



A 'Centered' approach to Leadership Succession Planning

Hosts: **David Mallon**, Vice President and Chief Analyst, Deloitte Consulting LLP

Jeff Rosenthal, Managing Director, Deloitte Consulting LLP

Stacey Philpot, Principal, Deloitte Consulting LLP

Guests: **Dave Pottruck**, Former CEO and chairman of Red Eagle Ventures and Charles Schwab

David Mallon (David): Who will your current leaders pass the baton to? How are you identifying the right people to guide your organization into the future and developing them to take the lead? Research by Deloitte Insights found that 86% of leaders surveyed believe leadership succession planning is either an urgent or important priority. Barely 14% believe they

do it well. So, what's holding organizations back, and how could they overcome these obstacles. In the first part of today's episode, you are going to hear from Dave Pottruck, he is former CEO and chairman of Red Eagle Ventures, in conversation with Jeff Rosenthal, leader of Deloitte's executive readiness offerings. Prior to Red Eagle Ventures, Dave was president and CEO of

the Charles Schwab Corporation, and he is former chairman of HighTower Advisors wealth management firm. Dave brings his very experienced first-person executive insights into succession planning. Later, my colleague Stacey Philpot will join Jeff and me to discuss why a human-centered approach to leadership succession is essential and how to put that concept into practice.

Jeff Rosenthal (Jeff): Hello, this is Jeff Rosenthal. I am part of Deloitte's leadership development practice, and I have the pleasure today to be speaking with Dave Pottruck. Dave, welcome to our Capital H podcast..

Dave Pottruck (Dave): Thanks, Jeff. It's a pleasure to be here with you.

Jeff: Thanks. Well, Dave, why don't you tell us a little bit about your background and what you are doing now.

Dave: Well, I served as a senior executive at Charles Schwab for 20 years. During that time, I spent a number of years as the CEO or co-CEO of the company. I also was on the board of Intel for 20 years. After leaving Schwab, I started a wealth management company that I led as the chairman for about 10 years. And right now, I have retired from most everything, except for an adjunct teaching appointment that I hold, and that gives me a lot more time to sort of enjoy my life, Jeff.

Jeff: That's great. Well, Dave, you obviously had an incredible career in the financial services industry. How did you approach succession planning in your career as an operating leader? And then I'd also be curious how that's evolved and how your thinking has evolved too.

Dave: Succession planning is a really interesting issue, and I've had an opportunity to look at it carefully, both as a CEO and as a board member. And I'm talking specifically about CEO succession. It's something that every board worries about and thinks seriously about. It's not only their responsibility, it's something that is reasonably top of mind that we need to have someone to turn to if things go badly, if we have a health crisis, or simply over time who is going to be our next CEO. And then as the CEO, you're supposed to be developing all of your people, but on the other hand, I think you have mixed feelings about that because you are sort of preparing someone to take

your job. In my observation on a number of companies, I don't think any CEOs really take on that role with energy and relish. They do it, they prepare pieces of paper, and certainly, I would say, all CEOs prepare their people to be better executives, but let me give you one example where I think CEOs could do a better job. So, for example, one of the key issues of being a CEO is to learn how to manage your board and deal with the board. And I was not well-prepared to do this and I didn't do this very well when I was CEO. But my experience as a board member is that the CEO has to spend time with each individual board member one on one to understand what their issues are, get their advice, get real candor, full candor that maybe the board member wouldn't offer in front of his or her peers in the boardroom. And so learning to get the best from every board member and getting to know your board members is important. As a board member, you appreciate that you are like 20 miles wide and two inches deep, and as a CEO, you don't realize your board members are that way. So, one of the really great preparations to become a CEO for succession planning, in my opinion at least, is getting your senior people to be on a board, on an important board, where they can learn what it's all about to be a board member and dealing with a board and that will groom them to be on the other side of the table. And I see very, very few CEOs that encourage their top executives to take on one board. Now, a board takes time and energy, no question, but you also learn and you get better. So, it's a worthwhile developmental activity, and boards want younger operating people on their boards, and yet I have in my experience seen very few CEOs that are out there actively encouraging their people to become board members.

Jeff: Interesting. Yeah, you talked about that idea of mixed feelings of a CEO potentially developing people. I assume that may appear to be some sort of a threat or cause anxiety for a sitting CEO. How would you advise current CEOs to get past that, to

find enough motivation to become more proactive and not let those mixed feelings get in the way of doing things to develop their people?

Dave: So, if you could put someone in a CEO job and have them think of themselves as having a 10-year run, then as you get four and five years into it, you start to think, okay, well, we need to get more serious now. We need to really start to ramp up the preparation of the next group of more than one candidate for that role. Now, this also presumes that every year on an ongoing basis, you are doing a talent review and you are looking not only at the direct reports of the CEO, but the two-downs. I think the board also has to appreciate what skills do we want our CEO to have. If you want someone to have a broad set of skills, then they have to have a broad set of experiences, and that means you have to take maybe your best financial guy, your CFO, and rotate him into some kind of an operating job. A lot of CFOs don't want to go into operating jobs or your guy that's running domestic, you ship him overseas and have him spend three years running Asia or running some other part of the world. And unfortunately, if we think of our CEO candidates as men and women who are typically in their late 40s, early 50s, a lot of them don't want to make those moves. And now, our cast of candidates are limited to those who somehow did some of that early. And so again, we don't have the broadest set of choices. We have a more limited set of choices.

Jeff: It's interesting because I think about that population you are talking about in their mid to late 40s, maybe less interested in these kinds of experiences. Do you think that's because maybe if they don't have line of sight to realize if I do this, this is my path to CEO, or is it maybe their desire is less. So, it's not a visibility issue, but maybe they just don't necessarily want that kind of role in the future.

Dave: Well, maybe it's just me, but in the companies that I have been close to, it seems to me that the people who emerge into the business leaders and chief officers of different functions, chief marketing officer, chief technology officer, CFO, et cetera, all the other people I met in those kind of roles were very ambitious and wanted to see their careers, their impact, their legacy, their rewards grow.

Jeff: One of the things I think I hear Dave and underlying a lot of your comments on this last topic is about accountability, accountability of a sitting CEO, accountability of a board, accountability of leaders being developed. Do you have any thoughts on that, I mean, that seems to be an issue we have uncovered in this whole discipline of succession planning and whether there is clear accountability on different roles on their behalf. Any thoughts on that?

Dave: Well, I would say that the problem you are describing is very typical because, for example, very few companies do any kind of public reporting in their annual reports or any of their reports on their succession planning. It's not something that's broadly communicated. It's usually something done quietly with a little bit of mystery, disclosure of any sort feels difficult, even too inside the company as the board materials are being prepared by the CEO working, let's say, with their HR director and making a presentation about who's my bench and what does the succession planning look like, the CEO becomes worried that that's going to get out and be either a motivator or demotivator, more likely maybe a motivator for one person and a demotivator for two or three others, as anyone is viewed as the crown prince. And so, the whole thing is fraught with accountability, disclosure, discomfort, and it's difficult to prepare. There's such a huge difference between being CEO and being a senior executive under the CEO that it's hard to really appreciate how you establish the full accountability or the full set of tools and experiences to be ready for that job.

Jeff: And you and I have talked in the past about, I mean, when you combine everything you've just talked about around the potential demotivators to take action on this, the awkwardness or potential anxiety, or ways that executives might feel less motivated to do something about this, and then combining that with all the other business priorities, both for boards and current executives, all the other things they have to worry about, succession being one of them, what advice would you have to help board-sitting CEOs, heads of HR, heads of talent, other line leaders to take action on this to prevent the unexpected departures or unexpected vacancies with all the other priorities that they have? What advice would you have to get people to take action when they've got so many other things on their plate?

Dave: Well, I am not sure I have a good answer for that, Jeff. Everything you do, here is the double-edged sword of it. So, you're the CEO of a Fortune 500 company, let's say, it could be smaller, but let's say a Fortune 500 company and you follow my advice and let's say you got three or four of your top executives on outside boards so they understand what that feels like from the other side, and three of the people that you are looking at as candidates are operating executives who are running reasonably integrated self-sustaining business units, and the fourth person is your CFO and you are really trying to develop them. Well, in some ways, every one of them is an incredible candidate to be recruited away. What we're doing is we're developing their suite of skills to become the CEO of some other company and be highly competitive. I mean, people are looking all the time and they are calling the best companies and trying to pick up the top people. Because the average tenure of a CEO today is, I think I read somewhere, like three years and I think that's the other part we haven't talked about is that the more work you do preparing your top people, the more ambitious they get and the more competitive they are when a search firm (12:34) calls to recruit them

away. So, that's just another problem to be solved. Now, what is the solution, you ask me for a solution, and I honestly don't know that I really have that. I think in some ways every top executive in a company who is not the CEO, who has the ambition to want to be the CEO someday, there are some number of things that they need to do and they may do those things before or after they become the CEO because anyone who is stepping into the CEO job, who has never done that job, is going to have to learn and grow in that job. And what we want our new CEOs, our newly promoted, recruited, whatever they are, CEOs to do is to accept the notion that on day 1 you are not really fully prepared for this job, but our job is to get you better. So, it's not just about preparing someone who is ready day 1, it's about preparing someone who is as good as they can be, but who is committed to continuing to learn and grow and has the humility to recognize, "I am not fully there yet, I have to get better. I have to seek out forces of advice to get better." And in my experience, the new CEO who did that was the one who grew the fastest and was the most successful.

Jeff: That's an interesting point, Dave, because as I think about it, it seems like a lot of attention is put on developing executives before they are put into that role, whether it is CEO or another role, but once they move into the role, it's almost like, "Ah, we are done now. We can walk away. They are in that role." And yet I think what you are saying is that's really just the beginning. The key part of that development is once they are in the job and helping them get successful from wherever they are starting out.

Dave: Absolutely. They need mentors and coaches, not board members because they won't have the same opportunity for complete objectivity and disclosure. They need a coach, a mentor, both, who they can turn to and who can help them grow into that role. That role will be, I think, bigger. If they've never been CEO, that role will be bigger in a number of dimensions than anything they've ever had and lonelier than

anything they've ever had before. And so, having someone to coach and help them develop, especially those first two, three years they're in that role, I think is immensely important.

Jeff: One other dimension, Dave. So, as you think about how work is changing or how corporate dynamics are changing and everybody talks about all the incredible advances in the last few years, whether it's technology or pace of change, digital revolution, all these dimensions. As you think about how where we are in the world of work, the implications for leadership, et cetera, and as you look ahead maybe five, ten years out, are there any implications for succession planning, both how we develop leaders and think about preparing for transitions? Does anything change as you look ahead from either the way it's done now or the way it was done previously?

Dave: Well, the only thing I would say that is really different is that the Internet follows you forever. And if we limit our search for people who've never said something stupid, who've never made a mistake, who've never had a difficult moment, then we're going to have a very boring group of people or a very limited group of candidates for our leadership jobs.

Jeff: Yeah, interesting. So, it sounds like it's both the fact that that's all now chronicled in one way or another, but also that others can manage that information. So, as you look back, so we talked a little about looking forward, but as you look back on your career so far, both in your CEO role, operating role, from a succession planning standpoint, anything that you would have done differently in any situation reflecting back?

Dave: Yeah, I think that I look back on some of the experiences which I'd rather not be terribly specific about, but I think it's easy to get lulled, you know, our CEO is terrific and he's not going anywhere or she's not going anywhere, and so this succession planning thing, it's not something we need to do right now. And, in fact, you never know what's around the corner and it is something you

need to do and that has come back to bite me. So, as I said earlier, I think you need to always have some concept of what you would do, number one, if you had to, where you would go for your replacement, even an interim replacement, and what would you do after, if you look at your top people and you say, okay, they are all, these are the three candidates we have to be the replacement CEO. Well, okay, what would we do as the development plan for each of them once they're in the role? So that, they're in the role and now you are really pushing forward with what gives us angst about any of them, and maybe they're not perfect day 1, but within two or three years, boy, could they be going at a whole different level. I've seen CEOs that, it was shocking to see how much better they got within the first couple of years as they really put time and energy into their skills and meeting people and talking and investing in themselves to get themselves better. They had the humility to know that "I need to just not get a year older, I need to get a year better."

Jeff: Yeah, it sounds like a big theme I'm hearing from you is if you were giving a message to company it would be, don't just think about before the transition, but really think about after.

Dave: Right.

Jeff: Last question, Dave. Let's say a current sitting CEO came to you for guidance in a significantly size company and said, "We are just starting, trying to create some discipline in succession planning and we want to be very focused." And they asked you, if you had to pick your shot and focus on a certain part of succession planning that you think would be highest impact? So, in other words, tell me what we should do and not worry about the rest? What would you tell them? What would be your advice about where to focus, where to start, what's going to really matter the most?

Dave: I would look for people who have the right kind of character, who understand how to connect with other people. One of the most important things for any company

is the company must operate as a team. I would say, "Who do we have that's our greatest magnet for talent?" Because anything we are missing, we can go out and get. There is an incredible marketplace of great people out there, but we may not have all we need today. So, who's our recruiter, who's our inspirer, who's the person who really cares passionately about this company and everybody who works for them cares passionately about them. That person who can be the magnet for talent is the person that I want.

Jeff: So, it sounds like what you're are saying is if you are going to invest in developing people and consider them for future roles, who do we start with? Who is the right face of the assets that we have and what you just described and those are the kind of people you are going to want to invest in and develop.

Dave: We are all going to get a year older every year. We are all going to get more experienced every year. We are all going to get smarter. We are going to have new skills, but not necessarily a difference in who we are on the inside in terms of our core values, our passion, our inspirational ability, that may or may not get better, may or may not. That ability to recruit talent and inspire talent to do their best, to reach high, to want to be a part of something great, I am looking for the people and they maybe down, they maybe down in the organization, and we have to promote them into bigger roles and do it fast, but who are those kind of people? Do we have those people? And if we don't have them, let's make sure we can go get them.

Jeff: Well, Dave, I think that's a great place to end. So, thank you for doing this. So, we have been talking with Dave Pottruck, accomplished corporate leader, board member, author, professor, among many other things. Dave, thank you so much for talking with us today.

Dave: My pleasure, Jeff.

David: Thanks to our guest, Dave Pottruck, for sharing succession planning wisdom from his four decades of executive leadership. In our next segment, I am joined by my colleagues, Jeff Rosenthal and Stacey Philpot. They are going to discuss how organizations can reinvent their approach to succession planning.

David Mallon (David): Welcome back. This week's episode of Capital H is focused on leadership succession, specifically this. In our most recent global human capital trends study, 86% of leaders rated succession planning as either an urgent or important problem and yet only 14% of confident in their organization's capabilities to solve for it. Joining me today to discuss the implications of this paradox and what organizations can and are doing about it are my colleagues, Jeff Rosenthal, he's a Deloitte Consulting managing director and he leads our executive readiness service line, which includes succession planning, executive development, executive assessment, and senior team effectiveness. Welcome, Jeff

Jeff Rosenthal (Jeff): Thanks David. Happy to be here.

David: Great. And joining Jeff and I are Stacey Philpot, a principal with Deloitte Consulting and head of Deloitte leadership's practice. She specializes in coaching senior executives on how they lead, innovate, and adapt to vulnerable markets and changing industries. Thanks for joining us, Stacey.

Stacey Philpot (Stacey): Oh, I am really happy to be here as part of this important conversation. Thanks, David.

David: So, let's dive in. Eighty-six percent of leaders believe leadership succession planning is an urgent or important need. It's a big number, almost 9 in 10. I don't think it's that hyperbolic to say that almost all organizations around the world are wondering where their next executives are going to come from. And only 14%, a tad more than 1 in 10, believe they do it well. Let's unpack this disconnect first. So, succession planning, we know from our Bersin research, can be derailed in

organizations by any number of issues, but what's your perspective? Is there a common thread here? Is there sort of a root cause? Let's start with you, Stacey.

Stacey: I think one of the things about succession that's so challenging is that it really hits on a lot of nerves in the organization, if you will. Choosing who a leader is going to be is a highly political and in many ways actually an emotional process, and it's also incredibly strategic. It's tainted by importance in the business and also some very human concerns and fears about the future, what people have roles, who is it going to be. It's just a, it can be a very, very complicated process and it's highly emotional. And what we find is organizations, and I know my colleague Jeff will speak more directly to this, is that sometimes they tend to go one of either two directions. They either tend to think that they can solve the issue by being very process-focused or they really focus on protecting relationships. And the reality with succession is to do it well, you have to pay attention to both parts of the problem.

David: What do you think, Jeff?

Jeff: Yeah, I mean, first of all, we were so fascinated by the gap that you mentioned, David, around so many companies saying how important this is, but so few doing it well. As Stacey said, when we looked at the specifics of how companies are failing or not doing this well, it really boiled down, a lot of it, to the notion that we are dealing with people. And human nature is human nature, and we have not been addressing many of the factors that cause anxiety or cause people to not want to do succession planning. So, we can talk about more details there, but essentially we have found that there's got to be a combination of bringing data into the equation, having an objective process, but also dealing with the reality that it needs to be "user-friendly process" where people feel engaged, where they feel that it's adding value, that it's easy to do, that it's not threatening, and companies have typically gone to one extreme or other and not combining both of those elements.

David: What would it mean to do succession planning in a way that was more reflective of the humans involved, a human-centered approach, as it were.

Jeff: So, a good example would be, one of the aspects where we found companies typically struggle is communication. So, how transparent is a company around, why are we doing succession planning. So, for example if a senior leader understands that succession planning is all about helping to plan for future leaders for their role, it's much less threatening to them, as opposed to if they feel like we are looking at people right now who could replace you. So, even in how communications is done and whether it's oriented towards the future or towards the present can make a giant difference on how well people will integrate succession planning than versus how much they will reject it or push back against it.

David: Stacey, I think there is a connection to your comment about it being a sort of political and potentially dangerous process maybe, there's a reason for people to have to fear. Is that what Jeff's getting at.

Stacey: So, I think to build on Jeff's point, right, is how do we make the process more humane. We have to consider two things. The first is just the truth that succession can be threatening to people, right, and so part of what I think Jeff was so astutely acknowledging was that when succession starts early and is about identifying potential successors down the road. It has a tendency to make people feel more vulnerable or potentially replaced. The second thing is what is the data that you use in your succession process. There's a lot of tools and methods and things out there that we know from research can validly and reliably help us identify who is the potential to be a really strong, effective leader. That said, what people need to feel, like the user experience if you will, of people being assessed or considered successors. The process has to feel fair to them. It can't just be accurate. And part of making it feel fair is including and exploring each leader's narrative and their career accomplishments and making

sure that's included in the process. They have to feel like they've been understood and they've been valued, and if you don't do that, even if your way of identifying leaders is accurate, it really disrupts the system and ultimately it doesn't work very well.

David: How do we create space for talking to or just acknowledge the human side of this conversation to create empathy for the people involved? How do we create that space to have that conversation?

Jeff: I think part of it, David, is like many other processes of organizations, to what extent are we designing it, is it essentially a customer-focused design. Another way to say it is, if our leaders are customers of this process, would they buy it if they had a choice. So, designing it in that way like we would other market-driven products should be the way to go. Another aspect just to, I think that makes a huge difference, and we found this in our study was to what degree is development actually involved in succession planning. So, if succession planning is just a matter of we're deciding on who's going to be next for a role, it doesn't actually take action, and so people don't feel like they're personally benefiting from it. But if part of the process is actually about planning, truly developing people along the way, preparing them for roles that might be two, three, five years out, it really changes the tone of it and creates a much more, a process that feels beneficial to everybody.

David: So, I would imagine, picking up on your comment and Stacey's last one as well, that a challenge here is essentially getting your current executives to not essentially do it how it's always been done. Their past processes, their past ways of figuring this out have been relatively subjective. So, how do you hold them accountable? Where does the culture change element come into this? How are we getting to something that isn't short-term thinking but is using data in the right ways and so on?

Jeff: So, I'll start here, Stacey. You can add in. But the accountability question is huge and what was fascinating for us in the study we did, the interviews we did, is in many cases, we asked the question, "Who's actually accountable for succession planning?" And the answer that we got most frequently, which was pretty surprising to us, was, "I don't know." Companies literally would say, "I'm not sure who's responsible. I don't know who it is. I don't know if it's HR or the CEO or the executive team." So that was a sign to us that this was an issue. So certainly the fact that accountability is unclear in many cases is a problem. Where it was working well, we found that either the CEO or an executive or a number of executives felt absolutely convinced that succession planning was a critical lever to their growth and they have the passion and the energy and the commitment to drive it.

David: Stacey, what do you think?

Stacey: It's hard to have something implemented in your organization if no one is accountable for it, I mean, that's sort of a basic management lesson. And I think if you add on top of that what we've already discussed, which is succession can be a very political process, it can be emotional, it can be threatening for people, it becomes all the more important. When we've seen people do it with really good results, it includes someone who has key accountability and a lot of systemic touchpoints. Meaning, HR is working with the CEO, who might even be working with the board. They've developed a good process that's fair and feels credible to people and, as Jeff mentioned earlier, they include development and that's hard, right. That's a high bar. But it really is what it takes on something as delicate and as critical as this.

David: If I kind of connect the dots between both of your comments, it would be very easy in an organization, because it is fraught with sort of issues of self-preservation and the like. It would be very easy to think,

we should do this in an entirely clinical way almost, just follow set of processes, maybe disconnect it from other related processes like performance management or, for example, day-to-day decision rights and governance of the organization, what have you. It would be very easy to think, we should separate it from those things because of that human subjectivity that's involved. I hear both of you basically saying quite the opposite. We should actually recognize that humans are involved and it's connected to all of these things that matter every day for the leaders of the organizations to make it part of how the organization operates day to day and also for the individuals, how they're growing day to day. Is that right?

Jeff: I think that's true, David. I mean, I'll give you one example what we heard. We heard a story about a company in our interviews that, financial services organization that had not done objective assessments, had not used objective data before for succession planning. And they decided to introduce an objective assessment for about 50 of their top leaders. Well, the problem was that they did not communicate very clearly to those top 50 leaders about how that data would be shared in the organization and how it would be used. So, while those leaders thought it was primarily for their development, in fact it was being shared with HR, with senior leadership, for succession decisions. And because that communication wasn't done well, it created massive anxiety and frustration and worry among those leaders, and the company really had to repair that situation. So, a good example where just trying to make to move to, oh, we're being more objective now without taking into account that the human equation didn't work.

David: Stacey, do you have an example similarly of where maybe an organization who is doing this in a human-centered way and that has resulted in a better slate?

Stacey: I think one of the organizations that Jeff and I had the privilege to work with really started by getting a lot of people involved in the conversation around what does leadership need to look like in this organization in the future. And so working with the CEO, the executive committee, and the people who would be assessed to talk about what were the industry pressures and as a result, what pressure might that put on what leadership needed to look like. So, for example, in the past, leadership had been very focused on one area of the business, but their growth was coming from a different place. And so they needed a different type of leadership, if you will. And then we took them through a very in-depth, high-touch, well-communicated process that included things like doing a half-hour onboarding videoconference to say this is what's going to happen, this is how the data is going to be used, this is why we are doing this, and this is what we are looking for. It took a long time, but what you had is people felt like they were able to give their input into kind of what they'd be assessed against, if you will, and that they felt very respected and then at the end, it was also very developmentally focused. So, each person left with a journey over a year of saying, "Here are the things and the types of concrete experiences, not just what you need to develop, but what are the concrete things you can do to address these," so that each person really got something tangible out of it that they could act on. And I think that was the process where people felt good about the process, the CEO and the board got good data, and people generally felt good about the process all around.

David: Building on to that example, so let's start to paint a picture then lay out a roadmap for our listeners as to sort of what they can do, where they go from here, how do organizations effectively address this problem that is leadership succession planning, kind of a quick hitlist of so what?

Jeff: Yeah, I mean, David, one thing I'll offer that I think is probably one of the very first things that I would suggest organizations do is start small. We've seen companies be very ambitious about hundreds or thousands of positions that they are doing succession planning for and that's really hard for all the reasons that Stacey just laid out in her example. So, our recommendation would be start with a smaller group, whether it's the most senior group or a subset, do that well, and then once you are successful there, slowly expand the scope of succession planning.

Stacey: I would completely agree with that because it can be such a delicate manner. What makes the most difference is that you do a high-quality delivery of your process and you get people involved and you learn so much because every organization is different. Culture plays a big part. A lot of people have points of view and opinions about this kind of thing, and there is that emotional piece. So, I think what we have seen is doing a pilot, doing it well, getting people excited about it, and then building it out versus trying to kind of design a massive process that will be used everywhere makes a lot of difference.

David: And I've heard you both say it's got to be useful for the people involved, not just for the organization?

Jeff: Yes, and some of the things that we have talked about, putting those all together, a process like being clear about what do we need in the future, looking for ways to integrate data into some of those decisions, and then as quickly as possible integrating development into the process so that those successors are actively being developed in one way or another, all that being overlaid by how do we communicate this in a transparent, high-trust way where there are no surprises and people do feel that it's a benefit for them, as well as the organization.

And that's the ultimate test, I think, is when this is done well, any successor or leader involved in this is going to feel like this is good for the company and it's good for me, and that's the winning combination.

Stacey: David, I do want to raise just one other point that I think I've seen from the experience of doing this, which is a lot of organizations right now are looking at things like gender parity, creating inclusive cultures, making sure they have diverse representation, and one of the things that they are struggling with is how do they have their leadership and their organization representative of their employee base and live up to the values that they may be trying to, that they believe in around issues of diversity and inclusion. And I think one of the best ways to work against unconscious bias, if you will, is to have really robust, fair, well-socialized succession processes. There are a lot of just human biases that get in the way of how we identify leaders and sometimes we just look for the wrong things, and it's not just a great way of saying, "How do I find the right person?" it's also a great way to operationalize an organization's commitment to diversity, inclusion, and parity. And more and more we're seeing that part of the conversation come up with clients. So, just wanted to share that thought too.

David: Thank you. We thank our guest, Dave Pottruck, for showing his insight in succession planning and thanks to my Deloitte colleagues, Jeff Rosenthal and Stacey Philpot. Join us next time as we dive into more topics and trends that focus on putting humans at the center of work.

