The Challenge of Complex and Fundamental Decisions in Supervision – *Consent Facilitation as a Helpful Method*

Lisa Aigner (Germany)

Abstract

In a BANI[1] world defined by uncertainty, complexity, and rapid change, traditional decision-making methods often reach their limits. Consent facilitation provides supervisors with an effective tool for constructively guiding complex and fundamental decision-making processes. Rather than overruling minorities or insisting on unanimity, this method integrates well-reasoned objections as resources for improving solutions. Its structured process distributes decision-making power, strengthens psychological safety, increases participants' commitment, and leads to durable, quickly implementable decisions. Consent facilitation thus becomes a key competence for making teams and organizations more resilient and capable of action.

As supervisors in Europe, we are increasingly confronted with decision-making situations that require not only professional expertise but also sensitive process design. Organizations are in constant flux, driven by globalization, digitalization, societal upheavals, and a world of work shaped by unprecedented uncertainty. In this context, traditional decision-making methods, such as majority voting or authoritarian leadership, often reach their limits. They create winners and losers, cement power structures, and overlook valuable perspectives. This is where consent facilitation comes in. As a core element of sociocracy, it offers a tool that not only feels democratic but also increases the quality and acceptance of decisions. Instead of engaging in fruitless debates or risking narrow majority decisions, consent aims for workable solutions that everyone can support. It is particularly suited for complex questions and fundamental decisions.

This is what we explored together during our session at the Summer University 2025 in Munich. The contents of this session are now presented here, supplemented with some personal experiences from the practice of consent-based facilitation.

BANI World and Organizational Reality: Why Classic Methods No Longer Suffice

The term BANI - brittle, anxious, nonlinear, and incomprehensible - aptly describes today's organizational world. Unlike the older VUCA[2] model, BANI highlights the emotional dimension:

[1] BANI: Acronym for Brittle, Anxious, Nonlinear, Incomprehensible; represents an evolution of the VUCA concept, describing a fragile reality shaped by anxiety, nonlinearity, and incomprehensibility, in which traditional models of planning and control reach their limits.

[2] VUCA: Acronym for Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, Ambiguity; describes a world characterized by high dynamics, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity. Originally derived from the military context, the term is now used to capture the challenges of modern organizational and leadership environments.

fear and overwhelm shape many decision - making situations. As supervisors, we experience this firsthand. We accompany teams operating in uncertain environments, where a wrong decision can have serious consequences. In such situations, simple majority votes often fail. They may appear efficient, but leave dissatisfied minorities and risk ignoring critical objections. Consensus decisions, on the other hand, can take too long and may be blocked if even one person vetoes. Consent facilitation offers a middle path: it does not ask, "Does everyone love this solution?" but rather, "Can you live with this solution, even if it isn't perfect right now?" This approach relieves groups and fosters pragmatic, yet high-quality decisions.

'Good enough for now and safe enough to try' is the guideline that helps to decide whether I can follow the decision already or if I should share my justified blockage.

Good Enough for Now & Safe Enough to Try - Principles of Consent Facilitation

Consent facilitation refers to refining a proposal until no substantial objections remain. An objection is not simply "I don't like this," but must be well-reasoned and related to the shared goal. This fundamentally distinguishes consent from consensus: not unanimous approval but the absence of justified blockages is decisive. 'Good enough for now and safe enough to try' is the guideline that helps to decide whether I can follow the

decision already or if I should share my justified blockage. This clear structure gives us, as supervisors, a reliable framework for safely guiding groups even through heated discussions.

Consent vs. Consensus and Majority Voting: A Paradigm Shift

The majority principle is deeply ingrained in most contexts. However, the outcome is that there are team members whose perspectives remain unheard and who may feel undervalued or left out - perspectives that could have improved the outcome. This can dampen team motivation, block implementation, or fuel hidden conflicts. Consensus processes attempt to avoid this, but often fall into the trap of perfectionism: searching for the one solution that makes everyone happy leads to endless meetings. Consent facilitation breaks with both extremes. It creates a balance between speed and participation. As process facilitators, we can thus ensure that decisions are made quickly, and are also supported by everyone involved. In a BANI world where uncertainty and change are the norm, this is a decisive advantage.

Psychological Safety and Equal Participation

A core element of modern organisational development and teams in general is psychological safety - the trust that one's contributions will be respected and that admitting mistakes or asking difficult questions will not lead to negative consequences. This, too, is something groups must practice. Consent facilitation strengthens this safety by ensuring that all voices are heard, requiring reasoned objections rather than personal preferences, and facilitating constructive discussions through

As supervisors, we act as process guides, ensuring that all voices are heard, discussions remain focused, and objections are treated as resources. This prevents information loss and dominance by only a few voices.

Classic decision-making paths often stall in complex organizations. Consent facilitation offers supervisors an effective alternative: it creates robust decisions without overruling majorities or pursuing endless unanimity. By integrating objections, solutions are improved, power is distributed, participation is promoted, and psychological safety is strengthened. This method is a vital tool for working in an increasingly unpredictable world.

structured facilitation. This balances participation: contributions from quieter members are integrated just as fully as those from dominant speakers. For us as facilitators, this means fewer hidden resistances and stronger identification with decisions. Most importantly, it enriches the quality of decisions with ideas that might otherwise have gone unheard.

The Facilitation Process: Phases, Methods, and Roles

A successful consent process follows a clear, structured sequence that can be communicated to participants (though it takes some practice for both sides). This structure provides orientation and reduces friction in complex decision-making. Of course, group dynamics can arise during facilitation - in such cases, one must decide whether to continue the method or address the dynamic first.

The phases can be summarized as follows:

- **Clarifying the topic:** Define the framework, goal, and subject of the decision.
- **Picture forming:** Collect perspectives and information without immediate evaluation.
- **Opinion forming:** Develop proposals, weigh arguments, and integrate input.
- **Consent decision:** Examine the proposal, take objections seriously, and address them.
- **Integration:** Adjust until no substantial objections remain.

As supervisors, we act as process guides, ensuring that all voices are heard, discussions remain focused, and objections are treated as resources. This prevents information loss and dominance by only a few voices.

Fewer Conflicts, More Commitment

Consent facilitation leads to greater acceptance and commitment because no one can be outvoted, there are no losers in consent! Decisions are less likely to be delayed or revisited, saving time and energy. By integrating objections, more perspectives are included, improving the quality of solutions. Potential resistance surfaces early and can be addressed before conflicts escalate. In dynamic environments, this method proves adaptable, allowing groups to respond flexibly to new information. The more experienced groups become with consent, the faster and more efficient these rounds become.

Practical Examples and Fields of Application

Consent facilitation is successfully applied in team supervisions, organizational development, conflict mediation, and non-/profit organizations. Groups without clear hierarchies

benefit especially, as consent allows for decisions that are broadly supported. For example, a European social enterprise planned to expand its counseling services. Through a consent process, some overlooked risks were identified and addressed. The result was a more robust plan and a team fully committed to it. Further evaluation cycles refined and improved the outcome over time, leading to high satisfaction and identification among employees.

Limitations and Success Factors for Implementation

Despite its advantages, consent facilitation is no cure-all. Groups need time and practice to become familiar with the method. Not every decision requires consent; routine matters or practical tasks such as scheduling, can be handled more efficiently in other ways. In hierarchical organizations, this power-balancing method may initially face resistance, yet over time, even leaders often feel relieved and less burdened by consent. Key success factors include transparency, patience, and a culture that values diversity. Teams should be gradually introduced to the concept of consent.

Lessons Learned

My personal experience with consent facilitation has been consistently positive, though teams often need time to adapt to its structured approach. Especially those participants unaccustomed to listening to others more than talking themselves may need an adjustment period. Nevertheless, supervisees are usually enthusiastic about the participatory outcomes. I also consider good facilitator training essential, as this tool is among the more methodologically demanding ones. With some practice, however, you can quickly benefit from its exceptionally sustainable and effective results. In my experience, it is helpful to address potential group or psychodynamic issues beforehand, as this method is rather strict and does not allow much space for them. With practice, however, such dynamics tend to appear less often during consent facilitation.

Consent Facilitation as a Key Competence for the Future

In a complex, unpredictable world, organizations need processes that ensure both stability and participation. Consent facilitation provides supervisors with exactly this opportunity. It enables robust decisions, strengthens psychological safety, and harnesses the collective intelligence of the group. It is more than just a method—it is an attitude: making decisions not against, but with each other and sharing power. Mastering this competence not only produces better outcomes but also builds more resilient, engaged teams and relieved leaders. Consent facilitation is a key tool of sociocracy and is well described in the relevant literature. I hope you will find this method both useful and enjoyable to explore. ■

Reference:

- Endenburg, G. (1998) Sociocracy as Social Design: Its Characteristics and Course of Development, as Theoretical Design and Practical Project
  Delft: Eburon.
- Endenburg, G. and Bowden, C. (1998) Sociocracy - The Organization of Decision-Making: “No Objection” as the Principle of Sociocracy
  Rotterdam; Stichting Sociocratisch Centrum.
- Rau Ted J. & Koch-Gonzalez, J. (2018) Many Voices One Song: Shared Power With Sociocracy. Amherst, MA: Sociocracy for All.
- Strauch, B. (2022) Soziokratie. Organisationsstrukturen zur Stärkung von Beteiligung und Mitverantwortung des Einzelnen in Unternehmen, Politik und Gesellschaft, 2. Auflage, Vahlen Verlag.

Lisa Aigner (Germany) is a social worker (B.A.), DGSv-certified supervisor, and mediator with a master’s degree in social management. With extensive leadership experience in values-based management and further training in psychotherapy, she brings solid expertise to supporting change processes. She ensures a resilient balance between the internal and external dynamics of people and systems.
Lisa Aigner works freelance as a supervisor and in organizational development. She also serves as the managing director of a non-profit in the social sector. She is co-editor of a specialist book on sustainability in German companies and advocates for ecological sustainability in supervision and coaching based on the Economy for the Common Good (ECG).