their communication skills and persuasiveness	%
3	Of all significant decisions, in ___% of cases someone was overconfident about the decision	%
4	Of all situations when someone had evidence that would contradict their beliefs (or clear information that would disprove their interpretation of the situation), in ___% of cases they ignored the evidence (or misinterpreted the information).	%
5	___% of situations when an individual or a team had to deal with difficult and/or uncomfortable issues, but focused on trivial issues instead.	%
6	When a potential or current employee was evaluated, in what ___% of the situations was the evaluation too positive due to factors not relevant to their job competency or organizational fit?	%
7	When a potential or current employee was evaluated, in what ___% of the situations was the evaluation too negative due to factors not relevant to their job competency or organizational fit?	%
8	___% of team conflicts that occurred because someone proposed ill-considered or insufficiently thought-out ideas	%
9	___% of team conflicts that occurred because someone opposed innovative or surprising ideas	%
10	Of all times when someone could have passed up valuable but negative information up the chain of command, they failed to do so in ___% of cases	%
11	Of all times when someone defended an idea too strongly, in ___% of cases they came up with the idea	%
12	Of all times someone continued investing resources into an ongoing project, in ___% of cases they did so even though they had substantial evidence that the project was not succeeding	%

1 3	Of all times when someone claimed that they had accurately predicted a specific development or outcome, in ____% of cases they actually did not predict it	%
1 4	Of all times when someone opposed making a change, in ____% of cases they did so only because it was a change, regardless of whether it would overall help the bottom line	%
1 5	Of all times when an inaccurate claim about something (a person, project, or other topic) became widely accepted, in ____% of cases this occurred because the inaccurate claim was frequently repeated by someone	%
1 6	Of all times when there was an opportunity to take a worthwhile risk, it was not taken in ____% of situations	%
1 7	Of all times when someone claimed that they made no errors in judgment, the ____% of times they were wrong	%
1 8	Of all times when a disagreement occurred, the ____% of times when someone let their desired conclusion influence their evaluation of the evidence	%
1 9	Of all times when someone's behavior was attributed to their personality, in ____% of cases their behavior was actually a result of the situation in which they found themselves	%
2 0	____% of individual or team plans did not include contingencies for threats (or opportunities) that were unlikely to occur, but could have significant consequences if they did arise	%
2 1	____% of individual or team plans overemphasized short-term and medium-term outcomes over long-term outcomes	%
2 2	Of all times when someone claimed credit for themselves in a team project, in ____% cases they claimed more credit than they deserved	%
2 3	Of all times when there was clear evidence of a problematic situation, someone ignored it in ____% of cases	%
2 4	Of all times when a decision was evaluated, the ____% of times when someone focused mainly on the outcomes rather than considering the quality of the decision-making process	%

2 5	Of all times when someone had to evaluate themselves, in ____% of situations they overestimated their positive qualities and underestimated their negative qualities	%
2 6	Of all situations when an outcome was being measured, in ____% of cases someone conflated the means used to measure an outcome with the outcome itself (i.e. equated employee responses on satisfaction surveys with actual level of employee satisfaction)	%
2 7	Of all situations when someone had all the relevant information needed to make a decision, in ____% of cases they continued to request additional information before making the decision	%
2 8	Of all times when someone thought that others in the organization agreed with them, they were wrong in ____% of cases	%
2 9	Of all situations when an action was considered, in ____% of cases the costs of failing to act were not adequately considered	%
3 0	Of all times when someone was evaluating a situation and making a decision, in ____% of cases they underestimated the intensity of feelings of other people (employees, customers, vendors, or other stakeholders)	%

Scoring Rubric

Numerical Score

Directions: Add up all the answers above to get the numerical score for your workplace.

Numerical score: _____

Letter Score

Directions: Use the guidelines below to give your workplace a letter score. Please treat the guidelines as an approximation, not as a conclusive determination.

For example, if the overall score is 700, but four of the questions have a score of 90, this indicates that some areas of your workplace are experiencing high levels of dangerous judgment errors that need to be addressed. In that case, you should give your workplace a C as the letter score.

By contrast, if the score is 1000 and all questions had a score of 30 or less, your workplace might need only minor tweaks to address dangerous judgment errors. These tweaks might include conducting some basic training on these errors and making some changes in your processes. In that case, you should give your workplace a B as the letter score.

Note that some judgment errors are much more dangerous than others. For instance, many strong companies have suffered major setbacks when they inaccurately evaluated the intensity of feelings among stakeholders, such as the strength of customer loyalty or resistance to change among employees. Give your workplace a lower score if the judgment errors you identify are particularly dangerous, based on your own estimate of the situation.

Please make sure to provide a justification if your letter score differs from your numerical score.

0 - 300: A

Your workplace is experiencing a **minimal** level of dangerous judgment errors. Current processes and practices are working well and require normal vigilance for cognitive biases to protect your bottom line.

310 - 900: B

Your workplace is experiencing a **slight** level of dangerous judgment errors and requires some fine-tuning in current processes and practices to stop harming its bottom line.

910 - 1500: C

Your workplace is experiencing a **moderate** level of dangerous judgment errors and requires a substantial intervention to adjust current processes and practices to stop harming its bottom line.

1510 - 2100: D

Your workplace is experiencing a **high** level of dangerous judgment errors and requires major changes to current processes and practices in order to stop significant harm to its bottom line.

2110 - 3000: F

Your workplace is experiencing a **catastrophic** level of dangerous judgment errors and requires a full-scale overhaul of current processes and practices to stop harming its bottom line.

Numerical score: _____

Letter Score: _____

Justification if letter score is different from numerical score:

Impact Evaluation

This section is optional, and applies most to those in leadership positions with profit and loss responsibility, ranging from department heads in larger organizations to the owners of small businesses. It provides a rough estimate of the financial impact of the judgment errors you uncovered and of how much money your organization, department, or team will lose in the next year if the errors are not addressed.

Directions: Do a rough estimate of the financial impact of the judgment errors you uncovered.

Some of these errors are easy to quantify. For example, it's relatively easy to estimate the costs of projects missing deadlines or running over budget, or the costs of throwing good money thrown after bad. It's harder to assess the costs of judgment errors that result in issues like internal conflict or misinterpreted evidence. For these issues you may choose to evaluate the financial consequences of the loss in productivity due to employee disengagement, time spent on internal politics over external productivity, increased sick days due to lowered mental and physical well-being, and the losses resulting from higher turnover and increased costs of hiring and training new employees.

1. Write down your current annual revenue and expenses, to the extent that these are applicable to your role:

Current revenue: \$ _____ **Current expenses:** \$ _____

2. How much can you increase your revenue and decrease your expenses in the next year if you eliminate 20% of judgment errors in your workplace (20% is a conservative estimate of the impact of effective interventions as shown by behavioral science research).

Increase in revenue: \$ _____ **Decrease in expenses:** \$ _____

3. Given the numbers above, how much would it be wise to invest into eliminating judgment errors?

Amount to invest in eliminating judgment errors: \$ _____

Competencies

The judgment errors described above fall into four broad competencies: evaluations of oneself, evaluations of others, strategic evaluations of risks and rewards, and tactical evaluations in project implementation. Although these competencies are somewhat overlapping, we can generally place each question as primarily within one of these four competencies.

Directions: Follow the steps below to identify the competencies that are most affected by judgment errors in your workplace. Focus on improving performance in these areas for maximum impact. If they are, then you can focus on that competency in improving performance.

Self-Evaluations: how good are the employees in your workplace at evaluating themselves?

Add your scores for the following questions:

Question	#3	#13	#17	#22	#25	Total
Score						

Divide the total by 5: _____%

This percentage represents how frequently the employees in your workplace fall into judgment errors when evaluating themselves.

Anything over 10% is an issue. Anything over 30% is a problem. Anything over 50% is a serious problem.

Other-Evaluations: how good are the employees in your workplace at evaluating others?

Add your scores for the following questions:

Question	#2	#6	#7	#10	#19	#28	#30	Total
Score								

Divide the total by 7: _____%

This percentage represents how frequently the employees in your workplace fall into judgment errors when evaluating others.

Anything over 10% is an issue. Anything over 30% is a problem. Anything over 50% is a serious problem.

Strategic Evaluations: how good are the employees in your workplace at evaluating risks and rewards, making plans, and having foresight?

Add your scores for the following questions:

Question	#4	#5	#8	#9	#11	#14	#15	#16	#18	#20	#23	Total
Score												

Divide the total by 11: _____%

This percentage represents how frequently the employees in your workplace fall into judgment errors when making strategic evaluations.

Anything over 10% is an issue. Anything over 30% is a problem. Anything over 50% is a serious problem.

Tactical Evaluations: how good are the employees in your workplace at project development, implementation, and problem-solving?

Add your scores for the following questions:

Question	#1	#12	#21	#24	#26	#27	#29	Total
Score								

Divide the total by 7: _____%

This percentage represents how frequently the employees in your workplace fall into judgment errors when making tactical evaluations.

Anything over 10% is an issue. Anything over 30% is a problem. Anything over 50% is a serious problem.

Resources for You

Fill out the form:

1) For digital resources

- Assessment on Addressing Dangerous Judgment Errors
- Five Questions Decision Aid
- Manual on Failure-Proofing
- Additional resources as they are developed

2) To connect with me for follow-up questions & support

- Including free 60-minute coaching session

Name _____

Email _____

Presentation Evaluation Questionnaire

To answer, please fill in the circle completely (●). Please choose **only one answer** per question.

Presentation Title:

Presentation Date:

Presenter Name(s):

Using the scale on the right, please rate each question/statement below.

1. To what extent did the presentation **fulfill your learning needs**?

Not at all (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Very much

2. To what extent did the presentation **achieve its announced objectives**?

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

3. How would you rate the **presentation content** or subject matter?

Very poor (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Very good

4. How would you rate the **order in which the content was presented**?

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

5. How would you rate the **materials** used during the presentation?

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

6. How would you rate the overall **quality** of the presentation?

Very low (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Very high

7. How would you rate the overall **usefulness of the presentation**?

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

8. How **relevant** is this presentation **to your organization's mission**?

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

9. My **knowledge/skills increased** as a result of this presentation.

Strongly disagree (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Strongly agree

10. The knowledge/skills gained through this presentation are **directly applicable to my job**.

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Please write your responses below:

11. What knowledge/skills acquired from the presentation will you now **apply** on the job? (List the most important three.)

12. What type of **support** would you need to apply the newly acquired knowledge/skills?

13. What worked **best** in this presentation?

14. What would you recommend to **improve** this presentation in the future?