



ANDREW HEDLEY, DIRECTOR, HEDLEY CONSULTING

Consensus is not a synonym for unanimity

There is much talk about the importance of achieving partner consensus on the big decisions that will define a firm's future direction.

Consensus is a worthy objective and one which, as research shows unequivocally, is likely to lead to a more cohesive firm. There is less clarity, however, over what consensus means in practice and how it should be reached.

What is clear is that consensus should not be a synonym for unanimity – firms have, for too long, been forced to the point of making the decision of least offence or of taking the lowest common denominator option by this misconception.

Consensus is perhaps best viewed as reaching a state of acceptance that a particular decision represents the best option for the business, albeit that it may have negative implications for some, including perhaps oneself.

What consensus means in practice differs according to the nature of the firm, but what is clear is that endorsement by the key stakeholders is essential for

any strategy to have a fighting chance of success.

In a ten-partner firm, this may mean that consensus requires all to be comfortable with the direction that the firm is taking, even if the result is a dilution of its efficacy.

In a 300-partner firm, the dynamic is quite different. Most partners in large firms are operating in something much closer to an employee-shareholder relationship than an owner-manager one.

Consensus in this context is a more political construct – securing the majority needed to carry sway and ensuring that the key powerbrokers are engaged and committed.

However, the traits underpinning a consensus-driven approach are the same in all firms.

These traits include clear communication, a sense of engagement and a feeling that one's voice can be heard (even if ultimately the direction taken by the firm is not that which has been personally voiced). It is about respect and giving partners an opportunity to

interact with the senior management team and inform its thinking.

Both academic research and anecdotal evidence suggest that firms that adopt a consensual approach to decision making tend to perform better in the longer term.

This is not to say that, on occasion, the leadership team cannot act unilaterally on big agenda items in order to avert a crisis or capitalise on a time-sensitive opportunity.

Rather, the overriding philosophy of the firm should be centred on building a common sense of purpose and direction.

Contrast this with a management style that is dictatorial, where partners are informed after the event and where important developments are relayed by the media.

Stated in these terms, it is clear which approach will deliver the longer term benefits, shared vision and unified partner group which is so important to the development of a successful twenty-first century firm. ^{mp}

ANDREW.HEDLEY@HEDLEYCONSULTING.COM

THE EDITORIAL BOARD



IAN JEFFERY
Managing Partner
Lewis Silkin



JULIOUS P. SMITH, JR
Chairman Emeritus
Williams Mullen



MALCOLM SHELTON-AGAR
Chief Operating Officer
Allen & Gledhill



MICHAEL SHAW
Managing Partner
Cobbetts



NEIL MAY
Executive Manager
Hogan Lovells



STEPHEN DENYER
Global Markets Partner
Allen & Overy



TIM ASPINALL
Managing Partner
DMH Stallard



DEEPAK MALHOTRA
Director of Strategy & Transformation
Fusion Universal



OZ BENAMRAM
Chief Knowledge Officer
White & Case



JEFFREY J. BERARDI
Chief Marketing Officer
K&L Gates



PAUL BRENT
Marketing Director
Boyes Turner



JILL KING
Former HR Director
Linklaters



JO LARBIE
HR Director
Bircham Dyson Bell



NEIL DAVISON
Head of IT
Farrer & Co



BEVERLY LANDAIS
CEO
Devereux Chambers



ANDREW HEDLEY
Director
Hedley Consulting