

AGWM Seminar with Melvyn Ming

June 30, 2003

Tape 1

Session 1

Ming: ... friends, and people we served with in the Philippines, and people we know because of school, and people we know because of the Northwest District, and relatives, and—you know, we were talking at lunch about all the connections. We were sitting at lunch—Herb Smith was the youth pastor for my father when I was in junior high. John Bueno's brother-in-law was in our wedding. Mike McClafin and I did a youth retreat together in 1971 with our youth groups. I mean, it is kind of funny, when you start putting it all together. So this is going to be delightful for us, not only because we have this time together, but we get a chance to see many friends, to renew acquaintances, and to enjoy what we are all a part of. Now, we have really, over the next day and a half, about five sessions, and they are going to be quite distinct. They do relate together, but we going to deal with a number of issues that I think are relevant to you. The first one we are going to do—the notes should be in your little folder, and in each session we will have new notes—this one deals with organization. You are in this room because you are a leader. That is why you are here! That is the point. At yet, we are at a time of transition, both in our denomination, culturally—and we want to talk about some of those issues for the next little bit.

And then, in the second session, we want to talk a little bit about the transformation that has to occur in an organization. How do you bring about transformation? Every organization has to have intervention. Every organization. An organization left to itself will decline. So we have to talk about how do we do that. You serve a unique vantage point in that by the very nature of missions—you deal cross-culturally, generally multi-culturally. But you also have an issue with your sending body that is doing tremendous cultural changes. Several have commented to me, "I have gone overseas, and I come back, and it is like the world changed home." We have to talk about that because that is going to affect how we do missions in the next decade. So we want to talk a little about that.

Tomorrow we will do a session really on—the name of the game today is, if you will, collaboration, teams, and empowerment. How do you identify strengths in people? How do you bring those strengths out? How do, in truth, leverage those strengths as a good steward to get good results? Then we are going to talk a session on coaching and mentoring. There was a time in leadership, what you had to do was make decisions. Today, the role has changed. One of the primary roles is coaching and mentoring. We want to talk about that and hopefully develop some skills.

Then in the last one, we will talk about how do we lead in change without killing what we are leading. Hopefully, we will bring it all back together. If we haven't by then, I will probably be dead, or at least no longer part of the Fellowship. One of the two. But we will find out where we get to there.

Now sometimes things are not as they seem. We look at something and think we see it, it is not always exactly the way. So to illustrate it (showing visual), count the number of black dots. Or try this one—are the lines parallel or not? What do you think? They are parallel, but because of the way the black is, it distorts perception. I mention that because sometimes we can have a group of people look at the same thing, yet they don't see reality. They see distortion; they see perception. They see through filters. That has to do with organization. So we are going to talk about that.

We are grateful. I grew up Assemblies of God. My mother and father were both pastoring churches when they married. They had to decide whether to take his church or hers, and they took hers because it was bigger! I can tell you, starting in 1953, where every General Council was, because that was our vacation. In 1953, it was in Milwaukee, because at 9 o'clock they opened the windows, and all the vats—it stunk! But I remember all these. I was in San Antonio at every major election. Oklahoma City. I am part of this heritage, and I am grateful to the organization our fathers built. Unfortunately, the world we live in is not like the world they live in. So we have to look at that and a couple of issues. You know, you can think missions overseas is not affected by what happens here, but that is not true. It is all interconnected. In the United States, we have moved from a Christian to a post-Christian country, and yet the glory days of missions were in pre-Christian and Christian times. That affects how you do deputation, how churches have missions services, how your funding base comes, about loyalty, about the view of career missionaries—all kinds of issues.

We have generational value issues that really, we came and were launched in a builder generation that viewed loyalty and commitment. If they gave you a pledge, you would have it until they died. We have generations today that don't hold some of those values high in their hierarchy. We have an aging constituency. You know, in the Northwest District, we have more ministers over 90 than under 26. At the last General Council, any vote could have been decided by the retired voters. It is true. It is because we are becoming a mature organization. We now have churches that are approaching 100 years. And our constituency has aged, and that affects us. It affects missions. It affects pastorates. It affects churches. It affects their view of all this. The percentage of our churches that are plateaued and declining in the United States—we hear this wonderful statistic that if you cannot rejoice to think of the millions coming to Christ around the world, something is wrong. Unfortunately, that is not the picture you have here. We will talk a little more about that later. Then there are many other issues. We were, in many years if you will, a mother church founding, and now in many countries where you work, the truth is there are many network partners, and it is a multicultural—not a cross-cultural—issue. So now we have to deal with all the issues of the business conglomerates and multiethnic groups, multinational groups, and all of those affect organization.

We will develop some of those issues later, but in this one, to set the foundation, I want to talk about a number of big issues that affect organizations in general. Whether it be a business, a local church in the United States, the division of world missions, or the Assemblies of God—I mean, obviously, anybody right now knows we're in major reorganization as a movement. By the way, all the classical Pentecostals are—the Foursquare, the Church of God, and all of them that were birthed out of the Azusa Street time are in major reorganization. They are at that point in their life cycle. But, what are these organizational issues, and how do they relate to us?

If you look in the business world, and you look over the last four or five decades, you find that in every decade there was, if you will, a cutting-edge—a hot issue. In the 1960s it was management. For example, the most popular theory of organization in the 1960s was management by objective. All of the MBA programs you find in American universities today, which in many cases are their foundation, were established in the 1960s. The American Management Association was one of the most influential organizations in America in the 1960s. Peter Drucker was king. It was a day of management. Then you found we moved to the 1970s and the hot issue became leadership. The church kind of trailed. We discovered management in the 1970s, so we reorganized the Assemblies of God. There were all these books on ministry by management. But in the secular world, it was all about leadership. It is interesting, by the way, you go to any good bookstore, or any great library, and if you look at the titles of the books, if it has the word management in its

Comment: When you consider all that was happening in the organizational literature of the west in the 60-70's (good summary here) what does this say to the faith based organizations that were emerging in this time frame as they would come to know and work with the post communist context.

title, it was probably produced in the 1960s. If it has the word leadership, it was probably produced in the 1970s. Now an interesting thing happened, by the way—they did not throw out the previous, but they did change the order. It was not management plus leadership; it became leadership plus management. So, example, Stephen Covey writes a book in the 1990s called *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. Habit 2 is leadership. Habit 3 is management. So they did not throw out, but they did add to.

Then we moved into the 1980s, and all across the country, businesses wrote vision statements. In fact, if you go to any corporate bylaws, and look at when their vision statement was written, almost all of the Fortune 500, it would have been written in the 80, because everybody was writing vision statements. We discovered John Maxwell and leadership. So we were a little bit behind. But anyway, vision was hot. Now they didn't throw out leadership, management, AND vision.

Then you go to the 1990s. The big issue was values. Those same corporations that wrote mission statements in the 80s wrote core value statements in the 90s—and we sent out the “vision kit.” We were close! What I want you to see is, though, if you pick a management book or a leadership book written in the 90s, if it was written in '90, '91, or '92, they probably told you to write your vision statement, then your value statement. If it was written after '93, it probably said to write your value statement, then your vision. They flipped, just like leadership and management flipped, these two flipped. So core values became, if you will, the key. So many of you have read a book like *Built to Last*, about core values. Well that was part of that transformation that happened.

Why does business keep moving ahead? You see, they are concerned, not about the souls of men and women, but they are concerned about profitability. And when the present is no longer profitable, they are looking for something that can help them. So they are always pushing the envelope there. Now, what happens when we turn to the 21st century? What becomes the hot issue? What becomes the cutting edge? All of a sudden, you find it is organizational issues. You will go down to Barnes and Noble on Glenstone, and go to the management section and you would look. Look at the books printed in '98, '99, and 2000. Teams, empowerment—all of these things about learning organizations, about defining culture, about corporate life-cycles. They are all organizational issues. And what it amounts to is corporate America discovered there was more than just the leader. There was a context.

It is that issue there that I hope we can spend about the next hour and a half working together on. What are these issues? What are these things that have become, if you will, the drive, the passion of the secular world? Then how does it relate to us in the Church?

That brings us to really the first major point. Organizational models are changing. A lot of people think it is an evolution. It is not. It is a revolution. Many people think the new is just the old tweaked a little bit. It is nothing like it. That is not unusual in that it happened in our culture just about 100 years ago. If you look at the 1700-1800s in America, we were organized as an agrarian society. In fact, you could not get elected president without the vote of the grange. Why do we have all these towns that are little towns? Because they were built around how far a farmer could take his crops to either storage or shipment. The farms were extended families—even farms that had non-family members tended to treat them almost like family. They probably all ate at the same table, for example. They were kind of treated like part of the family. And the system worked very well when you were dealing with small numbers of people—3, 10, 15—extended family was a great system. It worked wonderfully for us.

But all of a sudden, about the turn of the century, industrialization came. Now we have factories and mammoth projects. We are building the TWA and the great dams. You have steel mills and all this. You have thousands of people who don't know each other, aren't related to each other, working together. The agrarian model didn't work. It just didn't fit. The logistical dynamics caused it to become irrelevant. Now there were people still fighting for it. There were places it did still work. But society had a revolution. And all of a sudden, you find the industrial model is birthed. It was a model that worked very well in American free enterprise. It was a model that was suited to our culture of individualism and ruggedness, accomplishment, conquering. We developed whole vocabularies—"chain of command." Then we had two world wars which brought a military model; a military model and an industrial model are very similar. For example, in the military, you have officers and noncommissioned officers. In the business, you have labor and management. The same issues. Chain of command—decisions are made at the top. So it was easy for us, almost all of America was touched by those two world wars. Everybody was either in the war or supporting the war. And we learned to think that way. It was comfortable to us because it was effective. We were becoming, if you will, an economic power. All of a sudden, after a great depression, we are having cars and suburbia and success and all of these things. When things are going well, you tend to believe in it.

Comment: Now take what is outlined here and note how this will have affected the organizational shape of FBOs and compare to those being shaped by communism at this time ie church structures and thinking in Romania.

Well, it served us well, and we used it in the church very well. For example, if you talk about the "great churches" in the Assemblies of God, in the 60s and 70s, you almost always called them by the pastors' names—James Hamill's, Tommy Barnett's, Glen Cole's—see what we do? That fit with an industrial/military model. The general is Patton. It's Eisenhower. It's MacArthur. Look at the same context. It just came right across.

But something started happening, and it happened under the surface. And many people did not see it happen, did not know it happened, and were shocked when they realized it had happened. Somewhere around 1980—and it depends who you read, who you talk to when the date would be, some would date it as early as '78; some would date it as late as '92—but somewhere in the 80s we have this other revolution that occurs. All of a sudden, the players are different. For example, if you take the top ten stocks on the NASDAQ in 1980, none of them are in the top ten today. And five of the top ten companies were not in existence in 1980. And all of the top three were birthed not in the old organization, but in the new.

Let's talk about churches. If we take the top ten churches in America, largest churches in 1980, the churches over 10,000, only one of them is still over 10,000, and none of them are in the top ten. Most of them, by the way, were birthed since 1980, and they were birthed under the new paradigms. Not unusual, friends. Now, I say that because in our world, in our work, in our mission field, in our endeavor, in our department, the old system may seem to be working well. But the truth is, the ground is changing underneath us. If we do not recognize it, at some point, the ground will give. We have to look at what does an informational, what does an empowered, what does a 21st century organization look like? It was a true paradigm shift. Now, we don't need to be afraid of it because our parents handled the change from agrarian to industrial very well. They did well. So we can handle this one too. But it does take leadership.

Now, if we think about that for a little bit, if we look on page two of your handout. Without question, I am simplifying to the point of almost oversimplifying, but we don't have the time, if you will, to lay out all the disclaimers. But these are general comparisons between the two paradigms. Some would call it a 20th century or industrial model / 21st or informational. We are just going to look at three issues briefly: structure, systems, and culture. For example, structure. The industrial model, by its very nature, becomes bureaucratic. "Fill it in triplicate." "You have to get someone to sign off on that." "Have you gotten approval?" You have never heard these

words, I know. (Laughs) But you will find the new ones are non-bureaucratic, with far fewer rules, but also fewer employees. The old were multileveled. By the way, this is not a negative. Things that worked right in their time WERE right. You are not saying they were wrong; they were right at the time. But in 1980, here in Springfield, they drew up a series of what they called model organizational charts for churches of different sizes. They had one for 50, 100, 250, and 500. The one for 500 had ten layers from top to bottom. It was built up very much on a great Harvard business school model, you know, _____ of control, and all—it was really wonderful. The largest church in America today, not running 500 but 20,000, has six layers. There has been a change from that way to this way.

In the old system, you were organized with the understanding that management would manage. Decisions were made at the top. So things went up the chain and down the chain. **In the new one, they are organized with the idea that management will lead and lower-level people will manage.** You can find this in almost every industry—in schools, they have gone down to where decision is made at the local one, either the room, the wing—not at superintendent headquarters. They moved decision in business. Always the question is where can we push it down to? Where can it be made? That is fundamentally different. One controls power, controls information, controls decision making. The other one pushes it away and provides leadership. They are very different.

Another one here, characterized by policies and procedures. Notice this one—created many complicated, internal interdependencies. You know, the “fine print.” **The new ones are characterized by policies and procedures with minimal internal interdependencies.** I will give you one business example of this. In 1990 in Seattle, where I am from, we had two equal anchor department stores downtown: Frederic & Nelson and Nordstrom. They were within a couple of blocks of each other, about the same size corporation stores. Frederic & Nelson would definitely have been an industrial model. Their policy manual was close to 500 pages long. Nordstrom would definitely have been an informational—by the way, the only department store to make money every year in the 90s—their policy manual, then and now, is one sentence long total. There is no other. And that sentence is this, **“In every decision, use your best judgment.”**

I will show you, by the way, here is a story you may have heard. This is a true story that John Maxwell tells. When John Maxwell resigned Skyline Wesleyan and was going to move to Atlanta, the church gave him and his family, as a going-away gift, a month’s ministry to China. They were running, like you often are when you are changing, behind. The day came for them to leave. They flew out of San Diego to San Francisco on a Saturday—they were going to catch a flight Sunday morning for China. They are getting their clothes ready, and he had worn his shoes to where he literally had holes in them. But he had ordered a new pair—he always bought the same kind, always bought them at Nordstrom’s, and he had never tried them on. He was taking them out of the box, and as he looks at the box, it is not his size! It was actually two sizes too small. He tried just to see if, by chance, they would fit—they wouldn’t. His wife got on the phone. It was Saturday night in San Francisco. She called Nordstrom’s, and somebody answered. She said, “How late are you open?” They said they were already closed. So she asked if any were open in the Bay area that night—no, all were closed on Saturday night. Then the guy asked what was wrong. She explained the story that they were leaving for China the next morning, and he bought the wrong kind of shoes. He asked what kind of shoes they were and what size, then asked her to hold a minute. He came back on the line and said, “We have that. What time do you fly out?” She told him they flew at six in the morning. He said, “Okay. I will meet you. You are flying international. I will meet you there before you go through customs. You give me yours; I will give you these, and you will have them for the trip.” The next morning, he met them there; they changed shoes. John Maxwell put them on, threw the old ones in the trash, and went through customs. For the next month, he was in China. Now, at Frederic & Nelson, they would have fired

that guy at least five times. He answered the phone when they were closed. He did not work in the shoe department. He removed inventory without authorization. He drove, on his expense, off his company time, to the airport, paid parking. He did not get a receipt for the exchange.

Here is the difference in the two cultures. At Nordstrom, that guy is a living legend. They tell his story at all kinds of sales meetings. Five years later, Frederic & Nelson was out of business and Nordstrom was putting franchises all across America. One was stuck in the old paradigm; one embraced the new. Systems depend on few performance and depend on many, especially about customers.

Look at the next one: distributor and performance data, the executive element. Have you ever heard this, "Need to know basis"? I know you never heard that. You hold the card close to the chest. In the new ones, you put the cards out on the table. Now, we have a little software company, that lives in my neighborhood, called Microsoft. Let me tell you something interesting about that. Any employee, including a janitor, can log on to any terminal and see the full spreadsheet of the finances of that company, live. Any employee can see anything. See how different that is from the old? Systems. The old only trained top leadership. The new trains many levels. Why? Because lower-level leaders have to manage. I used to do consulting to support my habit of teaching in Bible colleges, and when I did businesses in the 80s, they would have me train top leaders. Often I would teach in an executive conference room, and it would be vice presidents. Today, they will have me teach everybody, because everybody has to manage. It is the change that has happened.

Then culture. The old ones were inwardly focused; the new ones are external. The old ones were centralized; the new ones are empowering. The old ones slow to make decisions; the new ones are very quick. The old ones were political—something goes wrong, you found who to blame. The new ones are very open and candid. The old ones were risk-diverting; the new ones are much more risk-tolerant. Now, what I want you to see is that the new is not the old warmed over. The new is not the old one with a little couple of tweaks. That is why you cannot go halfway. It is oil and water: they are different paradigms. Just like you can't put a V-8 in front of a buggy and call yourself Amish, the paradigms don't match.

Look on page 3 for a moment. This gives you some idea how it relates in the church. Under the old, it was the pastor. Now it is all leaders. Under the old, the work was done by the pastor—that is what we pay him for. Now he facilitates and equips everyone else to do the work. Under the old, it was one person, one job; now it is teams and teamwork. Under the old, it was tall and narrow; now it is wide and flat. Under the old, decision-making was top-down; now it is shared. Under the old, leadership style was controlling; now it is coordinating. Under the old, relationship was adversarial, win/lose; now it is collaborative. I want you to understand we live in a world where the systems of organization have changed. We who do the most important thing there is cannot afford to have our heads in the sand. God calls us to leadership, and we have to lead in the world we are in, not the world we left. We have to focus on that.

Look on page 4 to give you an example. At the top you find an organization—this comes from Warren Bennett, from UFC. You see the one on the left—that would be traditional, hierarchal, and industrial. It is very easy to understand. It is symmetric. Every box is a person. It is clear. It does not work very well. The one on the right is absurd! You look at it—it doesn't make sense. There are lines going everywhere. There are dotted lines. There are all these circles. It works very well. Sometimes, we revert for ease, not effectiveness. Right now, it is about effectiveness. We have a harvest, and the harvest is not waiting on our, if you will, being out of date. Jesus is holding off coming back until we reach this world.

Another model people often use now is a fishnet—down at the bottom—where every person is a knot on the net. You pull the net anywhere, it affects the whole organization. Notice what is on top: not CEOs, but needs and goals. What is driving your organization now is outcomes, not positions. I am just wanting you to recognize that this is a revolution, not an evolution, and the new paradigm is radically different.

There is this language that many of you have read and are familiar with, called “Learning Organizations.” It is part of this new culture. In most of the primary works on this, they will talk about at least five characteristics: systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning—I am going to kind of unpack those a little bit over the next few minutes here. First, effective organizations practice “systems thinking.” A system—anything can be a system, by the way, in counseling, you have family systems therapy, for example; in engineering, they have systems thinking, especially in physics. But in organizations, it says that all of this is interconnected in way, and it is not enough to look at a part. You have to see all of the interconnections that are there. So there is kind of a little description about that. Most things, like missions, are really systems within systems within systems, and they are all interconnected. For example, I will show you one—most missionaries itinerate to raise support. When I did it, most churches had three times a week I could speak: Sunday morning, Sunday night, and Wednesdays. But the truth is, most of the churches have Sunday morning, and you might get a ten-minute window. Well, that does not have directly anything to do with missions, but it impacts missions because there is this interconnectedness that we get our funding from these churches. So the venue is stuck. That would be an example of systems-thinking. That is why you can’t treat missions without treating your parent body, as long as the parent body pays the bills. Well, we have to talk that a little bit.

Let me give you a few analogies. Our purpose in this encounter is not to get really deep in theory. It is to catch the concept. I think sometimes analogies help us. In our family, at the holidays—at Christmas and Thanksgiving—for years, we put together puzzles. I don’t know when we started, but the holidays come, the table comes out, and the puzzle goes on it. People work on it at different times. You know, most puzzles, when you put them all together and look at the whole, it is a picture—it could be a mountain or pastoral scene or anything. Well, looking at the whole, we could call that synthesis—the ability to see the big picture. But to do it, you have to put pieces together. It is interesting, in our family, we approach it very differently. My wife and daughters, they do it by color. I am color blind. I am not going to see shades. It is all by shape. There is something shaped like this on this page. We look at it differently, but looking at the piece, we could call that analysis. Systems thinking is seeing the interconnectedness of all the pieces. In the church, sometimes we do synthesis or analysis, but we have forgotten systems—and it IS all connected. We have to learn to see that. Let me give you one more. Have you ever heard this: “You can’t see the forest for the trees?” Okay. If you see the forest, we could call that synthesis—seeing the big picture. If you see the individual tree, we could call that analysis. But do you know some trees only grow in the shade of other trees? Some trees only drop their seeds after a fire? That is system. It is the interplay of those variables. All we do for the kingdom of God involves all three of these.

Comment: I think what I am working towards is both a systems view of the situation and an analysis of the pieces. Keep this in mind.

One more. One of the most common analogies of the Church is the Body. When we look at you, we don’t look at your system normally, unless we are doctors. We look at you and see, “Good to see you. I see you have lost some hair.” But, the fact is you are made up of a series of systems. If any of those systems ceases to function, you are either sick or dead. Your health is based on the interplay of those systems. For example, your nervous system, if you don’t have it, your heart will never beat again. They are connected. You cannot say, “I think I will keep only six systems.” It is

not like your appendix, that you can do without. It requires all of them. The work of God is like that. It is many systems, but we have to learn to think systems, not just parts. So often, we are talking about parts. “We are in Bible school.” “We are in literature.” “We are in here.” “We are in this.” Until we learn to see the interplay, we will never be able to become a learning organization. And it involves all three kinds of skills.

On page 6, I put some examples of systems questions. These are not meant to be conclusive; they are just meant to be representative. Why do we exist? By the way, you could ask this about a media ministry, about a field ministry, about world missions, and about the church. The question can be sized to where you are. Who has God shaped us to be? The fact is, in anything that is multifaceted as much as world missions, we have a lot of subsystems shaped to do certain things, but those subsystems have to interplay. Where is God leading us in the future? Will the future be like that?

Here is, by the way, I think in missions—and I hope speak as a very good friend—but just like the church in America is almost 100 years old coming out of the Azusa Street revivals and all, there are problems that come with age. When we were across the tracks, and we didn’t have anything, and we were starting brush arbors and prayer meetings in store fronts, it didn’t require a lot of logistical. We weren’t worried about lawsuits and litigation and all these kinds of issues. But things come with success. A lot of times, in missions, when we birthed it, we started the church where there was no church; but now we often have mature national churches and multiple international partners all in the same arena. And that radically changes us, because the future will not be like church planting was in the 30s, which by the way, was quite honestly, in much of the 30s, 40s, and 50s, it took a strong individual who was a lone ranger to make it! They had to have grit! But now we are in a different context. There was a time we could be a little “colonial” almost. Not in this world—the times have changed. So we have to ask is the future going to be like the past, or is it going to be changing with this reality? What are we like, our constituency realities? I think in missions, I think it’s crucial—your sending church has changed. It does not take a prophet; it just takes minimal intelligence to fill that one! The sending church has changed, but also the globalization of multiple national churches has changed. So our realities are very different. Who makes up our community and the people we reach? This is one of the reasons why missions, early on, divided into regions and fields. Because what might work very effectively in Germany may not work in Bangladesh, because the cultural, contextual realities are so different. That’s why we have to know about that. Then who are we trying to reach—our focus? And then our model, and I am going to talk a little more about that one later, about our ministry model. And then what are we trying to accomplish? See, I can remember when it was real simple; we had three indigenous principles—boom, boom, boom. But now we have had success, we have planted churches. Now those churches are sending. We have planted schools and now those schools have great numbers of alumni. There are just a number of things. Those are systems kind of questions. Now a couple of principles about systems thinking. Everything can be connected. The fact is we tend to think as if one decision is made in isolation. But that decision has ripple effects, both good and bad, to other areas. I mentioned such a change—eliminating Sunday night church had a ripple-effect on missions! So there are interconnections. All actions have feedback. Every time you do something, there is some feedback, and sometimes the feedback comes way around. It is not direct feedback; it’s indirect. The structure determines the results.

You can have two organizations. One is structured that you put a 100 units in, you get 80 out. Another, with the same number of people and the same number of resources, is structured where you put 100 units in and get 120 out. The difference is not the input. It isn’t the work. It is the structure. We all know there are automobile plants that have the same machinery and the same number of workers, but have high quality control and some do not. What is the difference? The

structure. All systems work as well as the weakest link. It is a fact that our weakness is what comes back to get us there.

Good enough is usually best for the whole system. If you try perfection in one area, you starve other areas. You lose balance. You lose equilibrium. Then you can never do one thing. I hear people say, “All we need to do in America now is to plant churches.” What are we going to do with the 12,000 we have now? Say, “Tough luck, guys?” You can’t do that. You have a responsibility. Then the emergent properties are not reducible to the component. Because I teach churches, it is kind of fun—in fact, I will do this a little later, I will talk about some model characteristics—I will ask people that they will go to a model church and they have their checklist. Musicians. Songs. Lighting. Speaker. Announcements. They will sit there, and their church is going down, but this church is going up, up, up. They will say, “My music team is as good as that.” “We have prayer.” “I speak okay.” And they have all the checks, but they are still going down. They made a mistake—they thought it was the parts, not the system. It is never the parts. It is always the interconnectedness of the parts.

Ministry models express our paradigms. For example, in the church, we often talk about this: What does a healthy church look like? We would say it has several characteristics. There is the purpose of the church: it has inspiring worship, effective evangelism, intentional disciple-making, authentic community, gift-oriented ministry. Then there are certain things that others like. (You don’t have this, by the way, in your notes, because it was meant to be an illustration.) They are vision/mission driven, they have empowering leadership, they have functioning structures—not perfect; they are relevant contextually; they have passionate spirituality. Do you know, if you do those ten things, you can be any style of church and grow? People tell me all the time, “If we could just get the right style...” It’s not about style; it’s about systems. And if they are healthy, they will grow. Now, we have to think about some of our systems.

A third character of these new organizations: They embrace a shared purpose, values, and vision. Many times, in a mature organization, they think they have this, but they don’t. They have as many visions and values as there are people. They each have their own, and they get all of this conflict, and they can’t figure out why they are having conflict. “We’re all concerned about the lost!” But they don’t realize that what they share are not the same—they are similar, but not the same. So we talk about “vision,” “purpose” is there. One of the popular books in the business world says, “Shaping the identity of the corporation really begins with defining its mission, its reason for being, its purpose, its focus—its goal.” Every company, no matter how big or small, needs a mission statement as a source of direction, a kind of compass that lets an employee, its customers, and even its stockholders know where it stands and where it is headed. If you think about that, there are people that; if you looked in your church, they think the purpose of missions is church planting. The pioneer missionary going where nobody has ever been, planting a church. That is their purpose statement. There are others who think it is education. We will establish Bible schools and train. You see, all of them are related to the Great Commission, but they aren’t a shared purpose. You have to think about that.

Core values are even more critical. These are the key or top principles that describe how we intend to do ministry. They are constant. They don’t change. They are passionate. They drive us. They determine our priorities. They determine how we spend our money, our time, and our best people. They inform our decisions. They are non-negotiable. By the way, in any business, church, or religious organization, if your core values do not make 60 percent of your decisions at your administrative meetings, you don’t have core values. If you are not saying, “Hey, that’s inconsistent with our values; we can’t do it”—your values should shape decisions. If they don’t all you have is a generic statement, and it is not really impacting much. These are non-negotiable.

These are the things you live and die for. One author said they define who we desire to be and how we plan to minister. _____ said, “They are fundamental to what an organization does. They are ministry defining. And they have everything to do with a ministry’s distinctiveness.” I want to stop right there. In an organization like World Missions, you have this umbrella core value system that, by its very nature, has to be encompassing of a wide variety of ministries. But within that umbrella, you have to have entities that have highly focused value systems, or pretty soon everybody is trying to do everything, and nobody is doing anything well. There is a sense where you allocate leverage for resources, and core values help you do that. Values communicate what is important—the bottom line. I think that is kind of a crucial issue.

Let’s talk about what they are not. Look on page 8. They are not your statement of faith. Your core values are not a restatement of the sixteen fundamentals. They are not your beliefs; they are not your theology. Core values are not your biblical purposes, that they could describe any church. Core values are not your list of favorite programs. Programs are delivery systems—they are part of strategy, and they will change. Core values are not generic. If they can be applied to any missionary organization anywhere, they are not yours—they are just generic; they are platitudes, and they are NOT strategies. I mention that, because this is an illustration you might relate to. We see now the GPS. You can now, depending on how much money you want to spend, you can get something that tells you within three feet, five, twelve feet, where you are. You know that that is based on simple geometry. It is just triangles. But the more satellites it creates triangles with, the more accurate it is. Organizations that simply restate the same thing different ways only have one satellite, and they have very little identity where they are. Organizations that have theology and purpose and values and vision, and they are distinct, have much more orientation to where they are. But it takes the distinctiveness of them to have that accuracy. So we want to talk about that.

Noel Tichy, who many of you would know—he is one of the primary leadership writers. His book, *The Leadership Engine*, was one of the five best-selling leadership books in the 90s. He says this about values:

Winning leaders deliberately and consistently do five things:

1. They clearly articulate a set of values for the entire organization. They proclaim it. They communicate it.
2. They continually reflect on the values to make sure they are appropriate for achieving the desired results. (Are these values appropriate for an agency of God?)
3. They embody the values in their own behavior. (You see how it’s getting closer?) They live it out. They model it. They say, “Watch me.”
4. They encourage others to apply the values in their own decisions and actions.
5. They aggressively confront and deal with pockets ignorance and resistance.

Now this is a businessman. This isn’t a Christian. This isn’t coming from the Church. But they understand that values determine outcome. And we have to make sure our values reflect God’s intention. They affect our behavior, and we don’t tolerate values that are inconsistent with it!

It is clearly necessary to invent organizational structures appropriate for a multicultural age. But such efforts are doomed to failure if they do not grow out of something deeper—out of genuinely held values. We can create all the organization we want, but if we don’t, down deep, have something we anchor to that we call core values, all of the superficial fluff is doomed to failure. There is something deep there. _____ said, “Genuine success does not come from proclaiming our values, but from consistently putting them into daily action.”

And then vision. **Vision without action is merely a dream.** Action without vision just passes the time. Vision with action can change the world. You have to have the two—the strategy and the vision. Then the single defining quality of leaders is the capacity to create and realize the vision. I am going to say probably the most direct thing I've said. All of you people in the room, by virtue of your role, it is easy to think, "I am in a management role. I am the link. I am the communication. I am providing this administrative structure." **But if it is not driven by your vision-casting, we become nothing more than another bureaucracy.** You must lead with vision, not policy. It is the single defining characteristic. And you people are upper-leadership! You should be known for your vision-casting, not that you dot all your I's. I don't mind speaking now and then. (Laughs.)

Leaders **lift peoples' eyes to what matters.** They help people see what matters. There are always going to be problems. There are always going to be conflicts. There are always going to be tension. But can you lift their **eyes to what matters?** Can you look above it? Can you see it? There are several quotes there, but I will tell you this: All effective organizations are very clear in **communicating their purpose, core values, and vision,** at all levels. It is something you find.

So we can ask what is the purpose of AGWM. What are the core values? What is the vision? We will come back to that—we are not going to do it now, but we will come back to that.

Here is what I would like you to do. You have been sitting awhile. Stand up, turn to the left, and give the person you are facing a backrub. (Pauses) Okay, I'll let you get seated again. We will take a break in about 40 minutes.

Number four—characteristics of these organizational revolutions. Growing ministries have a **clear model of their ministry—a mental model. A model that can be explained.** By the way, all good models can be drawn on an _____ (has moved away from microphone). They have to be clear. Here is, I think, one of the holes that you have to, as leaders of AGWM, address. You see, when I grew up, in my generation, many of us grew up in the church. We knew missionaries, we knew about missionaries, and we heard missionaries. You have a huge part of our U.S. constituency that did not grow up in an Assemblies of God church. They have—if you talked about "World Missions department" or any of this, they are blank. They don't have a clue what we're talking about. They have **never heard of "indigenous principles."** Their concept, it is kind of like a clean slate. So, consequently, they have no internal grasp on what you are about. They really don't! Yeah, we give money, but I am not exactly sure what they do. If there was ever a time when you are going to have to **communicate your model of ministry to a new generation,** it is right now. They have to know how it is you do this thing called "world evangelism." And is more to them than their checkbook. They want to know! They are concerned **about outcome.** What are they getting? They are making this investment—what is the return? They are not like their parents or grandparents.

What I want to show you—and I will make the case stronger in the second session—but all of the effective, growing churches in America can give you their model. The ones that are plateaued and declining cannot. That same principle is going to be true in missions. The mission groups and agencies and **organizations that can clearly paint the picture of how they** do it, they are going to have support, funding, and missionaries. The people who cannot are going to have their base die away. It is not a right way to do it at all. In fact, we talked about sometimes with people we coached, there are step-by-step models, there are diagram models, and there are concept models. There are a lot of ways to do it. Some people call them business plans. There are a lot of different ways. But I am not going to dwell on this. This is really a minor point.

To give you an example, at Willow Creek, which is the largest church in America—which, by the way, has baptized over 1,000 adults in water every one of the last five years. Just their baptisms in the last five years would have made them the second largest Assemblies of God church in the U.S. Now, can say all you want about style, but the truth is you can ask any parking attendant their model, and they will name these seven steps. You can ask any nursery attendant their model, and they'll name the seven steps. You can walk up to any user, period, and ask them. They know how they do church. You may not agree with it, but they know their model. It is a step-by-step model, by the way—take a person from pagan to saint. Now, _____, the second biggest church in America, you can ask any parking lot attendant, they are going to tell you their model. They go around the bases, then they move them in from the circles, and they are an outside-in, moving them from uncommitted to ministry. Now, it is not right or wrong. The model is not the key. It is the fact that they know it! Their people understand how they do church!

The fastest growing church in the last three in years in America, North Point Community Church, they use a concept model: the foyer, the living room, and the kitchen. But all of their people know what it is. Is this a foyer event, a living room event? Why are we doing this? There is not a right way or wrong way to do models, and you don't have to be fancy or anything else, but you have to be able to paint a picture for someone who is clueless what AGWM is about. You have to be able to do it with a napkin or you will never have them buy in to the future. So we want to talk a little about that here. I ask you, what is the ministry model today? Is it still the indigenous church? If it is, you are going to have to reinvent it. If not, what is it?

Number five, page 10. Growing churches and organizations do ministry in teams. Part of this change, you will never find an organization that moves from an industrial to an informational that did not also move teams. Now, I will tell you a lot of industrial organizations try to add teams, and they thought that was it. About 100 percent of them failed because they never changed the culture. Teams do not work in an industrial culture. Groups work, not teams. So let's talk a little about teams here.

A simple definition of teams: a small number of people with complementary skills. Now that is a key issue. It is not five people with the same skill; it is with complementary. By the way, that is what makes them hard to lead, because they aren't like you. They don't look at things through your filter. They have got different skills. I often tease—if you are a strategic planner, and you put somebody who is a relational, people person, you are going to drive each other nuts! But you need each other. I used to tease, growing up, that I am kind of goal-focused and intense, and I always said that the Lord gave me Martha because I ran over people and she loved and healed them. So we make a great team. You need people with complementary skills. But then notice the next part—they are committed to three things together: a common purpose. If we have three people, and I am not pitting these against each other—do not draw a false conclusion—and one of us thinks the way we reach the world is media, one of us thinks the way we reach it is through education, and one of us thinks the way to reach it is through compassion ministries, we are going to argue about everything. Why? We want to reach the world, but we don't see doing it the same way. It's not that we don't believe in the other, by the way, but there is a common purpose, common goals, but—look at this one—a common approach. That is why you have to have subsystems, where you get people focused on the same approach, the same areas. We have churches in America that have been to Pensacola and Willow Creek, so they have a seeker-driven song service, a seeker-sensitive prayer time, a casual contemporary preaching, and a renewal altar call, and they wonder why it doesn't work! Well, there is nothing wrong with any of the parts; they just don't fit together! Their approach is different.

Then they commit themselves to mutual accountability. Let me say a word about that. In an industrial world, you are accountable to your boss. In an informational world, you are accountable to your team, including the boss. That is why you have 360-degree profiling and all that kind of thing that happens in the work environment.

A couple of characteristics of team ministry. You have got to do it together. We have a lot of people who work together in groups. We are professionally courteous, but we are not really together. We don't share the deep parts of our lives—we just meet professionally. A real team has to get deeper than that. They have to get where they really love each other. And there is a bonding there. Obviously, in Jesus, He demonstrated it so powerfully—the whole “one another” passages, all of them move well below the superficial level. There is a togetherness.

Then there is empowerment. You can't have a team if you won't share the power. It is the reality. You can have a group, and you have a leader and implementers. But you won't have a team if there is not some empowerment. But you will find in all of the literature on team, every time you find reference to the word empowerment, you will also find reference to the word accountability. You never get power without accountability. When there is accountability, there is empowerment. But they link together.

Then mentoring. I mention this one here because here is a sad thing for us in America. By the way, overseas, many of our people we work with are better than we are. Our culture is individualistic to the point of extremes. We have grown up on these imageries of the self-made person—don't depend on anyone, carry your own weight—and we have this whole culture of independence. And we have grown up believing that, which does not facilitate teamwork, which is interdependence. Very few people we work with know how to be a team. I don't care where you cut it in the Assemblies of God church world, everyone likes the idea of teamwork, but nobody has seen it. Because we don't have the skills, and you will never have a team if you don't mentor them in team skills, which are interdependent skills—not independent skills. But it almost always takes mentoring. It almost always takes a leadership team who lives it, who can now model it to take it to the organization. By the way, transformation with teams always has to start at the top. You cannot empower when you have no power. You have to start where the power is, then trickle it down through the organization. That is an interesting concept.

Here are a couple of quotes. Leonard _____, “The movers and shakers of post-modern culture are teams, which must become the dominant model of ministry and mission. There are no more clergy and laity; there are only ministers.” It is an interesting phenomenon we have in the Assemblies of God, our culture, when we use the word “minister” we almost think it means “clergy.” But our theology says “priesthood of believers.” Christians are ministers. So we have a little disconnection with our vocabulary here. But you will find, around the world, in churches that are reaching and retaining lost people, they have torn down the barrier between the priest and the laity. Now there are just ministers.

Don Peterson, former CEO of Ford, said, “No matter what you are trying to do, teams are the most effective way to do it.” Now, when you start teams, we said you are going to have to mentor them. You are going to have to coach them. You have to train them. They don't know how to do it. Many of you are familiar with the work we have here. There are skills. For example, a lot of people know how to do individual problem-solving; they don't know how to do collaborative. You watch them. You will be in a meeting, and they will say, “Let me take it. I'll come back with something.” They know how to do it alone—they don't know how to do it here. So we have to teach them collaborative skills that are involved. A lot of people have individual problem-solving skills, but not corporate problem-solving. A lot of people honestly are not good with interpersonal

skills. By the way, this is true in almost anything in ministry. More people are voted out of a church for interpersonal skills than theology, probably nine to one. I bet you more people leave missions out of interpersonal issues, not theology. But we have to teach people interpersonal skills. How do you get along with someone who does not think like you, and they feel strongly about it?

Then there is accountability. We talked about mutual—a small number—Cary and I, when I first came to Springfield, we were in an accountability group together. You know, you can't be accountable to 100 people. You don't have the time to tell the story, talk, have the intimacy, and all that. You can only be accountable to a smaller group. Great teams—that is why they are smaller groups—they move to a certain level of accountability that only happens when you break through the superficial. Then it does have to be individual—you have to hold yourself accountable. Then there are commitments to specific goal, common approaches, and meaningful purpose.

Now, what this diagram is illustrating, if you take a look, if you add skills and accountability, you will always get performance results. See the apex where they join? You get a skilled person, and they have accountability, I guarantee productivity goes up. If you have accountability and commitment, they will have personal growth. If you have skills and commitment, you will have collective collaboration better. Great teams need all of these. We have to mentor them in that.

Here is the major problem. When you switch to teams, things get worse, not better. This is true. Business, church—I don't care how good the people are. Because people know how to function under the old system. They don't know how to function under the new. So you find there almost always is a loss of productivity before there is an increase. A lot of people are like the children of Israel. They start on this journey, then they want to go back because it got worse, in their minds. If you are going to become a 21st century organization, if you are going to transition to this new world, you have got to be committed to walk through the valley before you get there. And it won't all be smooth. It will be rocky. There comes a point—and how long that point is depends on a lot of variables. People that are business people or people that have grown up in a team culture make the change very quickly. People that this is a tremendous paradigm shift, it takes them a while. But there comes a point that, all of a sudden, you see it kicks in. Then you start getting synergy, and your results are far better than your input. This is why the system produces more. But it takes a while to get there. Don't think you can shift the teams and have it be smooth. All the research indicates this is normal. It doesn't necessarily happen 100 percent of the time, but it happens most of the time with most groups. In growing ministries, teams will replace autocratic and "Lone Ranger" leadership.

Here is a point I want to make that you have to keep in mind. A lot of times, that autocratic and "Lone Ranger" leadership was perfect for their season. Be careful you don't trash people because they worked in a different time. The people who opened up the West in America were different from the people in the East, but without them we would never have it. They were right for their season. I find people who want to act like they were wrong—they were not. They were right in their time. So we want to be careful about honor here and recognition and appreciation. Let's not be simplistic. But they will be replaced. The times will change.

At our last district council, several people commented on this. We had our business, which normally took two and a half days, I think we cut it down to three hours. I have a group of people who work with me in pastoral care that we call "elders." They are all retired either pastors or missionaries. They are what I call my "professional lovers"—they just go around and love everybody that needs love. We were all having dinner one night after the business meeting, and

one of them said, “Boy, that was different today! Nobody got mad, and nobody yelled all day!” They were talking about it, “I remember when we went days on this!” So I asked what he thought about it and he said, “Boy, I liked it!” People can make the change, but let’s not forget that they were right in their times and seasons, and we need give honor that way.

Number six—growing **ministries expect every leader to develop personal mastery**. You know, you go to these businesses—I’ll mention Microsoft, because it is in my neighborhood. People work all hours. People sleep in their office. You see people walking down the hall in their pajamas. Some of the offices look like a teenager’s room nightmare. You kind of look at this and say, “This is a business?” **They have unbelievable freedom. But I am going to tell you something—if you don’t produce, you are out the door. It’s not lazy; it’s not undisciplined.** They expect you to be the best there is. And if you can do that better in your pajamas, they are fine with that. But it ain’t just for somebody who wants to play pinball. You will go to these churches that are having large numbers of adult conversions. There is a sense they have great empowerment. They’re team based. They provide resources, skills, and equipment. But I guarantee you, there is the other side of it. **Everybody is evaluated. If you don’t produce, you are not long in the system. Some would say “flushed out” the nonproductive elements.** I say that because—remember I told you the new organizations have fewer people? They are lean and mean. They don’t carry a lot of dead weight. The key to this is they build a culture where, instead of the boss telling someone to grow, people accept responsibility for their own growth. This is an important issue. You move from extrinsic to intrinsic growth. You move from, “Grow or you won’t get a promotion” to a culture that says, **“Growing will make you more significant.”** It is a huge issue, here. But they do expect personal mastery—every leader becoming good at what they do. I love the cartoon there. Hopefully, Dan will get better.

Number seven—empowerment philosophies will replace hierarchal systems. Now, I want to start making a point here. All of these elements—we’ve talked about systems-thinking, teams, personal mastery—they all have to happen, not just two of the three. It is part of the new paradigm. So, for example, you rarely have teams without empowerment; you rarely have empowered teams without systems-thinking. There is kind of a continuum there. In empowerment, we understand that, just like on teams, there is this large continuum from leader-directed teams to self-directed teams. On empowerment, from great empowerment to boundary empowerment. This is not “one or the other” or “yes or no.” There are these continuums.

But let’s talk about empowerment. What is it? **Empowerment means removing bureaucratic boundaries. I want to stop there for a moment.** That I told you empowerment always has to start at the top of an organization. The only people **who have the right to remove a boundary are the ones who had it in the old system.** Otherwise, it would be anarchy! It would be rebellion. It would be demanding my rights, and all that kind of thinking. It has to start at the top, and leadership has to give space, remove boundaries, to let people have more empowerment. To box people in and keep them from making the most effective use. Now notice this one here: skills, experiences, energies, and ambitions. Under the old, you had a job. Anything that was not your job, you were to stay out of. But you might have had great skill in something that wasn’t your job. But under the old one, “That’s not yours. Stay away from that.” Under the new, if you have skills, they say, **“Bring it on! Don’t keep your skill hidden. Bring it out here!”** It could have been experience, skill, background, energies, or whatever. It means allowing them to develop a sense of ownership over parts. (This is the key—it is not giving the bank away. It is ownership over parts. That’s why I used ____ networking and all that.) The processes that are uniquely their responsibility, while at the same time, demanding they accept a share of the broader responsibility and ownership of the whole. In an empowered organization, you can never say, “That’s not my problem.” I don’t care

whose it is, it is OUR problem because we all own the whole, not just our turf. It is a huge way of thinking change there.

Now, many people will say there are three keys to it: *Share information*. Under the old system, the easiest way to control was through information. You hid information from people. And without the information, they could not make good judgments. So you could leverage that positional. When you talk about empowerment, most people in America—whether they are Christian or non-Christian, do not believe you. They all say, “We’ve heard this before. I’ll believe it when I see it. People are cynical about empowerment because everybody—I go to all these churches, and they’re talking about teams and empowerment, and it’s obvious they have no idea what they mean. They’re just the old system with new window dressing. The only way to prove you mean it is to share something that was hidden before. This is what, in a sense, builds a trust. All of a sudden, you say, “I’m not holding the cards back. They’re all on the table to look at.” This causes the people to think that if you mean that, you may mean the other. That one almost always has to happen first, then the next two can usually happen simultaneously. *Create autonomy through boundaries*. Notice the word *boundaries*. It is not unlimited. Empowerment over a part—boundaries. Then you *replace hierarchies with self-directed*. With *self-directed*, that does not mean leaderless. But they do have a lot of *autonomy within* the boundaries. You will never have empowered teams unless leadership is willing to share control. Many people feel kind of like the cartoon. “It is great. You’re the team, I’m the boss!” Studies of creativity have suggested the biggest single variable of whether or not *employees will be creative is whether they perceive they have permission. The biggest variable*. The potential that exists within us is limitless and largely untapped. When you think of limits, you create them. Just the very thought, “Where are they?” means they are there.

On page 14, we have given you kind of an example here, and I don’t plan to develop it a lot. Many of us are familiar, because of background reading and all, with the issues of *transformational and transactional*. But I would go on and say there is even a third level of empowering kind of approach that goes even beyond transformational. You may want to look at that a couple of ways. First off, you may want to look and say, “How do I lead?” Look across and kind of circle that. See which column you tend to function in. Then how could you move a little bit, if you will, to the right, toward the empowering side? I am going to leave that one with you. I did not plan to develop it in this one. It is really a nice development of that issue.

Number eight. Organizational culture must be better understood. Every organization has a culture. In missions, we tend to stack organizations. So, for example, within a Bible school there is a culture. Within a field there is a culture. Within an area, there is a culture. And anybody that has been in missions very long knows that the culture is not the same across the board. You know, it is kind of interesting. Some people gave me hints about things they thought I ought to say, and they gave me exact opposites because they are in different fields, and their cultures are different. You have to understand our culture issues there. It is no longer cross-culture; it is multicultural and multinational. I am going to ask you this question: *Where in the development of missionaries do we teach multinationalism? I remember being taught about cross-cultural, but most of the world today is multinational*. Where do we teach people about that? We don’t in our Bible schools. It is an issue. Culture is the way we do things around here. The culture—it’s a common pattern of purposes, values, aspirations, and behaviors that develop over time and pass on to new people of “the way we do it around here.” *It is fundamental to the way we do things. We all have an aural culture. People learn the rote of our culture pretty fast*. Let me ask you to think about your organization. What do you lead? Everybody here is over something. Look at these continuums, and kind of decide where you are. Some cultures are inclusive, and some are cliquish. When you have been on the field ten years, you see it. Some have openness, and some

withdraw with whispering. Some have high trust, and some are empowered. Some are controlling. Some expect people to take initiative; others say don't do that before you get permission next time. Some encourage innovation, and others say, "This is the way we do it." Some encourage teams, and some encourage individuals. Now, think about your area, your field. Where are you on this? Is it a culture that represents Jesus Christ? If it is not, why aren't you changing the culture? Because, you see, your organization IS a reflection of Christ.

There is an interesting point that is happening in business today. No longer do businesses accept culture as it is. They actually do cultural intervention. If this isn't the culture we need to do what we do, we will change the culture. Are we making our culture godly? Or are we just making it traditional. An important question.

Number nine. Organizations have natural life cycles, if there is not intervention. Many of you have studied this. There are a number of books on it, primarily in the business community, but now some in the Church, that, left to itself, most organizations—it could be a denomination, a school, a business, or church—goes through a certain predictable pattern. The only thing that has really changed radically in the last 30 years is the length of time for the cycle has gotten much shorter. The "dot-coms" popping out very fast kind of thing. It is an important thing to note that within any great organization—the Assemblies of God—there are entities at various points on the life cycle. We are not all on the same point. One field might be at one point; another somewhere else. One school at one point; another school somewhere else. So it is not _____. But there is a predictability to it. In the business world, you can, generally speaking, determine where a business is on the life cycle with only about three documents. If you have their leadership minutes... *(end of side B)*