White salmon weather winter

This credit union updates its online banking website, so pilot fish with accounts there updates all of her family's accounts. The new feature was safety issues, says Pisces. I didn't like those three that were given, so I made a drop-down menu to see more questions. I chose my three new questions and wrote answers to make the couple know they were. But the first time he tries it, it undermines the password. Fish must go through the entire process of recreating your account settings. The next time he tries, the fish has to go through the whole process again - but this time she'll print the screen captures the questions she's chosen and writes answers to them. To make sure this doesn't happen a third time, the fish strolls it through the login process. But when they took up security concerns, the one that pops up is not one of the new issues the fish has selected. I deliberately chose questions I knew he could answer,' fish says. I went around the question of which high school I graduated from, but there it was, waiting for an answer. During my last script attempt with three attempts or you blocked, I mentioned that this was the first question of their three original options. So I provided the answer I used for the first question: Where were you born? Bingo, I was u. It's funny, thinks fish. It puts in a call to the same customer service representative who has already reset the account password twice. The rep tells the fish that many people get locked up on safety concerns. Can I talk to a programmer? Fish asks. I can't pass you on, says rep. Ok, write this down and give it to the IT department, says Fish. Tell them that while they allow users to select new questions, they record answers but keeping the original default questions as first presented. I also asked where to send my account to solve problems, but never heard from them, says Fish. But now we have a way to make security questions unanswered by hackers. For example, when asked Where were you born? we make a key in the year of the account owner's birth as a response. Answer Sharkey's call for true tales about IT life! Send me your stories in sharky@computerworld.com. You will touch the snazzy shark shirt every time I use one. Speak today's tale in the Google+ Sharky community, and read thousands of great old tales in Sharkives.Get your daily dose of takes from the ABSURD IT Theatre delivered directly to your inbox. Sign up now for the daily shark bulletin. Copyright © 2017 IDG Communications, Inc. In in-depth interviews, we asked Collins about the implications of his research and ideas for the economy, stock market and the very nature of executive leadership. Kind to the big companies that you wrote about all achieved excellent stock market results over a 15-year period. But stock market declined. Does this mean that We won't see good for big companies today? First, I want to correct a big misconception. The stock market is not down. What does the stock market look like relative to 1985? The stock market is not down. What does it look like relative to 1990? The stock market is not down. The market was irrationally out of the punch - we didn't have a stock market; We had a speculative casino. The tech bubble wasn't the new economy - there's a new economy that's been going on for years on a deeper level. But the brutal fact is that companies that were at the top of the tech bubble had no results. You can't make zero profits and claim you have results. In the case of companies that had great results before the bubble burst, they are in a period of decline now, but so what? The bottom line is in a company like Cisco, we don't yet know the answer. It may be that these companies are just in a very difficult 6- to 12-month period. Let me use the analogy. Let's say you have a great basketball dynasty like the UCLA Bruins under John Wooden. This is a team that is going to win 10 NCAA championships in 12 years. This is a team that has gone from good to great. But in 1970 they lost three games. Does that mean we're going to write them off and say they're not a great team? We have to look at a longer period of time. The same goes for companies that hit the bubble. It was too short a period of time. It will take longer to tell which companies that are in trouble now are just going through a moment period and will have the resilience to come back. But for many businessmen, the current slowdown is a sign of the demise of the new economy. This is one of the most dedicated times in history. Two or three years ago, what was the main complaint we heard? It's so hard to get good people! Whining, whining, whining! Today we have the greatest opportunity we will have in decades to claw the boat - not the bus, but the boatload - the big people. And big companies always start with who, not what. We can finally get to the right side of Packard's law. Packard's law is similar to the law of physics for large companies. It says no company can become or remain large if it allows its revenue growth rate to exceed its growth in getting the right people in a sustainable way. It is one of those unconditional truths that transp preceded technology and economics. Now, instead of trying to accumulate capital, we can accumulate people. If I were in the company today, I would have one priority over everyone else: acquire as many better people as I could. I would turn off everything else if I could afford it - buildings, new projects, R&D - to fill my bus. Because everything will come back. My flywheel will start turning around. And the single biggest limitation on the growth and success of my it's not markets, not technology, it's not a possibility, it's not a stock market. If you want to be a big company, the single biggest limitation on your ability to grow is the ability to get on and hang on to the right enough people. It's also a great time to get yourself to look back. When you were breaking packard law, you probably let a lot of the wrong people on the bus. It's a good time to get them. In fact, it's a little easier to do now. We can blame him for the circumstances. What else would you do to get capital for this revaluation period? It's also a great time to ask yourself some really hard questions. In a time of irrational prosperity, where the market will give you money, whether you've delivered or not, many companies haven't answered any of the questions in three circles (What can we be the best in the world on? which economic denominator best drives our economic engine? and which our core people are deeply passionate about?). They didn't have a clue that they could do better than any other company in the world that was resilient, they didn't have a profit denominator, and the only thing they had a passion for was flipping the company. Now we can no longer live in this fantasy land. We have to take a close look at everything we do and put them all on three Test laps. Any things that fail the test, we have to stop doing - today. I see a lot of companies that have found themselves with a lot of capital. So they wandered into all kinds of acquisitions or new businesses or new destinations, simply because they could. But they don't necessarily fit into three circles. Today, the task for them is to prune. Those who clarify their three circles will come out of this just fine. Those who do not deserve to die. CEOs today find themselves little time to prove their worth. What advice would you give the CEO in the hot seat? If I were a CEO in the hot seat, taking over a company I'd like to move from good to great, that's what I would do. I would do it well before the big stock chart and I would put it in front of my directors. I would say: We are on the left side of this curve. We want to be on the right side of the curve. Right? If that's what we all want, we know what it takes to get it. You can't keep luring from CEO to CEO. If you do, you'll end up in the Doom Loop - and then we end up as one of the comparative companies, not one of the big companies. I don't think all the directors are stupid. Most are smart, but they work out of ignorance, not a lack of good intent. We need to hit them on the head with empirical results. Our job is to beat the market in a sustainable way over time. We have to think about the share price over a five-year period. And we have to start doing whatever it will To get this flywheel turning. Finally, if I'm a CEO, I want the board to give me the following assurance: However long or short my tenure as CEO may be, whoever you choose, however my successor should pick up this flywheel in midturn and keep pushing in a consistent direction. I can only get a flywheel turn at 16 RPM. But my successor has to take it to 100 RPM. His successor must take him to 500 RPM, and his successor to 1,000 RPM. It's not about me as CEO - it's about commitment to a consistent program. We're not going to do the Doom Loop.CEOs who took their companies from good to big were mostly anonymous - a far cry from the celebrities we read about. Is this an accident? Or is it cause and effect? I believe it's more a matter of cause and effect than an accident. There is something directly related between the lack of celebrity and the presence of good to great results. Why? First, when you have a celebrity, the company turns into one genius out of 1,000 assistants. It creates a feeling that the whole thing is really in the CEO. And this leads to all sorts of problems — if a person leaves or if a person turns out not to be a genius after all. On a deeper level, we found that for leaders to do something big, their ambitions should be for the greatness of the job and the company, not for themselves. That doesn't mean they don't have an ego. That doesn't mean they don't have any self-service. This means that at the point of decision-making after the decision-making point - at critical facages, when Choice A will benefit their ego and choice of B will benefit the company and its work - time and time again these leaders choose Choice B. Celebrity executives, at the same decision points, are more likely to prefer themselves and ego over the company and work. Like anonymous CEOs, most of the companies that have made the transformation from good to big are unrelested. What does that tell us? The truth is that most people don't work in the most glamorous things in the world. They do a real job - meaning that most of the time they do a heck of a lot of irritability with only a few points of excitement. Some put baked bread. Some build retail stores. The real work of the economy is done by people who make cars that sell real estate, who run grocery stores and banks. So one of the big findings of this study is that you can be in a big company and do it in steel, in pharmacies, in grocery stores. It's just not the case that if you're not in Silicon Valley, you're not cool. It doesn't matter where you are. So no one has the right to whin about their company, their industry, or the kind of business they are in - ever again. Did the 11 companies that made the transformation take advantage Anonymity? One of the great advantages these companies had was that no one Kroger began his transition; Nucor began its transition; No one expected much. They could underestimate and overrun. In fact, if I took over the company and tried to make it go from good to great, I would tell my vice president of communications that his job was to make the whole world think we were constantly on the verge of doom. In the course of our research, we actually printed out transcripts of CEO presentations to analysts by good companies and comparative companies. We read all these. And it's impressive. Good people always talk about the problems they face, the programs they build, what concerns them. You go to comparative companies, they're constantly faltering, they're selling the future - but they never deliver results. If I'm not a CEO, how do good-to-great lessons apply to me? Good-to-great concepts apply to any situation – as long as you can choose the people around you. This is the most important thing. But fundamentally, we really do - we have great discretion over the people in our lives, the people we choose to let into our bus, whether in our department at work or in our personal lives. But the main message is: Create your own flywheel. You can do it. You can start building momentum in what you have responsibility for. You can build a great department. You can build a large church community. You can take each of the good ones to great ideas and apply them to your own work or your own life. What will your research teach you about changes in business as a whole? Is this essentially a message to go back to basics? Very rarely significant changes ever lead to results in a sustainable way. This is one of the really important finds of the book. We started with 1,435 companies. And 11 companies did it. Let's look at this fact for a moment. The fact is that this does not happen very often. Why not? Because we don't know what we're doing! And because we don't know what we're doing, we're launching into all sorts of things that don't produce results. We end up like a bunch of primitives dancing around a campfire chanting on the moon. What I feel strongly about is that we need some science to understand what it really takes to change things. Is he back to basics? No, it's looking forward to understanding. Why is it back to basics to say that CEOs should be ambitious for their companies, not for themselves? Why did he go back to basics to do who and people question first and what and where is the question second? So when it's back to basics for the company to start with a question like, Why have we sucked for 100 years, and what are the cruel facts that we have to confront? Why can I go back to basics to say that stop lists are more important than to-do lists? And since has it gone back to basics to say that technology is only an accelerator, not the creator of something? I don't think these concepts have come back to basics. Because if they are, we should be able to go back in time and find that people have used these ideas. People did not find this — that is why there are only 11 of 1435. So, no, he didn't go back to basics. This is looking forward to understanding. What is your assessment of the new economy? We've seen a lot of change and we've seen a lot of backlash against change. How do you make sense of everything? The huge changes that are happening around us make it the most exciting time in history to be alive. It's really fun. All these changes — changes in technology, globalization — are brutal facts that must be integrated into any decisions we make. People at Walgreens did not ignore the internet because they were focused only on the basics. They faced the brutal fact of the internet and then asked: How does this fit into our three circles, and how can we use it to twist our flywheel faster? You never ignore change - you hit them head on like cruel facts, or you come to them with a great sense of brilliance and excitement. This change, this new technology opens you up a way to prevail, to be even better as a company. All charity companies have made changes and used them to their advantage, often with great eyes. When there were new pianos, Mozart did not hang up his music. He didn't say: There are these new pianos! Harapsichord out of the way, so I'm being washed like a composer! He thought, This is so cool! I can do it loudly with piano forte! It's really neat! He kept the discipline of writing great music and, at the same time, embraced with great perspective and excitement the invention of the piano. With all the changes around us, we have to be just like Mozart. We maintain great discipline about our music, but at the same time, we accept things that can allow us to make even more music. Alan M. Webber (awebber@fastcompany.com is the editor-in-chief of Fast Company. Jim Collins (jimcollins@aol.com) wrote the essay Built to Flip in the March 2000 issue of Fast Company. His new book, Good for the Great: Why Some Companies Are Making the Leap... And others won't, will be available in October. October.