JUPITER PRIME

Consulting • Training • Advisory

جوبيتر برايم للاستشارات والتدريب

COURSE BROCHURE

Advanced Strategic Decision Analysis Training Course

jupiterprime.uk

info@jupiterprime.uk

Registered in the United Kingdom and Saudi Arabia

Advanced Strategic Decision Analysis Training Course

Strategic Decision Analysis is an advanced 2-week training course for senior managers, executives and decision analysts who must structure high-stakes choices under uncertainty, producing a Decision Analysis Case for a live strategic choice in their organisation. Volatile markets, conflicting stakeholder demands and abundant but ambiguous data make intuition alone a risky basis for major commitments. Jupiter Prime Training runs this course for leaders who want decisions that withstand scrutiny long after they are made.

Why Strategic Decision Analysis Matters Now

Three forces raise the stakes for strategic decisions today: boards and funders who ask how alternatives were weighed and what risks were accepted, faster cycles of disruption that shorten the time available to choose, and leadership teams whose members bring different assumptions and incentives to the table. Organisations that analyse decisions well commit resources with clear reasoning and learn from outcomes; those that decide poorly repeat costly errors and lose stakeholder confidence. The course applies multi-criteria decision analysis MCDA, the Analytic Hierarchy Process AHP and expected value reasoning, and connects chosen options to the Balanced Scorecard BSC of Kaplan and Norton for follow-through.

Who Gains Most from Strategic Decision Analysis

- Senior managers who bring major investment, market or restructuring proposals to executive committees
- Executives who chair decision forums and must reconcile competing views
- Decision and business analysts who model alternatives, probabilities and trade-offs
- Risk and finance leaders who test the downside of strategic commitments
- Board secretaries and strategy officers who design how decisions are prepared and recorded

A leadership team that attends with its decision analysts gains most, because executives and modellers can agree one framing discipline, one evaluation method and one record of how choices were made.

Strategic Decision Analysis Capabilities

Participants learn to separate the quality of a decision from the luck of its outcome and to build reasoning others can inspect.

- Specify the decision frame, objectives and alternatives before analysis begins — executives avoiding solutions to the wrong problem
- Build decision trees with probabilities and payoffs for sequential choices — investment committees comparing expected values
- Calculate weighted scores with MCDA and AHP for multi-objective choices — leaders balancing financial and non-financial goals
- Test robustness through sensitivity, scenario and value-of-information analysis — boards judging how fragile a choice is
- Apply debiasing techniques to individual and group judgement — decision forums reaching sounder conclusions
- Communicate the recommended choice with its reasoning and accepted risks — sponsors and stakeholders endorsing the decision

Key Strategic Decision Analysis Terms

- Decision frame — the agreed statement of what is being decided, why, by whom and which alternatives and objectives are in scope.
- Decision tree — a diagram of choices, uncertain events, probabilities and outcomes used to compare the expected value of alternatives.
- Expected value — the probability-weighted average outcome of an alternative across all the uncertain futures it might face.
- Multi-criteria decision analysis — a family of methods that scores alternatives against several weighted objectives to support a transparent choice.
- Value of information — the amount a decision maker should be willing to spend to reduce uncertainty before committing.
- Pre-mortem — a group exercise that imagines a decision has failed and works backwards to identify the likely causes.

Strategic Decision Analysis Day by Day

Day 1: Decision Quality and Its Enemies

- Decision Quality Chain — Judging a Decision Separately From Its Outcome
- Strategic Decision Typology — Distinguishing Reversible From Irreversible Commitments
- Decision Audit of Past Choices — Learning From the Organisation's Own Record
- Decision Rights Mapping — Clarifying Who Recommends, Decides and Is Consulted
- Decision Log Design — Recording Reasoning for Later Review

Day 2: Framing the Decision

- Decision Frame Statement — Agreeing Scope, Constraints and Given Assumptions
- Objectives Hierarchy — Separating Fundamental Objectives From Means
- Value-Focused Thinking — Generating Alternatives From What Matters Most
- Strategy Table Technique — Combining Choices Into Coherent Alternatives
- Stakeholder Value Mapping — Anticipating Who Gains and Who Loses

Day 3: Thinking About Uncertainty

- Uncertainty Identification — Listing the Unknowns That Could Change the Choice
- Influence Diagrams — Showing How Decisions, Uncertainties and Values Connect
- Probability Elicitation — Turning Expert Judgement Into Calibrated Estimates
- Scenario Thinking for Decisions — Testing Alternatives Against Plausible Futures
- Calibration Exercises — Improving the Accuracy of Executive Forecasts

Day 4: Decision Trees and Expected Value

- Decision Tree Construction — Laying Out Sequential Choices and Chance Events
- Expected Value Rollback — Calculating the Preferred Path Through the Tree
- Risk Profiles — Comparing the Spread of Outcomes, Not Only Averages
- Risk Attitude and Utility — Reflecting the Organisation's Tolerance for Loss
- Staged Commitment Options — Valuing the Flexibility to Wait or Expand

Day 5: Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis

- MCDA Model Structure — Linking Alternatives, Criteria and Weights
- Swing Weighting — Setting Criterion Weights From Real Value Differences
- Analytic Hierarchy Process — Deriving Priorities From Pairwise Comparisons
- Scoring Scales Design — Turning Qualitative Judgements Into Comparable Scores
- Dominance and Trade-Off Analysis — Removing Inferior Alternatives Early

Day 6: Testing Robustness

- Tornado Diagrams — Ranking Which Variables Swing the Result Most
- Monte Carlo Simulation — Exploring Outcome Ranges Under Combined Uncertainty
- Weight Sensitivity Analysis — Checking Whether Rankings Survive Changed Priorities
- Value of Information Analysis — Deciding Whether to Gather More Data First
- Robust Choice Criteria — Preferring Alternatives That Perform Across Scenarios

Day 7: Cognitive Bias and Debiasing

- Bias Catalogue for Strategic Choices — Recognising Anchoring, Overconfidence and Sunk Cost
- Pre-Mortem Analysis — Imagining Failure to Expose Hidden Risks
- Reference Class Forecasting — Correcting Optimism With Outside-View Data
- Red Team Challenge — Assigning Structured Dissent to Key Proposals
- Decision Checklists — Embedding Debiasing Steps in Routine Reviews

Day 8: Group Decision Processes

- Groupthink Diagnostics — Spotting Premature Consensus in Leadership Teams
- Nominal Group Technique — Gathering Independent Views Before Discussion
- Delphi Rounds — Converging Expert Judgement Without Dominant Voices
- Structured Debate Formats — Testing Competing Alternatives Fairly
- Consensus and Voting Rules — Choosing How the Group Will Decide

Day 9: Communicating and Implementing Decisions

- Decision Memo Structure — Presenting Frame, Alternatives, Analysis and Recommendation
- Visualising Trade-Offs — Making Analytical Results Clear to Non-Specialists
- Balanced Scorecard Linkage — Translating the Chosen Option Into Objectives and Measures
- Decision Review Triggers — Setting Signals That Reopen a Choice
- Post-Decision Learning Reviews — Comparing Outcomes With Expectations Fairly

Day 10: Practising the Decision Analysis Case

- Frame and Objectives Peer Review — Testing the Case Definition With Fellow Participants
- Model Walkthrough — Checking Trees, Scores and Probabilities for Errors
- Robustness Challenge — Stress-Testing the Recommendation Against Alternative Assumptions
- Mock Decision Forum — Presenting to a Simulated Executive Committee
- Decision Analysis Case Completion — Finalising Frame, Analysis, Recommendation and Review Triggers

Applying Strategic Decision Analysis After the Course

- Run a pre-mortem on one pending strategic proposal and add the identified risks and mitigations to its decision memo.
- Introduce a decision log and decision frame template for the next executive committee cycle.

Strategic Decision Analysis Questions FAQ

What is strategic decision analysis and why does it matter now?

Strategic decision analysis is a structured way to frame major choices, model uncertainty, weigh objectives and test robustness before committing. It matters now because volatility and scrutiny make unexplained, intuition-only decisions increasingly risky for leaders.

Which roles gain most from strategic decision analysis training?

Senior managers, executives, decision analysts, and risk and finance leaders gain most. You benefit most if you prepare or approve high-stakes proposals and need to show how alternatives were compared and why one was chosen.

How does strategic decision analysis differ from a shorter AI-enabled decision-making course?

Strategic decision analysis is a longer, method-centred course covering framing, trees, MCDA, simulation, debiasing and group processes in depth. A shorter AI-enabled course focuses on using predictive tools, while this course builds the full analytical and behavioural discipline behind sound choices.

What do you bring back from strategic decision analysis training?

You bring back a decision analysis case for a live choice, including frame, objectives, models, robustness tests and a recommendation memo. You also bring templates for decision logs, pre-mortems and review triggers.

Strategic Decision Analysis: The Way Forward

The Decision Analysis Case first informs whether the executive committee commits to the recommended alternative or requests more information. Executives, analysts and risk leaders use it to debate the choice on transparent reasoning. After the decision plays out, revisit the probabilities and weights, because comparing them with real outcomes is how a leadership team improves its future judgement.