

# Compliance & Ethics Professional

January  
2016



A PUBLICATION OF THE SOCIETY OF CORPORATE COMPLIANCE AND ETHICS

[www.corporatecompliance.org](http://www.corporatecompliance.org)

## Meet Kasey Ingram

General Counsel & Chief Compliance Officer,  
ISK Americas Incorporated  
in Concord, OH

See page 14

**27**

Unwrapping your  
gift policy: Love  
what's inside

Cynthia Scavelli

**31**

A sense of  
compliance in  
the workplace

Laura Serra Nova

**33**

Compliance in  
Spain: The other  
way around

Ricardo Seoane

**37**

The role of the  
data protection  
officer in Europe

Robert Bond

by Roy Snell, CHC, CCEP-F

# This is so frustrating

*Please don't hesitate to call me about anything any time.*

+1 612 709 6012 Cell • +1 952 933 8009 Direct

[roy.snell@corporatecompliance.org](mailto:roy.snell@corporatecompliance.org)

[@RoySnellSCCE](https://twitter.com/RoySnellSCCE) [in /in/roysnell](https://www.linkedin.com/company/roy/snell)



Snell

I am really tired of trite sayings made up by people who are trying to make a buck. My favorite was from years ago, when I was working in administration at Mayo. We had a speaker who wrote a book titled something like, "If It Ain't Broke, Break It." Well, the "Management Program of the Month" people are back at it with another trite, hot-selling title like, "Disruptive Management."

Let me explain something: If something is not broken, you should not break it. If something is working, you should not disrupt it. You should fix things that are broken and disrupt things that are not working.

In this country, we have too much management and too many meetings. We need to give more people responsibility, accountability, and authority for their area, and then we need to get out of their way. What we don't need is people five layers up having nothing better to do than to micromanage, break, disrupt, or otherwise change things five layers down. Five layers is so far removed from what those people know, that chances are slim they even know what they are changing things from or to.

There are people who will change something just because they "can think of another way." And there are people who "can think of another way" but who don't bother

to check if that thing has been changed five times in the last five years because five other people already "could think of another way." These people need to ask themselves first, "Will the gains made by my change be offset by the efforts spent making the change?" But even if a change can be justified because it will make something 5 or 10 or 20% better, the next question needs to be, "Will taking time to completely re-do something bring more benefit than using that time to do something that is not currently being done?" Or, in other words, "Is the 20% gain we will get from changing something that is kind of working be greater than the 100% gain we will get from tackling something that is not working at all?"

**There are people who will change something just because they "can think of another way."**

Monitor, audit, and check in on the people and areas you are responsible for. Look at their results on an aggregate level. If the results are good, go away and do something else. If the results are bad, then think about breaking, changing, or disrupting. But changing, breaking, or disrupting just for the sake of change is simply illogical. \*