Questions to Ask Before Starting Teams

"Don't mention teams to me," said the plant manager. "They're nothin' but trouble. Trouble and expense. Trouble and expense and time. I've already got troubles, I've already got expenses, and I don't have any time."

"How can you say that?" asked the internal consultant. "Teams have shown their value in industry after industry in achieving both quality and productivity goals. You've looked at that report I sent you, haven't you?"

"Yes, but it also says that teams take years to develop. I have productivity and quality goals, all right, but we measure them in days, not years. Besides, I've listened to people at the Plant Managers Conference. Plenty of them have started teams and those who are honest about it—and there's not a whole lot of them—say that for every win there's a crash and burn. Explain that."

"It's true, you're right. But there are reasons why teams fail. Listen, we're both under a corporate mandate to make recommendations on how to introduce high-performance teams here. We've got to come up with a plan, some sort of a process. We can't just send a memo and say, 'Forget it, too much trouble.'"

This conversation between a manager and a consultant charged with exploring the team concept probably didn't actually take place. At least none of the principals will admit to it. Everyone is still paying homage to teams, teamwork, empowerment, and self-management, but the buzz is gone. In the last year alone, dozens of firms have abandoned or put the brakes on their team-development efforts for any or all of the following three main reasons:

1. Teams cost too much.
2. Teams don't provide bottom-line results quickly enough.
3. Teams are poorly understood by line managers who have to foot the bill or spend the time in meetings and training sessions that seem useless to them.

Why do companies get started with teams and then drop the effort like a hot rock at the first sign of inconvenience or trouble? There are a variety of reasons for this failure of will and vision, and many of them fall under the head-

Why Have Organizations Dropped Their Teams?

A major aerospace manufacturer developed a five-day training program to help managers of team leaders understand the dynamics of the high-performance work groups that were forming in the ranks. After two pilot sessions, program revisions, and a train-the-trainer program, the course was blessed by management but never delivered. Boxes of books and tapes now sit in a warehouse.

A national home improvement retailer decided to use teams at its new distribution center, a 500,000-square-foot facility with the latest technology. After developing a selection procedure, a leadership program for management and team leaders, and a team-training program for all new hires, it abandoned the effort when its technical systems crashed and began causing unanticipated problems.

A major insurance company was fascinated by the concept of empowered teams and had made some headway in developing them. Then market share began declining. Now, talk of teams is dead, and those who are already working in teams wonder where the support went.

ing of planning. In our work with organizations that have experimented with teams, some successfully and some not, we found that by asking and answering a few questions beforehand the probability of implementing a successful team-work process increases dramatically.

If you are contemplating teams and any kind of teamwork or empowerment strategy, here are a few questions to ask before starting the process. By answering these questions, or even just discussing them, you will begin to get a feel for the planning required before launching teams in your organization.

But let's be honest about it. If it looks to you like too much trouble and time, take the hint: You probably shouldn't do it. If you're not willing to invest the time, then it's unlikely any team initiative will succeed. But then, that's probably true for any major initiative in any organization.

What Are Teams?

That's a simple enough question, but one that's seldom asked. We all think we know intuitively what teams are, so we assume we can dispense with that question. Think again.

Sure, we all know that a team is some people doing something together. We can all agree on that simple statement—and probably all disagree beyond that. That's why we've got this section in our opening chapter.

For our purposes, we could define a team as a group of people working together toward specific objectives within a defined operational sphere. And that's not a bad way to think about teams. But what does it mean in terms of successfully implementing teams? Where do we go from here?

The Five Ps in Team

Well, we propose thinking in terms of the Five Ps—purpose, place, power, plan, and people. It's a convenient way to focus on the basic areas in which you face the most important questions when implementing teams in any organization.

Purpose

You should begin with the *purpose* of the teams. Why are you using teams? What do you expect them to do?

Team We all know what this word means—"a number of individuals associated in some joint action," the dictionary informs us. So we may not think any further. That's a big mistake. A team should be defined in terms of purpose, place, power, plan, and people. If you fail to address those issues, your "team" may be little more than a group of individuals whose work is related but not coordinated in any disciplined manner.

Are they going to be natural work teams, project teams, or task-only teams? Are they going to be self-managed teams? Will they exist temporarily, then break up? Or will they last for years? Whatever the specific purpose of any team, the general purpose of all teams is that *bringing together people whose work is related and interdependent into a team allows them to work in a more collaborative manner to achieve individual, departmental, and organizational objectives.*

Place

The question of *purpose* leads naturally into the question of *place*. And that can be a big question: How do the teams fit into an organizational structure that shows only boxes, not circles and other new organizational forms? It's not just a matter of drawing a new organization chart, of course, but of adapting company thinking to a more collaborative workplace where people from many parts of the organization come together as teammates. This can play havoc with traditional organizational charts and requires rethinking how the organization is organized. When you discuss the question of *place*, you start raising some significant questions, such as the following:

- Who chooses the people to form each team?
- To whom do the teams report?
- How do we compensate teams?

After you've discussed and answered these questions of *purpose* and *place*, and any questions that arise out of your discussion, you can write a definition of your teams in terms of what you expect from them and how they'll fit into your organizational structure. Take as much care with this definition as

you would if you were forming a vision or mission statement. In defining your terms, you can deliver an important message about your company's values with respect to how people work and what's expected of them.

If you're forming several teams, you might have a set definition, but different purposes. Or, if you're forming quality circles, for example, and plan on each unit in your organization having its own team, then a single, generic definition might be enough. Once you've finalized your definition in terms of *purpose* and *place*, then you can move on to the third and fourth of the Five Ps—the *power* and the *plan*.

Power

The questions you need to address with regard to *power* depend on your definition of a team and the different types of teams you might have. Your questions will also depend on characteristics of your organization—such as size, structure, and type of business. While it's difficult to cover all the issues that an organization might need to address, we can simply suggest the major concerns that should guide your thinking about the *power* component of establishing teams.

What we mean by *power* is responsibilities and authority of the team. What will be the scope of the work of each team? Will it be working on issues that affect the entire organization? Or will it focus on a certain limited area? Do you intend your teams to be primarily advisory, to make recommendations to somebody? Or do you expect your teams to take action, to

---

CAUTION!

Specify the Purpose of the Team

Take your time on discussing purpose—and be brutally honest and as specific as possible. Think of this part of the process as though you were planning to create a company.

"Hey! I've got an idea! Let's start a company!"

"To do what?"

"Aw, gee, I don't know. But it just seems like a good idea."

Funny? Yes, but pathetic. Nobody would just start a company because "it just seems like a good idea" without deciding on the purpose of that company. But managers sometimes set up teams just because "it's a good idea." And that makes it a bad idea.

MISTAKE PROOFING

Questions of Control

Team, team, who's got the team? That can be an important question when team members come from different departments—especially in an organization charged with political power games and divided by turf battles.

It's a delicate matter, but not hopeless. Your best bet might be to treat each team as if it were an outside resource, like a supplier rather than a group of employees. Managers might then be less likely to involve teams in their power plays. Of course, you should also use extra care in thinking and wording the definitions of your teams.

make things happen? Will your teams be natural (include members from one functional area or department), cross-functional (include members from different departments), or project-based? What boundaries will you set for your teams? What will be the extent of their decision-making autonomy? These are important questions to address because they directly affect the team's ability to achieve its goals.

You should set down your answers as an extension of the definition you wrote earlier. What we're talking about here is devising a sort of job description, as you might have for each position in your organization, which outlines the responsibilities and the authority for each of your teams.

Plan

The fourth P—*plan*—refers to the structure of each team. How will it assume its assigned responsibilities and handle its designated authority? In other words, who on the team will do what and how?

You may decide to leave that matter up to the members of each team. Or you may set down some guidelines. How many members would be best for each team? Will your teams each have a leader? Will that leadership position be permanent or will it rotate among the members? What responsibilities and authority will the leader have? Should you establish specific areas of responsibility and authority for other members of the group? Will the teams meet regularly? How much work will be done during meetings? How much work will members do outside of meet-

ings, independently or in smaller teams? How much time might any member be expected to devote to the team?

Again, we can only give you an idea of the basic questions you should address. As a colleague of ours puts it, these are just "serving suggestions." How you choose to prepare your teams depends on your

> **Planning Particulars**
>
> Details, details, details .... Is the devil really in the details? Do you really need to establish every particular?
>
> Yes. No. Maybe. The right answer depends on your organizational culture. If you have very specific employee job descriptions and a thick policy manual, then you may need more detail than if your job descriptions are basically "do whatever it takes to get the job done" and the company policy manual is a thin binder gathering dust on a shelf.

organization and your needs. Finally, some organizations—particularly those that are smaller or structurally less complex—may prefer to consider the *people* before moving on to the *power* and the *plan*. But it seems wiser to follow the order we're taking here, to avoid the problems that are likely to result from choosing the members of your team before you decide how you want that team to function.

People

Now for the last of our Five Ps, the *people*. This is definitely a case of "last, but certainly not least." Remember: it's the people who make the team. What you've done to establish the purpose, the place, the power, and the plan for your teams should provide the proper context for them to succeed. But it all ultimately depends on the people.

And that's where you're on your own. We don't know your people. And we don't know who's in charge of choosing the members for each team or what constraints there may be. For example, if participation on your teams is voluntary, that may shrink the size of the candidate pool. Or if the teams are cross-functional, you'll have to choose team members in terms of appropriately representing the various functions.

At this point you should encourage whoever is responsible for choosing team members to get to know the candidates bet-

ter. What are the skills, knowledge, experience, and abilities of each person? More specifically, how do these resources fit your definitions of purpose, place, power, and plan for your teams?

Then, after you know all about the people in your pool, it's a matter of picking the best candidates. Doing that may not be as simple as it sounds, so what follows is some guidance.

A team is not just the five or ten best people—however you might define "best" in your particular context. A team is a mix, a combination that you hope will result in synergy.

So, the question to address here is not "Who are the best people?" but "How can we provide the best mix of resources and get the best results?" This may mean, for example, not choosing the most talented person, because she just doesn't get along with very many people. Or it may mean picking somebody who's a little short on skills and knowledge and experience, but who's got a natural ability to bring out the best in people around him.

So, that's it, the Five Ps of a good team. And now that you understand what's involved in forming teams, we come to a reality check.

Why Do You Want Teams?

That may seem like a dumb question. But we intend it as a challenge to an honest self-appraisal.

Teams, whatever their nature, are more trouble than they're worth, if they're not worth the trouble in bottom-line results. If, for example, teams are just a convenient vehicle for grouping lots of people who used to work for several supervisors down-sized out of the company and putting them under one stretched-thin manager, don't bother. But if, on the other hand, teams can truly take ownership of a work area and provide the kind of up-close process knowledge that's unavailable else-where, then full speed ahead.

Answering the question "Why do you want teams?" forces you to consider what specific business issues teams ought to be addressing. Without linking the "Why?" of teams to the needs of your business, you place their existence on shaky footing. Saying simply, "We feel teams will be good for our

business" doesn't establish a business reason for teams. Without a strong business purpose, teams risk many dangers, especially the following three:

> **Synergy** The result of interactions that make the whole greater than the sum of its parts. In our context, it means that your team members are cooperating in such ways that they can accomplish more together than they would if they were all working individually.

Key Term

1. Teams will waste a lot of resources going in various directions, either overly ambitious or just confused.
2. Team members will suffer from a lack of identity at crucial times because everybody needs to be motivated by a sense of purpose.
3. Teams will be among the first initiatives to suffer in the event of an economic downturn or if resources become scarce.

   Justifying teams from a business perspective also forces you to consider the nature of your work, how tasks are divided, your organizational strategy and design, and how you are staffed. Teams challenge functional silos, non-communicating work groups that really should be talking to one another. Thinking about teams as a business strategy makes you rethink your business strategy as a whole. In doing so, you may find that teams are only part of a larger strategy that includes products, services, customer relationships, competitive positions, and other, broader economic issues.

Where Do You Plan to Implement Teams?

The proper answer to this question is not "here and there." Too often teams are implemented in some likely area where there are lots of people milling about doing similar things. "Hmmm," some dreamy-eyed manager says. "That looks like a team to me."

   And indeed, that manager may be right. There may be the makings of a natural work team there. But, if the manager doesn't proceed carefully, he or she could lose something vital by formalizing that group of employees into a team.

   Sometimes people can work closely together, benefiting

from the bond of their work. But they may not like changing that natural community into a team. It's often a question of personality, of different social tendencies, of the introvert-extrovert continuum, and so forth.

It can also be a question of your organization. Sometimes employees like forming bonds for the sake of helping each other, or drawing more motivation from their work, or just making the activities less monotonous. But those same employees might resist forming teams for any purposes established by the organization. (If that's a general feeling in your organization, you may have a lot of work to do to change that environment if you want teams to have a chance to succeed.)

But even if you have a wonderful organization and wonderful employees, will you want everybody to be part of a team? Maybe, maybe not. That's up to you.

But if you don't communicate your plan to every employee—whether they're going to be on teams or not—that's bad managing. Everyone will be on tenterhooks until you let them know how they'll be affected by a team strategy. You're causing unnecessary damage, to the employees and perhaps to the new teams.

Identify those areas and groups that have good prospects for teaming due to the nature of their work or your business requirements. Let those employees know about it and provide them with a timetable and set of expectations. Let the others know what their roles will be with respect to teams and whether they'll be asked to participate in the overall strategy.

Few organizations switch completely and easily to a team-based

---

Smart Managing

The First Benefit of a Team

"The biggest benefit of teams may come before they actually do anything." That's what a colleague once observed. And she's right.

If you plan carefully for your teams, if you really think about them, it's like you're putting together a set of small clones of your organization. With every "Why?" you're probing some very significant issues. So, even if you decide not to set up teams, you've derived some benefits from the focused, probing thinking about your organization and how things get done.

structure. And unless you take steps to prepare them, traditional power bases in functional areas can threaten the success of teams within their units and in other functional areas. Understanding their roles with respect to the teams and understanding the importance of the effort can help persuade non-teaming units to support teams and give them the helping hand they'll need to survive.

Here are a few benchmarks to help you identify likely areas for teams.

- Is the work subject to decision making best done on the spot by experienced people who deal directly with the customer?
- Is there a need for cross training and multi-skilling so that, in time, anyone can do all the jobs in the work area?
- Are your people already functioning like a team, sharing information, solving problems, raising important issues, and thinking in businesslike ways about their work?
- Do the people in your prospective team area like and respect each other?

If your answer to these questions is yes, then establishing teams in such areas will make sense. But this doesn't guarantee that teams will improve performance. It still requires a trust-based relationship between employees and management. But if this is in place, and if you answer the above questions positively, then teams are likely to succeed.

What Do You Expect from Teams?

It would be rare indeed for the seasoned business manager to implement a costly strategy, purchase a million-dollar piece of equipment, or sponsor an expensive move from one

> **Key Term**
>
> **Communicate** Yes, it means to make known. But check your dictionary: "communicate" also means to be connected. It's generally used in that sense to talk about rooms in a building, but it's also a good way to think about people in an organization.
>
> When you communicate, you form and build connections among your people. If you don't communicate, connections form naturally, such as company grapevines. Whatever changes you're planning or expecting, let your people know.

office to another without clearly articulating what's expected from the investment. Yet businesses enter into costly, extensive, and sometimes risky team programs without once stating in writing what results they expect.

So, what do you expect from your teams? Higher productivity? Lower costs? Improved quality? Reduced head count? Define the benefits you expect, then set targets and goals so you know if there's a payoff from your move to teams or not.

Without clear goals you'll find it difficult to assess team performance unless things go really badly or really well, both of which rarely happen over the short term. Without goals, comparing unit performance "before teams" and "after teams" is like contrasting the effectiveness of gasoline versus solar power. Both provide energy, but their start-up, maintenance, and long-term costs are very different.

What's your implementation timetable? And what are your milestones for measuring team progress toward goals?

It's often been suggested that a successful team process may take from three to five years. If you wait three to five years to decide if you have a success, you may get a nasty surprise instead.

Evaluating Team Progress in a Changing Environment

Team development takes a long time. And during the development period, many things change: membership, management, technology, and business goals. How can you measure the effectiveness of a work unit that may have turned over once or twice, is reporting to new management with new goals, and has changed its principal focus and mix of responsibilities? (Maybe only the name of the team has stayed the same!)

Whether you use standard metrics like productivity and quality, developmental indicators like degree of decision-making authority, or process measures like opinion surveys, or a combination of all three, you should plan to measure your results regularly. Identify your indicators in advance.

It doesn't really take much effort to come up with a list of things you expect from your teams during the course of one or two years. Share those expectations with your teams. Then,

when the time comes to take your readings, be honest about the results, share them with the team, modify them if necessary, and establish new benchmarks based on what you learn.

What Roles Are Crucial to the Team Process?

What are the roles of leaders and facilitators? The importance of this question cannot be overstated. Your answers are critical in determining the future of your teams.

Leaders who do not have a clear vision of their role in establishing consensus, gaining commitment, developing people, and setting up the training to support those efforts will, invariably, revert to behaving like traditional first-line supervisors. Leaving the roles of manager, supervisor, or team leader to chance is an almost certain formula for ambiguity and confusion—and probable failure. Without clear roles and expectations, managers and supervisors will steer clear of the teams and hope the whole business goes away. Without written guidelines, team leaders run the gamut of behaviors from autocrat to absentee manager.

> ### Dealing with Failure ... or Success
>
> Smart Managing
>
> If a team fails or succeeds, it's not like when you're experimenting with a machine. We're talking about people. You can't just junk a team if it fails or buy a dozen more if it succeeds.
>
> That's another reason for setting goals and incremental targets. People don't want to fail, and a smart manager provides ways for members of a team to assess their work, so they know how they're doing. If the results are less than expected, then the manager and the team members can make adjustments. If the results surpass expectations, the manager can learn some lessons to apply to other teams.

Many organizations have taken the bold, cost-cutting step of eliminating layers of supervisors or managers and establishing teams. Nearly all have been forced to backtrack and reinstall some form of leadership. Why?

The first step in creating a team may have very little to do with the members of the team or its purpose, but a great deal

MISTAKE PROOFING

Start Smart

You might be thinking, "Hey! Working with a team is a lot like working with a new hire." And you're right ... if you provide each employee with a job description and the criteria you'll use for assessing his or her performance ... and if you allow each employee the responsibility, authority, and resources appropriate for the job ... and if you meet regularly with each employee to talk about that person's performance, making whatever adjustments you consider necessary. If so, then congratulations for being a smart manager! And you're off to a good start with your teams.

to do with how people are managed. Two issues are involved here. The first is that the managers may not be accustomed to allowing their individual employees much freedom to think and make decisions. The second is that managers tend to treat teams as if they were just groups of employees.

Changing the roles of the leader from commander to collaborator will begin to get a work group functioning like a decision-making body. As the leader becomes more skilled at developing decision-making abilities in the team, he or she can step back and assume other duties while the team adopts those responsibilities that were once the domain of the supervisor.

Leaders may not change behavior overnight, but the process of change must start with guidelines for new roles.

How Will You Evaluate Individuals Versus Teams?

Of all the traditional norms that teaming up may endanger, the one-on-one boss-subordinate relationship is perhaps the most critical and personal. Most organizations have a longstanding tradition of appraising lower-level employees not on results attained, since the employees seldom have responsibility for results, but on traits and behaviors.

These traits encompass such things as individual job skills, from typing to safety awareness, and personal characteristics, from friendliness to initiative. Some are relevant to the job, and some are not. But most focus on individuals. Case by case, it's arguable whether individual traits lead to job success. But on a team basis, the connection between individual characteristics

and team results is tenuous at best.

Will you treat the team as some sort of organic whole, with members responsible for each other's performance—"One for all and all for one"? Or will you continue to emphasize individual skills and abilities? If so, who does the evaluation—the team? the team leader? management?

Perhaps the best approach is a combination of team measurements and individual appraisal. But even then, who does the appraising, the boss or the team? And how are the team members expected to react to different work styles within the team, from real stars to slow learners? Should they learn to tolerate differences ("appreciate diversity" in the current vernacular)? Or should they seek a standardized work style and allow little variation in the service of uniform output?

When the concept of becoming an empowered work group is put to employees, they often are interested in the decision-making opportunities of hiring and firing, discipline, doling out rewards, and doing appraisals on each other. In reality, very few teams ever do these things.

Xs and Ys

Theory X and **Theory Y** are the two ends of a managerial continuum developed by Douglas McGregor several decades ago. They represent the ways in which managers view workers, according to different conceptions of human nature.

A Theory X manager assumes that work is inherently unpleasant and that employees generally are lazy, avoid responsibility, and need close supervision. The Theory X manager believes that the principal motivation is money and workers must be bribed or coerced to achieve the organization's goals.

A Theory Y manager assumes that people enjoy work and that employees generally are committed to their work, exercise self-direction, seek responsibility, and show creativity and ingenuity when given the chance. The Theory Y manager believes that recognition and self-fulfillment are as important to employees as money.

Pop quiz: Which of these managerial approaches is more likely to facilitate the success of teams?

Most, instead, concentrate on doing the work and leave the personnel stuff to managers and supervisors who are paid to endure such headaches. That seems most sensible. But teams that do get involved in selecting members or giving feedback and performance management of one sort or another need substantial training, just as their supervisors and managers would have received. Good interviewing or interactive training programs can take a week or longer and require skill practices in class and on-the-job coaching and monitoring.

This is a major investment, and managers should not enter into it without considerable thought. In short, don't give teams responsibilities you are unable to train them to fully accept and handle appropriately. Otherwise, you're dooming your teams to fail—and to cause a lot of personal damage.

How Will You Compensate Teams?

Because it's sometimes a tricky issue, outside the control of direct management, the question of compensation is often left unanswered until problems arise. Although many companies bite the bullet and set up pay-for-skills or special incentive bonus programs, many fail to address compensation issues at all. The result is that team members are asked to work together, but may be offered incentives for their personal contributions. Some teams lose interest when they're asked to do more with less and then don't get rewarded for doing so.

Teams require both monetary and non-monetary rewards. Pay should be linked to achievement of objectives. On the other hand, you should liberally dispense non-monetary, symbolic awards, like cups, jackets, plaques, or dinners.

What Resources Will You Budget for Training and Development?

Be realistic in appraising the costs of launching teams. Be honest about the amount of training, meeting time, and related resources that you'll have to invest in your team effort.

All teams need to learn more about communications and problem solving, but they also need trial-and-error practice

time as they begin to assume greater self-management authority. Just as good supervisors aren't trained in a day, neither are teams.

During the first year of its existence, a new team may require from 5% to 10% of its salary budget just for training, meetings, and other team-related activities. Expenses of this magnitude can dramatically cut into expected productivity growth and discourage managers who have not taken all the costs into account.

Don't let budget surprises hurt your teams!

What's the Organizational Impact of Teams and How Can You Manage It?

You may not be able to answer this final question easily or perhaps at all as you start to implement teams. But it's worth thinking about. If your teams are to be anything more than an experiment, this initiative is likely to fundamentally change your organizational culture.

Restructuring for teams means that the traditional paradigms for hiring, firing, appraising, pay, span of control, and career development have changed. Teams mean you may have to rethink and probably rewrite personnel policies, job descriptions, performance appraisal forms, union agreements, and many other documents.

> **Trinket Alert!**
>
> Beware of trinkets! Although we advise you to be generous with non-monetary rewards, take care as to how you use them. Remember: What makes them mean something is their symbolism, the value they have for the recipients and for their fellow employees.
>
> Companies that neglect to support and maintain that value pay the price. Their cups and jackets and plaques and dinners are valued as just so much plastic, cloth, wood, metal, and fattening food.

Hierarchies have been the norm for organizations for the last few hundred years. Teams and teamwork may very well be the new model for many organizations for the next few hundred years. If your organization is moving in the direction of teams, don't let it stumble along. Take an active role and you

> ### Honesty Is the Best Policy
>
> Smart managers understand human nature and they know their employees. Be honest about what you're expecting from your people and budget your time and expenses appropriately. Don't try to minimize figures in your zeal to establish teams.
>
> In one organization, the weekly team meeting that was expected to take only one hour turned out to take two or three hours per person, as team members followed up on meeting assignments, prepared for meetings, gathered data, or learned new procedures. The moral of the story: Know what you expect and the time and resources team members will need to meet those expectations.

will avoid many pitfalls—and be able to claim some responsibility for the success of teams and teamwork.

Manager's Checklist for Chapter 1

❑ When organizations drop their teams at the first sign of trouble, it's generally because of bad planning. To improve your chances of succeeding with teams, it's important to ask and answer a few questions in advance.

❑ Define what you mean by "team." Not everybody will understand this concept in the same way. Think in terms of the Five Ps—purpose, place, power, plan, and people.

❑ Why do you want teams? Answering that question forces you to consider which specific business issues teams ought to be addressing and how your teams should be linked to the needs of your business.

❑ Define the benefits you expect from teams, then set targets and goals so you can determine the payoff, if any.

❑ How will teams affect your workplace culture, particularly the managers? Be sure they're ready for role changes.

❑ Communicate, communicate, communicate. It's the lubrication of teamwork.