A discipline of programming pdf

Business disciplines refer to the practices that help a company grow. By introducing a business practice, an entrepreneur can help ensure long-term success and growth by creating a plan for the launch of an idea. Such disciplines help an entrepreneur to create a clear vision with regard to the company, to set goals and to create an action plan. It is important for entrepreneurs to stay motivated and take care of personal needs. Creating new personal and professional challenges can help an entrepreneur maintain his motivation. Increasing professional knowledge with industry-specific training and seminars can help him stay up-to-date and implement new practices. Employees are perhaps the most important assets in a company, so it's important for a group to work synchronously. By promoting and practicing teamwork, an entrepreneur can benefit from all the skills and talents within a team to increase productivity, quality and efficiency. Team building activities can ensure that employees work together as a well-oiled machine led by an entrepreneur. It is important for an entrepreneur to know how to manage her company's money. A business owner should always be aware of her company's financial situation and cash flow so that she can solve money problems at source instead of treating the symptoms. All entrepreneurs need a vision, or a big picture, when it comes to an entrepreneurial enterprise. Creating a vision or objective helps provide a focus and a framework on which important business decisions can be based. When developing a vision, an entrepreneur must take into account the value he hopes the company will offer to formulate an accompanying business plan. Developing a business plan should help an entrepreneur limit unforeseen circumstances so that she is ready for unplanned events. Before you embark on or invest in a marketing campaign, a business owner should have a clear idea about the desired product. Any type of marketing solution a company uses must effectively convey a clear message about a company's goods or services to the right customers. In marketing, also consider ways to retain and meet current customers, taking into account the fact that their needs and desires can change with time. In the early 1980s, Bill Greenwood and a small group of rebel railroaders took over most of the top management of Burlington Northern and created a multibillion-dollar company in piggyback rail services, despite widespread resistance, even resentment, within the The Medical Products Group at Hewlett-Packard owes most of its leading accomplishments to the remarkable efforts of Dean Morton, Lew Platt, Ben Holmes, Dick Alberting, and a handful of their colleagues who revived a healthcare company that most others had written off. At Knight-Knight, Jim Batten's customer obsession vision root at the Tallahassee Democrat when 14 frontline enthusiasts turned a charter to eliminate mistakes in a mission of great change and took the whole paper with it. Those are the stories and the work of teams - real teams that perform, not amorphous groups that we call teams because we think the label is motivating and energetic. The difference between teams that perform and other groups that don't is a topic that most of us pay far too little attention to. Part of the problem is that the team is a word and concept so familiar to everyone. At least, that's what we thought when we wanted to do research for our book The Wisdom of Teams. We wanted to discover what distinguishes different levels of team performance, where and how teams work best and what top management can do to improve their effectiveness. We spoke to hundreds of people on more than 50 different teams in 30 companies and beyond, from Motorola and Hewlett-Packard to Operation Desert Storm and the Girl Scouts. We found out there's a basic discipline that makes teams work. We have also found that teams and good performance are inextricably linked; you don't have one without the other. But people use the word team so loosely that it gets in the way of learning and applying the discipline that leads to good performance. For managers to make better decisions about whether or not to encourage or use teams, it's important to be more precise about what a team is and isn't. Most executives advocate teamwork. And they should. Teamwork is a set of values that encourage listening and respond constructively to other people's views, give others the benefit of the doubt, provide support, and recognize the interests and achievements of others. Such values help teams perform, and they also promote individual performance and the performance of an entire organization. But teamwork values in themselves are not exclusive to teams, nor are they enough to guarantee team performance. Also, a team is not just a group that works together. Commissions, councils and task forces are not necessarily teams. Groups don't become teams, simply because someone calls them that. The entire workforce of every large and complex organization is never a team, but think about how often that platitude is offered. To understand how teams deliver additional performance, we need to distinguish between teams and other forms of working groups. That distinction runs on performance results. The performance of a working group is a function of what its members do as individuals. A team's performance includes both individual results and what we call collective work products. A collective work product is where two or more members work together interviews, surveys or experiments. Whatever it is, a collective labour product reflects the joint, real contribution of Members. Working groups are both predominant and effective in large organisations where individual responsibility is most important. The best working groups come together to share information, perspectives and insights; to make decisions that help each person to do their job better; and to strengthen individual performance standards. But the focus is always on individual goals and responsibilities. Working group members take no other responsibility for the results than their own. Nor do they attempt to develop incremental performance contributions that require the combined work of two or more members. Teams are fundamentally different from working groups because they require both individual and mutual accountability. Teams rely on more than group discussion, debate and decision; more than sharing information and performance standards for best practice. Teams produce discrete work products through the joint contributions of their members. This is what makes possible performance levels greater than the sum of all individual bests of team members. Simply put, a team is more than the sum of its parts. The first step in developing a disciplined approach to team management is to think about teams as discrete units of performance and not just as positive sets of values. After observing and working with scores of teams in action, both successes and failures, we offer the following. Think of it as a working definition or, better yet, an essential discipline that real teams share. A team is a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common goal, a set of performance goals and an approach for which they hold themselves mutually responsible. The essence of a team is common commitment. Without it, groups perform as individuals; in doing so, they become a powerful unit of collective performance. This kind of engagement requires a goal that team members can believe in. Whether the goal is to convert the contributions of suppliers into customer satisfaction, to make our company proud again, or to prove that all children can learn, credible team purposes have an element related to winning, being first, revolutionizing or at the cutting edge. Teams develop direction, momentum and engagement by working to shape a meaningful goal. Building ownership and commitment to team purpose, however, is not incompatible with taking the first direction from outside the team. The oft-claimed assumption that a team can't own its goal unless management only lets it actually confuse more potential teams than it helps. In fact, it is an exceptional case, for example business situations, when a team creates a goal that isolated. Most successful teams form their goals in response to a question or chance on their path, usually by senior management. This helps by broadly listing the company's performance forecast. Management is responsible for clarifying the charter, rational, and performance challenge for the team, but management should also have enough flexibility for the team to develop engagement around its own spin on that goal, set of specific goals, timing, and approach. The best teams invest a huge amount of time and effort in exploring, shaping and matching a goal that is both collective and individual of them. This purposing activity continues throughout the life of the team. Failed teams, on the other hand, rarely develop a common goal. For whatever reason – an insufficient focus on performance, lack of effort, poor leadership – they don't coalesce around a challenging ambition. The best teams also translate their common goal into specific performance goals, such as reducing the reject rate of suppliers by 50% or increasing the mathematical scores of graduates from 40% to 95%. Indeed, if a team fails to set specific performance goals or if these goals do not directly relate to the overall goal of the team, team members get confused, pull apart and return to mediocre performance. When purposes and goals build on each other and are combined with team commitment, they become a powerful engine of performance. Turning broad guidelines into specific and measurable performance goals is the surest first step for a team trying to set a goal that makes sense to its members. Specific goals, such as marketing a new product in less than half the normal time, responding to all customers within 24 hours, or achieving a zero failure rate while reducing costs by 40%, all provide solid support points for teams. There are several reasons: specific team performance goals help define a range of work products that differ from an organization-wide mission and individual job objectives. As a result, such work products require the collective effort of team members to enable something specific that in itself adds real value to the results. By contrast, simply gathering from time to time to make decisions will not support team performance. The specificity of performance objectives facilitates clear communication and constructive conflicts within the team. For example, when a plant-level team sets a goal to reduce the average machine change time to two hours, the brightness of the goal forces the team to focus on what it takes to achieve or rethink the goal. When objectives are clear, the discussions can focus on how to pursue them or to change them; when goals are ambiguous or non-existent, such discussions are much less productive. The feasibility of specific goals helps teams keep their focus on achieving results. A product development team at Eli Lilly's Peripheral Systems Systems set clear measures for the market introduction of an ultrasonic probe to help doctors locate deep veins and arteries. The probe had to have an audible signal by a certain depth of tissue, can be manufactured at a rate of 100 per day, and have a unit cost less than a predetermined quantity. Because the team was able to measure its progress against each of these specific goals, the team knew where it stood throughout the development process. Either it had achieved its goals or not. As Outward Bound and other team building programs illustrate, specific goals have a leveling effect that is conducive to team behavior. When a small group of people challenge themselves to get over a wall or shorten the cycle time by 50%, their respective titles, perks and other stripes fade into the background. The teams that succeed evaluate what and how each individual can best contribute to the goal of the team and, more importantly, do so in terms of the performance objective itself rather than the status or personality of a person. Specific goals allow a team to achieve small victories as it pursues its broader goal. These small victories are invaluable for building stakes and overcoming the inevitable obstacles that stand in the way of a long-term goal. For example, the early Knight-Knight team turned a narrow goal to eliminate errors into a compelling customer service goal. Performance goals are convincing. They are symbols of fulfillment that motivate and energize. They challenge people in a team to work as a team to make a difference. Drama, urgency, and a healthy fear of failure combine to give teams their collective eye on a achievable, but challenging, goal. No one but the team can make it happen. It's their challenge. Not all groups are teams: how to tell the difference The combination of goal and specific goals is essential for performance. Each depends on the other to remain relevant and vital. Clear performance goals help a team track progress and hold themselves accountable; the broader, even nobler, aspirations in a team's goal deliver both meaning and emotional energy. Goals help a team track progress, while a broader goal delivers meaning and emotional energy. Virtually all the effective teams we've met, read or heard about, or members of have ranged between 2 and 25 people. For example, the Burlington Northern hitchhiking team had 7 members, the Knight-Knight newspaper team, 14. The majority of them numbered less than 10. Small size is, of course, more of a pragmatic guide than an absolute necessity for A large number of people, say 50 or more, can theoretically become a team. But groups of such size are more likely to break into subteams rather than function as a unit. Why? Large numbers of people have difficulty coping constructively a group, let alone doing real work together. Ten people are much more likely than fifty to work through their individual, functional and hierarchical differences towards a common plan and to jointly hold themselves accountable for the results. Large groups also face logistical problems, such as finding enough physical space and time to meet each other. And they face more complex limitations, such as crowd or herd behavior, which prevent the intense sharing of views needed to build a team. As a result, when they try to develop a common goal, they usually produce only superficial missions and well-intentioned intentions that cannot be translated into concrete goals. They tend to get to a point pretty quickly when meetings become a chore, a clear sign that most people in the group are unsure why they've gathered, beyond an idea to get along better. Anyone who has been through any of these exercises knows how frustrating it can be. This kind of failure tends to promote cynicism, getting in the way of future team efforts. In addition to finding the right size, teams need to develop the right mix of skills, i.e. each of the complementary skills needed to do the team's work. As obvious as it sounds, it's a common flaw in potential teams. Skill requirements fall into three fairly obvious categories: technical or functional expertise. It would make little sense for a group of doctors to litigate an employment discrimination case in a court of law. Yet teams of doctors and lawyers often try medical malpractice or personal injury cases. Similarly, product development groups that include only marketers or engineers are less likely to succeed than groups with the complementary skills of both. Problem-solving and decision-making skills. Teams need to be able to identify the problems and opportunities they face, evaluate the options they have to move forward, and then make the necessary trade-offs and decisions on how to proceed. Most teams have some members with these skills to begin with, although many will develop them best at work. Interpersonal skills. Common understanding and purpose cannot arise without effective communication and constructive conflicts, which in turn depend on interpersonal skills. These include risk-taking, useful criticism, objectivity, active listening, giving the benefit of the doubt, and recognizing the interests and of others. Of course, a team cannot get started without a minimal complement of skills, especially technical and functional. Still, think about how many times you've been part of a team whose members were chosen primarily based on personal compatibility or formal position in the organization, and in which the skill mix of its members was not given much attention. It is equally common to emphasize skills in team selection. But in all the successful we have encountered, not one had all the necessary skills in the beginning. For example, the Burlington Northern team did not initially have members who were experienced marketers, despite the fact that their performance challenge was a marketing challenge. In fact, we found that teams are powerful vehicles for developing the skills needed to meet the team's performance challenge. Therefore, team member selection should drive as much on skill potential as on skills already proven. Effective teams develop a strong commitment to a common approach, that is, how they will work together to achieve their goal. Team members need to agree on who will perform certain tasks, how schedules are set and adhered to, what skills should be developed, how to earn team membership, and how the group will make and change decisions. This element of engagement is just as important for team performance as the team's commitment to the goal and goals. Agreeing on the specifics of the work and how they fit together to integrate individual skills and improve team performance are at the heart of shaping a common approach. It is perhaps self-evident that an approach that delegates all the real work to a few members (or staff outsiders), and therefore relies on reviews and meetings for its only collaborative aspects, cannot support a real team. Each member of a successful team does equivalent amounts of real work; all members, including the team leader, contribute to the team's work product in a concrete way. This is a very important element of the emotional logic that drives team performance. When individuals approach a team situation, especially in a business environment, each has pre-existing task assignments and strengths and weaknesses that reflect a variety of backgrounds, talents, personalities, and prejudices. Only through mutual discovery and understanding of how to apply all its human resources to a common goal can a team develop and agree on the best approach to achieve its goals. The core of such a long and sometimes difficult interaction lies in an engagement-building process in which the team candidly explores who is best suited for each task and how individual roles come together. In fact, the team establishes a social contract between members that relates to their purpose and guides and obliges them to work together. No group ever becomes a team until it can hold itself accountable as a team. Like common purpose and approach, mutual accountability is a stiff test. Consider, for example, the subtle but critical difference The boss holds me accountable and we hold ourselves accountable. The first case may lead to the second case; But without the second, there can't be a team. Think of the difference between the boss holding me accountable and we hold ourselves accountable. Companies such as and Motorola have an ingrained performance ethic that allows teams to form organically when there is a clear performance challenge that is collective rather than individual effort. In these companies, the factor of mutual responsibility is the order of the day. Being in the boat together is how their performance game is played. At its core, team responsibility is about the sincere promises we make to ourselves and others, promises that support two critical aspects of effective teams: engagement and trust. Most of us are cautious in a potential team situation because ingrained individualism and experience discourage us from putting our fate in the hands of others or accepting responsibility for others. Teams fail to ignore or wish away such behavior. Mutual accountability cannot be taken more than people can be made to trust each other. But when a team shares a common goal, goals, and approach, mutual responsibility grows as a natural counterpart. Accountability comes from and strengthens the time, energy and action invested in figuring out what the team is trying to achieve and how to get it done best. When people work together on a common goal, trust and engagement follow. Teams with a strong common goal and approach are therefore inevitably responsible, both as individuals and as a team, for the performance of the team. This sense of mutual responsibility also delivers the rich rewards of mutual achievement in which all members share. What we heard time and time again from members of effective teams is that they found the experience stimulating and motivating in a way that their normal jobs could never match. On the other hand, groups founded primarily for the sake of becoming a team or for improving employment, communication, organizational effectiveness, or excellence rarely become effective teams, as evidenced by the bad feelings left behind in many companies after experimenting with quality circles that never translated quality into specific goals. Only when the right performance goals are set does the process of discussing the goals and their approaches give team members a clearer and clearer choice: they cannot agree to a goal and path that the team selects and in fact opt out, or they can pitch and be accountable to and to their teammates. The discipline of teams we have outlined is critical to the success of all teams. However, it is also useful to go one step further. Most teams can be classified in one of three ways: teams that recommend things, teams that make or do things, and teams things. In our experience, each type faces a characteristic set of challenges. Teams that recommend things. These teams include task forces, project groups and audit, quality or safety groups that are asked to study and resolve certain issues. Teams that things almost always have predetermined completion dates. Two critical issues are unique to such teams: making a fast and constructive start and dealing with the ultimate transfer needed to make recommendations. The key to the first point lies in the clarity of the team's charter and membership composition. In addition to wanting to know why and how their efforts are important, task forces need a clear definition of who management expects to participate and the time spent. Management can help by ensuring that the team includes people with the skills and influence needed to draw up practical recommendations that will carry weight throughout the organization. In addition, management can help the team to get the necessary cooperation by opening doors and tackling political obstacles. Missing the handoff is almost always the problem that teams who recommend things stymies. To avoid this, the transfer of responsibility for recommendations to those they should carry out requires the time and attention of top management. The more top managers assume that recommendations will just happen, the less likely they are to do so. The more engagement task force members have in implementing their recommendations, the more likely they are to be implemented. To the extent that people outside the task force have to carry the ball, it is crucial to involve them in the process early and often, certainly well before the recommendations have been finalised. Such involvement can take many forms, including participation in interviews, helping with analyses, contributing and criticizing ideas, and conducting experiments and trials. At the very least, everyone responsible for implementation should receive a briefing on the purpose, approach and objectives of the task force at the beginning of the effort, as well as regular evaluations of progress. Teams that make or do things. These teams include people on or near the front lines who are responsible for doing the basic production, development, operations, marketing, sales, service and other activities that add value to a business. With a few exceptions, such as teams for developing new products or process design teams, teams that make or do things usually don't have fixed completion dates because their activities are ongoing. In determining where team performance can have the greatest impact, top management should focus on what we call the company's critical delivery points, i.e. places in the organization where the cost and value of the company's products and services are most directly determined. Such critical delivery points may include accounts are managed, customer service is run, products are designed, and productivity is determined. If performance at critical delivery points depends on combining multiple skills, perspectives, and judgments in real time, real-time, is the smartest. Where does the team option make sense? Where the cost and value of the company's products and services are most directly determined. When an organization needs a significant number of teams at these points, the huge challenge of maximizing the performance of so many groups will require a carefully constructed and performance-oriented set of management processes. The question here for top management is how to build the necessary systems and process supports without falling into the trap of appearing to promote teams for their own good. The need here, to return to our previous discussion about the basic discipline of teams, is a relentless focus on performance. If management does not constantly pay attention to the link between teams and performance, the organization becomes convinced that this year we do 'teams'. Top management can help by setting up processes such as salary arrangements and training for teams that cater to their real-time needs, but more than anything else, top management must make clear and compelling demands on the teams themselves and then constantly pay attention to their progress regarding both team basics and performance results. This means focusing on specific teams and specific performance challenges. Otherwise, 'performance', like 'team', becomes a cliché. The focus of top management on teams and performance challenges will ensure that both performance and team do not become clichés. Teams that run things. Despite the fact that many leaders refer to the group reporting to them as a team, few groups are real. And groups that become real teams rarely see themselves as a team because they are so focused on performance results. But the possibility for such teams includes groups from the top of the company down through the division or functional level. Whether it's responsible for thousands of people or a handful, as long as the group oversees a number of business, ongoing programs or important functional activities, it's a team that does things. The main problem facing these teams is determining whether a real team approach is the right one. Many groups that do things can be more effective as working groups than as teams. The most important judgment is whether the sum of individual bests will be sufficient for the performance challenge or whether the group must deliver significant incremental performance that requires genuine, collaborative work products. While the team option promises better performance, it also carries more risks and managers need to be brutally honest when assessing the trade-offs. Members may have to overcome a natural reluctance to trust their fate to others. The price of faking the team approach is high: in at best, members are distracted from their individual goals, outweigh the costs and people take it upon themselves to impose their time and priorities; at worst, serious serious even the potential personal best of the working group approach. Working groups carry fewer risks. Effective working groups need little time to shape their goal, as the leader usually determines it. Meetings are run against well-priority calendars. And decisions are implemented through specific individual assignments and responsibilities. Most of the time, so if performance aspirations can be met by individuals doing their respective jobs well, the working group approach is more comfortable, less risky, and less disruptive than trying for more elusive team performance levels. If there is no need for performance for the team approach, the efforts made to improve the effectiveness of the working group are much more logical than plodding to become a team. While there is no guaranteed how-to recipe for building team performance, we observed a number of approaches shared by many successful teams. Establish urgency, demanding performance standards and direction. All team members must believe that the team has urgent and valuable purposes, and they want to know what the expectations are. Indeed, the more urgent and meaningful the reasoning, the more likely it is that the team will live up to its performance potential, as was the case for a customer service team that was told that further growth would be impossible for the entire company without major improvements in that area. Teams work best in an engaging context. That's why companies with strong performance ethics usually form teams easily. Select members for skill and skill potential, not personality. No team succeeds without all the skills needed to achieve its goal and performance goals. Still, most teams figure out what skills they need after they've been formed. The wise manager will choose people both for their existing skills and their potential to improve existing skills and learn new ones. Pay special attention to the first meetings and actions. First impressions always mean a lot. When potential teams first gather, everyone checks the signals given by others to confirm, suspend or dispel assumptions and concerns. They pay particular attention to the authority overseers: the team leader and all the managers who set up, oversee or otherwise influence the team. And, as always, what such leaders do is more important than what they say. When a senior executive leaves the team kickoff to take a phone call ten minutes after the session has started and he never returns, people get the message. Set some clear rules of conduct. effective teams initially develop rules of conduct to help them achieve their goal and performance goals. The most critical initial rules relate to attendance (e.g. no interruptions to take phone calls), discussion (no sacred cows), confidentiality (the only things to leave space we agree on), analytical approach (facts are friendly), end-product orientation (everyone gets assignments and does them), constructive confrontation (no finger pointing), and, often the most important, contributions (everyone really does work). Set and grab on a few immediate performance-oriented tasks and goals. Most effective teams track their progress to key performance-oriented events. Such events can be triggered by immediately setting a few challenging goals that can be achieved early. There is no such thing as a real team without performance results, so the sooner such results occur, the sooner the team congeals. Challenge the group regularly with new facts and information. New information helps a team redefine and enrich its understanding of the performance challenge, enabling the team to shape a common goal, set clearer goals, and improve the common approach. A plant quality improvement team knew that the cost of poor quality was high, but it wasn't until they examined the different types of defects and put a price tag on each that they knew where to go next. Conversely, teams are mistaken when they assume that all the information needed exists in the collective experience and knowledge of their members. Spend a lot of time together. Common sense tells us that team members need to spend a lot of time together, planned and unplanned, especially in the beginning. Indeed, creative insights and personal bonding require as many improvised and informal interactions as analyzing spreadsheets and interviewing clients. Busy executives and managers too often intentionally minimize the time they spend together. The successful teams we've seen gave themselves time to learn to be a team. This time does not always have to be spent physically together; electronic, fax and telephone time can also count as time spent together. Harness the power of positive feedback, recognition and reward. Positive reinforcement works both in a team and elsewhere. Handing out gold stars helps to shape new behaviors that are essential to team performance. For example, if people in the group are alert to a shy person's first attempts to speak out and contribute, they can provide the honest positive reinforcement that encourages continuous contributions. There are many ways to recognize and reward team performance that go beyond direct compensation, from having a senior executive speak directly to the team about the urgency of his mission to use awards to recognize contributions. Ultimately, the satisfaction that a team shares in its performance, however, is the most cherished reward. That said, we believe the additional level of performance teams can reach becomes critical for a growing number of companies, especially as they make major changes in business performance broad behavioural change. When it uses top management teams to execute things, it must ensure that the team succeeds in identifying specific purposes and targets. This is a second important issue for teams that run things. All too often, such teams confuse the broad mission of the overall organization with the specific purpose of their small group at the top. The discipline of teams tells us that for a real team there has to be a team goal that is distinctive and specific to the small group and that requires members to roll up their sleeves and achieve something other than individual end products. If a group of managers only looks at the economic performance of the part of the organization that is running to assess overall effectiveness, the group does not have its own team performance goals. While the basic discipline of teams is no different for them, teams at the top are certainly the hardest. The complexity of long-term challenges, heavy executive time demands and the deep-seated individualism of seniors conspire against teams at the top. At the same time, teams at the top are the strongest. At first we thought such teams were almost impossible. That's because we looked at the teams as defined by the formal organizational structure, that is, the leader and all his or her direct reports is equal to the team. Then we found that real teams at the top were often smaller and less formalized - Whitehead and Weinberg at Goldman, Sachs; Hewlett and Packard at HP; Krasnoff, Pall and Hardy at Pall Corp. Kendall, Pearson and Calloway at Pepsi; Haas and Haas at Levi Strauss; Batten and Knight at Knight-Knight. They were usually twos and threes, with an occasional fourth. Teams at the top are the hardest, but also the most powerful. Nevertheless, real teams at the top of large, complex organizations are still few and far between. Far too many groups at the top of large companies needlessly limit themselves from achieving real team levels of performance because they assume that all direct reports should be on the team; whereas team objectives should be identical to business objectives; whereas the positions of the team members determine their respective roles instead of skills; that a team must be a team all the time; and that the team leader is above real work. As understandable as these assumptions may be, most of them are unjustified. They don't apply to the teams at the top that we've observed, and when replaced by more realistic and flexible assumptions that allow the team to apply discipline, real team performance at the top can and does occur. Moreover, as more and more companies are confronted with the need to in their organizations, we will see more real teams at the top. We believe that teams will become the primary unit of performance in high-performance organizations. But that doesn't mean teams will supplant individual opportunities or formal hierarchy and process. Instead, teams will improve existing structures without replacing them. A team opportunity exists everywhere hierarchy or organizational boundaries inhibit the skills and perspectives needed for optimal results. Innovation of new products therefore requires maintaining functional excellence through structure and eliminating functional bias by teams. And frontline productivity requires maintaining direction and guidance through hierarchy, while leveing energy and flexibility through self-steering teams. We are confident that each company faces specific performance challenges for which teams are the most practical and powerful vehicle at the disposal of top management. The crucial role for senior managers is to worry about the company's performance and the types of teams that can deliver it. This means that top management must recognize a team's unique potential to deliver results, deploy teams strategically when they are the best tool for the job, and promote the basic discipline of teams that make them effective. By doing this, top management creates the kind of environment that enables team and individual and organizational performance. Performance.

19738979497.pdf , lebanon middle school pa , 30763719296.pdf , advanced_diploma_information_technology_unisa.pdf , connect gmail to google sheets , aadhaar card pdf password download , 26759985270.pdf , that time i got reincarnated as a slime web novel vs manga , path_of_exile_arc_witch_skill_tree.pdf , titan quest accomplished hero , rpg games android 2019 ,