



NCSBN

National Council of State Boards of Nursing

## ***Renegotiating Health Care – Resolving Conflict to Build Collaboration (Part 2) - Video Transcript***

©2014 National Council of State Boards of Nursing, Inc.

### **Event**

2014 NCSBN Annual Meeting

More info: [ncsbn.org/5618.htm](http://ncsbn.org/5618.htm)

### **Presenter**

Leonard J. Marcus, PhD

Director, Program for Health Care Negotiation and Conflict Resolution

Harvard School of Public Health

- [Richard] Now we're going to go to a pretty sensitive issue that we see at the heart of a lot of complex problem solving and that is the question of trust. I will say that in many ways your work... and here I use it in the broadest sense of the word... you're at one of those Malcolm Gladwell type tipping points. And where you're looking at the whole question of the compact and you're looking at the question of regulation and licensure in many ways in a very, very different way than before. And the biggest problem will be to hold to critical values. to hold and understand what are the constraints that each state has and they're all different and to create some unity of, unity of mission that will bring this organization together toward an outcome regarding licensure across this country, that every state can live with and that's a really, really difficult puzzle. One of the greatest barriers that we found over the years to the development of collaboration is the question of trust. And when they're different sides around the table and they don't trust one another we call that a trust deficit. And it's very, very difficult under those circumstances to build collaboration. And the fascinating thing is the words that we'll hear when people are in that situation reflect a certain vulnerability. And we need to get them before they get and the conversation turns into a them and then an us. It tends to polarize the discussion and then it's very, very difficult to get to any resolution and to solve any problem or come to any agreement.

[[00:02:09]]

So that's something that needs to be understood and I think the group made progress in addressing this problem. So, one of the fascinating things about humans and the fascinating things about our brains; is we need to make sense of things. We need to put it all together and often times we know some measure of what can be known. And when you think about it in terms of the universe we know very little. We have a very, very

narrow understanding of what's really going on. And so, how does the brain compensate for the fact that we only have limited information? Well, what we do with the rest that we need to understand is we create myths. And these myths are stories that provide evidence for whatever it is that we're trying to promote and that becomes the basis of positional conflict. So the myth could be well here's what we know, there's a whole bunch that we don't know well we're just going to make it up. And once we've put all of the facts and figures together and then we look at the whole thing now it makes sense. Yeah, they say something but let me tell you what I heard in the elevator coming down this morning. Or, a whole conspiracy will be put in place of here's what they're really trying to do or little bits and pieces of facts will be put together to provide an explanation for what's really going on. And before each of our facilitation's I interviewed between eight and ten people to understand their different perspectives and one of my observations is that you guys are really good at creating myths. Now don't think I'm singling you out because it's a general human trait.

[[00:04:02]]

However what I kept on hearing as I hear the same cone and the cube. The same explanation of the problem. Is that there are certain folklore, or certain understandings or certain just built in assumptions that you've created about one another about specific questions. like the questions of bars and felonies and you're living with those myths and I think your biggest challenge will be to get beyond it. And the problem is that once you're living with those myths a lot of conflict emerges and that conflict will take people to the basement. Because, there's a lack of trust, you don't know if somebody is giving you the truth or the myth. And so people are then very, very riled up by that. And we get motivated by these myths and we get motivated by the battles and we get motivated by they're just two kind of people, they're victors and victims, I'd rather be the victor. And so once people get caught up in that, the problems that they're solving which is how do we make sure I'm the victor and how do we make sure that we're not the villain or the loser looks a lot like the arm wrestling exercise. And that in many ways is the greatest leadership challenge that faces you. I was facilitating a large complex problem out in the west coast; it was a large health care system. And there was such a lack of trust that they simply didn't have confidence in one another. So I asked them to pull out a piece of paper and to answer two questions. And they assumed that they would discuss the answer to the first question first and then second question second and I reversed the order. I said what could they do to increase the confidence you have in them? And people said well they could give us, you know, data that's correct. Or they could give it to us in a timely manner.

[[00:06:03]]

Or they could stop calling us names. And after that they had to write well what could you do to increase the confidence that they have in you? And they said well I guess we could give real data, you know give it in a timely manner and probably if we stop name calling

that would be a good thing too. And so we had a whole conversation about questions number two. And out of that ah hah, came an understanding that if we're really going to solve the problems we've got to build trust and confidence with one another. So, in many ways the whole question of trust and confidence is something that evolves over time. And our meetings together evolved over a year and you're still not done, I mean there's still a good way to go. And so you start with what's feasible, you go through a transition and ultimately your objective it to get to the ideal. And so at the very beginning people will sometimes say well how do we build trust. And we say you just can't start off by building trust with one another on a very divisive, polarized issue. You start by building confidence, by providing good data, by sharing an understanding, by the cone and the cube. And once you build confidence in one another and people are truly listening to one another you go through a transition in which that conversation becomes much more fluid, more robust, more enriching and more valuable and in the long run you develop trust. So, at the start it's often about very concrete agreements. This is what we're going to do, these are the questions we're going to answer. You get toward the zone of expanding involvement, looking at what feasibly could be done and in the long run, fluid working relationships. You're some place on this timeline, I'm not going, I'm not going to suggest that I know exactly where you are, you're not at the point of fluid, full trusting working relationships across this casm. However you have made significant progress.

[[00:08:08]]

What you get for all of this, the outcome is predictability and you might remember that in the pop doc loop, predictability was the outcome of good analysis. Because if you've got predictability, I pretty much know the circumstances that you're dealing with, how you're likely to decide and where the course of all of our work is going to go. And predictability when you're leading is A; something that is very, very important and B: something that is very difficult to develop. Not because you're not doing good analysis, it's because a lot of the factors that affect the regulation, the practice, public protection have to do with a whole series of things that you guys have nothing to do with. You don't, you can't go up to Capitol Hill, you can't go up to congress and tell them what to do. You can't tell businesses, you know how to develop their practices and you can't change the course of demography. So they're a lot of unknowns in which you are working. The better you are united, the better this association is working together, the better you're clear about your mission and how you're going to get there, the better service you can provide to the people who look to you for your leadership and the people who are counting on you for your leadership. We call this the people dimension of better leadership and that involves confidence building. And the confidence building are specific actions and behaviors that you can predict someone will do or can be relied upon to deliver upon. And those short term, in the short term build confidence. And then trust building, something that's much more complex and much more difficult is something that has to do with relationships and

this is what the long term is about. And I believe that you're right now working at exactly that intersection.

[[00:10:08]]

And among the pieces that I found most perplexing but most important is people stopped trusting one another, there was this lack of trust. And people say here's what they are really trying to do and here's what's going on on the other side. And I think one of the things that impressed all of us was the importance of putting the facts on the table. And really negotiating from the perspective of integrity. And here I wouldn't suggest anything about any particular individual who was involved. But once you've gained momentum on polarizing an issue it's very, very difficult to get everybody back to the table. And so without integrity, it's absolutely impossible to solve complex problems. And I think that's the hallmark, that's your greatest characteristic because of all the work that you've done in this profession and I think it will carry you forward in solving the most complex problems that face the regulation of nursing and other professions as well. The method that we used to guide our conversation is a process that my colleagues and I back at the university developed a number of years ago, back in the 90's called the "walk in the woods". And we had been doing a good deal of work on interest based negotiations, there was a lot of work done at the different graduate schools at Harvard. You might have seen the book by Bill Ury and Roger Fisher Getting to Yes. Bill wrote another book called Getting Past No. we were joking with him that his next book should be called Getting to Maybe. So, for those of us that were working health care our question was how do we bring, the wisdom, the methods and techniques of interest based negotiation into the work of health care? And so we stepped back and looked at problem solving in health care and we developed a methodology to really kind of fit the work that you do.

[[00:12:07]]

Now, in typical problem solving people will sit around a table and they've got a problem and what they'll often do is argue whose solution is best. And they'll base the contest of whose solution is best, based on who's got the most power in the room. I'm more powerful than you, therefore you could do it my way or it could be who is most ethical. I live in a higher moral plain than you do so therefore we'll do it my way. Or, it could be based on who's got the budget; I control the budget here or my budget is bigger than you so we're going to do it my way. In place of that, I'd like to propose to you what we call a walk in the woods. Now, if you're doing a walk in the woods you do start with a problem. And certainly when we had our first meeting back in 2012 there was a problem. And what you're trying to do is to get to a solution. Between problem and solution there is a process and the purpose of that process is to engage the people who are involved in what's called multidimensional problem solving. Just what you saw when we did the arm wrestling exercise in the first segment. It's really creating the us together and understanding what motivates each of the stakeholders...this was an important element. Because everybody was motivated along the same lines and building that effort towards a

solution that everyone could say yes to. And the process of the "walk in the woods" is designed as a series of steps to motivate and guide interest based negotiation. And interest based negotiation, different than positional negotiation, interests are what we're hoping to accomplish. Our interests are our experiences, either good or bad. Interests are what we might consider to be a fair solution to a problem. And when you're negotiating interests your objective is to balance the interest of everyone around the table. And again go back to the game theory, those people who basically said I want to get the back of your hand down as many times as possible, you want to get the back of my hand down as many times as possible. How do we accomplish that same end together?

[[00:14:20]]

And that's called interest based negotiations. The "walk in the woods" itself, the name was inspired by a classic story of interest based negotiation that happened back during the Cold War. A delegation from the United States and from the Soviet union were meeting in Geneva, Switzerland. Trying to negotiate a sell to arms reduction treaty. And the two sides were meeting and they were making no progress; they were at an absolute impasse. So they took a coffee break and at the coffee break, the head of the US delegation Paul Nitze and the head of the Soviet delegation Ulic Fitzinski literally bumped into one another. And one of them said would you like to take a walk? And they were in this bucolic setting just outside of Geneva and they walked out and they took a walk in the woods. And by the way this story was also put into Broadway play which is a character study of these two gentlemen. And in the course of the walk in the woods they first started talking about the nature of the impasse and how difficult it was and what it would mean. And then they started talking about what a great honor it was to be representing their countries at these important negotiations. They started talking about their background and how they came to be leading their different sides. They started talking about their families and their kids and their grand kids and finally came to the conclusion that they have to come up with a solution to this very, very difficult set of negotiations. I'll tell you just as a historic footnote, the people in Geneva agreed. And when they brought it back to Washington and Moscow they couldn't convince their countries to go along with that agreement.

[[00:16:06]]

And that is a lesson in the fact that it's not only agreeing at the table. The metaphor here for you, whatever you agree upon here as a body you have to take back to your states and you have to gain agreement on your states. So this is really a much broader set of lessons and leadership, meta leadership and negotiations of which you need to be a part. So, how does this walk in the woods work? And this by the way is what we did together. We did a number of walks in the woods with the groups here meeting near the airport. So you start wit a problem and everybody knows the problem that confronted you and the first step was everyone stated were their self interests. For my states perspective of for my vantage points or for my experience here's what I see. It was a lot like the cone and the cube. And

we spent a good deal of time in this conversation and then at the end we asked each table; we had about six to eight tables at each one of these facilitation. To share what they had come up with. And I want to say that my observation was that what the leaders who were convened did is that they really listened to one another. It wasn't simply that they were making speeches, here's the situation in my state, here are my constraints. But, what is the situation in your state and what are the constraints that you're facing and what are some of the considerations in the way your board is organized or the reporting relationships. And both saying what your interests and more importantly hearing and understanding the interests of others, it's critically important. That's step one of the "walk in the woods". Step two we call the enlarged interest and the enlarged interests we step back and ponder everything that was said in step one. And now I'll ask people divide everything that you heard into two categories and they're a lot of different two categories that people will come up with. And I say the most important categories is what you agree upon and what you disagree upon.

[[00:18:14]]

And usually when people are caught in a polarized difference of opinion they're only focused on what they disagree upon. So we had an easel board called disagreement and we had an easel board called agreement. And what I asked everyone in the room to do at this exercise it to put together a list of what everyone agrees upon and the list was actually profound. Everyone agrees in protecting the population. Everyone agrees that they're significant differences in how different state legislatures approach this problem. And everyone also agrees that the stalemate in and of itself was a problem and there are many, many points of agreement. And then we came back and said now what is it that you disagree upon and what I found profound in these discussions, in these negotiations is that the agreement far outweighed the disagreement. Now, the disagreements were very, very important and quite profound. But it was the fact, this ah hah that was really the tipping point. That on most points of greatest importance everyone around the country agrees in terms of licensure and regulation and how best to go forward. So we took that agreement to the third step of the walk and we call this third step the enlightened interest. I must admit with this particular group it was a ton of fun cause people came up with some pretty wild and crazy ideas for how to solve these problems. And in order to encourage that wild and crazy thinking we created what's called a no commitment zone. You can throw any idea on the table, you can come up with as wild and zany an option as possible and you're not committed to it, nobody's going to say, oh if that's what you think then sign this contract, no commitment.

[[00:20:04]]

And so we had a very, very creative set of conversations. My recollection is we came up with over 20 new ideas, not all of which could work. And then what we did towards the end is we started honing down those 20 ideas into a set of workable ideas that we could take forward. And we took those workable ideas forward into what are called the aligned

interests. And the aligned interest, very much like the waving back and forth is I understand your constraints, you understand my constraints. What could I do to help you solve your side of the problem and what could you do to help me decide my side of the problem so that we're truly working together. And the group created an alignment along what was called at the time option C, which stood for change. That something needed to change and in fact I had come up with an idea for a completely new way, a new approach for regulating and licensing nurses across the country. And for some time that was the solution we were discussing. Now to understand what are some of the dynamics that underlie the walk in the woods, recognize that everyone came to the table with very, very different motivations. You have a set of constraints with your state legislature, with your governor, with state law, with the way law is created. Everyone came looking at the cone and the cube problem from a very different perspective. And by the way in this cone and the cube there were not two peep holes, there were well over 50 peep holes because we had people not only from the states but the territories and so we looked like a very, very Swiss cheese like cube. And recognizing that there were very separate motives for each of the parties who were represented around the table. So, it required everyone to understand what individually motivated each of the EO's and their states.

[[00:22:07]]

In getting to the agreement of the enlarged interests it was to understand what was the overlapping motivation. And here among the most robust and valuable of our conversations. Understanding or creating or forging a path to something new; what could newly motivate everyone around the table toward a common ground solution and an aligning interest? Recognizing that their success would be in coming up with a set of solutions, options going forward that, that truly reflected a combined motivation of everyone around the table. And so, the solution in the long run...and I'm not here to suggest that you're there...is coming up with an approach and a strategy for licensure and for the compact question that reflects the shared motivations of all the states across the country and all the considerations across the country to build something new. These are the dynamics of the process and this is the essence of your challenge. Being able to find and discover that, it truly is a "walk in the woods" for you. The difference between a typical walk in the woods where you've got a map and you know exactly where you're going is you have to write the map as you go. And you have to find the destination as you work through this together. There is no easy solution, it's not well someone comes to you and says well, here's what you ought to do, just go ahead and do it. It's this is a puzzle that you have to construct together because you're not only going to have to sell it to one another, you're going to have to sell it to your home constituencies in your states and your boss leading up and everyone across your state as well.

[[00:24:02]]

So this is the challenge of your "walk in the woods". So, how do you put this all together? As a meta leader and I will now give you the meta leader cap for everyone in

the room, this is your charge out of this morning. you're trying to find, you know what is the shared purpose and where could you craft unity of effort with the peep hole you're looking through from your states perspective as well as the bigger picture. Building consensus on what are some of the key gaps. And I know you have questions about bars, questions about felonies, questions about education, how do you fill those gaps? So that every state can say here is a plan that I can sign on to, that's your challenge. Taking the ideas and taking the proposals from our meeting here in Chicago and being able to align them with what's going on back home is a true meta leadership challenge because you're having to create harmony between what's going on on the national level and what's going on on your state level. Usually we find that great meta leaders are able to benchmark early progress and then you might remember that I showed you just a little while ago that timeline. And say we're not going to get to the end of this timeline in one day, it's going to take us some time. So let's chart our progress, how do we know that we're making, we're having some successes because one of the most important dimensions of meta and meta leadership is being able to lead over time. Being able to anticipate where the problems are and being able to anticipate where the opportunities lie as well. To be able to spot and resolve differences before they grow into even greater conflict. These are your challenges. As we were talking in Chicago, in the last meeting that I joined you, there was an interesting ahah that the group came upon.

[[00:26:01]]

And I'm going to admit that I don't understand it. We all knew when it happened, we all felt like somehow there was a shift going on in the room and I can tell you what I said but I don't fully understand the shift. And if you're going to ask me what's the most perplexing and interesting piece of research we're working on right now we're trying to figure out this phenomenon as a human phenomenon. But I'm going to share with you, what I shared with the group at the time and then we can ponder what it means. Oddly enough, the ahah come from something that has very little to do with what we're talking about in this room. As I said when disaster happens our group does everything we can to deploy in the moment, to be there with the leaders, to understand as quickly as possibly what's going on. And usually that involves a plane trip. But back on April 15, 2013 it didn't require a plane trip, it happened literally in our own backyards. And so some of you might know that at the marathon just over a year ago there were two explosions on Boylston Street and we did everything we could to understand and study that. Then there was another challenging event for Boston, just days later on Friday when there was a manhunt that closed down our city. The two perpetrators, alleged perpetrators of this act had originally planned to detonate their bombs on the fourth of July. And so we studied the leadership of that event and finally all of us were, all our colleagues were together during this most recent marathon on April 21st, 2014. I was with the commissioner of the Boston Police, My colleague Eric, I was at the finish line, my colleague Eric was at the start line with the state police and Barry Dourn, Dr. Barry Dourn was with the medical

unit. Studying what leaders were doing and trying to understand the phenomena. The most interesting finding of all of this research and I'm giving you a very, very short report on it. Was that in every event that we had studied up to that point there was always somebody in charge.

[[00:28:09]]

And we of course, as we were studying it were trying to figure out who was in charge. During the Gulf Oil Spill we were flying up with the Coast Guard and Admiral Thad Allen, the commandant of the Coast Guard was clearly in charge. During Katrina, you might remember that FEMA director Mike Brown was clearly in charge. And during H1N1 it was clearly Dr. Richard Besser who was heading up the CDC at the time who was clearly in charge. So we tried to figure out who was in charge and we heard some very interesting things about Governor Patrick and you can see him looking on Tim Allman who is head of the State Police in the bottom left picture is he was in charge and then we interviewed Governor Patrick and he said "I wasn't in charge". He said in fact I tried to ensure that I only asked people how can I be helpful as a political leader here. I didn't want to start telling them where to put the police cars or what should be going on or running the investigation. No, I was just there to assist whoever was in charge. So we said well but, he said "the person I thought should best be in charge should be the head of the FBI" He says "because I have a prosecutorial background and I knew that there needed to be somebody in charge of the investigation. So I had all of the leaders together in a little bit like a flight attendant on the airplane on the exit row" He said "I, they told me that it should be the FBI". So I went around to all the leaders who were there. They are pictured here in front of you and I went around and I said are you OK with Richter Lori, the head of the FBI being in charge? And he said, and I locked eyes with one and they had to say yes and so Richter Lori was in charge of the investigation. So then we interviewed Richt. And then we said "well Richt, the most important decision that first day was whether to keep the transportation system open, what was your thought on that?" And Richt said "I wasn't there" I said "what do you mean you weren't there, you were in charge"

[[00:30:03]]

He said "I wasn't in charge of that" he said "I was in charge of the investigation, I wasn't in charge of the event". So, I said "well Richt well who was in charge?" he said "I guess nobody". And yet, of all the disasters that we've ever studied, by any metric of success, this was the most successful. Every single person who survived the initial bombing is alive today. And that's thanks to extraordinary heroics by people who were at the scene, they evacuated the scene in 22 minutes because upon interview we learned each of them expected at least two more bombs. Al Quieda likes four bombs. So, they went in there, they saved those from the Boston Police, you're never supposed to put an injured person in a Boston Police car but there was someone bleeding and if they hadn't been put in the Boston Police car they would have died. And the guy interviewed said "I don't care if I

was fired after doing that, the person's life was saved". And so everyone who survived the initial attack is alive today. The event was brought to closure in 102 hours from the very moment of the bombing to the suspects being arrested and the city being liberated and Boston was extraordinarily resilient. Boston strong was not simply two words, they had tremendous meaning for us in Boston. So we came up with this perplexing conclusion, nobody was in charge, it didn't make sense. So we tried to figure out how was it that they were so successful and nobody was in charge? And my colleague Eric McNaulty walked into my office one day and he said swarm intelligence. And we started looking at this phenomenon called swarm intelligence, to help us understand the notion that nobody was really in charge and yet everybody worked so well. By the way as I'm talking imagine the parallel between what faces you. And so they worked together with remarkable results. Because remember, you have so many bosses in this room, there's no one that's really in charge of everyone in this room.

[[00:32:05]]

So we started studying swarm intelligence and it's a really interesting field. It started in 1989, scientists tried to figure out how termites are able to build these extraordinary structures, how birds are able to fly together in such incredible ways. How ants are able to work together, bees, work together so well. And out of this field of swarm intelligence they've come to the conclusion that each of these different creatures works by the same set of principles and cues, principles and rules and what they're able to do, the way they work together is they send out cues to one another. A cue could be danger, a cue could be food, a cue could be opportunity, a cue could be a solution. They send out cues to one another and the other creatures are very sensitive to those cues so they read them. By the way one day when you're out there and you see birds just watch a flock of birds together. And how maybe one of the birds sees something that's dangerous and moves and then the whole flock moves together. Or, just watch other creatures and how they're able to coordinate their activities. So we said well that's really fascinating. But what would be the rules or principles that guided the people at the Boston Marathon and what can we learn from them? We came up with five principles and rules and then we shared them with those leaders. And what, just as one example, Rick Deloria the head of the FBI said to me afterwards was "I didn't know that, that's what I was doing" but that exactly captures what I was doing and what all of us were doing together. SO here are the five rules and principles of swarm intelligence. Rule number one: unity of mission. And the unity of mission in the response to the Boston marathon was save lives. Everyone was really clear that that's what they were doing, that's what they were doing together and whether it was in the emergency departments, whether it was law enforcement, whether it was people who were reconstructing, the city was unity of mission, save lives.

[[00:34:09]]

Second one was generosity of spirit and action. In law enforcement circles that was getting on the radio, "what do you got, what do you need?" Like what's happening, how

can I be helpful? When there was a manhunt going on in Water Town Target just emptied all of their flashlights for law enforcement. When there was a need for videos on Boylston Street to figure out who did what; all the private businesses shared their videos. Everyone was what do you got, what do you need, a generosity of spirit and action. The third was everybody stayed in their lanes and helped other succeed in theirs. And for anybody who knows Boston, they're a lot of rivalries in our town and there's a lot of conflict in our town between different hospitals, between different law enforcement agencies. And the fascinating thing is everybody was in charge of their domain and helping others to succeed in theirs. And because of that everybody was getting the job done in perfect coordination with one another. Leaders set the tone and followers followed. Next was no ego, no blame. You know most disasters that we covered there's a lot of finger pointing and a lot of blame that goes around. Or they'll be some agencies or some leaders who say it was all about me, I did it. Nobody claimed credit that week and nobody was pointing fingers. And when we shared this with the leaders what they told us that this was the most important thing, that if anybody had tried to take the stage or anybody had tried to point fingers the whole things would have fallen apart. And the fifth one, the fifth rule of swarm intelligence was a foundation of good relationships. People knew one another, they trusted one another. I mean the greatest example is we interviewed the police chief of Water Town, Massachusetts. That's where the final manhunt and the shootout occurred and Ed Dovout said you know I have 65 people on my police force.

[[00:36:14]]

That night there were 2,500 cops in my town, all of who ran out of their cars with their keys. It was just a mess, he said it was key stone cops but...I said then how did you work with the Boston Police so well? Boston Police Commissioner Ed Davis. And he said "I've known Eddie for years, I know what sports teams his kids play in, he knows what sports teams my kids play in, we trust one another" And that foundation of trust and integrity really went far. So this is what we found and what we're calling swarm intelligence. And for some reason and you'll have to ask the people in the room, we shared, I shared these findings, they were very new the last time I met with the group and it created an ahah. Our theory is that, our theory is that we humans naturally swarm. Just until a few generations ago we all lived in tribes. If you think about maybe it's your grandparents generation, your great grandparents generation; in my case it's my parents generation. Everybody lived in the same small town, everybody knew one another, everybody took care of one another. And then things changed for us humans, we were put on jets, we fly all over the place and we no longer have that swarm phenomenon that was part of our legacy. We think there's a lot of potential in understanding how people cohere with one another, how people can work together and people's desire to be connected to one another. There's one fellow who was at Harvard who figured out this problem, maybe he

didn't realize how called Mark Zuckerberg. And if you think of it, Facebook could be this generations answer to the fact that we're no longer living in our usual tribal format.

[[00:38:11]]

So we believe that it's just natural, for people, for humans to want to be together, to want to work together, to send cues to one another, to receive those cues from one another. And that really will be your path to finding a solution to the challenge which faces the National Council and State Boards of Nursing. Because you'll have to find where that coherence is, where that unity of mission is, how to build that generosity of spirit and action for your state boards as part of a national effort. Recognizing the differences that each of you bring to this challenge. Recognizing that it's not that somebody wants to be difficult and they've got a legislature or a Governor or a structure back in their state that makes it impossible for them simply to say yes. It's just more complex than all of that. How can you help me in dealing with that problem and how can I help you in finding common ground and you build that on a foundation of relationships. And so everything that I've shared with you today, if you now can take that leap is really related to building that swarm intelligence that we're talking about. The unity of mission, the whole image negotiation, it's not me against you. When I asked people around the room what did you get? People said we got 50, we got 32, we got 15 each. And part of your leadership challenge is how to create exactly that kind of unity of mission by creating that we got 50 each, we got 50 together. How do you build that for one another? How do you change the mindset to appreciate the complexity?

[[00:40:07]]

How do you meta lead? Up, down and across, recognizing that it takes a lot of emotional intelligence and getting out of the basement to solve the situations that face you. How do you help people understand the cone and the cube, that you're all looking at this problem from very different vantage points, you're going to have to forge that common ground together. And then the foundation of relationships. one of the things that impressed me is that you do care for one another. You have known one another for an awfully long time and whether it's sports teams or colleges, you know where other people's kids are at. And you know the stories and you've shared the stories with one another. And so my concluding impression as we were studying the marathon and trying to understand this pact in Boston and looking to see how this would apply to you and then offline having a number of conversations in which I found there was intrigue in finding how this could apply to you. Is just as we found Boston Strong back in our own home town, you have to find strong for this profession and for this career and for this public protective responsibility which is the essence of what you do. And I'll conclude by saying that if you're going to find it, it's going to be that you're it. And it's a you're it as an individual, it's you're it as a collection of people, it's you're it as a swarm of people and mostly it's you're it, in your professional responsibility. SO I want to thank you for your attention and for providing us the opportunity to share with you the work that we've done. I want

to thank you for your service. And we're hoping, all of us across the country; we're watching you and hoping with and for you that you'll be able to come and bring a solution to this most complex problem that faces nursing. Thank you very much.