

Clutterbuck Coaching and Mentoring International (CCMI) in partnership with Turner International Enterprises (TIE) are pleased to offer this virtual program. The aim of this program is to embody the presence of a team coach. You will be supported throughout the program by some of the most experienced team coaches in the world.

Team Coaching Practitioner

SESSION 3 WORKBOOK: WORKING WITH PERILL

Contents

Instructions for session 3	3
Origins of the PERILL model of team function and dysfunction	4
PERILL: the story	13
High Performance Team Diagnostic	14
The PERILL model	14
How to use perill in discovery and preparation	24

Instructions for session 3

Purpose of session 3

- To apply learning to all our varied work situations and learn from how different others apply it.
- To practice using the learning in both supplied case scenarios and in situations brought by participants.
- To share the great diversity of learning between individuals and groups.
- To help each other with our emerging questions.

In order to deepen the learning and exchange during the sessions, we all together create a safe container where participants can experiment, explore, show their doubts and insecurities, and also support each other. We do so by:

- **Confidentiality**- in order to co-create safe environment for open sharing and exploration, breakout rooms are not recorded, and we ask participants not to talk about other people outside our cohort without their explicit permission.
- **Respect** – great diversity is one of the most prominent values of this Program, and we try to learn from our differences, rather than be judgmental...

How can you contribute & how do you show up?

Before joining session 3, take some moments to reflect on:

- Openness to others – how ready are you to share your experiences, knowledge, doubts, questions, emotions, or to explore your blind spots? What would you need to open a little bit more?
- Receptiveness – How ready are you to receive feedback? How able are you to embrace diversity and learn from it?
- How willing are you to challenge your colleagues in their thinking? How able are you of being supportive to others in the group?
- How prepared are you planning to be for session 3?

Origins of the PERILL model of team function and dysfunction

This article is adapted from a chapter in The Practitioner's Handbook of Team Coaching, Clutterbuck et al, Routledge, 2019

Either explicitly or tacitly, definitions of team coaching tend refer either to performance, as the primary aim of the intervention, or to an improvement in team awareness and collaboration, from which performance benefits may subsequently emerge. Amongst the former are Thornton (2010, p122) Clutterbuck (2010) and Hawkins (2014, page 80). Amongst the latter are Kets de Vries (2005, p68), Hackman & Wageman (2005, p269) and Hardingham et al (2004). To illustrate the contrast and complementary, I choose here one example of each, extracted from:

Clutterbuck (2010, p271) *A learning intervention designed to increase collective capability and performance of a group or team, through application of the coaching principles of assisted reflection, analysis and motivation for change*

Hardingham (2004, p165) *Enabling the team, and also the individuals within it, to "develop"... the focus of development tends to be on development itself, rather than on success.*

In an MSc thesis Williams (2016) interviewed coachees about their definitions of team coaching and found little consensus, but common themes were again achieving understanding and improved collaboration, and overcoming obstacles to performance.

The various models proposed to explore team function echo this duality. Lencioni's deficit model proposes five key dysfunctions of a team: absence of trust, fear of conflict, lack of commitment, avoidance of accountability, and inattention to results. Aptly sub-titled a fable, it provides insightful accounts of how failure in one aspect of a team's inter-relationships and dynamics may lead to failures in others. It is, however, limited on several accounts:

1. As a deficit model only, it provides few clues as to what a genuinely high performing team does (absence of a negative factor does not necessarily make a positive)
2. The assumption that the direction of causation is fixed (i.e. that each layer in the model leads to the next) is highly questionable – it is not difficult to find examples, where inattention to results, at the top of the pyramid, may lead to lack of commitment, or avoidance of accountability. Lencioni's model is essentially a linear approach to a complex system
3. It assumes that all performance disrupting factors are internal to the team, yet this is clearly not always the case -- Hackman and Wageman (2005) have demonstrated the importance of structure, size and resources, for example

The other commonly cited model is Hawkins' (2011) five disciplines of team coaching – Commissioning (what our stakeholders require of us), Clarifying (what the team is there to do), Co-creating (how the members work together) Connecting (what they do when they are not together) and Core learning (how the team as a whole develops and learns). Hawkins emphasises the position of the team as a system within systems – and hence the need for team coaching to take a multi-dimensional, systemic perspective.

Less well quoted by far is a thoughtful paper by Champoux et al (2015), who identified from their own literature analysis six characteristics of high performing teams, and interviewed leaders from eight organisations in different sectors to understand how the six characteristics were reflected in their organisational cultures. The six characteristics were: high level of trust; high level of respect; commitment to a clear and common purpose; willingness and ability to manage conflict; focus on results; and, alignment of authority and accountability. They offer a model of behaviours that may have a significant impact on these characteristics. The four quadrants of behaviours are: directing, primarily focusing on results; influencing, primarily focusing on people; supporting; primarily focusing on relationships; analysing, primarily focusing on quality, accuracy and perfection. They conclude that individuals' behavioural tendencies can provide an essential component for team success; however, differences can create unproductive conflict if not proactively managed.

Over the past 10 years, I have introduced a stream of trainee team coaches to these models across the world. In their feedback and presentations on practice, their feedback has been overwhelmingly a mix of positive and negative to each of the models. Based on this feedback, I began to explore with colleagues in my international network the possibility of generating a model of team performance and dysfunction that addressed the perceived weaknesses in the existing models; and which could be tested against real cases provided by trainee team coaches. In particular, the new model needed to address the requirements to be comprehensive, both in the issues it covers and the teams, to which it may apply; and to be circular, that is to recognise that in a complex adaptive system, every factor may influence every other factor. We also wanted to take the concept of leader-member exchange more firmly into account as a factor for performance and dysfunction.

In a study funded by the European Community in 1998, for Exemplas, and described in chapter four of *Coaching the Team at Work* (Clutterbuck, 2007), I proposed that effective teams maintained a constant focus on three core areas -- Task, Behaviour and Learning -- supported by interacting processes. The analysis of my interviews with teams showed that high performing teams constantly shifted their attention between these foci, so that they did not let the emphasis on one dominate the others. The importance of shared team goals (Hackman et al, 2005) I subsumed within the area of task, with goal setting and management being among the team's core processes. The complexity of goal management within teams and within coaching generally was further exposed in the many diverse contributions to *Beyond Goals* (David et al, 2013).

More recently, the cases of team coaching brought to training suggested that team strengths and weaknesses tended to fall into one of five contexts, which I originally named as 'pillars'. These contexts were:

- Purpose and motivation
- Externally facing processes
- Relationships
- Internally facing processes
- Learning processes

These five contexts largely reinforced the earlier model, the differences being that processes tended to be either internally or externally focused, that goal management appears to be part of a wider context (purpose) and that goal clarity in itself is ineffective without motivation to achieve the goal. I was also able to compare these with a global study of high

performing teams in a top five technology company. This study started with an extensive literature search and involved extensive interviews across the world with many of the organization's highest performing teams, at all levels and in multiple functions.

Since *Beyond Goals*, I have continued to test the logic and evidence for this five-context model. In 2015, I was commissioned by a large global dot.com to investigate the characteristics of its highest performing teams. This stimulated another extensive search of the literature on teams and performance, using Google Scholar and various other reference sources, to develop a template for focus group interviews. The literature searched was all in English language, although input was sought from pioneers of team coaching in France and elsewhere. Permission has not yet been granted to publish the results of the research within the company.

The literature analysis provided hundreds of factors, which I gradually combined into the themes in Table 1. It is quite probable that some potentially significant themes were omitted, because they were only mentioned once or twice. The table below represents the *recurring* themes.

Table 1: Proposed characteristics of high performing teams

Characteristic	Examples
Purpose and goals	• A clear sense of purpose • Clear goals • Goals that motivate • Everybody is working toward the same goals. • Everyone understands both team and individual performance goals and knows what is expected of them.
Role clarity	• Defined roles • The mission is broken down into meaningful performance goals for each team member to pursue. • Commitment to individual and team roles
Performance focus	• "Relatively more ambitious goals than the norm"
Skills	• Complementary skill set, and at times interchangeable skills. • High levels of emotional intelligence
Task processes	• Team members are clear on how to work together and how to accomplish tasks. • Authority to decide or act
Relationships processes	• Team members actively diffuse tension and friction in a relaxed and informal atmosphere • Operate like a strong family
Decision-making	• Disagreement is viewed as a good thing and conflicts are managed. • The team makes decisions when there is natural agreement -- in the cases where agreement is elusive, a decision is made by

	the team lead or executive sponsor, after which little second-guessing occurs.
Trust	• People have solid and deep trust in each other and in the team's purpose -- they feel free to express feelings and ideas. • Mutual support and trust
Communication within the team	• Multi-Directional Communication • Listening
Psychological safety	• Criticism is constructive and is oriented toward problem solving and removing obstacles. • The team engages in extensive discussion, and everyone gets a chance to contribute -- even the introverts. • Balanced participation
Collaborative processes	• Each team member carries his or her own weight and respects the team processes and other members. • Mutual accountability; acknowledgement of their joint accountability towards a common purpose in addition to individual obligations to their specific roles. • High-performing teams are unselfish.
Leadership processes	• The leadership of the team shifts from time to time, as appropriate, to drive results. No individual members are more important than the team.
Conflict management	• Conflict is encouraged when it is constructive; people focus on conflict of ideas rather than relationship conflict
"Requisite diversity"	• Reliance on diverse talents
Ownership	• Taking responsibility for self and colleagues

One of the key results of the study in 2015 was the role of the leader in these high performing teams, for which we coined the phrase *the secure leader*.

The recurring characteristics of the secure leader, regardless of national culture, were as follows:

1. Leaders, who are secure in themselves, don't feel the need to control. It is relatively easy for them to trust others, because if mistakes happen, they have big enough shoulders to share responsibility.
2. They recognise that trying to manage a large team is an impossible and fruitless task. Rather, they aim to support team members in managing themselves.
3. These leaders don't expect to be keep informed about everything, or to re-route information between members of the team. Instead, they expect team members to ensure communication happens between them and to tell the manager, when there is something he or she needs to know.
4. These leaders see part of their role as protecting the team from distractions from outside; equally important is ensuring that everyone understands and is aligned with the overarching team goals.

5. Their self-security makes them open to (and welcoming of) feedback from team members. They have a “growth mindset” – focused equally on their own development and that of the team.
6. They *care* – both about the team goals, but also about each of the team members as individuals. They make time for human interaction.
7. They are aware that they, too, are a work in progress and they are fully comfortable with that perception.

In further developing the model, therefore, it appears that a key moderating factor may be the role of the leader. There is an extensive literature on leader-member exchange and numerous studies establish the link between, for example, the leader’s communication and relationship-building skills and team performance. (e.g. Lee et al, 2010).

Overlaying all this data into a pragmatic, yet sufficiently evidence-based model takes time and it is fair to say that validation is still an ongoing activity. Along the way, the model has formalised itself into PERILL, reflecting each of the contexts plus leadership.

Let’s look briefly at each context in terms of indicators of high and low performance/dysfunction:

Purpose and motivation

Purpose is about what the team is there to do. It is the mission in Hawkins’ commissioning. The team purpose may be a subset of a wider organisational purpose or one generated from within. From purpose flows the collective energy that makes “the whole greater than the sum of the parts”. Indicators include clarity of shared vision, goals and priorities.

External processes, systems and structures

These are about how the team interrelates with its multiple stakeholders – customers, suppliers, shareholders, other teams within the organisation, more senior levels of management and so on. Indicators include reputation, performance against targets, environmental awareness (evolving markets, technology, competition etc). They also cover the team’s access to resources, such as information and finance.

Relationships

These are about how people work together – whether they enjoy each other’s company, respect each other’s ability, are honest towards each other and so on. Indicators include the level of psychological safety.

Internal processes, systems and structures

This is the internal mirror to the external and includes how the team manages workflow, supports each other, and maintains high quality of communication (both task-related and affective). Indicators include role clarity and decision-making quality.

Learning

This relates to the team’s ability to respond to its changing environment and maintain continuous improvement and growth. Indicators include whether it is ahead or behind the curve in terms of change in its environment and the clarity and relevance of members’ learning objectives.

Leadership

The literature on leadership is vast, with well over 200,000 citations, often contradictory. The GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness Studies – globe.com) demonstrate that perceptions and expectations of leaders vary extensively between cultures. The link between what leaders do and how the team performs is very hard to pin down, because it is not just about the leader and what he or she does. It is about the system, of which the team and the leader are part. So, models that rely solely on a set of leader competencies miss the point. One of the most powerful exercises in team coaching is to ask the team (with the leader's agreement) to specify what kind of leadership behaviours they need to be able to perform at their best, both individually and collectively. (The two lists are not necessarily the same!) Then the team discusses with the leader their responsibilities in helping him or her become the leader they need.

One of our planned studies is to explore the systemic factors affecting leadership in teams, where the leadership role is not fixed.

The table below illustrates the indicators in more detail. (Some indicators appear more than once, as they may be symptomatic of more than one issue.)

Table 2: Indicators of team dysfunction and high performance

Context	Dysfunction indicators	High performance indicators
Purpose and motivation	• Purpose too vague/ People interpret it in different ways • Purpose not endorsed from above / inadequate direction from above • Little or no connection with people's strongly held values (so low energy for achieving it) / Conflicts with other strongly-held values • Conflict about priorities between goals • Personal agendas predominate over the collective agenda • Low individual and collective resilience	• High clarity of mission, linked with wider (often societal or environmental) purpose • Goal clarity • Role clarity • High levels of collective and individual energy • High alignment on goal priority • Willingness to put team priorities before personal priorities • Ability to review and change goals rapidly • Engagement of stakeholders with the mission • Strongly shared values • Rapid recovery from setbacks
External processes, systems and structures	• Reputational issues • Lack of key resources • Operating within a political environment	• Strong radar for threats and opportunities • High reputation amongst stakeholders • Clarity of stakeholders' needs and aspirations

	• Failure to establish clear expectations with stakeholders • Environmental / market change • Cultural influences	• Strong communications (listening and informing) • Customers and suppliers have easy access • Strong attention to quality
Relationships	• Conflict is not addressed/ is denied • Lack of psychological safety • People feel undervalued / unsupported • Cliques and sub-groups • Lack of willingness to share responsibility for collective performance (blame) • Communication problems (relational)	• Right people with right skills • Complementary strengths and weaknesses • High levels of honest feedback • Understanding each other's strengths and weaknesses • Positive conflict encouraged and valued • High level of support for colleagues • Psychological safety • Valuing diversity
Internal processes, systems and structures	• Recurring quality problems • Lack of clarity about tasks and roles • Inadequate systems of review • Lack of clarity about what constitutes good (high) performance in this context • Unclear decision-making processes • Communication problems (systemic)	• Clarity of who is in the team and not • Appropriate team size • Distributed leadership • Strong decision-making processes • Working to everyone's strengths • Strong attention to quality • Rapid innovation • Role clarity
Learning processes	• "Too busy syndrome" (no time for reflection) • Individual and collective learning insufficiently valued • Lack of sources of external perspective and/or ideas • Low learning maturity/ differences in personal maturity • Resistance to change • Mistakes are repeated (not learned from)	• Team development plan for collective learning • Positive attitude towards mistakes • Learning objectives linked to evolving environment • Habit of reflection – time to step back from doing • Asking for feedback • Co-coaching/ coaching mindset • Seeking to be ahead of change

Leadership	• Absentee or over-controlling leadership • Poser concentrated in the leader • Lack of open conversations between leader and team • Politics	• Leader provides moral direction • Role model for learning and values • Leadership is distributed • Leader is "secure"
-------------------	---	--

The diagram below illustrates ways in which these contexts interact to affect team performance (light grey) and dysfunction (dark grey). The white boxes indicate the moderating effect of the leader's qualities and behaviours (LQB).

PERILL: The contexts of team performance and dysfunction

LQB	Purpose & Motivation	Externally facing processes	Relationships	Internally facing processes	Learning
Purpose & Motivation	LQB	Alignment of values between the team and its key stakeholders	Working enthusiastically together towards shared goals	Clarity of priorities; putting collective priorities before personal	Actively seeking ways to leverage and expand team strengths
Externally facing processes	Stakeholders unclear what you stand for	LQB	Strong collaborative relationships with stakeholders	Rapid and effective response to quality issues	Rapid product and service innovation
Relationships	People pursue their own agendas	Conflict with stakeholders; disrespect for stakeholders	LQB	High level of psychological safety leads to constant questioning of what we do	People take active responsibility for supporting each other's development
Internally facing processes	Duplication and waste of effort	Quality issues not acknowledged or addressed	People avoid "interfering" in each other's territory. Large "elephants in the room".	LQB	Culture of continuous process improvement
Learning	Learning focused on the individual not the collective	Slow to innovate	People "hoard" knowledge and expertise	Resistance to change	LQB

© David Clutterbuck & Coaching and Mentoring International

We have developed a diagnostic, currently in trial, that addresses each context with 20 penetrating questions. As we have observed that teams sometimes struggle to be honest in completing questionnaires of this kind, we have added an extra dimension – we ask them to rate the confidence, with which they make each answer.

Conclusion

As we learn more and more about how teams and groups function, the need for a more balanced perspective on assessing performance and dysfunction increases. Team coaches will need to take increased care not to distort their interventions with partial snapshots of the team's dynamics. Using a diagnostic questionnaire will often be part of the solution, but equally important, if not more so, will be the interviews the coach conducts with team members at the beginning of the assignment. Questionnaires only assess pre-set issues and may miss key dynamics that can only be identified by listening to the stories of the team members and how they make collective sense of the team and their part in its success or failure. In listening to those stories, it is important to work within contextual models that are sufficiently broad and well-evidenced to capture these dynamics. Otherwise, the team coach may unwittingly collude with the team to address one part of the team system, while ignoring other parts, on which that part may be dependent.

Bibliography

- Champoux, T, Chirls, C & Myers, M (2015) *Teams That Work: The Six Characteristics of High Performing Teams* Effectiveness Institute, Bellview WA
- Clutterbuck, D (2007) *Coaching the Team at Work*, Nicholas Brealy, London
- Clutterbuck, D (2010) Team coaching. In Cox, E, Bachkirova, T and Clutterbuck, D *The Complete Handbook of Coaching*, London, Sage
- David, S, Clutterbuck, D & Megginson, D (2013) *Beyond Goals: Effective Strategies for Coaching and Mentoring*, Gower, Farnham
- Hackman, J.R. & Wageman, R. (2005) A Theory of Team Coaching: *Academy of Management Review*, 30 (2), 269 – 287
- Hardingham, A, Brearley, M, Moorhouse, A & Ventner, B (2004) *The Coach's Coach: Personal Development for Personal Developers*, CIPD, London
- Hawkins, P (2014) *Leadership Team Coaching: Developing Collective Transformational Leadership*, Kogan Page, London
- Kets de Vries, MFR (2005) The Group Coaching Conundrum, *International Journal of Evidence-based Coaching and Mentoring*, 19(1)
- Lee, P, Gillespie, N, Mann, L & Wearing, A (2010) Leadership and Trust: Their effect on knowledge-sharing and team performance, *Management Learning*, June
- Lencioni, P (2002) *The five dysfunctions of a team: a leadership fable*, Jossey-Bass, SF
- Williams, J (2016) *An exploration into creating readiness for team coaching*, dissertation for Masters Degree, Henley Business School, University of Reading

PERILL: the story

- The origins
 - Basics of complex adaptive systems – how they work. Human beings as CAS
 - Teams as systems
 - The complex relationship between strengths and weaknesses
 - Research with high performing teams
 - Literature search
- The 6 elements of PERILL
 - What they look like from a linear perspective - - practical examples
 - Purpose: multiple levels of purpose;
 - Externals: relationships with specific stakeholders and influencers
 - Relationships: how to create a better working climate
 - Internal: We need a new communications plan
 - Learning: We need training in a specific skill
 - Leadership: Who makes what decisions? How do we allocate leadership responsibilities?
 - What they look like from a CAS perspective - - practical examples
 - Team with stakeholders making different demands (HR example – resource allocation); **conflict**; processes needed to manage priorities
 - Falling behind technology. Not just learning issue. Stakeholders (not willing to invest, different agenda). Relationships (avoidance)
- Using PERILL
 - As a diagnostic tool
 - As a workshop framework
 - As a reflection framework for the team coach

High Performance Team Diagnostic

The PERILL model

The PERILL model is derived from an extensive analysis of the research and other literature on team function and dysfunction. Each member of the team is asked to score all the questions from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 10 (Strongly agree), but also to rate how confident they are in the score they have given, from 1 (Not confident) to 5 (Very confident). The two numbers are multiplied to give additional insight into ratings. Individual scores are aggregated into a composite team score. For yet more data, a modified version of the questionnaire can be given stakeholders, for a 360- degree perspective.

The questionnaire can be used in part or whole as a one-off intervention or as an annual check-up.

Purpose and motivation	Score	Confidence in Score
We can collectively and clearly articulate our shared purpose		
We are highly aligned on what the team is here to do		
We have high clarity and agreement about our purpose and our vision of the future		
I am clear about our shared goals and priorities for the next 12-24 months		
We have high agreement between us on our goals and priorities for the next 12-24 months		
Our key stakeholders understand our purpose, vision, goals and priorities		
We review our goals and priorities regularly (every few months) to test them against changes in our environment		
We are very clear about our shared values		
I am enthused by the challenges involved in achieving our purpose and vision		
We are collectively enthused by the challenges involved in achieving our purpose and vision		
I am enthused by our goals for the next 12-24 months		
We are collectively enthused by our goals for the next 12-24 months		
I believe that my job role allows me to contribute something special to the world		
We believe that our job roles allow us to contribute something special to the world		
We have all the support we need from outside the team		
We are good at putting team priorities ahead of our personal priorities		
We recover quickly from setbacks		
We play to our strengths in the way we divide out work tasks		
We enjoy and find fulfilment in the work we do		

We enjoy and find fulfilment in working with our team colleagues.		
TOTAL		

External processes, systems and structures	Score	Confidence in Score
We are very good at monitoring what is going on in our markets – both customers and competitors		
We have a strong radar for threats and opportunities from outside our markets (for example, new technology or new potential new entrants)		
We have good information about our customers' strategies and challenges		
We have well developed processes for finding talent that is different from the talent we have now, when we need to		
We are very clear who our stakeholders are and the priority we attach to them		
We understand how our values align with those of our stakeholders		
We are good at telling our stakeholders what we are doing and why		
We are very good at listening to our customers		
We build long-term plans and ambitions around our those of our stakeholders		
We ensure stakeholders know who to talk to in the team and have easy access to the team		
If we need to expand the team or replace members, we know who to turn to		
There is a high level of trust between the team and its key stakeholders		
We learn constantly from our customers		
We would have nothing to fear, if stakeholders were to observe how we work behind the scenes		
The stakeholders, who set our purpose and goals, have full confidence in our team's ability and processes		
The stakeholders, who set our purpose and goals, feel sufficiently informed		
The language we use to describe our customers and suppliers is respectful		
We review regularly whether the values we espouse are the values we are living towards each of our stakeholder groups		
We engage with our stakeholders in reviewing and improving our operational processes		
We have all the external resources we need to succeed		
TOTAL		

Relationships¹	Score	Confidence in Score
We have the right people with the right skills and expertise to achieve our goals		
I can rely on my team colleagues to do what they say they will		
I believe my team colleagues want me to succeed		
We give each other honest feedback, even if it's tough		
We listen to each other well		
We take care of each other		
We demonstrate interest in each other's lives outside work		
We are complementary in our strengths and weaknesses		
We value the differences in our personalities, backgrounds and experience		
If we were starting this team today, these are the people I would choose as my colleagues		
We make sure everyone's voice is heard in meetings		
We argue in private but are united in public		
We have high respect for each other's ability		
We know when to let each other take the lead		
It's OK for a colleague to ask questions and make suggestions in areas, which are not their responsibility		
It's OK to admit and discuss our mistakes		
We are good at building on each other's ideas		
Conflict is generally very positive, around ideas rather than personality		
We show each other respect, both in private and in public		
We take time to say <i>Thank you</i> to each other		
TOTAL		

Internal processes, systems and structures	Score	Confidence in Score
We are an appropriate size of team for what we have to achieve		
We are very clear who is in the team and who is an external resource		
We supplement the skills sets and strengths of team members with focused resource from outside the team, when needed		
Our internal processes and structures respond very rapidly to external change		
We are able to stand in for each other in most circumstances		
We have clear norms of good behaviour in meetings and elsewhere		
We know exactly what we are dependent on each other for		
We understand our systems well		

¹ This section may be followed up if needed by the questionnaire *How psychologically safe is this team*

We regularly review our systems to make them more effective and to question the assumptions behind them		
We are more focused on being effective than being efficient		
We take responsibility for keeping each other informed, rather than expecting the leader to do it		
We quickly recognise and respond supportively to an overload on any colleague		
We may all take a leadership role, when it plays to our expertise		
We assign tasks as much as possible to match each person's strengths		
We have strong and reliable processes to manage decision-making, so that we avoid decision-making biases		
The leader is sufficiently self-confident to allow the team to get on with their jobs		
The leader ensures the team has minimum interference from outside		
We look forward to our regular meetings		
We implement innovations rapidly and effectively		
We are resilient		
TOTAL		

Learning	Score	Confidence in Score
We all have and use personal development plans		
We have and use a team development plan that integrates individual learning and focuses on how the team needs to evolve in the next 120-24 months		
We relate the learning needs of the team to the evolving markets and business strategy		
We include learning goals as well as task goals on our regular meeting agenda		
We engage in co-coaching and see each other as key learning resources		
We invite outsiders to present challenging ideas to us		
We prefer to be ahead of change, rather than behind it		
We frequently seek challenge to our assumptions and the way we do things		
We allocate time for individual learning, which can later be shared with the team – and expect everyone to take this time		
We allocate time for collective learning and reflection		
We have strong, positive practices for learning from mistakes and setbacks		
We are good at translating lessons from setbacks into practical change		
We invest in and build extensive networks to generate new ideas		
We invite challenge from other levels in the organization		

Leaders take seriously being role models for continuous learning		
We recognise that the need for continuous learning <i>increases</i> at each level in the organizational hierarchy		
We recognise and reward learning		
We value honest feedback		
We show we are serious about learning by protecting training budgets		
We default to a coaching mindset in meetings		
TOTAL		

Leadership	Score	Confidence in Score
The team is clear and agreed on what they need in terms of being led		
The team and the leader agree on the style of leadership needed		
Where appropriate, the leadership role moves between team members		
The leader shares his or her own development goals and seeks support from the team		
The leader's style is less managing people and more enabling them to manage themselves		
Meeting agendas are created collaboratively		
The leader invests substantial energy in making sure everyone understands individual and collective goals		
The leader helps the team understand the wider context surrounding goals		
The leader seeks and makes use of feedback from the team		
The leader protects the team from the worst of interference from outside		
The leader promotes the achievement and reputation of the team and its members, rather than his or her own		
The team values the leader for his or her knowledge and expertise (not necessarily just technical)		
The team values the leader for his or her intellect		
The team values the leader for who he or she is as a human being		
The leader is very approachable		
The leader demonstrates that he or she cares about the team mission and purpose		
The leader demonstrates that he or she cares about the team members		
The leader shows courage		
The leader is a role model for the team values		
The leader is a role model for personal development – both their own and coaching others		
TOTAL		

360 version

Purpose and motivation In my observation, this team:	Score	Confidence in Score
Clearly explains its collective purpose		
Is highly aligned on what the team is here to do		
Has high clarity and agreement about its purpose and vision of the future		
Is clear about our shared goals and priorities for the next 12-24 months		
Has high agreement between members on their goals and priorities for the next 12-24 months		
Takes time to make sure I understand its purpose, vision, goals and priorities		
Reviews its goals and priorities regularly (every few months) to test them against changes in our environment		
Is very clear about their shared values		
Is collectively enthused by the challenges involved in achieving our purpose and vision		
Is collectively enthused by its goals for the next 12-24 months		
Believe that their job roles allow them to contribute something special to the world		
Has all the support it needs from outside the team		
Is good at putting team priorities ahead of personal priorities		
Recovers quickly from setbacks		
Plays to individual strengths in the way it divides out work tasks		
Enjoy and find fulfilment in the work they do		
Enjoy and find fulfilment in working with their team colleagues.		
TOTAL		

External processes, systems and structures In my observation, this team:	Score	Confidence in Score
Is very good at monitoring what is going on in its markets – both customers and competitors		
Has a strong radar for threats and opportunities from outside its markets (for example, new technology or new potential new entrants)		
Has good information about its customers' strategies and challenges		
Has well developed processes for finding talent that is different from the talent it has now, when it needs to		
Is very clear who its stakeholders are and the priority it attaches to them		
Understands how its values align with those of its stakeholders		
Is good at telling stakeholders what it is doing and why		

Is very good at listening to its customers		
Builds long-term plans and ambitions around our those of its stakeholders		
Ensures stakeholders know who to talk to in the team and have easy access to the team		
Knows who to turn to if it needs to expand the team or replace members		
Has a high level of trust between the team and its key stakeholders		
Learns constantly from its customers		
Would have nothing to fear, if stakeholders were to observe how we work behind the scenes		
The stakeholders, who set our purpose and goals, have full confidence in our team's ability and processes		
Ensures the stakeholders, who set its purpose and goals, feel sufficiently informed		
Uses language to describe its customers and suppliers that is respectful		
Reviews regularly whether the values it espouses are the values it is living towards each of its stakeholder groups		
Engages with its stakeholders in reviewing and improving our operational processes		
Has all the external resources it needs to succeed		
TOTAL		

Relationships In my observation, this team:	Score	Confidence in Score
Has the right people with the right skills and expertise to achieve its goals		
Can rely on team colleagues to do what they say they will		
Want each other to succeed		
Give each other honest feedback, even if it's tough		
Listen to each other well		
Take care of each other		
Demonstrate interest in each other's lives outside work		
Are complementary in their strengths and weaknesses		
Value the differences in their personalities, backgrounds and experience		
Would choose each other as colleagues, given a clean sheet		
Make sure everyone's voice is heard in meetings		
Argue in private but are united in public		
Have high respect for each other's ability		
Know when to let each other take the lead		
Believe it's OK for a colleague to ask questions and make suggestions in areas, which are not their responsibility		
Believe it's OK to admit and discuss our mistakes		
Are good at building on each other's ideas		
Uses conflict positively, around ideas rather than personality		
Show each other respect, both in private and in public		

Take time to say <i>Thank you</i> to each other		
TOTAL		

Internal processes, systems and structures	Score	Confidence in Score
In my observation, this team:		
Is an appropriate size of team for what it has to achieve		
Is very clear who is in the team and who is an external resource		
Supplement the skills sets and strengths of team members with focused resource from outside the team, when needed		
Ensures internal processes and structures respond very rapidly to external change		
Is able to stand in for each other in most circumstances		
Has clear norms of good behaviour in meetings and elsewhere		
Knows exactly what they are dependent on each other for		
Understands its systems well		
Regularly reviews its systems to make them more effective and to question the assumptions behind them		
Is more focused on being effective than being efficient		
Takes responsibility for keeping each other informed, rather than expecting the leader to do it		
Quickly recognise and responds supportively to an overload on any colleague		
May all take a leadership role, when it plays to our expertise		
Assigns tasks as much as possible to match each person's strengths		
Has strong and reliable processes to manage decision-making, so that it avoids decision-making biases		
Has a leader with sufficiently self-confident to allow the team to get on with their jobs		
Has a leader, who ensures the team has minimum interference from outside		
Looks forward to its regular meetings		
Implement innovations rapidly and effectively		
Is resilient		
TOTAL		

Learning	Score	Confidence in Score
In my observation, this team:		
All have and use personal development plans		
Have and use a team development plan that integrates individual learning and focuses on how the team needs to evolve in the next 120-24 months		
Relate the learning needs of the team to the evolving markets and business strategy		
Include learning goals as well as task goals on our regular meeting agenda		

Engage in co-coaching and see each other as key learning resources		
Invite outsiders to present challenging ideas to us		
Prefer to be ahead of change, rather than behind it		
Frequently seek challenge to their assumptions and the way they do things		
Allocate time for individual learning, which can later be shared with the team – and expect everyone to take this time		
Allocate time for collective learning and reflection		
Have strong, positive practices for learning from mistakes and setbacks		
Are good at translating lessons from setbacks into practical change		
Invest in and build extensive networks to generate new ideas		
Invite challenge from other levels in the organization		
Has a leader, who takes seriously being a role model for continuous learning		
Recognises that the need for continuous learning <i>increases</i> at each level in the organizational hierarchy		
Recognises and rewards learning		
Values honest feedback		
Shows they are serious about learning by protecting training budgets		
Default to a coaching mindset in meetings		
TOTAL		

Leadership	Score	Confidence in Score
In my observation, this team:		
The team is clear and agreed on what they need in terms of being led		
The team and the leader agree on the style of leadership needed		
Where appropriate, the leadership role moves between team members		
The leader shares his or her own development goals and seeks support from the team		
The leader's style is less managing people and more enabling them to manage themselves		
Meeting agendas are created collaboratively		
The leader invests substantial energy in making sure everyone understands individual and collective goals		
The leader helps the team understand the wider context surrounding goals		
The leader seeks and makes use of feedback from the team		
The leader protects the team from the worst of interference from outside		
The leader promotes the achievement and reputation of the team and its members, rather than his or her own		

The team values the leader for his or her knowledge and expertise (not necessarily just technical)		
The team values the leader for his or her intellect		
The team values the leader for who he or she is as a human being		
The leader is very approachable		
The leader demonstrates that he or she cares about the team mission and purpose		
The leader demonstrates that he or she cares about the team members		
The leader shows courage		
The leader is a role model for the team values		
The leader is a role model for personal development – both their own and coaching others		
TOTAL		

How to use perill in discovery and preparation

The purpose of the discovery phase is to understand the “big picture” of the team – its context, purpose (to the extent that the purpose is clear) and the challenges it faces. PERILL provides a framework for constructing interviews with team members and stakeholders. Key questions to be addressed at this stage are:

- How do the team and its stakeholders perceive the team under each of the PERILL headings?
- What beliefs does the team have under each of those headings?
- What examples can they give of those beliefs in action?
- What incongruences and inconsistencies appear in the team narratives?
- What constraints does the team operate under?
- What are the team’s USPs and underused strengths?
- What *kind* of team is this and how does that affect what is possible?
- How did they come to be in the same team?
- What is the *general climate* in the team?

Useful questions to address the PERILL elements at this stage in interviewing members of the team include:

Purpose and motivation

- What is this team here for?
- If this team were not here, what would not happen that needs to happen?
- What is the value this team creates and who for?
- How does this team’s purpose fit in with the purpose of the organisation as a whole?
- What does it mean to you personally to be in this team?
- How does the team purpose align with your own personal purpose?
- What gives this team its energy? What drains its energy?

External systems and processes

- Who are your stakeholders?
- Which stakeholders carry most and least weight? What are the implications of this?
- What do your stakeholders most need and value from you?
- How often and how do you listen to your stakeholders?
- To what extent do you have the resources (people, money, support) to do the job?
- What are your biggest externally generated challenges as a team?
- How would your stakeholders describe this team?

Relationships

- What does it *feel like* to be in this team?
- If you were to start this team from scratch today, would you include all the same people?
- When did you last feel truly *listened to* by your team colleagues?
- How much *honesty* is there in conversations between team members?
- If you wanted to talk through an embarrassing mistake, would you choose first to discuss it with a team colleague or an outsider?
- What sub-groups and factions are there in this team?
- How diverse is this team?

Internal systems and processes

- What quality controls do you have?
- How do you make sure people have the information they need?
- What's the balance between vertical and horizontal communication?
- Can you give me some examples of process successes and failures?
- What do you do as a team that could be described as best practice? How do you know?
- What are the biggest internally generated challenges for this team?
- How often do you review the team's processes and systems?

Learning

- How rapidly are you adapting to change compared with your competitors? With your key stakeholders?
- What are your collective learning goals this year?
- How often do learning objectives appear in your meeting agendas?
- Can you give me an example of how the team responds to change in its environment?
- How do you ensure a balance between doing and learning?
- How adaptive and agile does the team need to be?
- What are the biggest challenges to the team's continuous learning?

Leadership

- How much leadership does this team need to perform at its best?
- How would you describe the team leader's leadership style?
- How does this influence the team's behaviour? Your behaviour?
- What is the leadership culture in this organisation? How does that affect the team?
- How and when do you and other team members show leadership?
- What is the *leadership contract* in this team? (The psychological contract about who leads in what situations?)
- How is *moral leadership* exhibited by and in this team?

Questions to stakeholders might include:

Purpose

- What is this team there for?
- How does it add value for you?
- How would you like it to add value for you?

External systems and processes

- What would a great working relationship with this team look like?
- How does that compare with what you have now?
- When is it at its best and worst?

Relationships

- Do you like working with this team?
- Do you trust them to deliver?
- What one thing would improve the quality of the relationship between you and the team?

Internal systems and processes

- How would you describe the team in terms of the quality of its processes?
- How well does it communicate with you?
- How transparent are its systems and processes to you?

Learning

- What are the biggest challenges you see for this team in keeping up with change?
- How innovative is it?
- How innovative does it need to be?

Leadership

- How would you describe the *formal* leadership of this team?
- How would you describe the *informal* leadership?
- How would you like to see the team as a whole taking a lead for the benefit of the organization and its stakeholders?

How to use PERILL in diagnostic mode

The purpose of diagnosis is to dig deeper into the interdependencies of the forces that drive the team towards more effective or less effective collective performance. A typical approach to using PERILL in this way at the early stages of a team coaching assignment is to ask the team to identify at least five examples, where it has performed very well and five, where its performance has been disappointing. Using the PERILL matrix and taking the issues one by one, the team identifies as many factors as they can – both positive and negative – about the example. For example, “the customer was upset we hadn’t told them that their main contact in the team had left” or “the customer thanked us for how efficiently and positively we corrected the mistake”. The team discusses each box in the matrix and what was happening there. It then looks for any links between boxes – again both positive and negative in outcome.

The exercise is repeated for at least two more examples. Now, the team can step back and look for patterns or systems *between* examples.

Having established these systems, the team lists these and decides which are the most important and the most urgent. They rate each up to 10 in urgency and up to 20 in importance and multiply the scores to achieve a ranking order. They may also rank them in order of “quick wins” to “tough nuts”. This allows them to select the systems they want to focus on immediately.

Throughout this process, the collective scores of the PERILL diagnostic provide clues to strengths to leverage and weaknesses to address. It is important that the team puts those scores into the context of real examples and the patterns that emerge from those examples. Otherwise, they will tend to move too soon into solutions mode, addressing individual symptoms rather than the system as a whole.