

program leaders. They also designed a train-the-trainer process to assist them in leading and managing this process in their respective programs.

This case study shows how a CO program strongly reinforces the elements of the LMC Framework and Process. The CO courses helped the leadership group reflect on their shared experiences, strengthened their ability to work together as a senior leadership team, and gave them concepts and tools that helped them create a shared mindset and advance their leadership and management practices so they could lead meaningful change for HHS.

→ **Case Study: Using the LMC Framework and Process in a Small Not-for-Profit**

The principles and practices of the LMC Process can also be self-taught and used to build teams in small organizations and on short-term projects. To illustrate this, I would like to share a case study dealing with a not-for-profit theater group. While this example takes place in a non-corporate business environment, it serves as an example of how not-for-profit organizations can equally use the concepts and tools of this book in their work.

The case begins with an actor, Steve Walters, who had a germ of an idea for a play based on the musical *Camelot*, but told in pantomime—thus he called it *Camelot the Panto*. Steve did not originally consider himself a director, but he knew he needed a team effort to make the play happen. He began by approaching two experienced directors to talk about his idea, only to discover that they had no interest in the play. Disappointed, he hesitated. Something held him back. For many years he had acted in the community theater, but he had no experience directing.

But then one day, by chance, he was in the theater and saw the executive director walking toward him. He had chills as he told the executive director his idea. There was a lull in the conversation, but then they both said

“pantomime,” and they automatically connected. Steve said it was electrifying; he had found an enthusiastic executive director who shared his vision and supported him to direct it.

Steve quickly committed to the project despite knowing that it would be a huge undertaking. At one point, however, he was overwhelmed with budgets and working with designers, technical staff, and community partners. While putting together a proposal for the production, he asked himself, “What have I done?” It was new territory for him, and more than he had expected. But he dug deep and believed so strongly in the project, and in the theater team, that he persevered.

He soon found that his enthusiasm was contagious. People who originally hadn’t committed to his idea rallied behind him, as did many new supporters. They became a core base of the cast, and as a bonus, it turned out that many had the pantomime skills the play would need.

He then put his vision into practice. He secured approvals and funding for the production and developed a set of guiding principles that would shape how he would lead a meaningful change in the way his play would be produced at this not-for-profit theater company. His changes were as follows:

1. The audition process would be fair and transparent for everyone.
2. The cast needed to have the ability to work in a team and the desire to learn about pantomime.
3. People would be selected based on the best fit for the role and play. Experience with pantomime was not necessary.
4. This would be a learning experience for everyone. He would teach people if they were new to pantomime.
5. Everyone would be held accountable to speak up and contribute their ideas and experiences.
6. They would have fun!

He then wrote the play according to his vision and did not accommodate any individual or tenured performers from the theater company. When he got to the audition process, he faced many challenges. The play needed 76 people to form two casts because they were doing 22 performances—11 for each cast. Although this was a volunteer organization, 100 people came out and auditioned for Steve during 12 audition sessions. Steve wanted the process to be fair and respectful and to ensure an equal opportunity for everyone. Each person, regardless of age, experience, tenure, or political connections, had to audition. This included the old well-knowns who thought they were shoo-ins for a role, as well as Steve's supporters who thought their personal connection to him would guarantee them a role. But not everyone made it. Some people had to be cut, which was hard to do. Even in this phase, Steve approached the work as a learning opportunity for himself and for those who participated.

For final casting, Steve called the people who did not get a role in the play. He didn't have to do this, but he wanted to acknowledge their effort and contribution. There were tears, shock, and silences. He met with each person individually and gave them feedback. He acknowledged the hard work they did to prepare for and participate in the audition process. He also wanted them to know that although this play did not have a role for them, there could be other opportunities down the road that might be more suitable for them. He did not want to negatively affect their love of theater or discourage them from auditioning for other plays in the future.

Steve didn't like this part of the job, but it was necessary. He believed that the way he managed this process was just as important as the outcome. He also believed he needed to be accountable for his decisions and not cave in or shirk his responsibilities, which he said was a humbling experience. He knew he had his own personal development challenges while at the same time needed to coach and teach the cast and other

people he had to work with. He recalled a time when he wasn't getting through to a young 11-year-old actor who had two left feet and was struggling onstage. He paired the 11-year-old with a 50-year-old to work together, which worked amazingly well. The child grew and then he flew! In this example, Steve used the community to teach each other. It was a perfect demonstration of the value of a mentoring partnership.

Steve viewed the theater as a family, and as such, he had to manage the group dynamics. During crunch time, there was a lot of conflict. To deal with it, he put in place a question-to-question process during the dry runs that required every actor, lighting person, and crew member to attend. This process cut through the interpersonal conflicts and helped everyone appreciate each other's talents and challenges. As a team, they learned to resolve sticky issues so they could "get on with the show."

Steve had to manage many volunteers. As he put it, they all had different needs, so he had to deal with each person differently to keep them motivated and engaged to keep volunteering. He could not afford to lose anyone. He also coached people who wanted coaching, and worked with others who needed coaching but may not have wanted it.

Steve even wrote a theme song that created a great team spirit. He also did little things like bringing drinks and treats to the rehearsals. These symbolic gestures meant a lot to the volunteer cast and crew members and helped them build relationships and ultimately strong bonds within their team.

As soon as the team bought into the vision, the play took on a life of its own. It was funded by the government and through some external donations from the public. The production went on to sell \$70,000 in tickets and became the biggest-selling show for that community theater. Over 3,000 people of all ages attended. The play exceeded past attendance records at some of the more commercial shows. It was electrifying and generated buzz, and it was a big moment for the cast, theater, and community.

When asked about his reflections on his Use-of-Self as the director, Steve said he believed strongly in the power of teamwork. Without it, they would not have achieved the results that they achieved working together. Though he was only partly familiar with the LMC Framework and Process, he felt that he had applied them in this endeavor.

Steve believes the mandatory team meetings kept the vision alive. Everyone came away from team meetings feeling informed, involved, and educated about their own and each other's roles, contributions, challenges, interdependencies, and impact on the success of the play. Steve feels the way he led and managed the team using the guiding principles also helped them reach a quality of performance and a level of business success that they never would have previously imagined. He believes the facilitated discussions, direction, and way he helped with troubleshooting and problem solving made a significant impact. People trusted him, embraced the plan, were engaged, and had fun. If you recall, these are some of the characteristics of a cohesive team.

Throughout the journey, Steve had to be mindful of his intentions and the choices he made in his Use-of-Self. He asked himself, "Why am I making these choices? What are my preconceived notions about being a director? What impact do my preconceived notions have on my thinking and actions? What is helping me notice that I do have choices? Do I recognize that I do have choices, and that the choices I make can be transformative?"

Over the five months of working together on this production, Steve formed a theater family that grew together and made a huge impact in the lives of the performers, their families, and ultimately the entire community.

→ **Maximizing the Power of the Team**

The LMC Framework and Process and the teamwork tool and techniques can be customized and applied to any size or type of organization. As you can see through the content

and examples in this chapter, developing teams to lead meaningful change is not achieved in the short term with a magic wand. It is an iterative process that continues throughout the lifecycle of the team and requires strong commitment and vision on the part of leaders, along with many activities and interventions that attend to the health and well-being of the team, the needs of each team member, and their interpersonal and group dynamics as people work together.

Large-scale transformational change work is complex. Often, the more complex the change, the greater the need for an expert design team to design, facilitate, coach, support, and evaluate the individual and team development process. If you work in a smaller organization, your leadership team may take on this role, or possibly include other internal or external people who have expertise and supports that you don't have within your organization.

Ultimately, creating cohesive teams and maximizing their power is an art, a craft, and a science. Teams are the glue that bonds people together for a shared purpose and engages their hearts, minds, and souls. With effective teamwork, collaboration, and partnerships, we can create workplaces where people thrive, find purpose, and achieve meaningful results that exceed expectations.