

# AGWM Seminar with Melvyn Ming

July 1, 2003

Tape 2

Continues Contribution Management: AGWM 3 page 12

**Ming:** ...probably do a very good job at their level but will never get promoted. Even the people like them. People say they do their job well, but they recognize they don't have the conceptual skills needed for the next level. And you'll find somebody that they've been a mid-level manager every year. Nothing wrong with it. But the fact is, their skills don't match. Now you move up to top—I want you to notice something.

There **is no technical skill there. I'm being really honest. There is relational and conceptual.** Now this is why CEOs get hired across industries. You know, back in the 70s, one of the most famous was Peter (Dowman?), who was head of Avis Car Rentals. Okay, a car rental company—now think about it for a moment here—and AT&T wanted him to become head of AT&T, and he turned it down. So they bought Avis Car company to get him; three years later, sold it. Now, what did he know about telecommunications? He rented cars. We try harder. But see, he doesn't need it. **He needs relational and conceptual. Why is it that people that are appointed—if you look at the presidential cabinet—you have people appointed to positions which they have very little background? They don't need it.** They've got an army of people with technical skills working for them. But they got to be able to get along on the hill, and they got to see the big picture. So that's why CEOs are hired—you know, the head of Pepsi becomes the head of Apple computers. Now **what do soft drinks and computers have to do with one another?** You see, it doesn't matter. It's the **skills they have.**

Now what I want you to notice is, I've told you this **is two different bodies of research.** They are very similar though. Remember I told you the top leadership visions and values—that's conceptual. Second, with staff training, that's interpersonal. Remember I told you when you got to the top, the rest results faded away. These two bodies of research say the same thing. Now that has great implications for all of you. **Some of you got in your positions because you did well at conceptual. But now you have to change your skill set . And if you don't step up, everyone below you gets handicapped. And so you've got to work at that.**

Now, to kind of help you think through that—in light of that—if you look on **page 13, we have a little response form for you to fill out. A little exercise. Very simple. Contribution analysis** report: Write your name in there. This is for you. You're not analyzing anybody else. This is for you. Okay? I will tell you, I'm not going to ask you to share this with anybody, so you can have full disclosure. Second line, my ministry. What is your ministry? Don't put: Missionary. I've got a chart up here that tells me what your ministry is that they gave me. What is your ministry? You know, are you a field, are you an area, are you a specialized ministry? You know, what are you? And then put today's date, because this could change if you change roles. Now I want you to fill it out in this order. First, fill out vision and values. Second, fill out staff development. Only third, do direct result. Okay, you're going to get about four minutes to do it.

**Female:** Give the instructions again.

**Ming:** Oh, okay. I want you to fill it out. But the first one I want you to answer, everyone in this room, is the middle one. Answer it first, then answer the third box, then the first box. Answer them in the order that fits your role. That's the role everyone needs to \_\_\_\_\_. You've got four minutes.

*(Stops to take test)*

Ask yourself, am I really contributing what I need to be contributing to really help this organization? Periodically make sure you're not drifting off into your comfort zone and not your result zone. It's kind of a \_\_\_\_\_.

If you look on page 14, let me give you some benefits—and there are great benefits. It provides an organizational framework for your efforts. You know, I have to tell you, when you start developing your teams where you know each other's strengths, and you're trying to put people in their strengths and all, it is so liberating because you know that the team is going to encourage you to do what God wants you to do. And I know, for example, for me, when I was a pastor—there are things I think I can do pretty well. And there are things I don't do well at all. But because of this concept, for example, those from the Northwest District know, the church I went to—you know, I don't have any trouble—I don't think—teaching and preaching, and I certainly don't struggle with managing. But, you know, pastoral care, you know, I have the compassion of a rock. You know, you come to me and want to talk about \_\_\_\_\_, I'll say, "Grow up, get with it, move on." But I was able to hire Don Strong who had pastored the church for 22 years. I call him my professional lover. I mean he never heard of anyone he couldn't love. And he just loves it, and at the end of the day, he goes home and, "I just helped so many people." And at the end of the day, I'd go home a nervous wreck! And so I went to church and said there will be a team and I'll do these things and they'll do these things, and you know, I didn't do any pastoral care. And one day it was kind of fun—by the way, he had pastored a church and built the property, and he resigned it because he just couldn't take those \$22,000 a month mortgage payments. They just kept him up at night—didn't bother me at all. We're walking out to lunch one day, and he said, "I just love this job. I get to help all the people, and you have to worry about the money." And I said, "I just love this job. I get to preach and I can handle the money, and you have to listen to all that crud." And we laughed together. And the truth is, we were both as happy as could be. I mean, just having a ball. You see, teamwork allows you to do that. See, he loved doing that, and I loved doing what I was doing—and together, we were free to do it. That can happen there. It does facilitate teamwork. Now you're not worrying about turf and position and title; you're worrying about, "Let's do the job." You're not even thinking that way. You're thinking, "Let do something for God." And then I think it does encourage an outside focus. It helps you get away from bureaucracy. Now this is what we're about. We're not about cubicles and triplicates. We're about changing the world. And I think that's very liberating to you.

An interesting thing I've talked you along, I'm going to address it right now very briefly. But any time you have empowerment, you also have accountability. Those two concepts are always linked. You'll never have one without the other in a good organization. Now I mentioned that because, if you look there on page 14, this was an example—if you will—of the accountability side of this equation. And this was actually adapted from the church that I pastored. But you can do it for any team or any ministry. We use one at the seminary part of the department when we were there. But, you know, I view that every leader has to be a vision-caster. It just goes with the territory. If you're a leader, you got to cast vision. So, everyone that got a paycheck from our church had to fill out a form every week—you know, how have you communicated the vision of your ministry this week orally and in print? And you couldn't just say, "Generic." You had to name how you did it, who you did it, and where you did it because it's easy to sit back and I think everybody knows it. They don't know it. You know, I laugh even in this room here. I know you've worked very hard on the value statement and all, but I've only found one person yet that could name us one. See, but you all know—"Oh yeah, we got it somewhere, let me get it back in the office," which means it isn't affecting decision.

Okay. So you got to have some way to cast vision. Then we felt growth was important. That would be the direct result, if you want to go back. So we asked questions, you know, who knew—because all growth happens with outsiders, by the way. \_\_\_\_\_ And then leadership—that’s the personnel issue, and so our people had to fill that out. Only after you fill that out could you put any items on the agenda. **And so, if you didn’t fill this out, you got no money, no calendar, no agenda. That’s called coercion.** But it did help us all **focus on accountability.** Now, you got to know that I also had to do this. Which meant I couldn’t leave the meeting. You know they had no end of fun on that particular day. But it was great, though, because it helped illustrate something—that everyone’s on it together.

Now, a couple of other issues related to this, on page 15, the most important question every person in any organization has to answer is, **“What can I contribute that will significantly affect the performance and results of this church? What can I do?”** Not, **“What can everybody else do?”** Not, **“What do I need? What can I do?”** Every person in a learning organization has to answer that question. **If you can’t answer the question, you’re probably not carrying your weight—**somebody else is carrying it. Because you have something you can do, and if you don’t know what it is and you’re not doing it, they’re losing. And so you encourage every person on your team to answer this question. And periodically the answer will change, by the way. Every time **the team’s personnel changes, your answers may change because the mix is going to be different—even though the titles may be the same, the mix will be different.** So I really encourage you to think through that question. And I will tell you, my theology says God has wired you to do something. And I don’t care what you want to call it: A special ability, spiritual gift, your shape, your divine design—whatever words you want to use—but God has created something that He put you in a group because you have something to add. **You’re there on purpose, and if you don’t know what it is, then probably nobody else does either.** So I think it’s important to articulate that.

Now, a couple of summary things here. Strong people, remember, always have **strong weaknesses.** **Do not let your weaknesses handicap you. Do not** let your weaknesses block you in. If you focus on your weaknesses, the truth is, you’ll never deliver your strengths. And you kind of got to deal with them—you don’t deny they’re there. You have to recognize that. **Peter Drucker** in his book *The Effective Executive* said this, **“The test of an organization is not gain, it is the capacity to make common people achieve uncommon results.”** What was the genius of early Pentecostals? It wasn’t that they had superstars. They just had a lot of average Joes consumed with passion that just threw themselves without reserve. They won all the best orators and some of them didn’t have the best exegesis and certainly didn’t have the best education—some of them did, by the way. We did have some highly educated too. But they were **just unrelenting,** and our organization made room for them—encouraged them. We celebrated them. It’s not what you can do with superstars; it’s what you can do with pastors that you ought to be saying. Peter and \_\_\_\_\_, in their bestselling book in the 80s, said this, **“Neither the few destructive ladders nor the handful of brilliant performers are the key. Instead are the attentions of the care, feeding, and unshackling of the average man.”** That’s what makes an organization great—the care, feeding, and unshackling—empowering, if you will, of the average person.

I’d like to make a few observations as we kind of bring some of this together. The first one is this: The contribution **needed from your organization at this moment may not be your strength.** That’s reality. Sometimes you’re out of game, sometimes you’re on a role, and what’s needed isn’t what you’re best at, but you just step up to the plate. By the way, sometimes when you step up, you discover it is a strength you didn’t know you had. I’ve certainly seen that in my own life. But sometimes it isn’t. I mean, I remember one day when I was talking \_\_\_\_\_, when I was a minister of music in Grand Junction for six weeks while we were youth pastors. I guarantee it wasn’t one

of my strengths. But you know what, we had a great time. We got a little enthusiasm, a little rock 'n roll, and you know, it was real good for them. They were glad when it was over. But you know, you have to step up and you have to recognize that. But I'm going to tell you this: You cannot do that indefinitely. **You can do it for a season. And if** you know the length of the season, it's more manageable. There are times when you'll know, okay **I've got to do it for the sake of the team.**

There was a story that went around about three years ago. One of the football teams that was coming, heading for the Super Bowl, they had an all-pro tackle. And in that team, over a period of time, they actually lost four guards. And they were right at the place where they would either make or not make the cut, and this guy was entering pro ball, recognized as the best there was, but they didn't have any more good guards. I mean, they didn't have any more guards—that's not good. And he went to the coach and he said, "The guy that plays behind me can't play guard, but I can play guard and he can take my place." And for the rest of that season, he played—this all-pro—played in the wrong position. **And he didn't go to the Pro Bowl that year, but he did go to the Super Bowl. See, that's what a team does. You're willing to step out of your position for the sake of the team. And that's what this is about.**

Second thing is, the better you can correlate your contribution and your strength, the better you'll be in the long run. For a season, you can do it when they don't matter. But the better you can bring them where they correlate, not necessarily identical, the better you can do that, the more likely that person will be able to make it for a long journey.

And then the third one is this: Using your strength to make a contribution is a positive motivation. You know, when you use your gift, when you use your strength and God moves, nobody has to tell you but God. Those of you who are into music, you know if you lead music and people come into the presence of God, nobody has to tell you, "Good job." You just know it happened and you're just thinking, *wow*. If you love to preach and teach, and you preach and God brings transformation to lives, nobody has to say, "Good sermon." It was enough. When you can get people ministering in their core, you won't have to be carrying them. They'll be self-motivated because this is where your strength mounts like eagles. When you're out of your strength, it's probably a bunch of buzzards, but not eagles. You've got to think who's on your team. Sometimes you have somebody—the right person in the wrong role. As quickly as possible, you need to migrate them to their strength, and that's where they'll be more successful and the team will be more successful. Peter \_\_\_\_\_ said this, "Those who demand a lot of themselves grow to giant stature without any more effort than non-achievers." Set the bar high. Get your expectations high.

If you look on page 16, we are not going to do this now, because I will tell you it would artificial doing it here. But I would encourage many of you to sometime set aside a couple of hours where you take your Bible and get away from your phone, and you maybe take this page, or a page like this, and just begin to ask God what He wants you to contribute, because ultimately, if you're in touch with God, you'll get the right answer. But I think it has to be done with a block of time, and I think it has to be done when you're not distracted, tired, in a group, because this is personal. But here's what I find: Most great leaders have a contribution plan. They know what they're bringing to the \_\_\_\_\_. They know their strengths; they're not proud; they're not arrogant, but as servant leaders, they \_\_\_\_\_.

Okay, let's just stop where we're at right now and pray.

*(Prayer)*

One of the issues we discussed was that at the level of leadership in this room, \_\_\_\_\_ articulate and \_\_\_\_\_ meaningful, but another one is personnel. One of the issues you find that has definitely happened in these paradigm shifts, not corporately/ organizationally, but, you know, there was a time in the industrial model that you went to \_\_\_\_\_ and then you spent your career. And in the informational, you do a life-long training. They moved away from, if you will, the pre-delivery. Another thing that has happened is somewhat of a shift from the institutional training and development of people, to approaching relational. And you'll experience this professionally as you work with younger leaders—that they're glad for the seminars and the training and that type of thing. But without some kind of relational grouping, they don't really do as well. In fact, we were sharing when we came into town with John and Joy last week about how in each session the room is divided, and after you share a session of the theology, then you would apply it where they could ask questions and talk. And this is much more in keeping with the generational styles of the upcoming generation as opposed to the pure didactic and then discussion. It's a much more integrative approach.

A couple of questions emerged and I want to mention a few of them—or respond to them, I should say. In this setting, one of the things I'm trying to do is raise some issues. But as everyone in the room is aware of the complexities of our organization and the entities within the organization, it is very difficult to have generic answers. But what I want to talk to you about, it won't take long, but several people asked questions related to this slightly different \_\_\_\_\_. When organizations shift from industrial to informational, or hierarchical to empowered, a number of things normally do happen together. For example, I mentioned they do generally move from program to systems thinking. They generally move from lone rangers to teams. They generally move from centralized control to empowerment. But, and you can't kind of dabble in both worlds. You've got to be careful pushing it too far in this \_\_\_\_\_. Like on a level of teams, some of you, for example, you have a missionary in a country that they are the only, the team is what they have at dinner. Well hopefully it's a meaningful team and they have good dialogue. But logistically, they're not going to function \_\_\_\_\_. That's just reality. I will say, though, some of you are struggling by not seeing that there is a way to move to be valued, if you will, without a rubber stamp. You'll find if they really buy into the vision, the value, and the model, they can meet three times a year and instantly start up, because they have this bonding on these deadlock issues that they don't have to warm up; whereas a group that doesn't have a bonding and those things are shaky, uncertain, they'll take most of the meeting to get to the point they should at to start. The fact is, you've got to have—one of those issues, remember, was they shared an embrace—embraced these core values, their models. If you're going to stick to these kinds of informational organizations, you must have the \_\_\_\_\_ almost to have the other. But everybody will not be in \_\_\_\_\_; it will have a team \_\_\_\_\_. You'll have a lot of groups that are anonymous. You'll have groups that are nothing more than committees.

Another question that came up, and I alluded to it, I believe—with empowerment philosophy, they do have to come basically from the top down. Now, in something as multinational as World Missions, the top could be at any sovereign point. So I certainly don't know all the ins and outs, but just from my hopefully warm history with this organization, we have this umbrella, you know, we're in a room here, I put on my AGWM, you know, we got this one organization. But the fact is that the group that we might call the region Africa or the group we might call Asia, we really also have \_\_\_\_\_, and some of those are even agencies within them. At any point to get to a sovereign point, that can be the start of the trickle down. But it can never work up; it can only go down from there. Now in many, many organizations, in fact, if you'll read the literature on this for both profit and nonprofit, the way to make transition—especially for a team-based culture—is not to get up and tell everybody they're a pain. That's what all the re-engineering

people tried. What you have to do is, whatever the top level, is of a sovereign component. They have to live it, develop it, probably a year or two before they can even talk about it. Then they're able to model it and take it down from there. But you do not \_\_\_\_\_. And if it comes to a \_\_\_\_\_; for example, they'll never tell you to transition a whole organization at once. They'll always tell you to layer, because each layer has to go through the process of discovering the skills, learning how to do it—remember that little curve that showed they went down? They have to get through it, and really only when they start up does the next level kick in. Because you have positive models, you have people who are coaxing it, who can say this is what we experienced—a testimonial, if you will. Do not think about this as a change like that, as most major organizations, you're talking 8-10 years.

Okay, so I'll go over just a few kinds of responses here—questions people had, and I'm sure that they're \_\_\_\_\_. But at least it was an effort to at least address some issues \_\_\_\_\_. And I would usually use the term group too. \_\_\_\_\_ are often are groups that are called together and are diverse that have to do strategic alignment. But they may not function as a true team, because they do come representing \_\_\_\_\_. But they have logistical—they are the systems strategic thinking group. A team has to have that bonding, a sheer purpose \_\_\_\_\_, you know, they have this accountability which demands a much higher relational level. A group is probably people that are put together by \_\_\_\_\_ of their function. They're at the table because they represent something. You know, they are in the Philippines, so they're a part of the Philippine group. Good organizations probably have all three. It's not like everybody in every place is on a team. It's just not going to happen. You've just got some things that are kind of appendages. By the way, you have some people you'll want to keep as appendages. We call them extra grace people, and you'd just assume not have them at the meeting, you know? You find a role for them as far away as possible from the meeting. And yet they're good people; they're just not going to contribute to the process. And every organization—and I know you wouldn't have that—but most organizations have that. There's all kinds of ambiguity. All leaders have to live with ambiguity. Some of the people with your greatest strengths may not be good team members. This is really \_\_\_\_\_. If a guy can raise money preaching, I could care less if he's warm and fuzzy at a team meeting. Book him in services and get him on the road. Let him go. If he can tell that same story a million times and tell it with joy every time, go for it! I mean, I can tell he's boring because I've heard him three times, but you know, let the guy go. But his role is not functioning \_\_\_\_\_. Now you have areas like that—that's okay. You have to live with some of those tensions. But you've got to create a culture where everybody's heard, everybody's valued, everybody tries to find their strength, everybody is given honor. See, if they're devalued, and that's where all this \_\_\_\_\_ comes into it there.

Okay, let's jump into talking about coaching emerging leaders. You all have a handout, I believe? I really appreciate Faye and her team for all her help on that. There at the beginning on page 1, you see, "Coaching is unlocking a person's potential to maximize their own performance. It is helping them to learn rather than teaching them." Now this is the key: It is helping them to learn, not telling them the answer. And that's a part of the world we live in here. Edward Demmings, the father of quality management, said, "Nothing happens without personal transformation." Some of you, I imagine, have read the book by Quinn called *Deep Change*. And the whole thesis of the book is that you don't change the organization first, you change you and then the organization can be changed. You've got to know that in coaching, you're trying to help them make the changes there. Eddie \_\_\_\_\_, one of the winningest football coaches in history, said, "Coaching is a profession of love. You can't coach people unless you love them." And this is a fact. You \_\_\_\_\_ you don't. You've got to love them. You've got to believe in them. You've got to care for them. You've got to value them if you're going to really help them. \_\_\_\_\_ said the corporation can never be something we are not. Now I'd like to take just a

couple of minutes here to talk to you about integrating biblical understanding. And I don't have this in your notes, but if you want to use the back, you can use it if you have not done a study on this. Many things we do, we hopefully learned from business community. But often you find, especially in today's world, the business community is rediscovering what's in the Bible. And they're just doing better than we are at it. Coaching is one of them. The concept of coaching permeates Scripture, and we moved away from it. We moved to institutionalized approaches. But I want to just kind of \_\_\_\_\_ this for a moment. I'm not going to take a great deal here because I think many of you have done this study, and I don't want to be redundant with our time. But the OT obviously, Jethro and Moses, I mean, the whole concept of staying under control, about diversification, about departmentalization, you know, all comes out of a mentoring/ coaching session there. Moses and Joshua—a tremendous example of how you develop an emerging leader who then actually took where you had not even been there. Moses and Caleb, now we don't often think about this one, if you follow the Scripture passages, you'll find there is evidence that shows their great coaching and mentoring, and you can see how Caleb was one of these people that went against the trend—I believe, coaching there. You'll find that with Samuel and Saul—Samuel obviously asked Saul to be the king. But he tried to shape his character as well. It wasn't just office. Even when Saul rebelled, Samuel is challenging him to repent, correct. He's still trying to pour into his life there. And then you find Samuel and David. He appoints him and gives him refuge and there are some issues there. Jonathan and David are wonderful examples of peer coaching. They had that peer comradery. Elijah and Elisha, tremendous passages there. \_\_\_\_\_ about the young king comes and they're coaching. So you have a pattern there. You move into the New Testament, and obviously Jesus with Peter, James, and John—He calls them out, but they're with Him at the mount of transfiguration. They're with Him at the garden. They're with Him at the healing of the synagogue official's daughter. They're with Him through all of that discord. By the way, Andrew was with them by that time. Here's this great coaching that's happening in life relationships. Barnabas and Saul, the passages there, he recognizes, he encourages, he facilitates. Barnabas and John Mark, the examples there of how there is tension but there is development there. Pricilla and Aquilla with Apollo, here are these tentmakers who tutored Apollo and he becomes one of the most powerful speakers of the early church. Great example there. Paul and Timothy—great passages that we would all immediately go to, but Paul and Titus as well. We find examples. I won't take time here, but there are a number of other passages I've not referred to there that directly speak to this coaching/mentoring talking about the student, when he's fully taught, will become like his teacher; the following of examples, the modeling, the whole concept of demonstrating there. You find a great number of passages that deal with that. What I want to bring to focus early is there are several overlapping concepts that we need to have a little clarity on, but we also need to be careful about not isolating them from one another, because I do think they overlap at points. So this concept of teaching, mentoring, and coaching. There are some people in groups that work with us in the A/G who make mentoring and coaching adversarial, and I think that's pretty simplistic, quite honestly. But, at your table, write a definition for the three and tell me the difference between them. By the way, the person that does this at your table is the person wearing the most black. Whoever has the most black is the team leader.

*(Noise as they do assignment)*

**Ming:** Okay, what did you guys come up with?

**Voice:** (inaudible)

**Ming:** Okay, teaching is imparting information.

**Voice:** Teaching: Imparting information. Mentoring: Putting life into someone else's life. Teaching but more involved. Mutual accountability involved. Coaching is a process of bringing the best out in someone, challenging the one you are coaching, building and molding.

**Ming:** Great. Okay, let's go.

**Voice:** For coaching, we have: Helping a person come up to their full potential. For mentoring, we have: Modeling, coming alongside of someone. And for teaching, we have John York.

**Ming:** Yeah. Now what I want us to do here is, in developing emerging leaders, in truth in some point in their development and probably repeatedly, they actually need all three, because some make different contributions. For example, if you have people that are coming into missions who do not have a heritage in missions, do not know about missions much. They have a call and they're passionate. There has to be a teaching to provide a foundation. We talked about imparting information, about developing theology, those kinds of issues. Whenever someone moves into an area, a skill, a field when they don't have a great background, they need some, if you will, front-loading. They need some information, not necessarily everything, but enough to function. Generally speaking, the word "mentoring"—by the way, in the concept of teaching, if you think about it, you do have a teacher and a pupil and there is a certain hierarchical mentality to it. The student will become like his teacher and that type of thing. Mentoring also tends to have that. Generally, mentoring happens in an area you have expertise in. You're telling someone how to do something. If you want to learn to be a more effective communicator, you go to an effective communicator and say, "Will you mentor me and help me develop this skill?"

*(End of side A)*

**Ming:** ...and coaching is really not knowing all the answers, but helping people discover them. And it tends to operate more if we'll walk along together, not one above. So you do find these little distinctions. Now, in most good relationships, you'll find elements of all three. So for example, you're working with an emerging leader who is brand new to your field or country, and you first give them orientation: This is what the country's like, this is the values, these are the things you need to avoid. You're giving them teaching. Then they're going to work in a particular ministry. They're going to work in ICI, and we say, "Okay, here's how you do this role in this country. These are the people you need to connect with." Mentoring. And then coaching may think, well we'd like to do something new. Well you're not going to tell them the truth \_\_\_\_\_ you're going to help them think through the process. You're going to help them know the issues. And so you see, in that one relationship, you've transcended all three. And that's what I want you to see. Very rarely in most ongoing relationships does it happen in total isolation. For example, my title on my business card says I'm a church leadership coach, because I do primarily tell them not how to do something but help them think it through. But there are times I'll move into mentoring—here's how you can do that. And that's more solution-oriented as opposed to process. I just wanted you to get a concept on that because some people are good at one or the other, but not all three. For example, some people are good teachers, but they don't know how to move away from the podium. They don't know how to sit down at coffee and talk. They do better in the structure. Some people do better at mentoring because they like that bonding, the Paul/Timothy, they like that kind of developing spiritual children. Some do good at coaching because in a sense they're gifted to help people process.

I'm going to talk about coaching. Now, it's going to overlap, but I'm going to talk about coaching. I want it kind of separate. So this is not a pedagogy class; this is not a mandagogy class. This is about coaching there. Some coaches only want to mentor people that will look like them,



and, really, that's cloning. They're willing to invest in people that will be just like them. But that's not really very effective. But people tend to focus their attention on things they think are like them. (Laughter)

Coaching is not cloning. Mentoring sometimes is. Coaching is not. Part of coaching is helping them do it their way, not your way. And you've got to be comfortable with that—that they may accomplish it and not do it the way you do it. But you're not trying to get them to do it your way; you're trying to get it done. A question you have to ask is: What do we want developing and emerging leaders to be like? What kind of values? What kind of character? What are the issues that are important? I think sometimes we think about the qualifications, for example, credentialing or appointment, but we don't sometimes reflect on the character or the values and some of those issues that underlay that. And how will they be mentored and coached? Younger members today will not stay in organizations that they are not mentored in. You watch them. You put them somewhere and leave alone, and they are out. Their whole value system is based on relationships and connections. They're attracted to people that will coach and mentor. They're repelled against the people who won't. Another thing I think we have to think about is if you look at the number of births by ages—right now the bedrock of our financial support in DFM and world ministries would be the builders. Many that are now in missions are the Boomers. The Xers were actually a relatively small window. But the Millennials, who are coming on, are going to be as big as the Boomers—I should probably say “bigger” statistically. They have an entirely different worldview. Something you'll find if you study any kind of generational studies, starting with the Builders, every succeeding generation became more fractured. So you could make these broad swoops about Builders. You couldn't quite make them about Boomers. They weren't quite as broad. And when you get down to Millennials, there are no broad swoops. There are these and these and these. They are subgroups, and that has great implications to any organization. One size will not fit all with them.

So I want to talk about some of the issues about coaching attitudes. I'm on page 2 of your handout now. I put three people up here to kind of symbolize this for a moment. The first one is Henrietta M\_\_\_\_. Henrietta M\_\_\_\_ led the first church in America in 1932 to run over 3000 in Sunday school, which in 1932 that was unbelievable—just almost unheard of. She probably, more than anyone, understands some organizational issues. But the issue I would like to talk about is she also taught a class for college students. And she had over 200 of her class come out into full time ministry, including Bill Bright, the founder of Campus Crusade, Richard H\_\_\_\_ was in the former \_\_\_\_ U.S. senate, Robert Munger who wrote *Tyranny of the Urgent Hummel*. All of those were Henrietta's boys. She coached and mentored a whole army of people. The middle one is Peter D\_\_\_\_, father of modern management, who has coached hundreds of corporate leaders. The third is John \_\_\_\_\_, who was the winningest college basketball coach in history, probably will never be equaled. But he won with tall teams, short teams, fast teams, slow teams. He was a coach. He knew how to take the players he had and put them into a combination.

I'd like to talk about attitudes, and these are not profound. They are not in priority order. They are just some thoughts I put down when I was thinking about it one day. But you have to be emotionally secure and not need to aggrandize yourself if you're going to be a coach. You cannot act like a know-it-all and help people. You'll just intimidate them. Great coaches help people relax, not help them get nervous. If you're emotionally insecure and have to have a lot of recognition, you can't focus on them—and coaching is about them. It's not about you. Insecure people often do not do a very good job of coaching because they have their own ego needs. You've got to want the best for the people you coach—personally and organizationally. Some of them are going to pass you. Some of them are going to be better than you. Some of them someday are going to be your boss. Everybody in the office that's been elected in our office has been my

student. But I still have their papers, so I still have an edge. But it's kind of an interesting role reversal here. It's wonderful. You have to believe there's more than one right way to do things—if you're going to coach. Now if you're going to clone, you don't. But if you're going to coach—you know, I got a way, you got a way; your way may be as good as mine. Let's go with it. You've got to believe there's more than one right way. You've got to be seeking the best for them and the organization—not the best for you. You've got to be seeking the best for them. You should not be judgmental or critical of people. If you're a person who's always knocking people, you'll have a tough time being a good coach, because you'll create fear that you're going to knock them. What you sow, you reap. Acceptance, admiration—very important. And you really can't help them if you don't like them. People sense that. You can pretend. You can know how to smile, know all the right phrases, but people can tell when you like them. If you want to coach somebody, they've got to know you really are for them. You have to listen very deeply, because they are sharing things that are very complex. You've got to make sure you really hear them. You've got to always be asking clarifying questions. You've always got to be saying, “Now make sure I understand you,” because if you don't hear them well, you will give them bad \_\_\_\_\_. You have to have a highly developed skill of asking questions. You know, in any industry, you have tools. A coach, their primary tool is their questions. A mentor, it's their answers. A coach, it's their questions. And you'll not have enough exposure about any situation to know all the facts. You're going to have to ask questions. I don't care how developed you are. And they've got to be strategic questions. You've got to always keep the big picture in mind. You manifest conceptual and critical thinking skills. Don't be confused by lesser things. Now, one of the things I do is mentor some coaches that work with churches. So if I go in to consult with a church—and especially if they're wanting kind of a systems analysis or something—the truth is, they'll send me a bunch of literature I will have studied, will have spent a weekend with them. And if you would look in my palm, you would probably see that I found somewhere between two to three hundred issues we're going to have to deal with. But you know what? I'm going to tell them three. And what effectiveness is, is knowing the three. See, there are hundreds of things they could tweak that won't change much at all. It'll make them a little slicker, a little better, but nobody will hardly know it. It's knowing the one's that matter. And that's why you've always got to keep the big picture in view. I don't care what it is. There's hundreds of things wrong, but some things don't matter. And part of the coach is: You don't let yourself get sucked into the minutia. You'll always keep pulling back. What are the things that'll make a difference for them tomorrow? And usually it's one, two, three. Now later on, you might help them on the minor issues, but they're minor. You're always keeping track of what's important and what's minor. And that's what that one's about there.

Number eight: You need to continually demonstrate that there is hope. Now, people are insecure. People are frustrated. Many people are near despair in the business world, in the church world, and in missions. They don't need someone to sit with them and say, “Well, you know, it's pretty bad. Hmm. Good luck.” Boy, that just really fills them, doesn't it? Wow, what a great day. They've got to feel like there is hope. Now it can't be pretend here. It can't be manipulation. It can't be smoking mirrors. You've got to believe that you can make a difference. And if you do, you've got to let them see that. I'm not talking about egotism here, we're just talking about God can do something here. This isn't out of control for Him. It is really a faith issue. Are you writing it off? Be careful there. Many times they're discouraged and giving up.

Number nine: You should not push your own agenda or styles. You're there to help them. You're going to have personal preferences in almost everything. You like certain kinds of clothes, certain kind of music, certain kind of worship style. You have all kinds of things. It's all right if you have preferences. If you're coaching them, you've got to say, “What's yours, and let's go with that.”

Number ten: You're at your best when they discover the answer and not you. Otherwise, you're teaching them to be codependent. If you have to tell them the answer, the next time they have a problem, they have to call you. A good coach doesn't want them codependent. A good coach wants to have taught them how to problem-solve so they can figure it out.

Now those are just a couple of attitudes. But I wanted you to see that, because you see it's quite different from traditional teaching. You're really there in a very different kind of world, and it takes time. It takes process. But, we want to work on that.

Another issue is—I want to give an example. What if you're coaching a group, a school, an \_\_\_\_\_, a church, a mission organization, world missions—about values. I asked you to write out your values. This has been a fun surprise in a way. Everybody knows you have them; nobody seems to know them, which says you've gone so far on the journey but not yet quite all the way. You've articulated and \_\_\_\_\_, but I would just tell you a couple of general observations. I looked at them this morning. By the way, I looked at the \_\_\_\_\_ for the last six months to see if I could figure them out, and I never did. I'm just being real honest. I never did. So I thought if I didn't, no casual reader did. I'm not knocking. I'm just saying that on the journey, you've started the process, but you have a few more steps to go. And one of the things I noticed was I actually thought the list was very good. There are always things a coach will play with, but you have them, right now, stated in sentence form. If you can't articulate them, I guarantee you they don't make any difference in the decisions you make in your conferences, because if you can't think of them, you're not filtering through them. Now here's what I would say to you, what you have is probably very good. You probably need to come up with one or two key words for each value that's easy to remember and then come up with a longer statement. One of the things I found is: Right now, it's understood by the people who envisioned it; it would not be understood by someone who wasn't a part of the process. So you're going to have to have some explanation—what do you mean when you use some of these words? You're going to have people that will follow you that weren't part of the formation, and they've got to know what you meant when you used those words. But when you coach, and all of you have these \_\_\_\_\_ amenities that function in your realm.

Here's the kind of things you teach a coach to do, on page 3. First, you tell them, "Listen this way." Have them read them to you. Don't you read them. Let them read them orally, and as they read, purge your mind of all your preconceptions and think of the pictures the words create. In our culture and thinking, when someone says a word, we get a mental picture. That's why we have trigger words, and the \_\_\_\_\_ words, and polarizing words, and healing words, because they create pictures. If you throw your agenda away and listen, if your pictures don't match what they mean, they haven't quite got the statement right yet. You want them where the pictures are self-evident. You work real hard on that. What is the picture that's being created by this for someone who didn't shape it—someone who wasn't here? When you're working on it, you know exactly what you mean. But the person who hears it two years from now doesn't. Another one, every value has an unstated value. We tend to think of the value, not what we're saying—this is where heresy comes in and all that. But an example, someone will say a value like this, and I'm not knocking it, but, "Everything depends on prayer." Now, at first, all of us, man, we believe in prayer. Prayer changes things. We can emotionally embrace it. But what that says is it doesn't depend on God or us. It says we get the beads and pray, you know. God's not in this—it's prayer. You pray enough and it happens. Now we don't mean that, but that's what it says. So they would need to revise and check out the reverse, because when you state a value, you're stating the opposite as well. You got to watch for and generally eliminate absolute words. Anytime someone says, "We always do this," well now you know they also lie. Very few things are always, never, must, can't. You make sure they say what they mean. And by that, here's what I would tell

people—I tell it to business, I tell it to churches, and I say it to you: Take your value statement and give it to a fourth grade girl who doesn't attend your church and say, "Tell me what this says." And if what she tells you doesn't match, you aren't there yet. You want somebody who doesn't have your filters, and so you do that.

Then look for incompleteness. Somebody might say, "We motivate people to use their gifts." Well, that's good; that's excellent. But do you develop them, do you empower them, do you support them, do you motivate or say, "On your own"? Then you've got to think conceptually. Are these things conceptually aligned? I would encourage some of you—and I debated doing it, and I don't think we really have the time—I debated having you take your statements and doing that with your statements. But I think this is probably not the right forum. But I do think you've got to get to the place that everybody knows them—that every time you're in a decision meeting and someone says something and you say, "That's not with our values/That's consistent with our values. We can do this because of our values." If you don't hear that kind of dialogue, right now, you are not operating with core values. You're operating with spin control.

Let's go a little deeper. Page 4. One of the things you'll have to develop is some kind of model you use for coaching. In the next few minutes, I'm going to show you several different kinds of models—I'm not advocating one or the other. They're really quite similar. I'll show you some from the Christian world and some from the secular world. This one here comes from Robert Logan. Many people are familiar with the work of Logan—the church multiplication network, church resource ministry, coach-net, some of those things. And his model is basically built on five concepts: You build relationships where you reflect on what needs to be done. You refocus, you resource, and review. And under each of those, there's a series of steps. Here's what I would tell you: Every good coach has a plan of attack. You don't start this not knowing where you're going. There is a process. There's a system to it, and this is one example of it. And you can look down and see what happening in that.

On page 5, I'm not going to take much time on that because we're going to develop something with much more detail. Robert Hargrove whose book, *Masterful Coaching*, is an excellent book, at the bottom of this page, talks about characteristics of a masterful coach—this is secular now. The ability to aspire, setting high standards, honesty and integrity—crucial—disciplined intensity, forward action, a passion to help others learn and grow. And I wanted to mention that disciplined intensity. In coaching, you have to have relationship, but you have to watch mellowing out too much. You're moving them ahead. In a sense, you want it relational, but you want it forward-moving. That's why it's called disciplined—not just rambunctious—but disciplined intensity. Another very common model is the grow sequence. This actually comes from John Whitmore. Excellent work—a British coach. He talks about when you meet with someone for coaching and say, "What's the goal of our coaching? What are we wanting to accomplish? Okay, we're going to work together here. What do we want the outcome to be? That's the goal. What are the present realities? What are the options?" And then follow the *who, what, where, when*. This is another model—another approach a lot of coaches use, especially when they're coaching organizations.

Now I told you that one of the keys to coaches are their questions. All great coaches—I've never had a great coach who didn't have a list of questions they worked with to start with. That's how you get to the truth. Now you don't use all your questions. But just like a mechanic has a lot of tools and doesn't use all of these tools to work on your car, but having those tools makes it possible for him to work on your car. Well if you have a lot of questions, you pull out the tools you need. But if you'll look here, his questions are divided by the functions. There are some goals questions and some reality questions, some options questions, and some will questions—which is

the last component. I love the cartoon on page 8—especially since we’ve had all the talking about teams. You’re going to want to look at some questions.

Now, another model that is called transformational coaching actually comes from Thomas Crane, and this one is what’s called a loop model. There’s a series of steps that take place: foundational phase, connect, delegate, observe, prepare. Then you have the learning loop. Then you have the forward to action loop. And this would be another kind of model. Why I’m giving you these—there are a lot of different approaches. Most coaches find a model that fits their temperament, their personality style. If you’re new to coaching, you probably need to pick a model and try it for a while, and then tweak it to make it your own. To start with nothing is very hard, so it’s easy to adapt one of these that kind of resonate with you.

Some things about coaching language on page 10. And this comes from Thomas Crane and his book *The Heart of Coaching*. “You” versus “I” or “we.” I will tell you, if at all possible, try to get rid of that “you” word. “You” sets up judgment, blaming, \_\_\_\_\_. “I” denotes self-responsibility, personal ownership, point of view. “We” indicates others and stresses teamwork. You’ll find the word “you” is judgmental—“YOU never...”; you can kind of hear where it’s going to go. But “I” and “we” are softer words. “Should” verses “could.” “You should do this.” The truth is, the word “should” is controlling. It’s over directive. It sets up feelings of guilt. “Could” is open but puts responsibility. “You could do this if you want. Are you ready to make the adjustment?” “You should do it” is much more authoritative and \_\_\_\_\_. “But” verses “and.” “But” tends to cancel out everything that was said before it. In our American minds, you can go, “I love what you just did...but.” Now what we all do is hit the erase button. Now the person thinks they’re trying to show the positive and the negative, but the truth is, they’re only exaggerating the negative. They would be better to start without the first part. “And” is much more inclusive. It shows paradox, tension, element, but “but” puts them in opposition to each other. So you’ll find that.

Another one is “try” versus “will.” “I’ll try” gives them an excuse for not succeeding. “I tried; just didn’t work.” “I will do it,” is a much stronger commitment. You’d rather have strength of commitment. Then there’s the whole concept in the language called “reframing.” By just reframing common words, you’ll help yourself in coaching. Reframe “always,” “never,” and “sometimes.” Now it doesn’t make hardly any difference in the bottom line, but it’s a much more easy dialogue point. You know, sometimes this is a tension point, as opposed to always a tension point. The minute you use an absolute word, if they can think of one exception, your credibility just went out the window. So try not to use those. Reframe “can’t” so what you’re saying is you “won’t” do it. They can do this but they won’t. They’ve chosen not to. And reframe mistakes as learning. “Well, that was good learning. How are you going to use that?” Mistakes, by their very nature, are kind of a negative one. And then eliminate “yes, but.” Just like the word “but” earlier. Just eliminate that. Don’t say that. Try not to say “it.” Nobody knows what “it” is. Say what it is. Don’t say “it.” And then “they,” they excludes people. It’s “us” and “them.” “They” by its very nature says \_\_\_\_\_ concepts.

Then if you look on page 12, “boss” versus “coach.” This is a great summary that comes from Crane, and you can see, you know, a boss pushes, drives. A coach lifts, supports. A boss tells, directs, lectures, asks, requests, listens. A boss talks to people. A coach engages in dialogue. A boss controls through decisions. A coach facilitates by empowering. A boss knows the answer. A coach seeks the answer. A boss triggers insecurity, using fear to achieve compliance. A coach stimulates creativity, using purpose to inspire commitment. A boss points to errors. A coach celebrates learning. A boss is a problem-solving decision maker. A coach is a facilitator/collaborator. A boss delegates responsibility. A coach models accountability. A boss creates structure and process. A coach creates vision and flexibility. A boss does things right. A

coach does the right thing. A boss's knowledge is power. In a coach, vulnerability is power. A boss's focus is on bottom line. A coach is focused on the process that creates bottom line results.

Now, why I want you to see this, I told you from the very first session that there would be a few paradigms—that there's this revolution. Well, you find it nowhere more than this area of coaching. Every book you're going to read on coaching is going to be in the new paradigm. So you see the language here: boss, coach, facilitator, collaborator. It's all that networking and power kind of vocabulary.

A couple of questions—and here's Crane's approaching toolbox—questions leading to reinforcement, questions leading to learning, questions leading to change, and questions for the coach—reflecting questions. You know, these are the kind of questions—now what I'm going to encourage you, by the way, when we're finished here—at some point, I encourage you to get your top 50 questions. You can use and steal and borrow and chase, but come up with 50 tools in your toolbox. Then, gradually, you'll refine it and them, you know. But you need some questions, because you need, when you're coaching, not to be worrying about the questions but thinking about the person. And if you're thinking about what questions need to be asked, you're not listening.

On page 14, 15, 16, here's 99 questions. These are the actual ones we use in our \_\_\_\_\_. You stop at 12? Oh.

**Audience:** (Inaudible)

**Ming:** They don't have after—oh, okay. There were actually 25 questions—25 pages in this handout. But, that's, yeah, we can handle this a little bit. What I think I might do, if it's an acceptable thing—I don't know if I have a master here except mine, but if somebody had some whiteout; because these people are meeting tomorrow, maybe we could print them and give them to them. But I'll kind of tell you what they are and that may, in effect, focus how we might use our time. I do want to do a couple of things. You will get the 99 questions we use in our company in coaching. There's a coaching self-inventory there that's very good for looking at your own self. How good a coach can you be? A great diagnostic tool that you can take and self-score. It's all there, and it gives you an idea of what areas of coaching you probably need to work on. There are 20 questions for transformation using the model: reframing, restructuring, revitalization, and renewal. And then there's a section on how to turn statements into questions. Then I want to talk to you—those are all the things in the pages you'll get tomorrow—on coaching vision casting. But I can do this one very easily, and this is a good one. What was your last page?

**Audience:** 12.

**Ming:** Okay. I'll give you these and use it from here. Thank you. And if somebody can just whiteout my little cue marks, then they can have that one, if you want it. You know, I've mentioned over and over that you guys at this level—vision-casting is key. All of your missionaries itinerating, in truth, yes they may be raising money, but they better be vision-casting. Okay? So how do you coach people to cast vision? By statistics, only about four to six percent are natural vision-casters, which means everybody else has to learn it. So how do you do it? Here are three questions. I'd like you to write the questions down and then work on them at the table, then I'll tell you my answers when you're done.

First question: How would you coach a missionary to become a more effective vision-caster?  
How would you coach a missionary to become a more effective vision-caster? Got it? How would you coach a missionary to become a more effective vision-caster?

Two: What questions could you ask them to bring out their vision? What questions could you ask them to bring out their vision?

Number three: What specific—now the word “specific,” the word “specific” is key—coaching can you give them to help them share a one to two minute spot in a service? One to two minutes. What specific hints/suggestions could you give them to help them share a one to two minute spot in a service?

Okay, you got the questions? Now, think at this point, you’re behaving like coaches, and so you’re imagining someone has been assigned to you. You’ve identified with someone, and you’re going to coach them. Now, the leader at your table is the person that’s been in missions the longest. They’re the leader for this activity. By the way, I’m going to give you five minutes.

You know, you think about this concept we were just talking about. Every missionary is a vision-caster. Every leader is a vision-caster. And yet, we do very little training on how to do it. We sometimes do work on writing it, but not how to communicate it. I have fun with my pastors that are in my coaching group. You know, they’re just like any other sampling of leaders. You know, four to six percent of them can get up and do it, and the rest struggle with it at varying degrees. So we make them—every group meeting—they have to come with a vision-casting story under 90 seconds. And at the end of 90 seconds, the group either has to be cheering, crying, or yelling, or I’ve got a gong that we hit. Well, the first time we did it, they were terrible. They were the most boring. I mean, man, if that’s visions, oh, thank God I don’t have it. They had it; they just couldn’t say it. You know, man, that gong, it got a workout. Boy the next time, they didn’t want to hear that stupid bell. They worked at it. By the last time, they’re just a 100 percent. People are yelling, cheering, crying—in 90 seconds. If they learn skill—it’s not something that you get from reading a lecture; there are ways to do it. So we asked a couple of questions. How would you teach a missionary to become a more effective vision-caster? Let’s let each table share one idea, and try not to repeat one that another did. By the way, I think they have mikes on your tables.

**Audience:** (inaudible) ...and then to show them how they fit into that.

**Ming:** Showing them how they fit into the big picture? Okay. So tying them into the model. Okay, let’s go to this table over here.

**Audience:** (inaudible)

**Ming:** Are there just mikes at certain tables? Oh, okay. How about one of you going over and using this mike. Okay, there, they’ve got a mike.

**Audience:** Hello? Is it on? For number three? Number one. Okay. Help the person develop and articulate their own mission statement, incorporating the corporate vision, the regional vision, field vision, national church vision, and their personal vision and how it all correlates together.

**Ming:** Now, they’re going to do this in two minutes. (Laughter.) Tim, at your table.

**Tim:** Okay. We felt it would be good if we could understand, as we coach them, kind of their personal experience. How, what kind of calling—sort of fit that in there, catch the personal aspects of it.

**Ming:** Good. That table back there. Mark? I don't know who's your—Wayne? Okay.

**Wayne:** Well, the first thing is: Remember who it is you're speaking to before you start out—your audience. You talking to Gen-Xers? You talking to adult Bible class? Why are you going? Why do you want to go, and why should we send you?

**Ming:** Great. The table right here in the middle.

**Audience:** Is this on? I think that taking a pastor that is leaving a successful pastorate and going into missions, what is it that God has placed in their heart and mind that's been a vision that inspired them to leave a successful pastorate to go into the mission field? Share that with the people.

**Ming:** Yeah. Share the motivation there. Okay, at the back. Ron, your table.

**Ron:** Yeah, we said that the first thing you've got to do is get together a lot of statistics, and show a lot of slides. (Laughter.) That's not what we said. We said, for one thing, you've got to share your passion, based upon the call that God has given you for the place you're going.

**Ming:** Okay.

**Audience:** We said to work on refining your vision because you can't communicate a vision that is ill-defined.

**Ming:** Okay.

**Audience:** We said, "Don't drool, and be passionate."

**Ming:** Good, okay. The table right next to us.

**Audience:** We said that as you share your call, your call should line up with your core values and vision.

**Ming:** Good. Line it up. Alignment. Let's come in here.

**Audience:** We talked about the history of your calling and your passion for \_\_\_\_\_.

**Ming:** Okay.

**Audience:** We do three points. Okay. First, know who your audience is. Know what the message is that you want to communicate. And know what kind of response you want to get back from the people.

**Ming:** Okay. Now, we've had a lot of ideas, and that's what I wanted you to think about, because you all do—you have to go to people on this. I'll give you the ones that I would use—just kind of give you a different perspective.



First off, I would make them watch vision-casters without listening to the words. Vision is always communicated through passion—not through words. You can feel vision, and you catch it more than you learn it. You watch vision-casters, and you'll learn how to cast visions. So I would get some tapes of vision-casters and say, you know, forget about the vision they're casting. Watch how they connect. Watch how they package the communication, because the communication medium affects the message, and if it's oral, it's got to be an oral—(*end of side B*)