CAMPBELL
STRATEGY. EXECUTION. IMPACT.

CAMPBELL INSIGHTS

Building a Culture of Execution

How to engage your team, eliminate barriers, and create accountability at every level.

Shauna N. Campbell
Founder & Chief Executive Officer, CAMPBELL

Most organizations do not fall short because they chose the wrong strategy. They fall short because the strategy never became anyone's Tuesday. The plan is approved, the retreat photos are posted, the document is beautiful, and then the calendar fills back up with the work that was already there.

Leaders often read that gap as a people problem. The team is not bought in. They lack urgency. They need to be held accountable. Occasionally that is true. Far more often, the people are willing and the system around them is not built to convert intent into delivery.

A culture of execution is not a personality trait an organization either has or lacks. It is the accumulated residue of a few specific habits, practiced visibly and repeatedly by the people with the most authority. Change the habits and the culture follows. Give speeches about accountability without changing the habits and nothing moves.

Execution is a system, not an attitude

When delivery stalls, the instinct is to add pressure. More status reports, a tighter deadline, a pointed conversation. Pressure applied to an unclear system produces anxiety, not output. People work harder on the wrong things, or work carefully on the right things and still miss, because the obstacle was never effort.

Before adding pressure, it is worth asking a plainer question: if this priority failed to move last quarter, what specifically stopped it? The answers cluster in a small number of places. The work was described too vaguely to act on. There were eleven priorities. Nobody could name the owner. The decision needed an executive who was never in the room. Progress was discussed but never decided on.

Every one of those is fixable, and none of them is fixed by exhortation.

Make the work specific enough to own

“Improve the intake process” is a direction, not an assignment. Two capable people will read it differently, build toward different outcomes, and both believe they delivered. The ambiguity does not surface until the deadline, when it becomes a disagreement about scope rather than a conversation about progress.

Work becomes ownable when three things are written down: the outcome the organization must receive, what is explicitly out of scope, and how anyone will know it is finished. That third item does the most work and gets skipped the most often. Acceptance criteria are not bureaucracy — they are the difference between a task that closes and a task that lingers in a status report for seven months.

> *If two people on the team would describe “done” differently, the work is not yet ready to assign.*

Reduce the list until the priorities are real

A priority list with fifteen items on it is not a priority list. It is an inventory of good intentions, and it quietly transfers the hardest decision — what actually matters most — from leadership to whoever is least busy that week.

Cutting the list is uncomfortable because every item has a sponsor and a reason. That discomfort is the point. When leadership refuses to choose, the choice still gets made, just further down the organization, with less information and no authority behind it. Naming three priorities and protecting them is a harder act of leadership than naming fifteen and hoping.

It also changes what the team hears. A short list says these matter and we mean it. A long list says everything matters, which every experienced employee correctly translates as nothing does.

Name one owner, not a committee

Shared ownership sounds collaborative and behaves like abandonment. When three names sit beside an initiative, each person reasonably assumes one of the others is driving, and the work advances only when someone happens to have capacity.

One accountable owner does not mean one person doing the work. It means one person who cannot look at a stalled initiative and think that someone else will pick it up. Contributors, approvers, and stakeholders all still exist around that owner. What they do not do is dilute the answer to a simple question: who is responsible for this moving?

Decision rights deserve the same clarity, defined before work begins rather than discovered at the first disagreement. A team that does not know who can approve a trade-off will escalate everything or decide nothing, and both are expensive.

Treat barriers as leadership's work

This is where engagement is actually won or lost. Teams do not disengage because the goals are too ambitious. They disengage because they have raised the same obstacle three times and watched nothing change.

An execution culture makes surfacing barriers safe and useful. Safe means a person can say this is blocked and why without it being read as an excuse or a performance issue. Useful means that when a barrier is named, something visibly happens — a decision, a resource, a removed dependency, or an honest answer that the constraint is real and here is how the plan changes around it.

That last option matters more than leaders expect. Teams can work within a constraint they understand. What corrodes engagement is raising a problem into silence.

RELATED CHECKLIST

Execution + Accountability Checklist

A sixteen-point control check covering scope, ownership, decision rights, cadence, risk, and handoff. Built to be completed with the delivery team at kickoff and revisited at every milestone. Download it at campbellconsults.com under Resources.

Build a cadence that produces decisions

Most organizations already have a status cadence. Far fewer have one that changes anything. The tell is a meeting where people take turns narrating activity, everyone nods, and the same items appear next month in the same condition.

A working cadence is organized around three questions rather than a tour of updates: what moved since last time, what is at risk, and what decision is needed today from the people in this room. That structure is shorter, considerably less comfortable, and the only version that earns its place on a calendar.

Predictability matters as much as content. A review that happens on a known rhythm shapes behavior between reviews. One that gets postponed whenever things are busy teaches the team that the priority is optional precisely when it is under the most strain.

Make accountability even-handed

Accountability has acquired an unfortunate reputation, largely because it is most often invoked downward and after something has gone wrong. Used that way, it functions as blame with better manners, and teams learn to manage their exposure rather than surface risk early.

Accountability that builds culture runs in every direction. Commitments are made out loud, with a name and a date. Progress is visible without anyone having to ask. Missed commitments prompt a conversation about what got in the way rather than a search for fault. And leaders are held to their own commitments in the same forum, on the same terms.

That last condition is not a nicety. A team calibrates its seriousness against what leadership tolerates in itself. When an executive's overdue decision is treated as understandable while a manager's slipped deadline is treated as a failure, the organization learns exactly what accountability means, and it is not the lesson anyone intended.

Culture is what the cadence rewards

Organizations rarely announce their culture accurately. What they actually believe shows up in smaller signals: which meeting gets cancelled when the week gets tight, whether the person who flags a risk early is thanked or quietly marked, whether a commitment made in March is still remembered in June.

Which is encouraging, because those signals are within reach. No organization can install a culture of execution by deciding to have one. Every organization can decide that priorities will be few, that owners will be named, that barriers will get a real answer, and that the review will happen on the date it was scheduled.

Hold those four things for two quarters and the culture will have changed without anyone needing to name it.

Where is execution breaking down for you?

CAMPBELL partners with nonprofit, healthcare, education, and public-sector organizations to strengthen strategy, tighten execution, and build the systems that hold results in place. Schedule a consultation at campbellconsults.com.