

LUV LIBRARY OF PERSPECTIVE

Creating the Conditions for Ownership

Perspective Discussion Guide

Library Title #001 | Shelf: Ownership

The purpose of this conversation is not to reach immediate agreement or develop an action plan. It is an invitation to explore the Perspective itself.

Understanding → Shared Ownership → Lasting Results

How to Use This Guide

For the person holding the conversation

This is a reflective dialogue, not a training, presentation, or implementation session. Choose the section that best fits the group. You do not need to ask every question.

- Invite discovery rather than persuasion.
- Allow disagreement, uncertainty, and silence.
- Ask for meaning before asking for solutions.

Do not rush toward consensus or an action plan.

- Select the questions that best fit the people, time available, and direction of the conversation.
- The conversation has been worthwhile when people leave thinking more deeply.

The LUV Learning Process

Experience → Reflection → Discovery → Ownership

Choose Your Conversation

Conversation	Designed For
Leadership	Executives, directors, board members, and senior leaders
Managers and Supervisors	Those translating organizational direction into everyday work
Frontline Professionals	Professionals working directly with people, families, and communities
Whole Organization	Leadership, management, administration, support roles, and frontline teams together
Community Perspective	People, families, youth, community members, partners, funders, contract holders, and others affected by the work

1. Before the Discussion

Welcome to this reflection on Creating the Conditions for Ownership.

The purpose of this conversation is not to reach immediate agreement, solve an organizational problem, or develop an action plan.

It is an invitation to explore the Perspective itself: what feels true, what feels uncomfortable, what raises questions, what challenges the way we currently understand ownership, and what we might see differently after sitting with the idea together.

LUV conversations are designed to invite discovery rather than persuasion. Participants are not expected to arrive at the same conclusion. The value of the conversation comes from hearing how the Perspective is understood from different experiences, responsibilities, and positions within an organization.

Ownership is often discussed as though it can be assigned, required, or measured by compliance. This Perspective invites us to consider something different:

Ownership is an outcome, not an instruction.

It grows when people understand the purpose, see themselves in the plan, and recognize that their hopes, goals, and future are not separate from what is being asked of them.

As you enter the discussion, resist the urge to move immediately toward solutions. Allow time for reflection, disagreement, curiosity, and questions that may not yet have an answer.

2. Shared Discussion Questions

Use with any audience before moving into the perspective-specific conversation

First Response

What stood out to you most in this Perspective?

What part felt immediately true or familiar?

Was there anything you resisted, questioned, or disagreed with?

What idea are you still thinking about?

What did the Perspective cause you to notice that you may not have noticed before?

Understanding Ownership

What does ownership mean to you?

How is ownership different from agreement?

How is it different from participation, cooperation, or compliance?

Can someone comply with a plan without owning it?

Can someone disagree with part of a plan and still take meaningful ownership?

Do you believe ownership can ever be required? Why or why not?

What changes when we understand ownership as an outcome rather than an instruction?

Conditions

What conditions have allowed you to feel genuine ownership in your own life or work?

What was present in those experiences?

What was absent?

What happens when people understand what is expected but do not understand why it matters?

What does it mean for someone to see themselves in the plan?

Is understanding enough to create ownership, or is something more required?

What role does mutual dignity play in whether ownership can grow?

Assumptions and Interpretation

Why might organizations mistake compliance for ownership?

What assumptions are often made when someone does not follow through?

When might a person appear resistant even though they do not yet see themselves in the plan?

Can a plan be reasonable, responsible, and well intentioned—and still fail to create ownership?

How might authority shape the way we interpret agreement, hesitation, or resistance?

What might we overlook when we focus only on whether someone completed what was expected?

Tension and Complexity

Is genuine ownership possible when some decisions are not negotiable?

What tensions exist between individual choice and organizational responsibility?

Can people take ownership within a system they did not choose?

What happens when safety, funding, legal requirements, or contracts limit available choices?

Is it possible to protect accountability without relying primarily on compliance?

Where might understanding end and responsibility begin?

What happens when the organization's plan and the person's vision for their future do not fully align?

A. Leadership Perspective

For executives, directors, board members, and senior organizational leaders.

Purpose

To explore how leadership understands ownership, authority, responsibility, and stewardship—and how those beliefs shape the conditions experienced throughout the organization.

Discussion Questions

What does ownership mean from a leadership position?

What do leaders sometimes assume when staff or community members do not immediately embrace a decision?

How might positional authority affect what looks like agreement?

Can a person freely express disagreement when the person asking holds greater authority?

What responsibility do leaders carry for creating the conditions surrounding a decision?

Is explaining a decision the same as creating understanding?

When leaders say they want ownership, what are they actually hoping to see?

How might a leader distinguish genuine ownership from respectful compliance?

What tensions arise when leaders must make decisions that others may not choose for themselves?

How can leaders remain accountable for outcomes without assuming that authority automatically creates commitment?

What does stewardship mean when the organization's principles, funding demands, workforce realities, and community needs pull in different directions?

What might leaders need to understand about their own relationship with control before they can create conditions for ownership in others?

Question to Sit With

When we say we want people to take ownership, have we created the conditions for ownership—or are we asking for agreement with decisions already made?

B. Managers and Supervisors Perspective

For those responsible for supervision, coordination, implementation, and translating organizational direction into everyday work.

Purpose

To explore how ownership is understood within supervision, accountability, communication, and the space between organizational expectations and daily realities.

Discussion Questions

What does ownership look like in a supervisory relationship?

How is professional accountability different from forced agreement?

Can someone responsibly carry out a decision they do not personally own?

What assumptions arise when a staff member questions a direction or does not immediately embrace it?

When does questioning reflect resistance, and when might it reflect thoughtfulness or responsibility?

How might a supervisor's authority influence what staff are willing to say?

What is the difference between a staff member understanding an expectation and believing in it?

Can ownership grow when people feel they must conceal disagreement?

How do managers hold both organizational responsibility and respect for professional judgment?

What happens when supervisors are expected to create ownership around decisions they did not help shape?

How might pressure from above affect the conditions managers create for those they supervise?

What does mutual dignity look like when accountability conversations are difficult?

Question to Sit With

What becomes possible when supervision makes room for honest thought rather than requiring immediate agreement?

C. Frontline Professionals Perspective

For professionals working directly with individuals, youth, families, and communities.

Purpose

To explore how ownership, expertise, engagement, resistance, and dignity are understood within direct relationships.

Discussion Questions

What do we mean when we describe someone as engaged or not engaged?

How do we decide whether someone has taken ownership?

What assumptions might we make when a person does not follow through?

How might our professional role shape what we see as cooperation or resistance?

What does it mean to recognize someone as the expert in their own life?

Can professional expertise and lived expertise coexist without one overriding the other?

What happens when the plan makes sense professionally but does not feel connected to the person's own future?

Is participation meaningful when the available choices have already been narrowly defined?

What is the difference between inviting someone into a plan and asking them to approve a plan?

Can a person be viewed as noncompliant when they are actually protecting something important to them?

What does mutual dignity require when a person makes a choice we would not recommend?

How might our interpretation of behavior change when we become curious about what the person is trying to preserve, avoid, or move toward?

When have you witnessed genuine ownership grow in someone? What seemed to make the difference?

Question to Sit With

What might we understand differently if we viewed hesitation not as a problem to overcome, but as information to become curious about?

D. Whole Organization Perspective

For conversations that include leadership, management, administration, support roles, and frontline professionals.

Purpose

To explore how the meaning of ownership changes across roles and how people within the same organization may experience the same decisions very differently.

Discussion Questions

Do we share a common understanding of what ownership means?

How might ownership look different from different places within the organization?

Where might one role see support while another experiences control?

Where might one group experience clarity while another experiences distance from the decision?

How does authority move through the organization?

Who is usually invited into conversations before decisions are made?

Who is usually informed after decisions are made?

How might those differences affect ownership?

What happens when an organization speaks the language of partnership but people experience decisions as predetermined?

Can an organization genuinely value ownership while relying heavily on compliance?

What tensions exist between consistency and individual discretion?

How might administrative, leadership, management, and frontline responsibilities shape different interpretations of the same situation?

What becomes possible when people across roles hear how the organization is experienced from positions other than their own?

Where might our organization be confusing shared purpose with shared agreement?

What might we discover if we stopped trying to defend our role long enough to understand another?

Question to Sit With

Can an organization create shared ownership without first creating shared understanding across the different roles that carry the work?

E. Community Perspective

For conversations with—or in preparation for engaging—people, families, youth, community members, partners, funders, contract holders, and others affected by the organization's work.

Purpose

To explore how ownership is experienced from outside formal organizational authority and to remember that people affected by decisions hold knowledge the organization cannot generate on its own.

Discussion Questions

What does ownership mean from the perspective of someone affected by an organization's decisions?

What makes participation feel meaningful rather than symbolic?

What helps people believe their voice will matter?

What causes people to believe that a decision has already been made?

What is the difference between being informed, being consulted, being heard, and having influence?

When does asking for input build trust, and when might it deepen mistrust?

How might past experiences with systems affect a person's willingness to participate?

What risks might people experience when speaking honestly to an organization that controls resources, services, funding, or opportunities?

How can organizations recognize that silence does not necessarily mean agreement?

What knowledge do people, families, and communities hold that professionals or leaders may not see?

What happens when an organization invites participation but cannot offer unlimited choice?

How can funders, contract holders, and community partners contribute to—or limit—the conditions for ownership?

What does mutual dignity require when different groups hold unequal authority?

How might organizations distinguish between gathering community input and entering into genuine conversation?

What would allow people affected by the work to recognize themselves in the organization's understanding of success?

Question to Sit With

Are people and communities being asked to participate in the organization's plan—or are they being invited to shape a future they can genuinely recognize as their own?

4. After the Discussion

Do not rush to translate the conversation into an action plan. Allow participants to leave with questions, tensions, and emerging insight.

What idea are you still sitting with?

Did anything shift in how you understand ownership?

What did you hear today that you had not considered before?

What tension remains unresolved for you?

Where did you notice yourself becoming defensive, curious, or surprised?

What question do you want to carry forward?

Whose perspective would deepen this conversation?

What would you like to understand more fully before deciding what this Perspective means for your work?

Participants may reflect silently, write privately, or share with the group. No one is required to leave with the same conclusion.

5. Guidance for the Person Holding the Conversation

Your role is not to teach the correct interpretation or guide participants toward a predetermined answer.

- Invite rather than persuade.
- Protect dignity.
- Allow disagreement.
- Resist correcting people too quickly.
- Ask for meaning before asking for solutions.
- Make room for silence.
- Notice whose voice is missing.
- Avoid forcing consensus.
- Remain curious about tension.
- Let discovery belong to the participants.

When the Conversation Moves Too Quickly Toward Action

What do we need to understand more fully before deciding what to do?

What belief is underneath that proposed solution?

Are we trying to resolve the tension before we have understood it?

What perspective have we not yet heard?

The conversation has been worthwhile when people leave thinking more deeply—not merely when they leave with a list of tasks.

6. Continue the Conversation

Ownership grows through understanding, reflection, and discovery.

This discussion is not intended to complete the work. It is an invitation to begin seeing the conditions surrounding ownership more clearly.

Consider continuing the conversation through another audience perspective, a related LUV Library title, or a deeper organizational dialogue.

Continue the Conversation with LUV

Every organization carries its own history, pressures, relationships, responsibilities, and possibilities. If this Perspective raised questions about what ownership means within your organization, LUV invites you to schedule a complimentary conversation.

Together, we can explore leadership conversations, team reflection, guided dialogue, and the LUV OIS – Organizational Implementation System.

Understanding → Shared Ownership → Lasting Results