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ABSTRACT

Research literature and popular press books and articles were reviewed concerning the issue of how to use teams effectively in the workplace. Three expert interviews were conducted with people who have been team members and facilitators in their organizations. These organizations are using teams effectively. It is clear that when given the proper training and support, teams can significantly increase worker productivity and satisfaction and increase customer satisfaction. It is also clear that, without such training and support, the use of teams can be a frustrating and non-productive process.
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CHAPTER 1
THE PROBLEM

In 1990, the Scottsdale School District made the decision to begin empowering individual schools in areas ranging from budgets to curriculum. The term for this process is Site-Based Shared Decision Making (SBSDM). The school district's belief is that, "Shared decision making, involving collaboration and leadership, is essential" (District SBSDM Committee, 1994, p. 15). It was decided that the individual sites, rather than the District, can more adequately address the needs of the students and the community they serve. The process of becoming a site-based school includes writing a site improvement plan that supports the District strategic plan while addressing the unique needs of the school. A 'training' budget has been allocated for any school endeavoring to change, to be used at the school's discretion. Some classes have been offered by the district on how to begin the change process. It has been suggested that sites beginning this process form committees to divide the work and begin the process. In November of 1994, the District published a handbook containing specific guidelines and expectations for becoming a site-based school. Beyond that, it is up to each individual school to decide how to begin empowering itself and making decisions that will benefit the community it serves.

Background of the Study

Traditionally, the schools in the district had been run in a top-down, hierarchical fashion. Until 1988, the district decided how the curriculum should be taught and what materials would be used. Principals made sure that the
District's decisions were implemented in the classrooms. Teachers worked in a variety of ways, including in pairs, as "team-teachers," however, teachers have been isolated from each other often, while interfacing primarily with the students. They had not typically been a part of making decisions for the schools. Only recently, through the adoption and implementation of SBSDM, have teachers begun to participate in decisions that were traditionally made strictly by the district.

Even though becoming part of an SBSDM plan has opened up opportunities for all those involved, it has presented some confusion as well as some frustration when decisions have not been able to be reached or, when reached, have not been realized. Many of the reorganizational problems are similar to those of any organization that is in the process of transitioning from a traditional, top-down, management style to a more participatory style of management.

Because the researcher values the concept of shared decision making and believes that a school site which learns how to work effectively in a collaborative way ultimately enhances the educational climate and quality of education for the students, the researcher has attempted to provide a structure to enhance the success of undertaking such a change. Therefore, to help with the transition process, the value of using participation specifically through the formation of teams has been explored.

Rationale for the Study

It is the belief of this researcher that allowing a school to adopt an SBSDM model does not automatically ensure that such a process will occur, or, if attempted, that it will be successful. It is further believed that an unsuccessful attempt at change may hinder the change process because of the resulting discouragement at a wasted effort.
The recommendations from the District have been to set up committees to carry out the duties of the school. Until late last year (1994), little written material had been provided in the way of instruction in the best way for schools to reorganize themselves into a site-based school. Additionally, little information was provided as to the best way for the committees to operate. The rationale for this was that as part of the change process it would be best for each site to discover what would be best for them. Consequently, some schools have floundered. At the researcher’s site in particular, an inordinate amount of time has been spent in arguing and debating issues, including, but not limited to, exactly what it means to be empowered to make our own decisions. Many of these debates resulted in tension, discord, and disharmony among the staff. Many members of the initial committees resigned, believing the process doesn’t work, and many others wavered in their commitments to their respective committees because of an overall lack of purpose. Those committees who had a specific task were more successful and more pleased with the process, yet did not fit into an overall school plan.

Without a clear plan, the committees found that attempting a major change was an overwhelming task. Clearly defining a plan, and choosing the best method to implement it are problems that need to be addressed if we are to be successful.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to design a model for the implementation of teams in the site based shared decision making process at Pima Elementary School.

**Research Question**

What is the design of a model for the implementation of teams in the site-
based shared decision making process at Pima Elementary School?

Significance of the Study

The research may show how using teams can improve morale and employee satisfaction, increase productivity, and can be used as an effective tool to help promote school-wide change. If the value of using teams to facilitate school change can be determined, then teams may be used more extensively and change can occur more rapidly.

If a team environment can be created, the entire school community stands to benefit. Theoretically, in a team environment better decisions are being made. Therefore, the students stand to receive a better education in a healthier, happier environment. This, in turn, could create more community satisfaction and support which will also have a positive impact on the school environment. A model is needed so that the use of teams can be implemented effectively at Pima Elementary and other schools in the district.

Definitions of Terms

Potential team: This is a group for which there is a significant, incremental performance need, and one that is trying to improve its performance impact. Typically, however, it requires more clarity about purpose, goals, or work-products and more discipline in hammering out a common working approach. It has not yet established collective accountability (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993b, p. 91).

SBSDM: Site Based Shared Decision Making is a blending of site management and planning, and collaborative decision making. Site based management and planning is the process by which decisions are made at levels closest to the issue being addressed. Collaborative decision making is the process by which individuals affected by and responsible for implementing decisions share in
making the decisions. Therefore, Site Based Shared Decision Making is an inclusionary process in which the people who effect and are affected by significant decisions participate in making those decisions. It is a process to enable effective school improvement. The intended focus is on vision creation as well as problem solving (SBSDM Committee, 1994, p. 1).

**Site-based school**: a school that is using site-based shared decision making as it's primary method of decision making.

**Site-Improvement Plan (SIP)**: an action plan intended to address and meet local needs while also supporting the district Strategic Plan (SBSDM Committee, 1994, p. 9).

**Stakeholders**: groups of individuals affected by or responsible for implementing site plans or decisions. Stakeholders groups would generally include students, parents, staff (certificated and non-certified), site administration, district or department administration, and community (SBSDM Committee, 1994, p. 10).

**Team (Real team)**: a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993b, p. 91).

**Assumptions and Limitations**

One assumption is that the people who were interviewed responded honestly to the interview questions. It is assumed that since the District has initiated the change towards self-governing schools, it is already aware of the merits of de-centralizing (moving away from bureaucratic management) and using some of industry’s proven strategies for implementing change. It is also assumed, therefore, that the District will support any site’s plan to further the
process, particularly, the use of teams since they are collaborative, decision-making units. A limitation of this study is the researcher's personal preference towards creating a team environment. Most of the literature selected had a favorable opinion of using teams in the workplace, though many studies did describe the challenges involved in using teams. Another limitation of the study is that some of the research reviewed was done in organizations other than schools, particularly, in private industry. It is uncertain how easily successful business practices can actually be transferred into a bureaucratic educational environment.

**Organization of the Remainder of the Study**

The organization of the remainder of the study is as follows: In Chapter 2, the literature about the use of teams is reviewed. The literature review is organized into three sections. The first section defines the team concept. The next section examines the reasons for using teams. The third section discusses how teams have been set up and used successfully in both business and educational settings. Chapter 3 identifies the research methodology used. Chapter 4 contains a presentation and analysis of the data. Chapter 5 contains a summary of the entire study, and the researcher's conclusions and recommendations. The transcriptions of the interviews of team participants are included in Appendix A. Appendix B is used to present a model for introducing and using a team approach in facilitating site-based shared decision making at Pima Elementary School.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition of the Team Concept

The word “team” brings to mind a variety of meanings to different people. Some think in terms of sports, some about a two-person partnership, like a marriage, and many believe a team is any group of people who are working together. As reported in Definitions, a team is a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goal, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993b, p. 45).

A team is different from “teamwork” or “teamwork values.” Teamwork values are the kinds of skills that allow the team to function more effectively. They include such things as listening, responding constructively to other’s ideas and opinions, giving others the benefit of the doubt, being supportive, and recognizing other’s achievements. “Such values help teams perform, and they also promote individual performance as well as the performance of an entire organization. But teamwork values by themselves are not exclusive to teams, nor are they enough to ensure team performance” (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993a p.112).

Real teams have the capacity to outperform other kinds of working groups such as committees or task forces. To understand how teams deliver extra performance, it is important to distinguish between teams and other forms of working groups. While a working group’s performance reflects what the
individual members do, "a team's performance includes both individual results and what we call 'collective work products' (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993a, p. 112). The fundamental difference between teams and working groups is mutual vs. individual accountability. Teams rely on group deliberation of issues/concerns and ultimately produce products through the co-contribution of all of its members. " This is what makes possible performance levels greater than the sum of all the individual bests of team members...a team is more than the sum of its parts" (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993a, p. 112).

Marc Bassin (1988), a human resources executive for General Foods, explains that his company believes that organizing its work force into work teams "is, in general, the single most critical factor in creating a work environment that enables and promotes the achievement of peak performance..." (p. 62). He defines group peak performance as "a group's ability to sustain superior output, quality and member satisfaction in terms of its principal goals..." (p. 62). He attributes "the unique synergy created by the integration of the various resources and capacities of its members, focused against a clearly understood and deeply valued goal" (p. 62) with making extraordinary outputs possible. He maintains that it's not the especially talented individuals who make peak performance possible as much as the dynamics of belief, collaboration and support.

Bassin (1988) describes" teams" as multidisciplinary groups of individuals, who are focused on and fully dedicated to a specific business, groups of businesses, or a fairly major long-term project within the organization. The key ingredient in such a team is the strengthened sense of ownership, involvement and responsibility for business results by all team members. (p. 64)

If we compare Bassin's (1988) definition of teams to the Scottsdale Public School District's meaning of Site-Based Shared Decision Making, we can see
some similarities. The “strengthened sense of ownership” and the “involvement and responsibility for...results” coincide with the District’s idea of “an inclusionary process in which the people who effect and are affected by any significant decision, participate in making those decisions” (District SBSDM Committee, 1994, p. 1). Despite the district’s intention of empowering the individual sites, many of the school sites, initially, organized themselves into fairly unstructured committees with broad goals, making having a common purpose a difficult feat. According to Iraci and Norton (1989) it is the team that “serves as a change-agent unit with well-defined roles, authority, and expectations for each individual member as well as for the team itself” (p. 23). It is possible that by helping to move these committees into a team structure, the District’s goals can be achieved more readily.

Hopkins (1994) explains that while a team “shares some characteristics with committees and task forces, the team is a non hierarchical group designed to provide an egalitarian environment for exchanging information and ideas. Each member has an assigned role, is allowed to input freely into discussions, and—most important— has the power to influence directly the final decisions of the group” (p. 37). It is not loosely organized, and each member is equally important.

Katzenbach and Smith (1993a) sum it up when they say,”The essence of a team is common commitment...This kind of commitment requires a purpose in which team members can believe...Credible team purposes have an element related to winning, being on the cutting edge” (p. 112).

Caudron (1994) compares working in a team environment to an astronaut’s mission. “When U.S. space shuttles blast away...into the vacuum of space, the astronauts on board become isolated communities in which members must rely...
on others to survive...” (p. 41). She explains that even though the mission’s success depends on teamwork, that it is not something that comes easily to the group. “Teamwork doesn’t come naturally to this group of high achievers. Only through extensive training can they work harmoniously” (p. 41). Linda Godwin, mission specialist with NASA’s Johnson Space Center in Houston is reported by Caudron to have said, “We have to be willing to compromise and make decisions that benefit everyone as a whole” (Caudron, 1994, p. 41).

Organizations that are making the move to self-directed workplace teams or site based management, need to strive for the kind of harmony exhibited by shuttle crews. It sounds simple enough in theory: put employees with different areas of expertise and talent together, empower them to solve problems and make their own decisions, and together they’ll create better products, faster processes, more profitable companies, and more satisfied customers. Judging by the number of organizations struggling with workplace teams, however, bringing a group of individuals together can create barriers to success. Calling a group of workers a team doesn’t automatically make a team.

According to Caudron (1994), “One of the primary reasons teams don’t always gel immediately is that North Americans are raised in a society that values individualism... Even the athletic teams...give trophies to the most valuable player” (p. 42). Lee Sproull, professor of management at Boston University agrees. “It’s quite unrealistic to put us in corporate America (after all this conditioning) and ask us to be team players” (Caudron, 1994, p. 42). Nevertheless, the same expectations are being placed upon the educational community with their shift to site-based management.

Another goal of work teams that opposes our cultural conditioning is the idea of employee empowerment. When you take employees out of a traditional,
hierarchical structure in which bosses tell other bosses what to do, (or superintendents tell principals who tell teachers) and put them into teams in which they can make their own decisions, Caudron (1994) asks, "Is it any wonder that few readily take to the idea?" (p. 42).

The opposite problem related to empowerment is also true; that is, employees will embrace their new responsibility as decision makers only to be shot down by those above them "who aren't used to having their direct reports take charge" (Caudron, 1994, p. 43).

Drake (1990) explains that another problem created by "shifting responsibilities from individuals to groups and from managers (bosses) to workers" (p. 39) is being able to measure the team's productivity. Especially in service organizations, team success is often measured largely by customer and employee satisfaction rather than by a tangible product. And while "training teams to be cross-functional eliminates much of the bureaucracy at an organization" (p. 39), she agrees with Caudron by stating that this "can also create some problems because some employees, especially managers, have a hard time dealing with a streamlined, less traditional organization" (p. 39).

Hoerr (1989) elaborates on this; "At one and the same time, it promises workers autonomy over their jobs but also threatens their old way of working. It gives managers a powerful tool to improve productivity and quality but could undermine their control..." (p. 56). He goes on to explain that while moving an organization to a team approach is, indeed, a huge undertaking, companies are willing to do it because it "gains workers' knowledge and commitment ... along with productivity gains that exceed 30%" (p. 57).

Bassin (1988) suggests that "although teams might not be...for every situation, they offer a certain amount of promise as a basic pattern for
approaching work in most organizations" (p. 68). It may be that future organizations will resemble loosely coupled circles that can move and adjust quickly, rather than the stable, bureaucratic pyramids of today. “For such an organization, the ability to create peak performance teams will be a critical, competitive, advantage” (p. 68).

Business Applications of the Team Concept

Introduction

According to Hoerr (1989), “there are signs that real employee involvement is sinking into the core of Corporate America. What had been a slow evolution...is turning into a revolution on the way work is organized in U.S. companies” (p. 56). Lee (1990) agrees, and suggests,”Like many revolutionary ideas, this one is simple. Much of it boils down to a belief...in giving responsibility to the people who do the work” (p. 26). He, too, does not deny that the results of this belief can be staggering, saying that “putting it into effect is guaranteed to send shock waves throughout an organization--waves that sweep away many time-honored practices” (p. 26). According to George and Wellins (1991), even though teams have been used in some firms for decades, they have been growing in acceptance in the past four to five years. “Once viewed as radical isolated experiments, they’re now expected by some experts to be the workplace wave of the future in terms of organization and peak performance” (p. 26).

Both manufacturing and service firms have embraced the use of self-directed teams (SDT’s) as a way of maintaining a competitive edge. A self-directed team is a small group of employees responsible for an entire work process. Team members work together to improve their assigned operation or product, plan and control their work, and handle day to day problems. They are often involved
in company wide issues including operations and business planning. George and Wellins (1991) state that "Xerox, A.O. Smith, General Electric, General Motors and Colgate Palmolive are a few of the industries using SDT's. Service organizations with SDT's include Aid Association for Lutherans, AT&T, The U.S. Postal Service, and IDS Financial Systems" (p. 27). Experts consider the use of teams to be "just as applicable in service organizations as in manufacturing because in both, the customer...is the driving force" (Drake, 1990, p. 39).

An autocratic organization still using a rigid chain of command, obviously has a lot of ground work to do before creating work teams, "but so does a company accustomed to the trappings of participative management" (Lee, 1990, p. 28). Lee (1990) reports that Ed O'Brien, Director of Education and Training at Corning, Inc. says,"This process is a lot of work. You're asking people to adapt to dramatic change" (p. 30). He's referring to a change in which a once-familiar work environment suddenly requires new skills, not to mention new behaviors.

George and Wellins (1991) list what they consider to be the primary differences in SDT type organizations and the more traditional ones:

* They're usually leaner, with fewer layers of managers and supervisors.
* The leader is more coach than planner and controller.
* The reward systems tend to be skill or team based, rather than seniority based.
* Information...is shared readily with all employees, not just the top few.
* Employees are expected to learn all the jobs and tasks required of the team, not just a single job or task.(George & Wellins, 1991, p. 27)

The first three characteristic are addressed by Cynthia Mann, team leader in Human Resources for Macey's West Control Services. In the researcher's interview on the use of teams in her workplace (See Appendix A) she addresses the idea of how leadership styles affect the way teams function, along with some of the benefits of working in teams.
Unlike most resource roles in which individuals are asked to contribute in their area of expertise only, team members are expected to focus their energies of the total business or project needs, as if the business were their own. This concept is one of the key ingredients to the team process used at Dial Corporation. (See Appendix B)

According to Lee (1990) the degree to which a team actually may be considered self-managing is simple to judge..."it's the number and kind of management responsibilities they take on" (p. 28.).

The Effectiveness of Teams in Business

Marc Bassin (1988) believes that human resources are any organization's primary asset. Even so, he feels that most larger organizations still organize their people in work patterns that "inhibit or limit their employee's contributions" (p. 62). He explains that General Foods changed that pattern by implementing work teams as a strategic approach to maximizing its human resources. According to Bassin (1988), General Foods found that the best chance for approaching levels of peak performance was through establishing work teams. He contends that "teams are the most effective vehicle to stimulate member participation and involvement... recent studies on innovation in large companies show that most successful development work is accomplished through fairly autonomous... work teams" (p. 62). Their benefits include:

* More sharing and integration of individual skills and resources
* More stimulation, energy and endurance by members working jointly than is usual when individuals work alone
* More emotional support among team members
* Better performance in terms of quantity and quality, more wins, more innovation
* More ideas for use in problem-solving
* More commitment and ownership by members around team goals, i.e. higher motivation
* More sustained effort directed at team goals
* More team member satisfaction, higher motivation, and more fun
* The sense of being a winner, greater confidence and the ability to achieve more. (Bassin, 1988, p. 62)

In describing why teams work so well, he explains that it is precisely the ability of a team to create a “cycle of positive dynamics,” each impacting and reinforcing the other, that enables individual team members to reach higher levels of performance than if they worked individually. He is convinced that “teams provide an opportunity to achieve more with less or, in the case of development, to move more quickly” (p. 62).

Bassin (1988) concludes by saying that using teams creates more excitement and enthusiasm in the workplace because of the combination of fulfilling the social needs of belonging and the additional energy team members provide for each other. “Having fun at work is an essential ingredient for a productive work force. Winning teams are fun and the opportunity to help make the team a winner can be a powerful and long-term motivator” (p. 65).

According to George and Wellins (1991), “productivity and quality are up in companies that use self-directed teams” (p. 28). They reported that researchers sent ASTD (American Society for Training and Development) surveys to 440 HRD executives at Fortune 500 companies and private companies with at least $500 million in sales. Of the 230 respondents, 74 said their companies use SDT’s. The SDT’s in these companies were responsible for improving quality (88%), scheduling (59%), setting productivity goals (59%) and resolving their own disputes (50%). They say that organizations are finding that improved quality is one of the most significant benefits of SDT’s. The reason for it is that everyone, not just managers and supervisors, are expected to be the “eyes and ears” of the organization. Its up to all the team members to inspect quality and make decisions “on the spot” as to whether it passes inspection or not.
Lee (1990) reports that at Johnsonville Foods in Sheboygan Falls, WI, “it's standard operating procedure to ask employees to take responsibility for the decisions that affect them” (p. 26). Because of the company’s president, Ralph Stayer, Johnsonville has become a low-hierarchy, high-involvement, team-directed operation. He is convinced that the people closest to the work must make the decisions that affect the work. Teamwork has paid off for Johnsonville. Since 1986, productivity has risen more than 50%. And Johnsonville isn't alone. Lee says that accounts of companies that have achieved seemingly miraculous results by implementing a team approach to produce their products or services have begun to trickle into the mainstream business press in the past few years. Those accounts, according to Lee (1990), “often cite productivity increases in the double digits and equally grand leaps in quality improvement” (p. 26.).

For example, Lee (1990) discusses a recent report in Fortune which credits teamwork for productivity increases of up to 40% at a General Mills plant. The same story cites a Federal Express team that saved the company more than $2 million a year by spotting and solving a billing problem. He continues by saying that according to Business Week, by using teams, the insurance operation of Aid Association for Lutherans boosted productivity by 20% and reduced case-processing time by as much as 75%. He discusses Procter and Gamble's experimentation with work teams in the '70's. Although P&G did not discuss the results of its early experiments, “in 1986 Business Week reported that the company's teamwork plants were 30% to 40% more productive than its traditional facilities” (p. 29).

Lee (1990) explains that companies that have made a commitment to a work-team approach, or their consultants, “often label the change they have undergone a ‘transformation’, a ‘revolution’, or the unveiling of a ‘new
paradigm'... they fundamentally change the way work is organized and performed" (p. 26).

Hoerr (1989) reports that the EI (Employee Involvement) movement has "unleashed enormous energy and creativity" by those who like the idea of "using their brains, as well as their bodies, on the job" (p. 58). He describes a General Electric Co. plant in Salisbury, N.C that has increased productivity by a remarkable 250% compared with GE plants that produced the same products in 1985. Hoerr (1989) cites a newly released report for the Brookings Institution in which Steve Levine and Laura D'Andrea Tyson of the University of California reviewed all major studies of employee involvement. They said, "If you sum it all up, meaningful participation has a positive effect on productivity. It's almost never negative or neutral" (p. 59).

According to Hoerr (1989), Richard E. Walton, a top EI theorist at Harvard University says, "To have world class quality and costs and the ability to assimilate new technology, we must have the world's best ability to develop human capabilities" (p. 59). He advocates the use of teams to do this.

Drake (1990) says that regardless of the problems inherent in bringing about change, new opportunities for empowerment and job variation can result from being part of a team. "Working in teams makes it easier for people to communicate and provide feedback, so it is simpler to make improvements and improve customer service" (p. 40).

**Development of Successful Teams In Business**

In researching how successful teams are created, Katzenbach & Smith (1993a) found that there is a basic discipline that makes teams work. It involves developing direction, momentum, and commitment by working to shape a meaningful purpose. They also found that teams and good performance are
inseparable.

According to their research, most successful teams shape their purposes in response to a demand or opportunity usually put in their path by higher management. "Management is responsible for clarifying the charter, rationale, and performance challenge for the team, but management must also leave enough flexibility for the team to develop commitment around its own spin on that purpose, set specific goals, timing and approach" (pp. 112-113).

They found that the best teams invest a tremendous amount of time and energy "exploring, shaping, and agreeing on a purpose" (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993a, p. 113) that they can own, both collectively and individually. This "purposing" activity continues throughout the life of the team.

The best teams then translate their common purpose into specific performance goals. It is when purposes and goals build on one another and are combined with team commitment that they become a "powerful engine of performance" (p. 113). Transforming broad directives into specific and measurable performance goals is, according to Katzenbach and Smith (1993a), the "surest first step for a team trying to shape a purpose meaningful to its members" (p. 113).

Virtually all the effective teams they met, read about, heard about, or have been members of ranged from between 2 and 25 people. Most of them have numbered less than 10. Ten people are far more likely than fifty to work through their "individual, functional, and hierarchical differences, toward a common plan and to hold themselves jointly accountable for the results" (p. 114).

In addition to finding the right size, teams must develop the right mix of skills. Skill requirements fall into three general categories:

* Technical or functional expertise
* Problem solving and decision-making skills
* Interpersonal skills: These include risk taking, helpful criticism, objectivity, active listening, giving the benefit of the doubt... (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993a, p. 114)

A team cannot get started without some minimum complement of skills, especially technical and functional ones. However, they found that it is equally common to overemphasize skills when selecting team members. "In all of the successful teams we've encountered, not one had all the needed skills at the outset" (p. 115).

Effective teams develop a strong commitment to a common approach, or to how they will work together to accomplish their purpose. Team members must agree on how schedules will be set and adhered to, who will do particular jobs, what skills need to be developed, how continuing membership in the team is to be determined, and how the group will make and modify decisions. One very important element of the "emotional logic that drives team performance" (Katzenbach and Smith, 1993a, p. 116) is that every member of the team does equivalent amounts of real work.

No group ever becomes a real team until it can hold itself accountable as a team. Team accountability is about the promises made to themselves and others, promises that underscore two critical aspects of effective teams: commitment and trust. Mutual accountability cannot be "coerced" but, when a team shares a common purpose, goals, and approach, "mutual accountability grows as a natural counterpart" (p. 116).

Rideout & Richardson (1989) suggest that understanding the "multidimensional" components of team-building is important in creating effective teams. They found that appreciating and nurturing differences and addressing gender, as well as personal diversity, allows for "an environment where creative choices and decisions can occur" (p. 529).
Rideout and Richardson (1989) suggest that selecting an outside consultant to do initial team building sessions can be an asset. "Having an outside consultant allows all team members to participate fully... This person could neutralize adversity to topic areas, deal with defensiveness if it arises, and encourage appreciation of differences in the initial stages" (p. 530). They also recommend rotating facilitation among the staff members to allow each member to participate and facilitate the group.

Rideout and Richardson (1989) see effective team building as a critical aspect of management and believe that the concept of appreciation of differences "adds not previously tapped dimensions to team building" (p. 532). Their belief is that leadership which supports, appreciates, and encourages differences and provides an environment for mutual respect can only enhance the effectiveness of teams. They propose that when an environment is created "whereby differences are appreciated and nurtured; there can be creative choices and decisions, with an outcome of excellence for both individuals and agencies" (p. 532).

Campion and Stevens (1994) have compiled a list of characteristics team members need to possess in order to be effective. They have labeled these characteristics "knowledge, skill, and ability requirements" and refer to them as KSA's.

Campion and Stevens (1994) found that "congenial and amicable interpersonal relations" are present in more effective teams because "they free members from having to deal with difficult conflicts and process issues" (p. 507). They also lead away from feelings of alienation, frustration, and withdrawal, instead, leading to the willing and productive participation on the part of all team members. They suggest that team effectiveness depends heavily on the ability
of individual members to successfully manage interpersonal relations with one another. They explain this individual capacity as "interpersonal competence" and describe it as "the ability to maintain healthy working relationships and to react to others with respect for ideas, emotions, and differing viewpoints" (p. 507).

In a team environment, the interpersonal demands appear much greater. Campion and Stevens (1994) suggest that a team-based setting requires that each employee be capable of interacting in a positive and effective manner with peers, that is, there is a greater need for team members to be capable of effective interpersonal communication, conflict management, facilitation of team discussions, collaborative problem-solving, and so on.

According to Campion and Stevens (1994), problems from faulty interpersonal relations can originate from two extremes. At one extreme, team members may engage in destructive conflict or dysfunctional patterns of interpersonal behavior that disrupt the accomplishment of team tasks, or, at the other extreme, members can become "so oriented towards sharing warmth, support, and good feelings that the task itself is all but forgotten" (p. 199).

Campion and Stevens (1994) suggest that conflicts arise when members believe their different goals cannot be achieved simultaneously. They suggest that the ability to air and relieve interpersonal friction as one of the critical team-building functions. They assert that conflict inevitably arises as a consequence of team functioning and state, "group conflict is as common as group harmony" (p. 79).

According to Campion and Stevens (1994) conflict is not something more effective teams try to avoid. Instead, when conflict occurs in effective teams, it tends to be constructive, civil, and not personally threatening. They conclude
that conflict is unproductive only when disagreements reach an impasse and incapacitate a team. But, "constructive conflict allows teams to identify problems, develop solutions, and work tradeoffs without alienating members" (p. 507).

Another quality to be developed, especially in self-managed teams, is that employees are expected not to ask supervisors to solve problems, but rather to take initiative to solve problems themselves. Campion and Stevens (1994) state that even if teams are not self-managing, members are still often expected to participate in problem solving. They suggest that the critical issue in collaborative problem solving is knowing when to use team participation.

Campion and Stevens (1994) also suggest that by involving all team members, multiple perspectives are brought to bear which may “improve the diagnosis, the range of solutions considered, and the likelihood that incorrect solutions will be differentiated from correct ones” (p. 508). They conclude that individual team members should possess the knowledge, skill and ability to “identify situations requiring participative group problem solving and to utilize the proper degree and type of participation” (p. 508).

Campion and Stevens (1994) describe a unique obstacle called the groupthink phenomena. It occurs whenever the desire for team harmony and unanimity interfere with the ability to critically evaluate alternative solutions, leading to poor quality decisions. Another unique obstacle discussed here is team conformity. Groups can exert strong forces on members to conform to the majority opinions. Therefore, the authors suggest that “team members should be able to help their teams recognize and avoid problems of groupthink and conformity” (p. 511).

The next area Campion and Stevens (1994) explore is the communication skills requirements of effective team members. They maintain that effective
communication is known to influence important team processes and outcomes, and say it is an explicit component of many current models of work team performance. Campion and Stevens (1994) suggest that the KSA's needed for effective communication in teams are:

   The KSA to understand communication networks, and to utilize decentralized networks to enhance communication where possible. The KSA to communicate openly and supportively, that is to send messages which are: (1) behavior or event oriented; (2) congruent; (3) validating; (4) conjunctive; and (5) owned. The KSA to listen nonevaluatively and to appropriately use active listening techniques. The KSA to maximize consonance between non-verbal and verbal messages and to recognize and interpret the nonverbal messages of others. The KSA to engage in small talk and ritual greetings, and a recognition of their importance. ( p. 514)

Other KSA's that team members must possess are (1) goal setting and performance management KSA's and (2) planning and task coordination KSA's since, with self-management, team members "must possess the KSA's to perform some essential managerial activities" (p. 514).

Campion and Stevens (1994) state that "a clearly defined mission or purpose is critical to team effectiveness according to both the conceptual... and empirical literature" and that "an appropriate level of goal difficulty is important for team performance" (p. 515). They suggest one way to enhance goal acceptance is to use participation for setting goals stating that this "may also lead to better quality goals and greater satisfaction with the process" (p. 515).

Campion and Stevens (1994) describe effective teams as being aware of their own performance and progress toward goals. These teams will frequently evaluate their progress and make adjustments in goals or activities. The members must be able to "differentiate their contributions from those of other members and perceive a link between their performance and their success" (p.
516). Equity must also be considered when making workload assignments in a team.

In summary, Campion and Stevens (1994) maintain that the KSA’s are needed for interacting with employee teams and for participating on management teams. Thus, they believe training must not only ensure that managers possess teamwork KSA’s, but that managers know how to train these KSA’s in employees.

Based on this research, it is easy to see why training is considered by some to be a vital part of creating successful teams. The skills required and exhibited by successful team members are detailed and complex, and may not be easily developed without training.

George and Wellins (1991) discuss the extensive commitment of time invested by some companies in order to train their employees to be successful in self-directed work teams. They describe an employee who, in his first year, participated in more than 120 hours of on-the-job and classroom training and point out that this was just the beginning. His company will continue to have him participate in new training and development activities involving an additional 40 or more hours a year. They name organizations such as Hownet, Sara Lee Knit Products, Tennessee Eastman Company, GE Aircraft, and Colgate-Palmolive as having similar training schedules for their teams.

George and Wellins (1991) quote Doug Nickerson, a human resources representative at GE Aircraft as saying, “Training and organizational growth are so woven together that you can’t accomplish your objectives without training, both technical and interpersonal” (p. 28).

George and Wellins (1991) quote another training representative from Tennessee Eastman who states, “Without extensive training, teams aren’t
effective. Period. I have employees who say they can’t believe the positive difference our team training has had on their work” (p. 28).

George and Wellins (1991) suggest this training is required because people who haven’t worked in teams before “need new social and leadership skills. As team members, they’re required to perform a greater variety of tasks and... to work within a new cultural context” (p. 27).

George and Wellins (1991) also suggest that it is the role of a team leader to teach teams how to lead themselves. “Leaders should receive nearly the same training that team members get. That includes ...interaction, conflict resolution, and problem-solving” (p. 30). They also believe that leaders should be trained in the skills unique to their new roles such as coaching for success, encouraging initiative, leading successful meetings, and reinforcing effective performance.“Training...enables leaders to support their teams, keep them moving, and protect them from disruption. It also helps teams learn to manage themselves” (p. 30).

George and Wellins (1991) believe, based on their research that it’s critical to develop a training plan prior to team implementation. They feel that part of the self-directed team process involves forming groups or committees who will be responsible for the initial team implementation. They also found that teams evolve over time, and that it’s best if the training occurs as close as possible to the time that the skills are needed on the job.

It seems, according to George and Wellins (1991), that the greatest payoff for most training professionals is to watch others grow and develop. They state that just 10 years ago “many organizational leaders would have considered such innovations impossible. The evidence now shows that they would have been wrong” (p. 31).
Caudron (1994) describes similar needs at Gossen Corporation in Milwaukee. There, the need for training became apparent because the issue of individuality was an ongoing struggle. “Even though the company reorganized into teams more that eight years ago...the goal of teamwork was too abstract,” explains Jeff Butterfield, president. “We operate in a culture where people don’t see the value of their expertise to other departments” (p. 42). To overcome this misconception, Gossen embarked on an employee communication and training effort that continues to this day.

The goal of this effort is to continually remind employees of the company’s mission to satisfy the customer. “You can’t ask people to change and accept new responsibilities unless they understand the ground rules and expectations,” Butterfield says. “But when they keep a mission in mind and when top managers continually reinforce the importance of that mission, everyone reads from the same page. Suddenly, there becomes reason to work together” (Caudron, 1994, p. 42).

The importance of having a clearly identified mission may sound like a gross oversimplification but according to Caudron’s (1994) research, “successful teams are those in which members know why they’re working together” (p. 42).

In order to be effective, team members have required training in group dynamics, communications, problem-solving and brainstorming. Caudron quotes the training coordinator at Shelby Die Casting in Shelby, Mississippi, “We’re teaching employees how to be empowered” (Caudron, 1994, p. 43).

For employees to gain more control over their work, leaders have to have less control. Caudron explains how Fred Mott found this out, when the Tallahassee DEMOCRAT in Tallahassee, Florida, for which he was general manager, reorganized in an effort to improve service to the newspaper’s
advertisers. “Managers had to learn how to communicate the goals they wanted to accomplish rather than the problems they wanted to fix. Today, the team identifies its own problems, which creates buy-in necessary for members to want to solve those problems” (Caudron, 1994, p. 45).

Caudron (1994) agrees with George and Wellins (1991) that just because employees become empowered in self-directed work teams doesn’t mean there’s not a role for managers in the team-based approach. What it does mean is leaders have to learn to lead in new ways.

Caudron (1994) suggests that companies need people who are experts in team process and who understand and can help with the interpersonal challenges posed by teams. Ideally, this person isn’t a technical expert...but rather a facilitator who is an expert in giving feedback and resolving conflict. This facilitator, who may work with more than one at a time, provides the objective voice a team needs to “stay on course when personality and work-style differences threaten to throw them off” (p. 45).

Caudron (1994) explains that team leaders play a significant role at Bausch & Lomb. In the contact lens division, the company has created twelve cross-functional teams and one hundred fifty department teams, all charged with addressing specific business issues. “Each team is assigned a facilitator or advisor who helps resolve team conflict” (p. 45).

Caudron (1994) suggests the rationale for this: “Without skilled leadership, teams easily can flounder, get off course, go too far or not far enough, lose sight of their mission and connection with other teams, lose confidence, get stymied by interpersonal conflict, and simply fall short of their enormous potential...” (p. 45). Given that leaders are necessary, the book’s authors suggest that the new role of the team leader be:
* To build trust and inspire teamwork
* To facilitate and support the decisions made by their teams
* To expand them capabilities
* To create team identity
* To make the most of differences
* To foresee and influence change (Caudron, 1994, p. 45)

Caudron's (1994) research suggests that even if you have managers who understand their new role, a clearly identified company mission, and employees who believe they can make decisions on their own, teams will not work without "training, training, and more training" (p. 45). That's why, Caudron explains, that for at least a year before each space shuttle mission, the astronauts chosen to fly on that mission work together almost every day.

Caudron describes this type of commitment to training as extending to corporate America. For example, it wasn't long after teams were implemented at Bausch & Lomb, that the company realized employees were going to need training if they were to be successful in their new roles as team members. There, a 16 hour course teaches such things as the stages of team formation, how to structure meetings and agendas, the six step problem-solving process and how to resolve conflict. Employees attend courses with their team members and work on actual team problems. In the end, she suggests, "creating effective self-directed work teams--and teammates--takes nothing but time" (p. 45).

Lee (1990) explains, "Not only must team members learn one another's jobs--a massive cross-training effort in itself--they also must learn how to work as a team" (p. 30). At Corning, employees spend 15 to 20 percent of their time in training. That's the equivalent of one day each week. He quotes one Corning official as saying, "This is a training intervention that changes the organization. Without training, you can't make the transition" (p. 30).

According to Lee (1990), Ed O'Brien, Director of Education and Training at
Corning, Inc. said, “People have to understand why you’re doing this. The process is a lot of work. You’re asking people to adapt to dramatic change” (p. 30). To O’Brien’s way of thinking, training’s crucial role begins in the process of communicating the whys and wherefores to employees. He feels a good starting place is a course on global competition, designed to help employees understand why there is a need for the kind of revolutionary change working in teams brings. Next, he suggests a general introduction to the concepts involved in work teams. Then he introduces courses designed to teach the skills necessary for team members to be successful “problem solving, decision making, resolving conflicts, giving feedback and the like...” (p. 30).

Lee (1990) believes that in order to make teams work, management must learn to give employees responsibilities, comparing that to the responsibilities parents must allow their children to assume.

Caudron (1994) quotes NASA’s Godwin as saying, “You’ve got to spend a lot of time at it (team building) and it isn’t all formal training. It’s getting to know people and working together with them for many months. You have to develop confidence in others, and alot of what creates confidence and effective teams is being in close proximity with you teammates on a regular basis” (p. 49).

Drake (1990) agrees that employee attitudes have a big impact on the success of the teams, and suggests that employees don’t always view the change with a suspicious eye. Sometimes they invite change. She quotes Kristine Busk, manager of Training and Organizational Development at Northern Michigan Hospitals as saying, “I think we’ve been underutilizing the talents and abilities of a lot of people in the organization” (p. 42).

However, in discussing some of the obstacles that companies face, Drake (1990) points out that, “Implementing self-directed teams requires ideological
and organizational changes within a company" (p. 39). Hoerr’s (1989) research reiterates this idea. He quotes W. Patrick Dolan, a St. Louis consultant as saying, "Very few companies understand how deep the change must be, and really go after it" (p. 42). Because of this, Hoerr (1989) suggests that managers who fear hostile takeovers should “think twice about investing in human-capital programs such as the continual training that’s needed to help workers improve their technical and social skills” (p. 42). Hoerr states that, according to Dolan, “Training is always a peripheral, secondary consideration, and when push comes to shove, it keeps sliding.” (p. 42).

Nevertheless, Bassin (1988) believes that for a company to reach extraordinary levels of achievement, it must establish high performing teams.

He describes characteristics of high performing teams as having:

**Goals.** They must be clear, important missions, with well-ordered, agreed-upon objectives...they must have clearly understood priorities based on member discussion and negotiation, as well as recognition and value for accomplishing results within a distinct timeframe.

**Roles.** The team is a diverse representation of skills and perspectives. Individuals should have the authority to act...each member’s growth and accomplishment within the framework of team output and interdependence is recognized and valued. Members must understand each other’s involvement.

**Leadership.** The leader must champion the team and maintain a broad multifunctional project viewpoint. He or she must be attentive to the working climate of the team and work to establish a positive operating environment. The leader, whose leadership approach is modified to fit changing needs of the team, also obtains needed resources for the unit.

**Team relations.** The rules and norms of behavior are openly discussed and agreed upon, establishing a climate of trust, mutual respect, excellence, and innovation...Members are as attentive to how they work as they are to the final results (process and content).

**Rewards and recognition.** The team is given the recognition and latitude needed to perform efficiently. Informal team celebrations might be held during the life of the project. (Bassin, 1988, p. 65)

In addition, he feels the company must ensure that the individual’s
contributions to the team’s output are “expected, valued, and rewarded” (p. 65).

On the subject of training, Bassin (1988) maintains that, in most cases, peak performance teams “don’t occur or develop naturally, even if members possess strong skills or abilities” (p. 65). He suggests that, for most teams, teaching levels of peak performance requires “considerable devotion, concentration and energy directed specifically at this issue” (p. 65).

Bassin (1988) describes five requirements which, together, form the team’s foundation and characterize most high performance teams.

The first requirement is vision. This is the team’s overriding purpose for existence. The team’s vision becomes its agenda. Vision is effective only when it is held and shared by all of the team members. The team’s vision becomes its source of power and motivation. The vision must be anchored on a job worth doing in the eyes of each team member. To be most successful, visions should be imagined with sufficient detail to create a living picture.

The second requirement, according to Bassin (1988), is a perceived dependent need. Team members must all realize that the vision is not achievable without their combined talents. This is the difference between real teams, and less cohesive interdependent groups.

Third, Bassin (1988) views the team leader as having the primary responsibility for “formulating, communicating and behaviorally representing” (p. 67) the vision that is to be shared by all members. This requires distinct, but interrelated steps:

* It must by worthy of ownership by the group
* It must be communicated continually to members in a way that gives it vitality and life.
* The leader must embody and model the vision in his or her behavior with the group. (Bassin, 1988, p. 67)

In nearly all cases, teams will face occasions when obstacles to progress seem
overwhelming. Because of this, they must possess the ability to recover, benefit from their mistakes, and continue to move forward, with the leader’s behavior setting the tone or standard. The leader eventually must transfer responsibility for the team’s development to the team members, and as this responsibility is embraced, groups transform into teams.

The fourth element in building a team is coordination. This is a process for effectively using and integrating member’s resources. Since good intentions often fail to produce exceptional results without a clearly defined process for working together, having a clearly defined process is helpful. Teams work best when there is a regular system for setting priorities and integrating resources. Activities are then organized around clearly defined outcomes. “It’s important that teams learn to meet and plan together effectively so they can reach levels of peak performance” (Bassin, 1988, p. 67).

Finally, in order to be effective, teams need to be able to adjust and respond to changing conditions, whether from within themselves or from their environment, to remain effective. The better they are able to adjust and respond, the more effective the team will be. Generally, as teams mature, their ability to use feedback and readjust improves as they go. In peak performance teams, this ability is shared by all members and becomes almost second-nature.

Combined, the five elements of vision, dependent need, leadership, coordination process and the ability to adjust and adapt form the foundation for peak performance.

Bassin (1988) asserts, “As in any kind of growth and development... balancing these elements to produce optimum effectiveness is a difficult task. It requires significant time, energy and skill in the part of all team members...” (p. 68).
Bassin (1988) maintains that there are certain obstacles to building peak performance teams:

_Expectation:_ Most individuals have never experienced peak performance, therefore, they don't expect it of themselves or others. Since, without an expectation, there can be no achievement, some team member's expectations must be significantly stretched so they can think of themselves as concerned with all aspects of the business, not limited only to their area of expertise. The group vision must be stronger than individual agendas and the opportunities for group members to help one another must be unencumbered by competition among themselves. This is not to say there isn't room for extraordinary individual performance in a team context. On the contrary, often it's the team support that helps individuals achieve levels of peak performance.

_Compensation:_ Bassin (1990) believes that compensation programs which directly link the compensation for individuals in teams with team output must be developed to truly support the group. He feels that teams which exceed their objectives should directly share in the rewards. The key issue here is the reinforcement of the team concept through compensation programs.

_Continuity:_ It takes considerable time to establish identity, build trust, work out roles and procedures, solve problems and gain confidence before the team begins operating at optimum levels. Six months to a year is not an unrealistic time frame for this type of development. Changes in membership can be quite disruptive. When the members know they will be working together for several years the continuity serves as a prime motivator. A relatively high degree of continuity is essential for building peak performance teams.

_Career movement._ Once an employee becomes part of the team, the member is exposed to all aspects of the business. A logical move for the
stronger team members is to become a team leader. In that position, the individual has a unique opportunity to act as a mini-general manager and to develop the perspectives and skills necessary for higher levels of management. Thus, by presenting an alternative path to higher management, teams can pose a threat to those employees who feel more comfortable with traditional notions of career movement.

**Power, authority and organizational layers.** Because teams are empowering vehicles, as they mature and succeed, team members naturally begin to gain confidence and desire more responsibility. A problem is likely to occur when this extended role or scope of responsibility overlaps onto those in the next level of management. As a team matures, it becomes clear that they are often quite capable of assuming the role of this next layer of management. This can lead to confusion and frustration.

Lee (1990) describes this growth as “predictable stages, requiring increasing levels of employee involvement on their journey from traditional to self management— a journey that can take anywhere from 2 to 10 years to complete” (p. 27). He bases this on Developmental Dimensions International (DDI), a Pittsburgh-based consulting firm, model of the self-directed work team continuum which shows seven steps along the way to autonomy and on another evolutionary model which frames team development in terms of five stages: start up, state of confusion, leader-centered, tightly formed, and, finally, self-directed. The model suggests that “rotating leadership, rather than using an ‘informal’ leader who takes the place of the supervisor is one characteristic of a work team that is on its way to becoming self-directed” (p. 27).

Like George and Wellins (1991), Lee’s (1990) work suggests that the steering committee that initially studies the feasibility of using work teams in the
organization is the group that must defuse as many potential "land mines" as possible. He recommends that the committee focus on six key questions:

* Are the work processes compatible with self directed work teams?
* Are employees willing and able to make self-direction work?
* Can managers master and apply the hands-off leadership style required by self directed work teams?
* Is the market healthy or promising enough to support improved productivity without reducing work force?
* Will the organization's policies and culture support the transition to teams? (Lee, 1990, p. 32)

Once the decision to use teams has been made, Hopkins (1994) suggests that they "need not suffer the fate of their predecessors. The recipe for team reform is as simple as discipline. Eight guidelines can help..." (p. 37)

Eight Edicts for Effective Teams

Have a goal. Develop a clearly stated purpose, and put it in writing. Define success. How will the team know that it has accomplished its mission? Members must define, in advance, what constitutes victory. Set a lifespan. Establish a lifespan for the team...as a rule of thumb, reconsider any lifespan of more than six months. Know who's doing what. Assign specific roles to each team member and determine the relationships among the people in the group. Develop a team agenda. How is the team going to accomplish its mission? If team members can't state a plan of action in five or six simple sentences, than they might want to go back to the first guideline...Make meetings meaningful. Keep meetings short-no more than 90 minutes long...At each meeting have an agenda with three or four items that will be covered...You can photocopy the minutes (in their handwriting form) to give to team members as they leave...Remember that meetings provide time for team members to report on their progress and problems; they are not the most effective vehicle for solving problems. (Hopkins, 1994, p. 36)

Education Applications of the Team Concept

Introduction

Cavanaugh and Yoder (1984) believe that while the concepts and practices of team management have been developed and implemented primarily in business and industrial settings, educational institutions have, in recent years,
begun to examine the merits of team management as it applies to educational settings. Maeroff (1993a) agrees and elaborates, “The team approach, which borrows techniques from business and industry, revolves around the premise that a small but knowledgeable and dedicated group...might be an effective wedge for dislodging the status quo in schools” (p. 44). He feels that a small but growing number of school systems are taking a fresh approach to school change, experimenting with using teams within a school as the main vehicle for change, instead of relying solely on innovative individuals or attempting to convert a whole faculty at once. He believes that established practices in schools are almost certain to be challenged once teams have been built and assigned with bringing change to a school.

Lindelow and Bentley (1989) caution that because team management has become somewhat of a fad, some school districts have rushed to implement it without fully understanding the concept and without the commitment, trust, and training to make it succeed. Some team management approaches "work very well" while "others are merely labels attached to existing hierarchical structures" (p. 137).

Lindelow and Bentley (1989) explain that no one model fits all school systems and that each district must find a model that best responds to its needs. Any district moving to team management must go through a period of examining and modifying the components of whatever model they choose before it can become a workable system. They suggest that the best source of ideas on team organization is descriptions of successful team management systems or reading about team models which have been proposed by a few writers. The core, they say, of the team management concept is the process of making decisions. This process determines the team’s potential for establishing a
consistent response to issues and for fostering an *esprit de corps* among the members.

Eastwood and Tallerico (1990) point out that theory and research related to effective schooling, school improvement, organizational development, and corporate excellence emphasize the importance of broadened participation and collaborative approaches to organizational leadership. Such approaches challenge traditional notions of ‘labor-management.’ Similarly, policy recommendations advanced by groups such as the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy underscore the need for fresh perspectives on the distribution of power and authority in schools, along with the concomitant expansion of teacher union concerns. These issues have contributed to changing norms and new expectations for shared decision-making and collegial planning in today’s schools.

In New York, for example, a major assumption underlying the statewide “School Improvement Program” model is that planning teams are a critical part of the educational improvement process. “These teams, comprising various combinations of teachers and administrators, are typically faced with the complex and time-consuming tasks of assessing needs, defining goals, evaluating alternatives, developing plans for innovations, and other similarly weighty responsibilities” (Eastwood & Tallerico, 1990, p. 3). Even so, according to Ellermeyer (1992), research has demonstrated that “teachers desire more collaboration with their professional colleagues, particularly as it relates to the improvement of classroom practices” (p. 164).

Lange (1993) sees school restructuring and reform as the number one issue in education today. Harrison and Killion (1990) believe that “site-based management, participatory decision making, and empowerment of teachers”
(p. 22) are some of the school reforms being initiated to improve our nation's schools. Along with this, team management has proved to be an effective management method. Outlining a program in Newark, Ohio school system, Harrison and Killion (1990) claim that team management techniques can give everybody concerned about education a say in identifying and solving problems. "Broad-based participation, reports Ohio School Boards Association, yields improved communication between factions, a higher degree of trust, and higher quality decisions" (Lindelow and Bentley, 1989, p. 136).

Clearly, the bureaucratic model of school organization, which assumes that instructional policies are developed at the top of the state and district hierarchies, translated into rules and regimen by administrators, and implemented by teachers must be replaced by a more professional model. Rallis (1988) thinks that in order for that change to occur, "two conditions must exist simultaneously: policy makers and administrators must provide the structures and the resources to enable teacher leadership to grow, and teachers must become more professional" (p. 646). The word "resources" here means money, but it could also mean things like innovative structures to legitimize and support instructional leadership by teachers such as teams. "The team has formalized and legitimized the collegial support system" (Rallis, 1988, p. 646.)

Clark and Sgan (1986) believe that the traditional model, with the central office supervisor and the principal as the major providers of support, has not worked for education. Therefore, they feel there is a need to "develop a new structure for the delivery of support services" (p. 72). They think that one way teachers can get the support they need is through school-based teacher support teams.
In 1986, the NEA--now a teacher union--joined with the National Association of School Principals to create Ventures in Good Schooling, a document that urges the establishment of collaborative schools in which the professional autonomy of teachers and the managerial authority of principals are harnessed together. That publication recommends...that principals involve teachers in decision making, that teachers play an active role in setting the school budget and in evaluating the performance of their principals; that principals seek teachers’ advice on staffing needs and staffing decisions; and that principals and teachers jointly develop schoolwide plans for instructional improvement and for recognizing student achievement. (Barth, 1988, p. 642)

The use of SBSDM, coupled with team management is bringing this vision into reality. As Cavanaugh and Yoder (1984) note, “team management as it applies to educational institutions is not a passing fad. Rather, it is a viable, long-range alternative to autocratic models of organization” (p. 93).

Pellicer and Stevens (1984) put forth a good working definition of team management. It is “the sharing of decision-making and the dividing of responsibilities to more effectively utilize human resources...” (p. 53). According to them, those who utilize a team management process must hold a special set of beliefs about people:

1) A person performs best and is most satisfied when he or she is meaningfully involved in decision-making and has the opportunity to grow professionally.
2) Each staff member is crucial to the operation of an organization and will contribute if given a real opportunity.
3) An organization can be effective without relying solely on a formal hierarchical arrangement of people. Each person regardless of status or formal position in an organization should be treated equally, fairly and with respect.
4) Each person who must carry out the decisions, rules, and regulations of an organization should be involved in determining policies and making major decisions.
5) Each person will perform his or her job responsibility better if he or she has an opportunity to interact and share ideas, information and concerns on a regular basis with those affecting and affected by those responsibilities. (Pellicer & Stevens, 1984, p. 53)
Rogers (1994) discusses how the concept of leadership is changing with the use of teams. Traditionally, leadership has been ascribed to the individual, and teamwork has been seen as “a unified group of people working harmoniously to achieve leader-imposed goals” (p. 150). Clearly, this is changing. Because of the forces converging on American society, “globalization of the economy, the diversity of our work force, the constant and rapid cultural changes brought on by new technologies, to name a few” (p. 150), long-held beliefs about leadership in organizations are being called into question.

Rogers (1994) states that “leadership is a collective rather than individual action, occurring among and through a group of people who think and act together” (p. 150). Rogers (1994) examines the idea of leadership by teams versus the traditional view of leadership and contends that a good team is “part and parcel” of good leadership.

Glatthorn and Newberg (1984) feel that “a team approach to instructional leadership is a more realistic method for improving schools” (p. 60) because it allows the principal to carry out other functions that have high priorities.

Barth (1988) sees the school as a “community of leaders, a place whose very mission is to ensure that students, parents, teachers, and principals all become school leaders in some ways and at some times” (p. 640). As in any system, leaders emerge. With the team system, however, the leaders are not always the same people.

**The Effectiveness of Teams in Education**

According to a review of 11 publications on school improvement teams, ownership and commitment to improvement are natural consequences of shared planning and decision making. The review also concluded that active employee participation can enhance schools (School improvement teams,
Richardson (1993) reports on Kramer Middle School in Willimantic, Connecticut, where a group of educators made a commitment to create programs that will help students develop more positive self-images and help establish a learning environment that includes “a safe and orderly learning place, a clear educational mission, instructional leadership, a strong home-school partnership, (and) high expectations and equal opportunities to learn” (p. 26).

Part of this restructuring entailed the establishment of teams. These teams help teachers better prepare students to reach their full potential personally and academically. As a result of implementing a team-based program, where each team was seen as an essential component in developing the whole child:

* Connecticut Mastery Test results have increased
* Discipline referrals and suspensions have decreased by 30%
* Absences have decreased by 11%
* Vandalism of school property decreased to one case per year
* The atmosphere is friendlier, more family-like and people work in groups to solve problems and better meet student needs
* Students trouble shoot team and school problems with the principal in a student-advisory group
* Teacher-student bonding is more solid
* Students are more vocal about teacher efforts. (Richardson, 1993, p. 26)

L. E. Scarr (1988), superintendent of Lake Washington School District in Kirkland, WA, describes the rationale of using teams to implement change in his school district, “We wanted a master plan that would be responsive to the changing needs and situations. Therefore, we emphasized relationships and interactions rather than rigid, hierarchical structures of rules...We also developed operating principles that are people-oriented, providing guidelines for communication in areas such as cooperation, support, loyalty, disagreement,
and initiative" (p. 13). He explains that these dramatic changes resulted because of the district-wide master plan that affected every employee, every position, and every function of the school district.

According to James Akenhead, superintendent of the Marlinton Local School District, Alliance, Ohio (1991), “creating a sense of teamwork will increase the effectiveness of your staff and improve your chances of success as a school executive” (p. 28). In Cavanaugh and Yoder’s (1984) research, they found that, when it came to using teams in the school setting, “the bottom line is increased productivity coupled with an increased sense of accomplishment and self-esteem” (p. 96.) The team management system which they studied, “has resulted in a flexible and adaptive structure, wherein individual talents and expertise are maximized” (p. 98).

Judy Roger’s (1994) discusses the role of the team in promoting organizational learning. ”A team-centered approach enhanced the capacity of organizations to master new knowledge and use it effectively to improve innovation, problem-solving, and productivity” (p. 151). Rogers (1994) suggests that moving leadership from an individual to collective practice, “will provide better response to the complexity and diversity of campus issues” (p. 153).

Hopkins (1994) states that “the team concept represents an excellent system for sharing vital information and reaching conclusions that are both consensus-driven and beneficial to everyone connected with the organization” (p. 37).

According to Pellicer and Stevens (1988) school business officials who try to manage their division responsibilities by themselves may not survive. “In this age of increasing size coupled with complexity... the team management concept offers an effective approach to full use of human resources” (p. 53). Business officials who have implemented team management have experienced five
major benefits:

* **Improved Quality of Decisions.** ...Group decisions where individuals bring diversity of experience, technical knowledge and points of reference are almost always superior to decisions made by one person who has a single perspective and expertise limited to one field.

* **Increased Efficiency.**

* **Greater Accountability.** Because team members are continually interacting, and job responsibilities are clearly defined, crucial job responsibilities are not likely to fall through the cracks. Each team member is aware of his or her job and the responsibilities of the other team members as well. When tasks are not completed there can be little “buck passing” because job functions have been pre-established and communicated to all team members.

* **Job satisfaction.** Each team member...is a member of the decision-making team. Because he or she is involved in deciding policy and direction, self-worth is increased, followed by improved job satisfaction and positive staff morale.

* **Reduced crisis management.** When the business manager meets on a regular basis with the staff...there is much less chance that major unforeseen problems will manifest themselves... When a crisis does occur...communication channels have been firmly established and will remain open and function smoothly through resolution of the situation. (Pellicer & Stevens, 1988, p. 53)

Glatthorn and Newberg (1984) state that the reason they believe in a team approach to instructional leadership is “that it emphasizes the critical leadership functions: giving feedback about instruction; providing incentives for implementing programs; demonstrating a visible commitment to the program; and monitoring the progress of all students through the curriculum” (p. 62). Barth (1988) says, “I would like to suggest that all teachers can lead...every teacher is good at, or wants to and can become good at, some important part of the life and work of the school... their leadership is a major untapped resource for improving U.S. schools” (p. 640). Glatthorn and Newberg (1984) believe that an organization is best served by leaders who empower others. Instead of being centralized in the principal’s office, with a team approach, the critical functions of curricular and instructional leadership are assigned to those on the
staff most capable of performing them. They explain the idea of greater accountability by suggesting that when the talents of a team are mobilized and a low-key system of professional accountability is in place, all the critical functions are being carried out by someone, without the worry of simply assuming that those tasks are being done.

Tindill (1991) says that "secondary schools are characterized by some very profound, deeply rooted structures, and a great deal of historical baggage which combines with other things to yield inertia" (p. 3) but that it is possible to "provide recommendations which would be helpful to decision makers and educational practitioners in developing plans to help secondary schools grow and improve..." (p. 3).

In a study on high school leaders and their schools Pellicer, et al. (1990) found, in every school they visited, that the "principal and the school had recently faced extremely difficult problems and/or conditions. These included racial tensions, suicides, drug abuse, large budget cuts and/or declining enrollments, imposed graduation requirements and violence or vandalism" (p. 22). In almost every case, the schools were able to address these problems while raising test scores, making improvements in curriculum and instruction, increasing parental involvement, and engaging in developmental projects. It was the administrative team, under the leadership of the principal, that was the arena for planning, decision-making and problem-solving. Pellicer (1990) states, "the case studies prepared for this report support the conclusion that effective principals develop strong, collaborative teams..." (p. 22).

Bradshaw, et al. (1991), in their study of at-risk students in a rural area concluded,

The results of our Arkansas experience reinforce previous research that Teacher-Assistance Teams can support and enhance the collaboration
and empowerment of teachers, address student and school-wide problems, provide preventative intervention for “at risk” students, and identify appropriate referrals to special education. (p. 7)

John T. Lange, assistant superintendent for Phoenix Union High School (1993), in a 15 month study of six schools and principals changing from centralized to a decentralized school governance, observed the following benefits:

1. **Redefinition of the principal’s role** : ...the role of the principal under site-based management...having changed to a more facilitative capacity and to a more participatory style.

2. **Autonomy and its effect on improving school culture and contributing to success in school reform** : ...the main theme here...was that as autonomy was achieved, the perception grew that better decisions were made than would have been made had the centralized system of school management prevailed.

3. **Site-based shared decision making fostered a commitment to decision** : Commitment, or confidence, is created as staff members become part of the solution and feel responsible for their decisions.

4. **A more cohesive staff was evident under site-based shared decision making** : ...ability of the sites to make their own decisions...brought about a sense of teamwork and staff cohesiveness.

5. **Trust among staff members and principals increased under site-based shared decision making** : ...as staff members became more comfortable in their decision-making role and provided meaningful input, the principal developed more trust in faculty judgment.

6. **The principal and the staff developed new personal skills** : Principals learned that site-based shared decision making required a change from being autocratic managers to participatory leaders. (Lange, 1993, p. 99-100)

Maeroff (1993a) believes that, “at its best, team building can be the first step in fostering a more professional atmosphere in the school. It can contribute to school change in these ways:

* Bolstering a team spirit in the school community
* Providing teachers with process skills that enable them to interact in more constructive and productive ways
* Fostering a more intellectual atmosphere in the workplace
* Causing teachers to see themselves as sources of knowledge for their
peers and as researchers capable of generating new knowledge.
* Forging new relationships with business, foundations, and institutions of higher education that are drawn into team building
* Strengthening links between professional development and the needs of the students. (Maeroff, 1993a, p. 47)

In talking about professionalism and communication, Rallis (1988) notes that "the formal structure of the team provides a built-in way for teachers to make decisions on teaching. Now we consult with one another, as doctors and lawyers do" (p. 647).

In another article, Maeroff (1993b) explains that "the ties between teachers and principals are strengthened by the team building process" (p. 26). He says that teachers are more inclined to give the principal a full hearing and, sometimes, the benefit of the doubt and that another potential benefit of team building is "the fresh willingness of faculty members on the team to accept part of the burden of leadership" (p. 27).

The benefits of using teams in the school are numerous and varied. Ellermeyer (1992) believes that "a team approach may serve to improve the quality of evaluation and, ultimately, the quality of classroom instruction" (p. 161). Akenhead's (1985) observations are that administrative teams have "reduced community and staff conflicts, raised job satisfaction for team members, increased efficiency and cut confusion, improved board/administration relationships, and helped pass school levies" (p. 22). He explains that under the team approach, he has seen the following changes: "administrative meetings are more frank and open; the team no longer needs to refer to minutes of previous meeting to find out who is responsible for what; team members are willing to air and clarify uncomfortable topics..." (p. 22).

Bentley and Lindelow (1989) believe that participative decision-making, besides increasing job satisfaction for most employees, also gives them a sense
of ‘ownership’ in the organization. They believe that decisions made by a group “in most cases are likely to be better than decisions made by one person” (p. 142). They emphasize that “collaborative decision-making also increases the coordination of tasks and enhances the general quality of communications in an organization” (p. 144). The results are better, more resourceful educational programs.

Iraci and Norton (1989) suggest that even principals can form teams among themselves to improve their performance. “The impact of team principaling is greater than the sum of its parts because each administrator has not only been permitted but encouraged and required to develop particular skills to an exceptional level of performance” (p. 24). Team principaling also fosters a more refined focus on specific areas, stronger decisions, and a sense of ownership in the team concept.

Robert Kessler, Superintendent for Reed Union School District, Tiburon, CA (1992) shares his experience with the team concept, “After having an adversarial environment for many years, the district now has open communication and an atmosphere of developing trust” (p. 38). James E. Mitchell (1990), superintendent of School District 12, Adams County, CA, says “we’re convinced this approach can lead to the restructuring of education that is vital to reform” (p. 43).

As Harmon (1983) maintains, certainly, the most exciting part of working as a team is the constant exchange of ideas. Team members share their problems and, in sharing, allow their colleagues new insights into problems that face teachers in different areas. Perhaps even more significant are the results of Rideout and Richardson's (1989) work which suggest that the benefits of team building are “renewed trust, understanding, and appreciation for differences
among staff" (p. 532).

**Development of Successful Teams in Education**

**Overview of successful teams.** This section discusses the components that go into the make up of successful teams in an educational setting.

Eastwood & Tallerico's (1990) study focused on identifying and elaborating on "those factors found to help or hinder the development and effectiveness of planning teams" (p. 3).

Eleven major factors were found to contribute to team member satisfaction and to the successful development and functioning of school improvement planning teams.

In descending order of importance, those factors were:

1. **Skill Development**: in service training to develop skills in shared decision making, group processes, and the effective schools research,
2. **Adequate Time to Conduct Team Business**: time to participate fully in team planning/decision-making without feeling rushed, including time to meet deadlines,
3. **Strong Administrative Support**: facilitators facilitate team functioning rather than take a laissez-faire approach,
4. **Establishing Purpose**: early establishment of the reasons for taking the new team approach,
5. **Team Formation**: determining when teams should be constituted,
6. **Communication**: the vehicle for keeping all interested parties informed of what is going on,
7. **Member Selection**: accomplished in some democratic fashion,
8. **Sharing the Plan**: making sure that all interested parties know and understand what will be expected,
9. **Team Tasks**: defining the responsibilities and jobs that are required of team members,
10. **Team Procedures**: determining how the team will conduct business,
11. **Team Size**: determining how many members will constitute the representative team. (Eastwood & Tallerico, 1990, p. 5)

This research also suggests that, before forging ahead with improvement efforts, a cooperative spirit must be generated. Eastwood and Tallerico (1990) concluded that only in an environment that is "undergirded by staff commitment and a clear understanding of the team's charge to improve the school" (p. 11), are long-term success and institutionalization of improvements possible.
Pellicer et al. (1990), in their research on high school leaders, examined several educational models in eight secondary schools. Their goal was to provide a guide for principals and to establish a basis for further research. What they found was that the evidence strongly suggests that four factors in team success are significant in understanding of the administrative team in schools:

1. The most basic factor in team success is the degree of autonomy accorded the school by the district.
2. Position power of the principal within the school is a significant factor in team operation.
3. The school-community environment with its values, expectations, and problems create a climate for the school apart from other influences.
4. The quality of staff members, characterized by their competence, diversity, and stability is a factor in school productivity. (Pellicer et al, 1990, p. 22)

According to these researchers, “in every productive school,...the team, under the principal, was the final body to which other groups reported. Plans, problem solutions, and decisions were made final in team meetings” (p. 26). They found that two factors which affected team operation, in addition to school size, were the degree of formal status accorded the team, and the extent of delegation of authority. “In all cases, team members, particularly assistant principals, were delegated specific areas of responsibility with specified authority for taking action” (p. 19).

Bentley and Lindelow (1989) found that each team is unique in its operation and organization yet all have certain features in common. The commonalities include:

- a superintendent dedicated to the concept, the division of the team into working subgroups, the lack of a written board-administrator agreement, the separation of principal welfare issues from other district decision-making issues, a decision-making process based primarily on consensus, an organizational structure open to input from all members, and an atmosphere of professionalism and trust that permeates the team. (Bentley & Lindelow, 1989, p. 145)
According to these authors, “group oriented leadership brings out more than commonalities among team members, it also surfaces the differences, the unique perspectives of group members, and capitalizes on them to enrich group learning and functioning” (pp. 151-2).

Cavanaugh and Yoder (1984) found that the successful development and implementation of a team management model is dependent upon several key components:

* A commitment to change must be accompanied by the board and superintendent.
* The entire organization must be included in the model— not simply administrative personnel.
* There must be team participation in problem-solving and goal setting, with all team members involved in working toward common goals and objectives.
* Members of the organization must commit themselves to work to establish collaborative relationships and trust among team members.
* A system of communication is needed to provide a regular flow of information among team members. Critical also to the communication process is a continuous evaluation process.
* Compensation must reflect the achievement of clearly defined and measurable goals and objectives. (Cavanaugh & Yoder, 1984, p.93-94)

Cavanaugh and Yoder (1984) feel that the importance of extensive and thorough inservice cannot be overemphasized. “It is imperative that all members of the organization not only understand the concept and ideas of any new program, but also develop the necessary skills to implement a new system” (p. 96). They believe that in-service must focus on group processes in the areas of problem-solving/communication, goal-setting/decision-making, and values clarification. They maintain that through such activities they have been able to break down barriers which, consciously and/ or subconsciously, inhibit teaming. Additionally, “the interaction has led to a building of trust and understanding between team members. This, in turn, has facilitated ownership of goals and
objectives...and resulted in a commitment to complete, or assist in completing, those goals and objectives" (p. 96).

The following are key components of the system:

* Objectives and goals are established annually for the district as well as for individual buildings and positions...
* Development of goals is based on input obtained from an annual survey of school district staff, parents, students, and community members.
* Individuals and teams are responsible for implementing and accomplishing formally established goals and objectives.
* Administrators are evaluated and compensated on the basis of job performance under a formalized system of review. (Cavanaugh & Yoder, 1984, p. 93-94)

**District involvement.** Maeroff (1993a) believes it is unreasonable to expect schools to make major changes in an atmosphere in which the central administration does not alter their expectations and yield some control. He feels that one of the greatest contributions that a central administration can make to team-building efforts comes from its "commitment to continuity at a school" (p. 45). Conversely, the 'death knell' for teams in some schools has come in the form of repeated teacher transfers. This strips the teams of key members, weakening the foundation that has been put in place for building a changed structure in the school. According to School Improvement Teams (1990) the benefits of school improvement teams can only be experienced if administrators are "willing to unleash the power of the professional staff" (p. 2).

Robert Kessler (1992), superintendent of Reed Union School District, Tiburon, CA describes the process of change his district went through in getting started. Included in his description are "team agreements" as well as a discussion of some of the attitudes that allowed the change process to be successful.

Several years ago, as part of a countywide professional development
project, the Reed Board of Trustees made an initial commitment to developing teacher involvement in decision-making. Once the Management Team was in place, we hired a trainer to help us analyze our personal styles and develop effective group dynamics. Out of the training process came our Team Agreements: to commit to operate by consensus, respect one another’s styles, speak honestly, and advocate the team’s decisions to our constituencies. Taking the time to work out these agreements was critical for success... (Kessler, 1992, p. 36-37)

He explains that now everyone in the district feels responsible for coming up with a product, instead of exhibiting the attitude that “it’s not my problem--it’s yours!” (p. 37). At times, there were serious questions about how they could reach consensus, but “everyone persevered, and eventually we drafted a plan...”(p. 37).

He describes one of the most persistent problems as finding the time necessary for the frequent Management Team meetings. However, his opinion is that dealing with those challenges is unconditionally preferable to the system he had been used to. “I believe that making a mutual commitment to work by consensus and to base decisions on the best interest of kids is a model that can work anywhere” (p. 38). He writes the following suggestions for School Districts:

Involveschool board members from the beginning.

Take time to build trust. Group training sessions to develop team agreements are an invaluable way to begin shared decision making.

Use neutral facilitators. Facilitators keep the consensus process intact, remind the group when it is straying from its agreements, and focus the group on its tasks.

Be honest. There is no room for unspoken agendas or behind - the - scene manipulations. Individual members priorities or concerns need to be stated and time taken to deal with them as they arise.

Be patient. Reaching a group consensus takes more time and patience than...in a traditional, hierarchical system but recommendations will be accepted with a remarkable spirit of trust. (Kessler, 1992, p. 38)

James Mitchell (1990), superintendent of School District 12 in Adams County, CA outlines a plan of action for successful school change. The first step
he describes is to “Commit your board to action” (p. 42). He believes before you can initiate any actions or invest any resources, you must be committed enough to the decision to invite employees to participate in making decisions. He feels that involving administrators early will prevent efforts at site based management from faltering. Often, the resistance of administrators who are fearful of losing authority and control, has kept change from occurring. “In our school system, we made the mistake of introducing what we called decentralization without adequately explaining our vision and goals. We wanted shared decision making, but we tried to impose it by mandate” (p. 42). He suggests that a better approach would have been to involve more administrators in the planning stages, “allowing them to raise objections early on and giving them time to grow accustomed to what was to come” (p. 42).

Mitchell (1990) advises seeking outside expertise to help develop a site-based management plan. Because few school systems have experts on staff who can train others in consensus-building, group process skills, and shared decision making, he feels an outside consultant would be beneficial by providing this expertise, plus the knowledge of more progressive management concepts and added experience in working with the problems surrounding site-based management.

Other recommendations Mitchell (1990) makes are to visit other school systems who have already implemented site based shared decision making, and working closely with unions. He suggests that some people feel “the promise of shared decision making might appear to be only a lure to win teacher’s acceptance of an increased workload” (p. 42). His district avoided this by making serious efforts to educate employees about the vision and goals, and by involving union leaders.
Mitchell explains that because decisions are often slow and difficult, it is important to be aware of time commitments. This is especially true in the early stages, while employees are learning the skills of facilitating and reaching consensus. He warns that "unless you warn teachers of this difficult early stage and take steps to commit resources... to ease the heavier workload, resistance to site-based management will mount" (p. 42).

Another important strategy in being successful with this process is adopting the appropriate policies. Mitchell (1990) suggests that "the policies should provide guidance on how implementation of site-based management will take place, and the policies must send a clear message to everyone...that the board is committed to the program's success" (p. 42-43).

Mitchell (1990) recommends starting with a pilot program because of the fact that some staffs are more receptive to shared decision making than others. His district learned that "you shouldn't force people into a process that's time-consuming and demands they take on added responsibilities" (p. 43).

He suggests beginning with schools where administrators and staff members are interested in shared decision making. Mitchell (1990) feels that, with time, their success will reassure others and spark interest among teachers throughout the school system, particularly as long as principals allow staff members to participate when they are ready. He asserts that building trust can take time, "anywhere from two to seven years, so learn to be patient" (p. 43).

When Harrison & Killion (1990) discuss their district’s change program which began in 1985, with comprehensive training for school personnel in needs assessment, vision building, the implementation of plans, and evaluation, they stated that originally they viewed training as the remedy for most problems. In light of their mistakes, however, they began, in 1986, to
explore the components of organizational development they had bypassed and initiated efforts to correct those deficiencies. They found shared goals as one of the major distinguishing factors between “moving” and “stuck” schools. Their district’s “Vision and Goals” now reflect the importance of shared goals and require that all units and schools become aligned behind those goals. (p. 24)

Tindill’s (1991) research suggests that it is the support of the Management Committee which is crucial to the decision of whether or not research sits on a shelf gathering dust or becomes a dynamic for change. Their approach was to develop a strategic plan for the Management Committee to approve and to “gently work with the school board to develop proposed actions which would be politically sensitive” (p. 7). What became clear to them was that there is a very real phenomenological set of actions which resulted from research directed proposals when those proposals are visited upon a school district.

**Administrative involvement.** Maeroff believes that if the principal is not on the team, then a lot of energy the team might otherwise devote to its work will have to be spent trying to convince the principal of the merits of what the team wants to accomplish. The principal, in turn, needs assurance from the central administration that the expanded efforts in this direction will be approved of and, perhaps, even applauded. He elaborates on the importance of the principal’s role to the change process by saying,

> In almost all instances, the participation of the principal is pivotal... A principal who undergoes team building along with the teachers is more likely to end up sharing their convictions... Where a principal is insecure or caught up in defending the top down hierarchy, the team’s effectiveness is likely to be impaired. (Maeroff, 1993b, p.26)

According to Maeroff (1993b), the teams that turn out to be the best positioned to bring about change are frequently those at schools where the
principal was "receptive to change and to sharing authority" (p. 27). Such schools are good candidates for team-building. He believes that principals "sometimes should retreat into the background so that others can gain attention" (p. 27-28).

He shares some of the important lessons principals have learned by being team members:

* The role of the principal is not primarily to make unilateral decisions but to manage the process of decision making.
* The greatest obstacles to change at the beginning of the process are the people whom the process is trying to empower.
* Trust must exist between the principal and teachers.
* Mistakes are an acceptable part of the change process. (Maeroff, 1993b, p. 28)

Hallinger (1989) echoes Maeroff by suggesting that after the team has been organized and roles have been clarified, it is the principal who must "ensure that members have the necessary skills to perform their roles successfully" (p. 89). He believes that principals must delegate instructional leadership functions by clarifying role expectations and providing the necessary training and support to ensure that everyone has the skills necessary to perform the tasks.

Wilhelm (1984) believes that the process by which decision making within a building is shared need not be complicated, but that it is necessary to develop consistent processes involving as many appropriate people as possible. He also states that assurance of group development is necessary so that creative solutions to group problems can be made. He, too, sees the principal's role as pivotal and states, "the successful principal earns his or her success by ...commitment to involvement as a means of solving problems in the complex situation of education" (p.30).

Rallis (1988) points out that in the schools where teams are working
effectively, the principals have provided the essential resource of time. Team members report that having regularly scheduled periods of time set aside to discuss problems that are important to them, and to collaborate on solutions, is valuable to them. They also report that the training they received empowered them.

Rallis (1988) found that in the schools where teams are working effectively, “administrative support is visible and strong” (p. 647). The principals of these schools head their teams, schedule time for team activities, gather required information, and facilitate the completion of paperwork. “But they do not run or control team meetings, because they view the teacher members as the experts in instruction” (p. 647). They also report that, in these schools, the teacher participants are dedicated to their own and their colleague’s professional growth and are willing to listen to one another. They are also willing to contribute extra time and energy when needed.

In the schools where the teams were not working effectively, there was an “absence of administrative support and involvement seems to have negated any importance or impact the team might otherwise have had” (Rallis, 1988, p. 647). In these schools, colleagues seldom brought their problems or concerns to the teams. When team meetings were scheduled or additional training suggested, team members would regularly raise questions about working beyond contracted hours. In general, Rallis (1988) observed that these school settings did not “encourage collegiality or continued growth in professional knowledge and skills” (p. 647).

Fischetti and Maloy (1985) use a sports team analogy in discussing effective teams:

By design and talent the Celtics were a team of specialists, and like a team of specialists in any field, our performance depended on individual
excellence and how will we worked together. None of us had to strain to understand that we had to complement each other’s specialties, it was simply a fact, and we all tried to figure out ways to make our combination more effective. (p. 164.)

Fischetti & Maloy’s (1985) research begins to analyze what happens when public school teachers, building administrators and university faculty work as school improvement teams in urban secondary schools. They observed that teams develop social relationships, shared assumptions, and collaborative activities based on the attitudes of team members toward teamwork and school change. They determined that these attitudes predicted the effectiveness of the school improvement team.

Fischetti and Maloy (1985) suggest that characteristics of effective teams are easily observable. In effective teams, the principal has empowered the team, allowing their creative input and ownership of improvement activities. He or she also serves as an active team member. An effective team undertakes substantive school improvement tasks. Team members are able to see their roles in relation to the improvement process and positive communication among team members, as well as continual clarification of their roles and responsibilities, “facilitate the testing, revising, and implementing of new ideas” (p. 166).

Their research indicates that less effective teams often include an administrative leader who, initially, is supportive but who gradually becomes more and more reluctant to include team members in problem solving discussions. This limits the team’s ability to focus on realistic and attainable projects. In this environment, members have difficulty communicating shared concerns. Therefore, the team becomes less cohesive, less open to self-assessment, and less able to change their negative characteristics. In this
setting, team members express bitterness or condescension toward one another about the breaking down of team efforts, and "team projects remain unfocused and difficult to organize" (Fischetti and Maloy, 1985, p. 165). Fischetti and Maloy (1985) also state that rigid declarations of view and perspectives can take discussions "further and further away from the reality that is being considered" (p. 165).

Fischetti and Maloy (1985) report that teams of fewer than four members have "too small a power base and are ineffectual in generating substantive school improvement projects. Similarly, eight or more members have great difficulty in managing ideas" (p. 166). They found that teams without active administrative support lacked credibility, yet when the principal was directly involved in the work, teams organized themselves more rapidly and worked with greater diligence than teams with less administrative participation.

Kain (1993) states that the administrator has an opportunity to set up teams for success. Rather than merely letting teams "do their own thing", "administrators need to encourage a positive spiral by giving teams success early" (p. 29). Kain suggests sending the team to a workshop or on a visitation, bringing in someone from the outside to help them out, or providing release time for planning. "The point is that the payoff for setting up success is worth the effort" (p. 29).

Harmon (1983) asks, "Will teams work in any school" (p. 367)? Certainly not, he maintains, without an administration that fosters an open organizational climate as well as enthusiastic, positive, and professional staff. "But where administrators support the staff, encourage initiative, delegate responsibility, and allow people to learn from their errors, the team concept has no limits" (p. 367).
Team building. Rogers (1994) says team building is described as having both relational and interpretive aspects. The relational work includes "creating a team structure that fosters connectedness, interaction, and collaboration" (p.106). . .the interpretive work involves "achieving inclusiveness, examining assumptions about power, and learning to take the role of the other..." (pp. 152-153).

According to Maeroff (1993a) a district can "enable the team to thrive" (p. 44). This involves formal team-building that occurs in a kind of academy or workshop, during which "experiences are structured so a high degree of bonding occurs among members of the team" (p. 44). During this training, the team spends considerable time delving into the dynamics of group interaction and into the workings of the change process. This team-building process prepares team members to be able to teach what they've learned to colleagues by modeling it. Ideally, all of this is provided in a context that "imbues the team with fresh thoughts about pedagogy, content, school organization and student learning" (p. 44). Team members should be able to rely on each other for support and encouragement, "unlike the isolated sole practitioner who tries--usually without success--to enlighten the entire school" (p. 44).

Team building implies an experience that lasts at least several days and perhaps several weeks, a period during which members of the team are free of all other duties as they prepare for the work of functioning as a cohesive unit in the school. Maeroff (1993a) believes this type of training can be held almost anywhere as long as the recipient teams are insulated from other concerns. A corporate retreat center, a conference room in a motel, a college campus, a school building otherwise empty for vacation are all settings that will do, as long as the participants are treated with the dignity of a good management training
program.

The initial program Maeroff (1993a) describes is done by an outside facilitator and is designed to teach group process skills, an understanding of the dynamics of change, and to provide facts and information on cutting edge ideas. At these workshops, teams are encouraged to form a vision for school improvement and to create a plan for engaging colleagues at the school in this effort.

"The point of team-building is that the members of a team learn to work together, including being able to disagree without destroying the unity of the team" (Maeroff, 1993a, p. 47). If members strive toward consensus, they can approach the rest of the faculty with some ideas that they all agree are acceptable for promoting the process of change in their school. As they develop leadership skills, team members may "be able to rally others to the cause of change" (p. 47).

Maeroff (1993a) contends that building a team is very different from the usual practice of forming a committee or task force to carry out an assignment in the school. Rather, it involves school-wide change. "At its best, team building can be the first step in fostering a more professional atmosphere in a school" (p. 47).

According to Hallinger (1989), the first step in forging an effective team is to develop a common definition of instructional leadership. He suggests instructional leadership includes three dimensions: "defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting the school learning climate" (p. 86).

Defining the school mission involves leading staff members in the development of a mission and communicating this mission to the entire school
community. When put into practice, the school mission should evoke “a sense of shared purpose among staff members, students, and community” (Hallinger, 1989, p. 86). School goals should evolve from the mission, addressing the more specific areas of schoolwide focus. “The development of a few, annual school goals delineates responsibility, promotes accountability, and provides a unifying framework for instructional improvement” (Hallinger, 1989, p. 86).

Bradshaw, et al. (1991) describe the sequence of events followed by the Arkansas Department of Education of 55 local educational agencies to implement Teacher Assistance Teams throughout the state of Arkansas over a three year period. This project represents the blending of Federal, State, local and University consultants and resources. They, like Mitchell (1990), discovered that for successful implementation of teams to occur, participation of schools had to be voluntary, administrators and teachers should not be pressured to establish teams, and the principal is a critical factor in initiating and maintaining teams. They also found that “systematic initial and follow-up training is essential” (p. 7). Initial training, according to this study is most effective if conducted in late September of October.

Another critical factor in creating team success, according to these researchers, is on-going support and contact after training. “Immediately following the training, contact must be established with teams to support their efforts and advise them during the first critical weeks/months in developing their team” (p. 7).

Bradshaw, et al. (1991) concluded that in order to establish and maintain effective teams, a minimum three year plan of voluntary, local administrative and building principal commitment was required along with thorough, initial and follow-up training. Also needed is “a system for team support and
networking; and an evaluation system which provides useful data for measuring team effectiveness and efficiency, and provides information for future planning” (p. 7).

Porod (1993) found that, to be successful, teams need strong leadership from both the administration and a team leader. He believes that ensuring the team leaders have the skills necessary to make the teaming concept effective requires careful selection, appropriate training, regular meetings, motivation, communication, decision making, follow-up, and easy transition.

James Akenhead (1985), superintendent of the Marlington Local School District, Alliance, Ohio suggests that the first step in putting together a management team is to decide whether you want to do it yourself or hire an outside consultant. He feels that if you can afford it, it is easiest to hire professional training consultants. He asserts that the basic concepts and activities which follow can serve as the foundation for building a management team:

* Identify the problem and assign it to someone.
* Develop listening and helping skills.
* Deal appropriately with confrontation.
* Shift gears: Confront and help at the same time. (Artis & Carver, 1990, p. 22-23)

Akenhead (1991) uses a sports team analogy in describing how to form successful teams. “The true measure of a coach's success is the ability to put together a winning team. The same is true of every school executive...you must spark enthusiasm among staff members. You must oversee their training and assignment to the right positions on your team” (p. 24.) He suggests that you’ll spend long hours working with staff members to develop their sense of teamwork and to “train them to coordinate, solve problems and work independently yet cooperatively” (p. 24). In summary he recommends using the
following tips:

* Get everyone involved.
* Insist on teamwork.
* Develop a game plan.
* Announce your goals.
* Spend time in practice.
* Give people their due.
* Help out your new players.
* Correct your mistakes.
* Be willing to change tactics.
* Use talent wisely.
* Prepare for injuries.
* Give your team time to gel.
* Insist everyone play by the rules.
* Keep in touch with the owners.
* Remember everything won’t always be rosy. (Akenhead, 1991, p. 27-28)

Fischetti and Maloy (1985) discovered that when teams lack mutually examined and mutually understood ways of working together, team members become unable to articulate their goals with agreement and certainty. This hinders planning, weakens school-university ties, and short-circuits the energy of any particular change projects.

In terms of the process, teams initially focus on what they perceive as specific wrongs done by specific people. Fischetti and Maloy (1985) defined this attitude as "blaming." "Blaming attributes the cause of situations requiring change to particular individuals or groups who, in the view of the blamer are the problem. Dropouts, illiterates, or underachievers are labels frequently applied to students in educational systems who exhibit problems" (Fischetti and Maloy, 1985, p. 166).

Superintendents, principals, parents, school committees, or other teachers outside the team are often perceived as sources of organizational or administrative problems. In this way the change was directed at changing
people rather than changing the school. So, the first task for teams is to not blame people but, instead, “to discover how to think about what can be done to improve schools” (Fischetti and Maloy, 1985, p. 166).

A second major instructional focus is making the realities of collaboration more explicit. Teams invariably struggle while conceptualization, planning, and implementing school improvement ideas. In addition to refocusing teams away from blaming activities and making collaboration more explicit, a third instructional agenda has been to enlarge team projects and agendas to avoid “paralysis of imagination” (Fischetti and Maloy, 1985, p. 167).

Fischetti and Maloy (1985) found that preparation of a key results plan guides the team from their ideas to some specific results. Teams which were able to analyze problems together and then develop positive change plans, were the most successful teams.

There was a clear, recurring pattern of success or failure contingent on team member’s attitudes. The less effective teams had “multiple agendas, paralyzed thinking, blaming attitudes and individual coping skills” (Fischetti and Maloy, 1985, p.167). More effective teams had members who thought in enabling ways, “using multiple perspectives, innovative and creative ideas and open attitudes about individual and group change” (Fischetti and Maloy, 1985, p. 167).

Fischetti and Maloy (1985) also discovered that characteristics of effective teams “did not randomly or automatically happen” (p. 168). As team members discussed their attitudes and assumptions toward school change, particular characteristics of the team were formulated. Being aware of the characteristics produced by their own ideas toward change is critical if team members are to have the opportunity to change the scenarios they are creating. “When team
members remain unaware of the assumptions guiding their work together, the stumbling blocks created lead to ineffectiveness” (p. 168).

According to the researchers, “Teams rarely discover viable combinations of attitudes toward change, self-interests, realistic projects, and mutual benefits without beginning to critically examine their reasons for working together” (Fischetti and Maloy, 1985, p. 168).

According to Berger (1989), other important considerations in building an effective team are a shared vision of what constitutes excellent education and choosing the people on your management team. These are “among the most important decisions you will make” (p. 22).

Nagel (1991) feels that team building can be accomplished by learning “side by side.” She thinks using case method can assist a professional grouping, identifying needs, clarifying goals, gaining cohesion, exploring working norms, recognizing colleagues, creating interdependence and synergy. She asserts, “The sense of collegiality that comes from working on projects cooperatively is a well-known phenomenon. Many studies supporting cooperative learning for young students apply just as strongly to the needs of adults” (p. 42).

Pellicer & Stevens (1984) give seven steps for implementing a team management approach:

1) Select the Team.
2) Assess Needs.
3) Identify Specific Goals and Objectives for the Organization...State these in tangible, measurable terms so that the success can be verified.
4) Divide Responsibilities Among the Management Team:...Allocate a balance of job tasks.
5) Hold Regular, Formal Team Meetings. Establish a regular meeting time and date...
6) Regularly Assess Organizational Progress...Have the team monitor
itself relative to the goals established...Don’t wait until the end of the
year to judge the degree of success...
7) **Select Team Format Early.** Decide the operational procedures of the
team as soon as it is established. (Pellicer & Stevens, 1984, p. 54)

**Group Process.** Garascia (1986) discusses the steps a faculty can take to
keep communication open, guidelines regarding the use of a facilitator, and the
faith dimension of team-building. He asserts that “although there is no one
“super-model” for how groups (and by extension, staffs) develop and function,
there is consensus regarding the growth of groups and the issues encountered
as groups develop”(p. 40).

Garascia (1986) characterizes the development of groups with three words:
inclusion, control and openness. In the first stage, inclusion, the major
preoccupation of group members is identity. Members have a need to be
known and acknowledged for who they are and what they can do. This,
therefore, is the stage of gaining recognition and credibility.

The second stage is control. Here, the major preoccupation is dominance.
The entire group experiences a need for leadership and authority-taking. There
is a struggle to resolve how the members will participate in decision-making.
Will the up/down polarity become fixed, with a few people becoming the “power”
members? Or will the polarity be resolved more creatively, thus moving the
group to the third stage (Garascia, 1986)?

When a group moves into the third stage, openness, it has successfully
resolved the issues of the two previous stages. This stage is characterized by a
desire for the sharing of feelings, and by closeness and openness among
members. The major preoccupation of this stage is caring (Garascia, 1986).

Garascia(1986) also postulates that groups go through four distinct stages:
forming, storming, norming, performing. The forming stage is the beginning of
the group, where the participants experience a mixture of energy and hesitation to become a unified group. Soon, the group moves to the storming stage, where there is a jockeying for position and power struggles. If this stage is successfully dealt with, the entire group moves into the norming stage. Here, the group begins to set realistic expectations of how members are to communicate, trust and reconcile with each other. Garascia (1986) states, "the last stage is performing, where the group 'gets down to work' (however work is defined by the particular group)" (p. 40). He continues by explaining "A group 'clicks' as it moves beyond the obstacles of mistrust and protection of turf" (p. 40).

Garascia (1986) feels that the causes of staff tension are as follows:

- **Stage transition difficulty**: sometimes a faculty gets "stuck" in a transition from one stage to the next. If this occurs, an outside facilitator may be needed.
- **Turnover of faculty**.
- **Institutionalized up/down tension**, (p. 41)

Garascia's (1986) discussion of using an outside facilitator to assist the faculty in team development involves two approaches. The first views the facilitator as an ongoing part of the staff's operation. In this approach, a facilitator might come in every year to either help the staff "kick things off" or "wind things down." The second approach involves crisis management. It occurs when the staff as a whole agrees that there are enough crisis signals to warrant bringing in a facilitator to prevent the disintegration of the staff. The danger signs by the staff as a whole are:

* Jockeying for position
* Competitive behavior
* Turf battles/power struggles
* Drop in level of candor
* Overuse of grapevine
* Excessive meetings
* Formation of coalitions
* Drop in level of caring for vision of the school. (Garascia, 1986, p.41)

Garascia (1986) feels the following ideas represent some ways in which a school faculty can "ensure team building is an ongoing reality":

* Begin the year with an expectation setting session focusing on open communication about people's needs.
* Plan a retreat during the year...
* Be willing to take risks...
* Examine the group's styles... How can each be more effective at empowering his/her colleagues?
* Take responsibility for the situation. Do not engage in behavior that tears down, such as gossip, but in behavior that builds community by affirming and reconciling others.
* Structure regular times of prayer and reflection... model the meaning of a supportive community. (Garascia, 1986, p.41)

In Artis & Carver's (1990) case study of the Cedar Rapids team emphasis was placed on the formation of a group. They suggest five helpful actions/processes in "making one of many":

1) place persons in easy reach of one another;
2) begin with alikes or help them become alikes;
3) physically separate the (intended) group members from others in the organization;
4) give individuals in the group unique characteristics-e.g. names, logo, clothing; and
5) demonstrate that the group is interdependent with other groups. (p. 39)

Artis and Carver (1990) found that cohesiveness advanced by using activities that helped members identify and classify needs that the group could meet, and by actions that assist the group in meeting those needs, "allowing members to give of themselves for the group" (p. 39).

In their study Artis and Carver (1990) found that when team members were separated from their colleagues by being transported to a week long retreat on Mackinac Island, clearly, the financial support their foundation gave added
value to the group's initiation, formation and early cohesiveness. The structures and processes associated with physical separation of the team from other district members "exemplifies positive factors which are helpful to forming groups to accomplish organizational tasks" (p. 39).

At the end of the year, the Cedar Rapids group manifested four conditions associated with collaboration:

1) an achievable goal was agreed to by all;
2) a sufficient level of trust was developed among team members;
3) a sufficient openness was present to allow for interaction about goals, strengths, needs, beliefs, and values; and
4) different competencies of individuals were utilized. (Artis & Carver, 1990, p. 39)

Akenhead (1985) explains that team members go through the following stages as they learn and grow as a group: 1. Unconsciously unskilled. 2. Consciously unskilled. 3. Consciously skilled. 4. Unconsciously skilled (p. 23). He feels that once you and your team know the skills for understanding and handling problems, you can use them in solving problems.

Kain (1993) reviewed a study which examined 27 work groups ranging from "spectacularly successful" to "dismal failures." The study required that the groups researched meet three criteria. First, they had to be real groups, meaning they were in tact social systems with interdependence and boundaries. Second, they had to have one or more tasks to perform. Third, the groups had to operate within an organizational context or in a larger social system to qualify.

The first dimension of group effectiveness Kain (1993) discusses focuses on group output. Group output means "the degree to which the group's productive output (that is, its product, service, or decision) meets the standards of quantity, quality, and timeliness of the people who receive, review, or use that output" (p.
The second dimension "is the degree to which the process of carrying out the work enhances the capability of members to work together interdependently in the future" (p. 25). In other words, does the ability of the group to work together increase or decrease over time? It is postulated by Kain that "an effective team is one that wants to stay together for another year" (p. 25).

The third dimension of group effectiveness "is the degree to which the group experience contributes to the growth and personal well-being of team members." (Kain, 1993, p. 25). Regardless of what the task is, it is important to examine the impact of the group on individual members. According to Kain, if a group is highly effective in its task, but blocks the individual development of its members, it is not effective. Based on this, Kain asserts that the experience of being on a team ought to enhance teachers' morale and contribute to creating what is called a moving school, one which adapts readily to change.

Kain explains a number of assumptions about groups:

1. Influences on group effectiveness are diverse and multiple
2. Groups can perform in many different ways and achieve the same degree of success (or failure)
3. Groups develop their own versions of reality and act accordingly (Kain, 1993, p. 26)

Because of these variables it is suggested that leaders should not manage group behavior in real time, but create "contexts that increase the likelihood (but cannot guarantee) that teams will prosper- taking care to leave ample room for groups to develop their own unique behavioral styles and performance" (p. 26).

Kain (1993) explains the conditions that enable groups to perform as "the process criteria of effectiveness: sufficient effort, adequate knowledge or skill, and appropriate task performance strategies" (p. 26). Effort can be enhanced by giving the group meaningful work, and by placing it in an organizational context
that rewards groups (rather than merely individuals). Offering group assistance in coordination problems and building group commitment also increases the group's ability to perform. Insuring adequate knowledge or skill in a group involves three supports: a group staffed with the right expertise and communication skills, educational support made available as the group uncovers its weaknesses, and help in learning to "weight" member's input. Appropriate group performance strategies result from clear group norms, access to information in the larger organization and help fostering creative strategy development. Based on this research, Kain (1993) suggests that teachers and administrators to do more than merely appoint teams, "we must begin to enable ... teams to work effectively" (p. 26).

Kain (1993) feels that "when deadlines were absent, fuzzy or constantly changing, groups invariably encountered problems" (p. 28), therefore, teaching teams need to work with clear expectations regarding time. He suggests that regular meetings and established agendas can help alleviate these problems. More importantly, he feels, is the team's initiative in establishing a rhythm. "There are perfectly appropriate times to establish team expectations (the early part of a year or term) and other times when it is best not to disrupt the flow" (p. 28).

Kain (1993) describes five "trip wires," or common mistakes in setting up successful groups, and ways to avoid them:

**Trip Wire #1:** Call the performing unit a team but really manage members as individuals. If teams are going to work, then teamwork, rather than competition among members, must be rewarded.

**Trip Wire #2:** Fall off the authority balance beam. Kain suggests that the idea of balance advocates shared authority. That is, managers retain authority
over the direction and outer limits of teamwork, but assign team members full authority for the means to accomplish their work. He believes that teams ought to be changing their timetable, rescheduling students, establishing goals, bringing in outside resources, developing routines, and instituting rewards, all in the name of doing what is best for kids.

**Trip Wire #3: Assemble a large group of people, tell them in general terms what needs to be accomplished, and let them work out the details:** Kain found that groups with healthy structures develop healthy interpersonal processes; those without the structure have process problems. The structure arises from the three elements identified in the first part of the review: a well designed team task, a well composed group, and a clear, explicit specification of the team’s authority and accountability.

**Trip Wire #4: Specify challenging team objectives but skimp on organizational supports.** Four areas were identified that need support: a reward system that honors teams rather than individuals, an educational system that allows teams to initiate learning, an information system that gives teams access to the data they need, and the mundane material resources they need to operate. “Schools committed to teams will not wait for the January professional development day to assist a team floundering in October” (p. 29).

Organizational support means there is a willingness to bring in the necessary help or send the team out for training when the need arises.

**Trip Wire #5. Assume that members already have all the competence they need to work well in a team.** Kain agrees, especially for teams not accustomed to working together (like teachers), some coaching can help team members learn the skills they need to work well in a team. “We do need to learn skills that were generally not a part of our teacher training” (p. 29) Teaching teams, in
order to be successful, will have to accept coaching and seek out training.

**Communication, trust and commitment.** Iraci & Norton (1989) found that for a team to operate effectively, there must be interaction and communication from the members. They suggested that a “willingness to accept direction, commitment, and accountability” (p. 23) was also important, along with the ebb and flow of team leadership.

St. John (1991) states that, “Effective communication and performance are important for the administrative team as well as the faculty and staff” (p. 88). And, Reynolds (1990), suggests that a “lack of effective communication and collaborative efforts... strengthened feelings of isolation and intensified the stress which inevitably accompanies any change” (p. 5).

Reynolds (1990) found that one of the things contributing to the communication problem within the professional staff was “the lack of consensus as to a commonly held educational goal or school mission” (p. 6). She believes that, in an ideal situation, an entire staff would reach consensus concerning a schoolwide educational vision (mission) “and then work to make it a reality” (p. 7). It is her belief that the current emphasis in the business world and in schools on empowering the worker through shared decision-making makes the need to possess these skills urgent. She states, “many scholars... agree that in complex tasks, and tasks involving values, group decision-making and problem-solving is advantageous” (p. 17).

She found a more promising approach for use in schools in LOGS, “a repertoire and language of group skills, that facilitates collaborative group problem-solving and decision-making” (p. 19). One of the tenets of LOGS is “the rejection of fictitious consensus and the creative use of conflict” (p. 26). In order for this to occur, group members must feel secure enough to take risks” (p. 26).
Another requirement for such a group is the presence of clear and shared
goals. Reynolds (1990) shares that the "clarification of goals" is a necessary
first step in school improvement. According to him, "a shared goal or clear focus
is essential for an effective school" (p. 20).

Reynolds also suggests including climate setting activities in each meeting
of a group. The purpose is to create a condition for mutual support an
interdependency. The need is stressed for teachers to have more time with
their colleagues within the school day.

A suggestion made by Barth (1986) is that the site for faculty meetings be
rotated among the classrooms of different teachers. "During the first 20 minutes
of the meeting, the host teacher would share something of the activities that take
place in the classroom...and some of the special characteristic of the class" (p.
22).

Bentley & Lindelow (1989) believe that "successful team management
demands strong commitment to trust and shared decision-making among all
participants. Team design is also crucial, especially regarding communication
channels" (p.135). Their research describes successful team management in
Yakima, Washington; Rio Linda, California; and Attleboro, Massachusetts and
draws the conclusion that "the evidence from successful teams clearly shows
that what is practiced is more important than what is on paper" (p. 135). They
found that not only does the success of team management depend on "more
than a superintendent willing to share power" (p.135), it also depends largely
on such factors as trust and commitment. Team members had to trust the
superintendent to respect and implement the team's decision and team
members had to feel free to disagree with the superintendent without fear of
falling into disfavor. The superintendent, in turn, "must have trust and
confidence in the team to make intelligent decisions for the district" (p. 140) and all team members must have trust that all are working primarily for the good of the district. Furthermore, as highly visible administrators, principals must support the team decisions, “even those to which they make little actual contribution and over which they had little control” (p. 140). Roland S. Barth (1988), co-director of the Principal’s Center and Senior lecturer in education at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. suggests that “the fate of teacher leadership lies in the relationships between principals and their faculties” (p. 640).

Like school-based management, Bentley and Lindelow (1989) also discovered that team management requires an increased amount of time and effort in order to make it work. They found that successful team management depends on the commitment of all team members to the system and on their willingness to spend the extra time and effort needed for shared decision-making.

Bentley and Lindelow (1989) discovered that numerous, successful team management systems lacked a written contract. Instead, these districts depended on trust, faith, and informal understandings among team members. But, whether or not a formal agreement existed, they found that “all team members should clearly understand the team’s objectives, organization, and operating procedures” (p. 142) and that “a list of unambiguous arrangements has often been the life-blood of an otherwise doomed management strategy” (p. 142).

Another requirement for success is that each member of the team feels that his or her involvement is genuine and important. Respect for the individual is key and once an “informal” consensus is reached, all team members must
agree to abide by the decision. Bentley and Lindelow (1989) suggest that those who initiate a team approach to management would do well to remember this paradox:

Although the democratic method and team management would seem to go hand in hand, these writers observe that the practice of voting on issues generally produces mediocre work and low satisfaction with decisions. It “represents a political rather than problem-solving perspective on issues solution.” More effective are the “Consensus Mode” in which a team wrestles with an issue until every person accepts one solution and the “Centrist Mode,” which has the team providing suggestions and reactions to the one who makes the decisions. (p. 144)

According to Bentley and Lindelow (1989), the universally recognized way to maintain an environment conducive to team management is to establish an evaluation system. They found that evaluations “can promote effective communication and greater trust in both team members and the system itself” (p. 144). And, according to Porod (1993), “team leaders should evaluate goals established as a joint effort by team leaders, then review the goals of each individual team: team members need the opportunity to reflect on their progress during the school year” (p. 9).

Bentley and Lindelow (1989) believe evaluations also can show teachers that their voices have a significant impact in the decision-making process, and that regular evaluations of the team enhance the ability of members to communicate with each other. “This skill...is the team’s single most important ingredient: We believe that the best decisions are made about the schools only when there is communication among all groups so that decisions can be based on as much information and as wide a breadth of expertise as possible” (p. 144).

Porod (1993) suggests that a fair stipend, additional planning time, and paid professional workshops should be provided as incentives to encourage the
growth of the team leader and the entire teaming program. He found that, in
order to be successful, team leaders must establish a consistent meeting
time, set an agenda before every meeting, and follow that agenda to enable
team leaders to establish a sense of organization and efficiency. He suggests
that all team members should have the opportunity to place items on the
agenda prior to the meeting and that team leaders should attend meetings of
school administrators to “increase their opportunities for leadership,
participatory decision-making, and empowerment” (p. 8). Also important is that
all team members have the opportunity to express their opinions about a given
issue before any final decision is made. Porod (1993) suggests that for
consensus decision making to work effectively team members must:

* Agree to operate by consensus
* Respect each other’s styles
* Be honest
* Support the team’s decision. (Porod, 1993, p. 8)

Porod (1993) asserts that a majority rule vote is an alternative approach to
consensus decision-making, but that kind of decision-making sometimes
alienates team members.

Because communication is essential to the effective operation of any school,
team leaders must share essential information with team members as soon as
that information becomes available. Porod (1993) also suggests that leaders
should reward team members for a job well done.

Porod (1993) concludes by saying that “the transition of team leadership
should not be left to chance. This transitional period may provide the
opportunity for additional training, planning, and ongoing effective
communication skills before the new leader takes over” (p. 9).

Artis and Carver (1990) found that group members need to be aware of their
different strengths and be able to communicate openly with each other in order
to develop trust and set realistic goals based on collaboration. Because everyone can win, the win-lose perspective that often characterizes hierarchical role relationships can be minimized.

Artis and Carver (1990) discuss using a facilitator stating, “Facilitating requires encouraging behaviors which are instrumental in helping to define and achieve a group goal. It may well entail identifying and providing resources that further broaden the knowledge and decision choices of the group” (p. 40). They suggest that an outside consultant can help the organization generate valued information about its situation, help it to make free and informed choices and to build an internal commitment to the choices that are made. “Facilitation involves setting the atmosphere, posing questions, and exhibiting and demonstrating behaviors and attitudes - all toward the end of developing openness, trust, and respect among members” (p. 40).

A key to their team’s success was the commitment by every member to be at each monthly session. Following through with this commitment helped them learn to trust one another, to disagree with one another and to rely on the strengths they each brought to the effort. Their goals and the associated workload was shared by all members.

Artis and Carver (1990) conclude, “Collaborative teams require trust within the group and the expectation of district officials that what the team does will be of value” (p. 43). They define collaboration as “one or more persons working with other persons toward the attainment of a common or agreed-on goal” (p. 165). One of the goals of the Fellowship team in Cedar Rapids was to become a collaborative team. The goal was accomplished.

Based on the experience of others who have successfully used the team approach to decision-making, they suggest the following:
* Avoid the Democratic Approach. Most success is gained from team management if members...work as a group to reach consensus on decisions.
* Give Teams Time to Work.
* Inservice the Staff on Team Management. While a business official may understand...the tenets of team management, he or she cannot assume that the staff will "buy-in" to the approach. (Artis & Carver, 1990, p. 55)

In discussing the process of Site Based Shared Decision Making (SBSDM), Lange (1993), makes many of the same suggestions that have been made by others in setting up effective teams. He asserts that, "the single most threatening aspect of maintaining SBSDM is time" (p. 101). Extra time is required for a participatory style of management, which means additional responsibilities and roles for principals, teachers, support personnel, and parents. Therefore, he feels recognition should be provided of the additional responsibilities for school staff members.

Lange (1993) is committed to the idea that in order to work effectively, responsibilities such as group decision-making should be carried out in a less hurried manner. This is so that debate on the issues of reform and restructuring can take place. Additional time also allows decisions to be made without "mock participation." It also permits the scheduling of meeting times during hours that encourage parent/community attendance.

Lange (1993) offers research-based advice about the SBSDM process:

1. The primary motive for initiating SBSDM should be the desire to improve scholastic achievement and student success.
2. Total district acceptance and commitment should be promoted if shared decision making is to be successful.
3. Strong alliances should be forged with employee groups
4. Time should be taken in the planning phase.
5. Once the definition, policy, and regulations are agreed upon, formal adoption should occur.
6. Upon board approval, inservice training should begin immediately.
7. The district should maintain the original steering committee or appoint a new steering committee that is representative of the groups involved
in the process.
8. Expect some principals, building personnel, community members, and parents to be reluctant.
9. Care should be taken to avoid structural bias... (Bylaws should provide for a group that is representative of the school...meetings should be scheduled to allow for meaningful discussion in a non-hurried way, and to ensure that students, parents, and community members can attend. Finally, site council membership should be flexible to allow specialists of consultants to participate, on an as needed basis.)
10. Because shared decision-making is inefficient, decision making arenas should be established- (These arenas should delineate which decisions will be made at the site versus which will be made by the district...which decisions can be unilaterally made by the principal; and which decisions should be put before the shared decision-making teams...)
11. Those involved should be kept current on the latest research regarding both school administration/management and teaching and learning.
12. The principal's role will change. As a facilitator, the principal may be viewed more in a consultative role...to the staff member.
13. The resources of the control office should be utilized.
14. Frustration should be expected.
15. Individuals involved should expect to train the “boss”...in order to maintain progress, principals may have to train their superintendents regarding SBSDM and how it works.
16. Tension, suspicion, and conflict should be expected.
17. Provision should be made for site-based options and for waivers form restrictive rules and bargained agreements.
18. Principals should view teachers as allies, not as “union people.”
19. SBSDM should be expected to make a positive difference in students.
20. As roles change and time requirements become more demanding, matching salaries to new responsibilities must be evaluated. (Lange, 1993, p. 101-105)

Ferrard & Repa (1993) suggest that gathering information for planning and monitoring purposes can enhance shared decision making in schools. “Some have taken the approach that plans can be designed by collecting data on what is already occurring and not occurring. Others have focused on surveying teachers about practices they would prefer” (p. 71). Their research indicates that a combination of those approaches yields the best information.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to design a team model for the implementation of site based shared decision making at Pima Elementary School. The research question was: What is the design of a team model for the implementation of site-based shared decision making at Pima Elementary School?

Research Design

The descriptive research design has been used for this project. According to Merriam and Simpson (1989), the purpose of descriptive research is to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest. This included (1) a collection of facts that described the team process, (2) a justification of current conditions and practices as it relates to the use of teams in business and education, (3) an evaluation of the findings, and (4) a comparison of the team experience between business and education in order to assist in designing a team approach to SBSDM at Pima Elementary School.

Source of the Data

The respondents to the interview questions are people who have been heavily involved in using the team process in their respective careers.

Cynthia Mann has a Masters Degree in Communications and is currently a Human Resource Manager for Macey’s West Control Services. She is
responsible for researching, designing, and implementing a teams approach for Macey's West Control Services, the part of the company which is responsible for all billing in the Western Region.

Diane Panarello has a Masters Degree in Education. She is a Learning Resource Specialist and has been teaching for about 15 years. She has been working in a team environment for the past four and a half years. Diane was on the initial committee who hired teachers for placement on teams in a start up school that was designed to use teams as part of their operational procedures.

Mark Preston has a Masters Degree in Business Administration. He is a Brand Manager for the Consumer Products Group in the Dial Corporation. He is a Team Leader for the Renuzit brand.

Instrumentation

The interview questions asked the respondents to describe how their teams are organized, the type of training they received, their personal experiences working in teams, and how the team process is acknowledged, rewarded and compensated in their respective organizations. These questions were developed from the review of teams literature, to see if what the literature was suggesting regarding the development and implementation of teams was being used in practice.

Procedure

The first interview with Cynthia Mann was conducted on-site at Macey's West control Services. Cynthia explained how this division was set up around the concept of using teams and explained, in general, how that process took place, how it works, and how it continues. This initial interview is what helped to determine the researcher's commitment to explore the concept of teams in the form of a research project. The transcribed interview took place over the
telephone in January, 1995, and was tape recorded with the respondent's permission.

While working with Mark Preston on another project, it was discovered that he was heavily involved in the use of teams. The researcher requested an interview about the topic. The interview took place over the telephone in January, 1995, and was tape recorded with the respondent's permission.

The researcher sought out an opportunity to interview Diane Panarello, based on the knowledge of Diane's involvement with the team process at Mountainside Middle School, a Model School for the Scottsdale School District. The researcher worked with Diane at another school within the District, was aware of her varied experiences, and curious about her opinions of working in a team environment as opposed to a more traditional setting. The interview was conducted and transcribed at a school site in June, 1995.

The transcriptions of all interviews are located in Appendix A.

After reviewing the literature and conducting the interviews, the researcher designed a model for implementing teams in the Site Based Shared Decision Making process at Pima Elementary School which is located in Appendix B.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The interview questions are summarized below.

1. How are your teams organized and how do they solve
   problems and make decisions? All of the respondents reported
   their teams are organized around their particular work functions.

2. What kind of training did you receive before beginning the
   team process? How was it decided upon?
   All the organizations provided some sort of training before involving their
   employees in the team process. Macey's provided 120 hours of training
   up front, Dial's training is ongoing, and Mountainside's training occurred
   at the beginning of the year the team process was implemented and is
   supported by the administrative team.

3. How would you describe your experience of working in teams
   as opposed to working individually or in work groups?
   All the people interviewed had a positive experience of working in
   teams. Two of the respondents mentioned a lightened workload,
   particularly in terms of responsibility, and all mentioned greater
   productivity and better ideas.
4. If you have worked in more than one team, were there any significant differences? What were they and how would you account for them?

The most significant differences discussed were those of the team's personality. The individual's attitudes affected the total personality of the team and contributed to the team's effectiveness. At Dial and Macey's the commonalities experienced were more significant than the differences. These included to clearly define the objective, and to use an agreed upon problem solving procedure. Both of these organizations had meeting roles, agendas, and used visual aids to help keep the meeting on track.

5. How are teams acknowledged by compensation or rewards? (team accountability)

Each of the organizations represented had a reward system in place for recognition of team performance. All had an evaluation system that included team performance. Only the Macey's organization had a compensation program in place for team performance.

A complete transcription of the interviews are found in Appendix A.

The researcher interpreted the above data when developing a model for implementing teams in the Site Based Shared Decision Making process at Pima Elementary School.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary
Research literature and popular press were reviewed concerning the issue of how to effectively use teams in the workplace. Three expert interviews were also conducted with people who have been team members and facilitators in their organizations. These organizations are using teams effectively. It is clear that when given the proper training and support, using teams can significantly increase worker productivity and satisfaction and, increase customer satisfaction. It is also clear that, without such training and support, the use of teams can be a frustrating and non-productive process.

Conclusions
In addition to the formal interviews, several informal discussions took place with employees of various local companies about the use of teams in their workplace. These included employees of Motorola, Goodman's, Dial, Macey's, and a large aeronautical engineering firm. With the exception of Goodman's, whose CEO, according to the employee with whom I spoke, is reluctant to 'let go of control', even though teams are formally in place, all of the responses were overwhelmingly positive. In every case, the employees had been with their companies before and after the implementation of the teams process. Without any prompting on the researcher's part, all espoused benefits such as greater worker satisfaction, better quality decisions, higher customer satisfaction, more
fun and a feeling of having accomplished more individually within the company. It is also true that each of the organizations with whom the people the researcher spoke with are employed, are heavily invested and highly committed to the use of teams and have been using them for several years, with the exception of the Goodman’s employee, who was also the most skeptical and the least satisfied with the process.

The literature review underscored what the interviews revealed: that if the teams are properly run, and staffed by committed employees, the results far exceed the results of the traditionally run organization.

The research seems to suggest that the most effective teams have between eight and ten members, a shared purpose, common vision and goals, clear set of standards or operating procedures, and a degree of autonomy within the parameters of the organization’s mission statement and goals.

It seems that in all successful teams, members utilize each other’s strengths, build a sense of trust, and operate by consensus. Often, in the initial stages, teams go off-site to receive their training and to build relationships. This suggests a higher level of commitment on the part of the organization towards the team process. Often, facilitators or team leaders are used in the initial stages, or until the team learns to operate effectively on its own, and begins to generate its own leaders.

In general, once the team process is in place and is being supported by upper management or administration, the organization begins to consistently reap many benefits. These benefits include a sense of ownership by employees which in turn fosters a higher level of decision making capabilities, trust and strengthened relationships among co-workers and between organizations and their customers, higher productivity, and greater employee satisfaction.
It is also generally true that using teams for decision making and day to day operations does require more time and more skill than in more traditional settings. Because of this, it is important to provide both the time and the training of the skills.

The research also suggests that the team process evolves and is refined over time. Once the initial decision has been made to use teams, it can take several years before teams are operating at maximum efficiency throughout the organization. If there is not a consistent effort from the organization at creating and running successful teams, then, generally, the team concept won’t work. If, however, the organization has the support in place for properly run teams, then the overall quality and success of the organization can improve through the use of teams.

Recommendations

It is the researcher’s belief that using teams is the most effective way to carry out the work of the school, therefore, it is the recommendation of the researcher that a commitment to the use of teams as a way of implementing the site-based shared decision making process be made by Pima Elementary School. This commitment includes on going training in the teams process and an evaluation system that includes participation on a team as one of the criteria for an excellent appraisal. A model for implementing the use of teams at Pima Elementary School is included in Appendix B.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTIONS
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW WITH MACEY’S WEST CONTROL SERVICES TEAM MEMBER

CYNTHIA MANN: TEAM LEADER IN HUMAN RESOURCES FOR MACEYS WEST CONTROL SERVICES

1. HOW ARE YOUR TEAMS ORGANIZED AND HOW DO THEY SOLVE PROBLEMS AND MAKE DECISIONS?
   They are organized around work groups. By that I mean the we have three divisions that work at Macey’s: They are Sales Audit, Customer Service and Accounts Payable. They’re divided around work processes. For example, Accounts Payable pays bills for all the stores and they’re divided by vendors, so there may be a team that pays all the menswear, a team that pays ready-to-wear, and possibly, jewelry, and a team that pays Liz Claiborne, and a control team. So, they’re divided around processes that are alike. Same with Customer Service. There’s a fraud team, a quality assurance team, a big ticket team and by that I mean they pay all the mattress, furniture, - they don’t pay the bills, I’m sorry, they answer all the calls related to customer’s that have big ticket problems. So, again, they’re all assigned to a specific work team. So how they solve problems and make decisions: through round table discussions. They have team meetings and those team meetings-if there’s a problem or a decision to be made- they meet together and hash out the problem. For making decisions they all went though a training class to learn how to make decisions by consensus and so they are supposed to do it by consensus- I’m sure it’s by default, sometimes. There are times, the decision making level ,where a manager may make the decision or (we don’t call them managers, we call them leaders and developers) then there are times when there’ll be a joint decision between the leader-developer and the team members and then there are times that it will be the member call. So the member will have the sole responsibility of making the decision.

2. WHAT KIND OF TRAINING DID YOU RECEIVE BEFORE BEGINNING THE TEAM PROCESS? We were responsible for setting up training for the entire facility. so everyone in our entire facility went through three weeks of training: 60 hours of team process skills and 60 hours of technical skills, depending on the area that you worked in. So to answer that question- we all went through the same training that everyone else in the facility went through, which included communication skills training, telephone skills training and group process training.
HOW WAS IT DECIDED UPON?
We did some bench marking with other companies that had teams/team processes established. We met with General Electric, our sister organization in the East, Panola, and some consultants that we have on staff at Macey’s and through a process of elimination, we started developing a program that we felt would (work for) our facility and the support facility that we have. We had two successful examples to follow. The other organizations, GE and Panola, had teams in place and they were successful, and we had started an empowerment program in the stores. What was the biggest issue was that the same facility in LA wasn’t successful and the customer satisfaction wasn’t there; the teams/work groups weren’t in place. (Because of) the way it was going in Los Angeles, which is where we were based, they felt like this was a perfect opportunity to be able to reengineer the process. WHAT WASN’T WORKING IN LOS ANGELES? WAS IT THE SAME TYPE FACILITY? Yes, the exact same facility and it was the traditional way it was run. The work group processes weren’t in place. They were divided amongst groups and if you would have asked them, they would have said they were successful to an extent. But the process wasn’t engineered and the customer satisfaction wasn’t there. By that I mean, they didn’t have the same kinds of work teams. I’ll just take Accounts Payable. I said that each team member would be responsible for paying ready-to-wear or something like that (or menswear, or whatever), and, in Los Angeles, what they would do is: one person would take and input an invoice that we needed to pay a bill on in the computer, and then they would pass it off to somebody else who would do a second step and then they’d pass that second step to another person who’d do a third step. By this time, you’d have three or four people involved in this process and when a vendor, like a Ralph Lauren or somebody, wanted to get back in touch with us, they would call one of the people at the facility and say, “Can you help me with my bill?” and there was nobody who could tell them from start to finish how the bill was actually processed because there were so many different people that worked on their account. So, the way we reengineered the process here was that there was one person or one team that would go start to finish with that vendor and they knew everything about that person’s bill. So, therefore, that increased customer satisfaction because they at least had a contact person. They had someone who knew what they were talking about and could go through, start to finish, doing all the processes, instead of just a production person who really just sat there and typed in invoices all day. So, we engineered the processes to support our customer population. So, I guess, customer satisfaction would be the biggest reason.

3. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR EXPERIENCE OF
WORKING IN TEAMS AS OPPOSED TO WORKING INDIVIDUALLY OR IN WORK GROUPS? Most of my experience, I worked individually. The nice thing about working in teams is you have more people to spread the blame (on) as well as the success. You have more people to support the effort to get something done. Its not necessarily all on my shoulders to have to do it. For example, our training: In Human Resources, even though I developed the training and initiated the training where we are now ,we've trained other trainers to be able to participate and help train, which was a cumbersome process for one person, so that helps. Not only that, but all of our employee relations issues, anything Human Resources related, everybody knows how to do everything, so we all help each other out. Individually, I was doing it all and feeling overwhelmed. Sometimes its tough because I work well individually, too, and probably the biggest thing to get used to in working in teams is we used to have an office with four walls and a door that I could close and shut the world out. In working in teams, we have an open space where we're all out with everyone else. Now obviously, there are some Human Resource issues that are confidential that we have to deal with behind closed doors, but, for the most part, my office, my desk space, is in the working space with everybody else. So, that took an adjustment - to be out in the open with the noise and the activity and those kinds of things going on. Working individually, too, is sometimes more productive for me because sometimes I work really well at long periods of time on a project and I used to hate being interrupted- that was an adjustment for me- from working individually to working on teams. Overall, I would say I still appreciate working in teams more. The atmosphere is much more relaxed, much more casual. There are better results, I think because there's more than one person involved in either the production part of it or the end results. So there are alot of different reasons why I like it more than individually. And working in groups is really how I had my job set up in Los Angeles. Maybe not day-in and day-out, but there was a group of people that did something similar to what I did in San Francisco and in Texas, and we would all meet and try to make decisions and, really, (I think you're calling it 'work groups')it was like working in a team. So there wasn't alot of difference, I guess, to answer that question (work groups).In the work groups, we worked in different places and got together maybe monthly or quarterly. We were all training managers or coordinators and so we all got together, even though we didn't work in the same stores, we still got together to do the same things in separate locations, but we had different customers. We did the same things and had a consistent plan of action that we all conducted, but it was for a different audience. We would meet monthly to coordinate our efforts to make sure we were consistent in communication, education, and the processes that we took back to the stores.
4. IF YOU HAVE WORKED IN MORE THAN ONE TEAM, WERE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES? WHAT WERE THEY AND HOW WOULD YOU ACCOUNT FOR THEM? I think I probably answered that in the last question. The main difference being that we worked with a different audience but we had the same goals and same curriculum that we utilized in each of the stores. The results could be different based on the audience. The team personality also makes a significant difference—not only the team members/players—but what I’ve found, depending on who the coach is and who the senior executive is, that definitely, the personality and leadership of the coach makes a big difference on the personality of the team. For example, in Sales Audit in our area, the coach is very traditional and still as a hard time with the team process. She calls working with a team ‘playing nicey-nice’ and that, of course, comes across to the group. She really is very traditional and still directive-alot more directive than other coaches. Therefore, her team tends to have...are being taught one way, and yet the direction and true modeling is more traditional, so there’s a lot of confusion on that team. ARE THEY LESS PRODUCTIVE? There’s more dissonance and conflict, not necessarily less productive, that I know of or have results that I could share because of that variable. I couldn’t say that, but there is definitely more conflict. That’s what I can talk about-the conflict that goes on within the team because of styles of management that seen to be contradictory to the way that we’re taught. On the Customer Service team the coach’s personality and his direction tends to go half and half: traditional or more directive to participative—but it tends to be more changing as opposed to consistent. So, one day, depending on his mood or the decision that has to be made, he may be directive or he may be very much wanting to have more participation. So, I think, that leads to conflict in the team, too. But, for some reason, his group seems to manage really well and I think that’s because he’s a very, very high-energy leader-coach, and, truly, if you had to take a temperature of the climate of the team, I would say its very good. So I think its a tough call for coaches to know when to let go or how much to keep (of the training). I think that’s the biggest struggle that they have, and we probably need to have more training for coaches (Sr. Exec.), leaders(Sr. Exec.), and developers(Jr. Exec.) so they know what to keep and what to let go of. We only have four coaches in the facility. In fact, we have less management period. Its really pretty flat (the organization). We have less of those (coaches, leaders, developers) than we have members and I don’t know the ratio of members and leaders.DO YOU HAVE AN EXECUTIVE TEAM? IF YOU DO, DO YOU USE MEETING ROLES WHEN YOU MEET? Leaders and developers meet as a group, by area. So Customer Service’s leaders and developers generally meet, Accounts Payable’s
leaders and developers generally meet, and Sales Audit leaders and developers meet. Rarely, do we meet altogether as a whole facility. Its usually by area or divisions. Everyone was trained in the same skills. I would say, (the ones who perform) closest to what they were trained is Payables. They tend to run their meetings by consensus and have the same roles in place. Customer Service and Sales Audit have more directive and traditional style leaders so they tend to direct more meetings instead of letting go and letting someone else facilitate them. Customer Service seems to do well in running it that way. In Sales Audit, its completely different-I don’t think their meetings are effective at all.

5. HOW ARE TEAMS ACKNOWLEDGED BY COMPENSATION OR REWARDS? (TEAM ACCOUNTABILITY) Teams are evaluated. In fact, that was the toughest part. The team members had a representative from each team that came together to write a review for our facility. Probably 75% of it is team accountability and then 25% would be individual accountability. So, definitely, they are rated according to their team. Even though we told them that coming in, (and) we had these representatives that would come back and tell them, they still had a hard time when it came to review time seeing, “they were really right!” If our team didn’t perform well instead of getting a “very good” on our review, we may have received a “good” because our team didn’t perform well. So, that was a ‘wake-up call’. And this year we’ve changed it slightly because it was a little bit of a cumbersome process. It took allot of time and too much writing, so we’re now conducting quarterly reviews so that by the end of the year, there’s no surprise. Coach’s, leader’s, and developer’s evaluations are based on teams. Support staff is based on different criteria. Their reviews are based more on individual performance. We knew that we had to develop the team evaluations for everyone or else what’s the use of going to teams? IS YOUR COMPENSATION TIED TO EVALUATIONS? Yes. We also had bonuses the first year we were open. And then every quarter, bonus was based on overall team performance and individual team performance, as well as individual. So, there’s overall facility performance, overall team performance. and then individual (performance) that went into the bonus. And it had to be a stretch for them. It couldn’t be something that they were normally doing everyday. It was not based on good performance-it had to be over and above.
INTERVIEW WITH MOUNTAINSIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL TEAM MEMBER

DIANE PANARELLO: LRC TEACHER AT MOUNTAINSIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL

1. HOW ARE YOUR TEAMS ORGANIZED AND HOW DO THEY SOLVE PROBLEMS AND MAKE DECISIONS? The first year the school was opened, we interviewed for people who would be willing to work in teams. Six to eight teams of teachers are formed each year along with an administrative team. The teams have some flexibility about how many members they have and what they teach. For example, in a five man team each teacher would teach a subject. In a four man team that would vary, based on the number of students or personal preference. In a three man team, each teacher would teach more than one subject. The smaller the team, the smaller the class sizes. The administrative team works with non-compliant team members. They are affectionately referred to as “the integration police.” Even though all people who are hired know they will be working in a team environment, sometimes, once they actually begin the process, they choose not to cooperate. Each team has a team leader who attends weekly meetings with the administrative team and brings the information back to their own teams. Teams usually have a representative on the Site Council (the governing body of the school). If not, then a concept called ‘pyramiding’ in used, where a Site Council member is responsible to inform the team. All decisions are made by consensus.

2. WHAT KIND OF TRAINING DID YOU RECEIVE BEFORE BEGINNING THE TEAM PROCESS? HOW WAS IT DECIDED UPON? The whole concept of the school was founded upon the idea of integration. Using teams has proven to be the most effective way of implementing integration. In order for teams to work, you have to have people who are willing to communicate and open to the whole idea of teams. The first year we were open, we all attended “Cowboy Camp” which was an all day and overnight experience of team-building activities. If you are hired, you are required to take classes in integration, cooperative learning and complex instruction. The facility is designed to support the team concept. There is a team planning room with computers where we can easily meet and design our curriculum or discuss any problems we might be experiencing. The District was instrumental in deciding upon this idea of school wide integration with the use of teams.

3. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR EXPERIENCE OF WORKING IN TEAMS AS OPPOSED TO WORKING
INDIVIDUALLY OR IN WORK GROUPS? Working in teams has been a very positive experience for me. It has created a supportive environment so I don’t have to bear all the challenges alone. For example, if there are some parents who are having a problem we meet with them as a team. We share the work load as well as ideas on how to handle different situations as they arise. Professionally, I have learned so much as far as teaching techniques and styles. I’ve become more motivated and creative since I’ve begun working in a team.

4. IF YOU HAVE WORKED IN MORE THAN ONE TEAM, WERE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES? WHAT WERE THEY AND HOW WOULD YOU ACCOUNT FOR THEM? There were two people the first year, who were not on my team the second year. They were not as flexible. They left the school because they had difficulty working in teams. When everyone is motivated, things go much better. They also go better if everyone really believes in the team process and in their individual teams. Being flexible is important, and so is dividing up the work fairly.

5. HOW ARE TEAMS ACKNOWLEDGED BY COMPENSATION OR REWARDS? (TEAM ACCOUNTABILITY) Teams receive an extra planning period each day, plus an early release day once a month for team integration planning. We gave up five minutes a day for the early release time. We also have a positive reinforcement program where people are recognized in a newsletter. Teams are expected to keep minutes. New teams have to do two integrated units; in-place teams have to do four, and submit them to the Site Council for evaluation. The rewards are intrinsic: seeing your kids achieve, hearing the positive feedback from the parents, and having better working conditions.
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW WITH DIAL CORP. TEAM MEMBER

MARK J. PRESTON: BRAND MANAGER : CONSUMER PRODUCTS GROUP, THE DIAL CORPORATION

1. **HOW ARE YOUR TEAMS ORGANIZED AND HOW DO THEY SOLVE PROBLEMS AND MAKE DECISIONS?** Our teams are all cross-functional in nature. Each team that we have: teams at category level, which is our total franchise, that has a strategic focus. Then we have what we call "brand teams" which will take several of the brands and the team is responsible for tactical and somewhat strategic decisions on a brand by brand basis and, again, truly cross-functional. We have operations, we have marketing, we have R&D, we have package engineering, we have finance; all functions are represented on the team, and we have sales input, also, from our trade marketing organization. Everybody has equal say. We rotate leadership. Every two months we have a new person installed as leader, facilitator, note taker, timekeeper. We have very structured agendas. In terms of problem-solving, we generally use a consensus form. There'll be issues brought up by various people in whatever function they represent. We will all spend some time problem-solving on it and try to reach a consensus. Now, that doesn't mean that there's always consensus. Sometimes there are command decisions made that are generated generally, from senior management, but whereas, in a typical organization, especially a marketing organization, most decisions are driven by marketing( we try to steer occasionally), but the decisions are truly a group decision based on consensus.

2. **WHAT KIND OF TRAINING DID YOU RECEIVE BEFORE BEGINNING THE TEAM PROCESS? HOW WAS IT DECIDED UPON?** There is a substantial commitment to team training throughout Dial. Some divisions are more committed to it and have had better success with it than others, and so, as a corporation, we invest heavily in team training. There are all kinds of seminars that are taught (managing, personal relations, etc.) and everybody is encouraged to participate in them to make them, as individuals, more adept at working within teams and working with different personality types, and make their team skills better. I'm not sure how it was decided upon, which of the training programs we would go with. I don't get that involved with it. I will say that we have full time, on staff consultants that work with us on all of our teams. Some sit on our teams- the more strategic teams on a regular basis. Others they participate in as a subject matter expert, and may
participate in one to two meetings per month, just to make sure that the team process is working out well.

3. **HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR EXPERIENCE OF WORKING IN TEAMS AS OPPOSED TO WORKING INDIVIDUALLY OR IN WORK GROUPS?** This is the first corporation that I've worked at that truly is committed to the team process. There are some downsides, in terms of, we do seem to have meetings and, maybe, I'd like to have fewer meetings. On the other hand, the amount of productivity that is generated from our organization, Households, and particularly the Renuzit business, far outweighs what people are generally able to produce on an individual basis, so, I would say, that the teams are very effective and that we anticipate problems that we could not have anticipated without the cross-functional nature of the teams, and sometimes, are able to shortcut our way beyond some problems that we would have run into just working individually or in just work groups. Occasionally we do break into sub-teams which really do look a little more like work groups, rather than taking up the whole team's time on a subject that only affects two or three individuals. We'll break out into sub-teams for more efficient use of time.

4. **IF YOU HAVE WORKED IN MORE THAN ONE TEAM, WERE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES? WHAT WERE THEY AND HOW WOULD YOU ACCOUNT FOR THEM?** Yes, I sit on several teams. As a matter of fact, most of us do and the differences really revolve around personality. Each team develops its own personality based on the people that sit on it. I'm not sure if you want me to elaborated on that or if that's self-explanatory. There are some commonalities in terms of procedures: problem-solving methodology, but each team has a distinct personality depending on the people that participate in it. **ONE OF THE QUESTIONS THAT CAME UP IN SOME OF THE READING I WAS DOING, IS THAT IF A TEAM DOESN'T HAVE A PURPOSE, IF THERE'S NOT A CLEAR GOAL, THEN THEY CAN ACTUALLY BE COUNTERPRODUCTIVE.** Absolutely! I was wondering if you ever encounter that in your organization, or if you stay pretty 'on target'. Again, that's part of what our team consultants help us with. They make sure that we're not going around and around in circles because that can happen fairly rapidly when you get in a group. We clearly define what the objective of each of our problem-solving (meetings is), what is the outcome we want to get to and that helps us from going round and round in circles. **IS THAT SOMETHING YOU DO AT EVERY MEETING? DO YOU POST IT?** Yes, it is. We have a written code of conduct that we post at every
meeting. It lists a whole series of activities and responsibilities and two of the big ones are start the meeting on time and end the meeting on time. We have meeting agendas that we post following each meeting that list action items on an individual basis, that list what the next problem-solving issues are going to be, and what information will be necessary, and then, as we go into the problem-solving, we clearly state the objective for the problem-solving. We have facilitators within the group. One of the roles we assign every month is facilitator, and that person's job... it's all of jobs, not just one person specifically, assigned to say "wait a minute- that's nice but that's just information sharing- that does not move us toward that objective." So, in that way, we try and minimize the non-productive time in meetings, because if you've ever sat in any meeting, not just team meetings, but any meeting, there can be a lot of discussion and if it's not headed toward an objective, it's a waste of time. So, we do clearly state objectives as we move into the problem-solving on an individual basis...Meetings start and end on time. As we get to the end of a meeting, and it appears we are going to run over, it is incumbent on the leader or the timekeeper or facilitator to say, "We're not going to have enough time to finish the meeting, we have to come to some agreement, can everyone extend for ten minutes?" There has to be agreement on that, generally there is. Sometimes people are not able to because of prior commitments.

ARE THE FACILITATOR AND LEADER THE SAME PERSON? No. The facilitator and leader are not the same. We have a meeting leader. It's incumbent on them to actually run the meeting. We also have what's called a 'natural leader' to the team. Generally, it's marketing people who are the natural leaders of the teams. The brands that are my brands, that I'm responsible for all aspects of the brand, I'm the natural leader of that brand's team. Now, we have meeting leaders and my role is as a coach and to make sure that the discussion heads in a direction we need, that we get resolution, that they have in front of them all the factors that they need to make a good decision; but it's still the meeting leader's job to run the meeting. A facilitator is someone who advises the team as to the process vs. the content and it's not necessarily a consultant. A facilitator facilitates, or makes easier the process of the meeting and what they're looking for is, "Are we going off track, deviating from the agenda? Are we problems-solving when we should be brainstorming? Are we spending too much time discussing this issue? Does everybody agree on this?"

And, you're right, sometimes if there's a specific issue that someone needs to be the champion for, it's more difficult for them to facilitate on that issue. But, we do not change facilitators per se, on an issue by issue basis. Now, the other two roles that are pivotal are note taker - we have somebody that's responsible for taking notes, writing down action items that have to be performed. We spend the first part of the meeting giving out recognition for the achievements that have occurred over the past
week. We do a little bit of time information sharing. The note taker writes down the recognition and then all the action items. Then they set the agenda for the following week and are responsible for publishing that agenda the following day. And we also have a timekeeper. Each portion of the meeting is allotted a certain amount of time, and it’s their responsibility to say we’re running over for this section, can we borrow some time..., how much are we going to need for this section? **DO YOU HAVE A WHITE BOARD, PAD AND EASEL?** Yes, all of the above. We go to them often. It’s a good way to problem-solving- to put visuals up for people so we can get our brains around it.

5. **HOW ARE TEAMS ACKNOWLEDGED BY COMPENSATION OR REWARDS? (TEAM ACCOUNTABILITY)** We are good at giving recognition. Compensation, no, per se. Rewards, yes, we give out certificates and those kinds of things to be fun, but other that that, the rewards are the success of the business, and the recognition and respect of your peers. For example, the established brands team will be recognized on a regular basis for the profitability contribution, for new item introduction and it will come in a variety of way. It will come in letters from the general manager, company newsletters, group meetings in front of your peers, and so I think there’s alot of recognition given. What we do not have is a specific compensation package that is team-based. **ARE YOU EVALUATED ON THE TEAM PROCESS?** Yes, a part of the evaluation program is how well people work on teams. **WHAT WOULD YOU SAY TO SOMEONE WHO IS JUST BEGINNING TO USE THE TEAM PROCESS?** I think most of Corporate America is just in the process of learning about teams. There’s alot of the “old boy” network who are scared to death of them because it’s taken power away from people who are used to just, kind of delegating and commanding. On the other hand, if people can get in and get a look and see what kind of productivity that can be generated by a properly run team -again ‘properly run’ is really important- if you just turn these into group brainstorming sessions they’re nothing and they’re counterproductive- but if they’re run correctly, if the processes are in place, they can be very, very beneficial and productive. There are some real general pitfalls, and we’ve talked about them today. If you can avoid those, you can get real productivity, if, again, you can get the right kind of leadership on the teams and have fun. Another key component is we enjoy ourselves! We laugh, we have fun, but ,in the end, we turn alot of work out.
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APPENDIX B
A MODEL FOR USING TEAMS IN SITE-BASED SHARED DECISION MAKING
AT PIMA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

This model assumes that the administrative leadership is committed to improving the SBSDM process through the use of implementing a team approach.

The first step in creating a team environment is to begin educating the faculty about the difference between teams and committees and the benefits of using teams. This will be done through a presentation at the beginning of the school year. (See Figure 1 in the appendix for a sample presentation.)

The presentation will be followed by an endorsement from the administration along with the commitment to provide the training and tools required to make the transition from working in loosely organized committees to highly effective, peak performance teams.

During the first year, a total of six quarter-release days will be requested from the District for the purpose of creating a team environment. The initial three quarter-release days will be allotted for training in group process skills. Additionally, three quarter-release days will be designated for the development of team visions/missions, the setting of goals and objectives, and for evaluating the work of and the effectiveness of the teams (celebrations!). All training sessions will be held in a location that is pleasant, comfortable, free from distractions and preferably off-campus. The participants will include all faculty members, the school administrators, and the members of the parent and school community who are currently serving on a site-based committee. Each session
will last three hours, from 1pm to 4pm. Refreshments will be provided.

The group process skills training focuses on the knowledge and skills that are needed in order to be a successful group member. Specifically, it emphasizes the importance of everyone being valued and respected and able to contribute to the group. It examines individual and group dysfunctional behaviors and how to overcome common obstacles in group interactions, and discusses meeting norms and roles. This training will be done by an outside facilitator. The training sessions will be held for three consecutive weeks.

The fourth quarter release day will be held two weeks following the training in group process skills. The teams will be asked to meet some time before this to establish their meeting norms.

During the fourth quarter-release day, the teams will develop their team visions and mission statements in line with the school mission statement, goals and objectives. (See Figure 2 for school mission statement and goals.) The facilitator of each team will lead the teams through a visioning exercise and end with teams writing their mission statements. (See Figure 3 for format of Creating Team Vision/Mission Statements workshop.) The objective of this session is to have teams develop a clear sense of purpose to guide their work during the school year.

The fifth quarter-release day will be held the following week. The objective of this session is to give teams the opportunity to develop four or five goals and action plans to be accomplished during the school year. Each team will be guided through this process by their facilitator. (See Figure 4 for format of Developing Goals and Objectives workshop.)

The sixth quarter-release day will be held the last month of school. This meeting is designed to help the teams evaluate their performance. Individual
team members will be asked to assess their own progress in the use of group process skills and to evaluate the effectiveness of the training they have received. The teams will also evaluate their work as a whole, then share their accomplishments with the entire group in the form of celebrations. (See Figure 5 for format of Team Evaluations and Celebrations workshop. ) The outside consultant will be asked to attend this session as a wrap-up to the first year of working with the teams approach.

Additionally, the consultant will be invited to attend a meeting of each of the established committees during the school year to assess their progress in the use of meeting skills and to help with any problems that may have developed. An administrator will visit at least one meeting of each group to observe how the meeting skills and group interactions are working. These visits will help the administrator evaluate how the team process is progressing and identify the types of training needs that may arise.

A room at the school will be designated for team meetings. Each team will be provided with the materials needed to run an effective meeting, including: an easel, pads, markers, and tape, copies of Individual Dysfunctional Behaviors (Figure 6 ), questions a facilitator can ask a group to help keep it on track (Figure 7 ), copies of Observer’s Checklists (Figure 8 ), Meeting Agendas (Figure 9 ), and Action Plans (Figure 10 ). Also provided will be a copy of Brainstorming procedures (Figure 11 ) and Consensus without Compromise (Figure 12 ). These materials will be kept in a space that is designated specifically for each team, and will be available for every meeting. A large, laminated copy of the Task Behaviors and Maintenance Behaviors (Figure 13 ) will be posted in the meeting room. Individual teams will be asked to develop their own Meeting Norms (See Figure 14 for sample Meeting Norms ) to be
posted during each meeting.

During the first year, the teams will self-evaluate and determine the areas they feel they need more training in. The second year, the evaluating administrator will require that each member of the faculty include as one of their annual goals, a team-related goal. By the third year, the team environment should be well-established. At this time, the evaluating administrator will indicate the individual’s team performance as part of their annual review.

In addition to the celebration planned for the sixth quarter-release day, quarterly rewards will be given. Once a quarter, the team leader (formerly chairperson) will be given the opportunity to submit a form stating why his/her team should win the prize for outstanding achievement. These will be evaluated by the Site Council and awarded at the end of each grading period. The winning teams will receive a fully catered lunch and a $20 gift certificate for each member. Additionally, they will be recognized with their picture and accomplishments on a team bulletin board, and in the newsletters that go out to the community.

The second year of the training program will include a one-day refresher course on group process skills. This will be done off campus, with established teams. The morning session will include a review of the skills, and a visioning activity for the teams. The afternoon session, will be time allotted for reviewing and establishing goals/objectives and action plans for the coming school year. The outside consultant will be available to help teams in their use of group process skills. Training needs will be assessed at the end of the first year, and scheduled before the beginning of the following school year in order to ensure the time (quarter-release days) required for the training.
FIGURE 1
Sample of Presentation to Faculty

The word “team” brings to mind a variety of meanings to different people. Some think in terms of sports, some about a two-person partnership, like a marriage, and many believe a team is any group of people who are working together. In the workplace, while a team shares some characteristics with committees and task forces, the team is a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goal, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable. Real teams have the capacity to outperform other kinds of working groups such as committees or task forces. However, calling a group of workers a team...doesn’t automatically make a team.

Marc Bassin, Human Resources Executive for General Foods, explains that his company believes that organizing its work force into work teams “is... the single most critical factor in creating a work environment that enables and promotes the achievement of peak performance. Their benefits include:

* More sharing and integration of individual skills and resources
* More stimulation, energy and endurance by members working jointly than is usual when individuals work alone
* More emotional support among team members
* Better performance in terms of quantity and quality, more wins, more innovation
* More ideas for use in problem-solving
* More commitment and ownership by members around team goals, i.e. higher motivation
* More sustained effort directed at team goals
* More team member satisfaction, higher motivation, and more fun
* The sense of being a winner, greater confidence and the ability to achieve more

When educators at Kramer Middle School in Willimantic, Conn. made a
commitment to create programs to help students develop more positive self-images and help educators establish a better learning environment, they chose to use teams as the primary vehicle for making these changes.

These teams help teachers better prepare students to reach their full potential academically and personally. As a result of implementing this team-based program, where each team is seen as an essential component in developing the whole child:

* Connecticut Mastery Test results have increased
* Discipline referrals and suspensions have decreased by 30%
* Absences have decreased by 11%
* Vandalism of school property decreased to one case per year
* The atmosphere is friendlier, more family-like and people work in groups to solve problems and better meet student needs
* Students trouble shoot team and school problems with the principal in a student-advisory group
* Teacher-student bonding is more solid
* Students are more vocal about teacher efforts.

Becoming a high-performance team requires having clear performance goals and a commitment to learning the team process. This usually involves extensive training and a commitment from the members to operate as a team. Our hope is that as we take the first step by crystallizing our goals and objectives into action plans, we will begin to move towards levels of peak performance. Our commitment as a Site Council for this year is to provide training in group process skills and to prepare for ongoing training as needed.
FIGURE 2
Pima Elementary School Mission Statement and Goals

PIMA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

MISSION STATEMENT
Our purpose is to provide quality education for all students. We are a TEAM. the Pima School Community will foster a nurturing environment through our commitment to communication and cooperation. We will facilitate the development of each individual's physical, intellectual, emotional and social potential.

SCHOOL GOALS

* Maintain and promote a safe, clean and attractive environment.

* Encourage a cooperative, competent and caring school community in which everyone is included and accepted.

* Provide a balanced curriculum which includes basic skills and opportunities for new and creative methods of instruction.

* Develop in each student the ability to take responsibility for their own actions and develop a responsible decision-making behavior.

In order to develop the skills needed for students to become self-directed learners, problem solvers, clear and creative thinkers who will produce at their personal best, the commitment of the entire Pima Community is necessary. Implementation and evaluation of these goals and objectives will be coordinated by the Pima Site Council.
FIGURE 3
Format of Workshop: Creating Team Visions and Mission Statements*

Agenda (posted): 1pm - 2:40pm Visioning Activity
2:40pm - 3pm Break
3pm - 4pm Writing Mission Statements

Introduction (on overheads):
Vision is the mental image of your team’s ideal. It is the process of looking to the future and creating the most desirable scenario for your team. The team vision tells or shows what the team would ultimately like to become.

Visioning activities are creative activities using words, pictures or metaphors to illustrate member’s aspirations for the team. Working from each member’s individual vision, the team collectively builds a shared vision that incorporates aspects from all members.

Directions (on overhead):
Objective: to create a vision for our teams.

Part 1: 25-30 minutes
Inclusion Activity: Each member shares with the group an achievement that you have first imagined, then accomplished.
When the group has finished sharing, individually answer the questions on handout 1: (you may use pictures, words or symbols)
FIGURE 3 cont.

Handout 1

1. Who is our ‘customer’, the receiver of our work?
2. How might we be doing business five years from now?
3. If our customers were wildly happy with our work, what would they be saying about us?
4. What would it be like if we were working to our optimum as a team?
5. What would we create or contribute to our organization and our customers if we were working to our optimum?

When all group members have had a chance to answer the questions, share your answers with each other.

Part 2: 30 minutes

Exercise: Imagine the today is this day, three years from now. the television program “60 Minutes” is filming to profile your team as an example of excellence in your field. The following people will be interviewed: 1) the team members, 2) a member of the parent community, 3) a District representative, 4) a student, 5) a teacher who benefited from your team’s work. Pretend you are the group being interviewed about the success of your team and what you did to make it happen. what were the ingredients? What behaviors or heroic acts? How did you overcome obstacles? What is it you would like to hear being said about your team’s work?

Prepare a 3-5 minute presentation.
FIGURE 3 cont.

Part 3: 30 minutes

Presentations

Wrap-up  Questions: What energized you about these presentations? Which part struck a chord for you personally?

End this activity by all team members making statements of appreciation to each member of the team: “I appreciated it when...”, “Thank you for...”, “I identified with you when...”

20 minute break with refreshments

Part 4: 45 minutes

Writing a Mission Statement

“Visioning gets us energized and looking to the future creatively and towards how we would like to be seen. The mission statement will focus us and help us to make sure that all of our actions are taking us toward that vision.”

Handout 2

In order to create a mission statement, consider the following:

* Who is our customer?

*What products and services do we provide?

*What do we do for the customer that is unique?

*Why does the customer need us?

____________________exists to do what?__________________________for whom?__________________________why?__________________________

__________________________
Directions:
Each member writes his or her own mission statement using the above handout. These are then transferred to flip chart paper and posted on a wall. All read the statements. Then, each member reads their statement aloud, one at a time. After each one is read, ask the team, “What special words or ideas do you like in this statement?” Underline those words in a different color and proceed to the next chart, repeating until all have been reviewed. Then ask, “How can we merge this into one statement we can all agree upon?” Ask if there is one they particularly like and choose that one to work from, adding words and ideas from other statements. Edit, checking to make sure everyone agrees on the final draft. Keep working until everyone agrees. Then rewrite on a clean sheet of chart paper and post.

Wrap up: 15 minutes

Share statements around the room.
Ask, “What impressed you the most about this activity?” and “What kinds of things did you learn about your team members or the organization as a whole?” End by having team members give one another statements of appreciation.

*Adapted from Hartzler and Henry (1994)
FIGURE 4
Format of Workshop: Developing Goals and Objectives *

Each team will need: Copies of their vision/mission statements

Copies of last year’s goals and objectives

Introduction (on overhead):
Goals are broad strategic statements of what we want to accomplish.
Objectives are tactical: they spell out specific activities and time lines for what
must be done in order to accomplish the goals.

Directions (on overhead):
Objective: to develop specific measurable goals and objectives that further the
mission and vision of each team.
Inclusion activity: Share with each team member a goal that you have achieved.
Discuss the actions/strategies you used to achieve it.

When all members are finished sharing, individually answer, in a general way,
the questions on Handout 1.

Handout 1:
1. What are the major things we want to accomplish this year?
2. What are the necessary, specific steps that need to be taken to accomplish
our goals?
3. What time lines will we need to assure our goals are accomplished?
4. How will we be accountable?

Discuss with team members the answers you wrote. Then, look at last year’s
goals and objectives and discuss the following questions:
* Which goals are still relevant?
* Which goals need to be updated?

Decide on four or five goals for the team. Brainstorm various strategies for achieving these goals. Decide on strategies. Use the form provided to list your goals and action plans: one for each major goal.

Reflective Questions: Which strategies did you use in helping you decide upon your goals and objectives? How was using meeting skills helpful in this process?

Each participant makes a statement of appreciation to the other members of the team: “Thank-you for...”, “I identified with you when...”, “It helped me when...”

*Adapted from Hartzler and Henry (1994)
Major goal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>How Measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 5
Format of Workshop: Team Evaluations and Celebrations

Agenda: 1pm-1:45pm  Team Evaluations
1:45-2:00pm  Break
2:00-3:00pm  Develop Presentations
3:00-3:30pm  Presentations
3:30-4:00pm  Wrap-up

Part 1

Directions:

Inclusion Activity: Share with your team members the most frustrating and/or the most rewarding event from the school year. This can be work-related or personal.

When everyone is through sharing, answer the following evaluative questions* as a group. Have a recorder write your group’s response:

1. Did we have a common goal?
2. Was our goal compelling enough to create a team identity?
3. Was our structure appropriate to our task?
4. How well did we collaborate with each other?
5. What kind of coordination did we require to reach our goal?
6. Was our team goal a higher priority than our individual goals?
7. Was our personal success achieved through the team’s success?
8. Did we have a set of common values?
9. What rewards were tied to our team performance?
10. Did we exert pressure on ourselves to improve the team’s performance?

*Adapted from Hartzler and Henry (1995)

Have the facilitator turn in your team’s responses.
Part 2

Develop a skit that showcases your team's trials and triumphs over the school year. Each skit must contain a song, rap, or poem and a poster, sign or symbols that represent your team in some way. You may use any of the props provided, and any other props you can find.

Part 3

Presentations

Statements of Appreciation

Reflective Question (Please answer individually, and turn in as you leave): How has the training you've received this year affected the quality of your team's performance? How has it affected you, individually?
**FIGURE 6**
Individual Dysfunctional Behaviors

* **Aggressing:** Deflating the status of others: disapproving of the ideas or values of others: attacking the team or the problem it is attempting to solve: joking maliciously; resenting the contributions of others, and/or trying to take credit for them.

* **Recognition Seeking:** Calling attention to oneself through boasting, reporting on personal achievements, acting in inappropriate ways, fighting to keep from being placed in an inferior position.

* **Self-Confessing:** Using the team as an opportunity to express personal, non-team related feelings, insights, ideologies.

* **Acting the Playboy/Playgirl:** Showing a lack of involvement in the team's task. Displaying nonchalance, cynicism, horseplay, and other kinds of 'goofing-off' behaviors.

* **Dominating:** Trying to assert authority or superiority by manipulating others in the team. This may take the form of flattery, of asserting a superior status or right to attention, giving directions authoritatively, interrupting others, or putting down contributions of other members.

* **Help Seeking:** Attempting to get sympathy from other team members through expressions of insecurity, personal inadequacy, or self-criticism beyond reason.

* **Hidden Agendas:** Seeking to further one's own interests in spite of the impact on the team.

* **Blocking:** Resisting, disagreeing, and opposing beyond reason, bringing up dead issues after they have been rejected or bypassed by the team. Uses killer phrases-"That won't work," "They'll never let us do that," Etc.

* **Railroading:** Getting one's own way by sheer force of will, wearing the team down, preventing other viewpoints from being considered.
FIGURE 7
Facilitator’s Questions

* How to you feel about __________, ____________?

* Is this where all of you want to be?

* Do we need to restate the objective?

* Are you comfortable with the way things are going right now?

* We seem to be getting off target-can we refocus?

* I’m lost-is anyone else?

* Do we need to talk about ________________?

* Do you have all the information you need?

* Would polling people’s ideas at this point help?

* Would brainstorming people’s ideas at this point help?

* I’m feeling a little confused-is anyone else?

* Is the team satisfied with what’s going on?

* Are we clear on what’s happening now?

* We have heard from several people, what do you think?

* Could you say that again, I’m feeling a little confused.
FIGURE 8
Observer's Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOB's</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving Info/Opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Info/Opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying/Elaborating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOB's</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Setting/Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 9
Meeting Agenda

Date: _____________ Time: _____________ Location: _____________

Attendees: ____________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Objectives: ____________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Topics: __________________________________ Time Allotted: _____________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________
FIGURE 10
Action Plan

Meeting Goal: ____________________________________________________________

Decisions Reached:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Key Driver</th>
<th>Due Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next Meeting:
Step #1: Creation of Ideas

1. **Suspend all criticism.** Don’t evaluate or judge any suggestion, no matter how crazy or ludicrous it may seem. Be concerned with quantity, not quality.

2. **Look beyond the obvious.** It may be crystal clear in you mind what has happened or what you could do, but don’t stop ther Ask yourself, “What else could be happening?”

3. **Be creative when you formulate ideas.** Be freewheeling. Don’t let anything restrain your ideas. What you think is an impossible suggestion may shed new light on the situation. Combine two ideas or make a change to improve an existing one.

4. **Record your ideas.** Some of the best thoughts remain only in the form of ideas. Then they get lost or forgotten. Write out an idea to make sure you’ll remember it.

5. **Set a time limit.** Eventually, you’ll develop a “sixth sense” of when you have covered enough ground, but until you do, agree upon a time limit or a set number of suggestions as your stopping point.

6. **Persist until you reach the limit.** Being creative can be hard work, but you must keep at it. Don’t stop when the obvious answers are listed. Keep going.
Figure 11 cont.

Step #2: Evaluation of Ideas

Evaluate the suggestions on the basis of some criteria. Generating a range of ideas is only the first step in brainstorming. The second step is evaluation and ranking of those ideas. Your goal is to surface the most appropriate and feasible solution or idea.

Criteria Include:

* **Feasibility.** Can you really do this? What will it cost? Will it work once you try it?

* **Rationality.** Is the idea too far out? Does the technology or expertise exist to try it?

* **Acceptability.** Will those in authority accept the idea? If not, how can you sell the idea?

* **Effect.** What impact will the idea have on other people, procedures, costs, etc. Will it be negative or positive in the short run? Long run?

Step #3: Categorize ideas

Group like ideas together.
FIGURE 12
Consensus without Compromise

CONSENSUS WITHOUT COMPROMISE
(MANEUVERS AND STRATEGIES FOR
REACHING THE CREATIVE, WIN-WIN DECISION)

1. Clarify: reach common agreement on what words
   mean to each participant.

2. Combine or collapse: integrate two or more items.

3. Rewrite: alter semantics and meaning of
   communications until acceptable. Restate in a more desirable
   manner.

4. Reduce: eliminate least desirable options.

5. Categorize: lump options together into separate
   categories.

6. Convince: use charisma or logic to convince
   participants.

7. Minority report: accept and value diversity by
   including differing views.

8. Accommodation: expand limits to creatively include
   differing points of view.

9. Change the rules: reaching consensus is more
   important than following arbitrary guidelines like
   time, number of options, etc.

10. Paradigm shift: change the context of the task.

CONSENSUS DECISIONS

Consensus has been reached when:

All group members agree to support the decision even
though it may not be everyone's first choice.

Everyone is committed to it as if it were the first choice of all
members.

Everyone agrees that he or she has had sufficient
opportunity to influence the decision.
FIGURE 13
Task Behaviors and Maintenance Behaviors

If a team is to be successful, it must pay close attention to two areas: Task Behavior and Maintenance Behavior. Task Behaviors help to accomplish the task at hand. Maintenance Behaviors help to create and preserve healthy and cohesive team relations. A team that gets the job done but hurts relationships among its members in the process is not truly effective.

Listed below are specific task and maintenance behaviors that contribute to team success. They should be practiced not just by the leader, but by all of the team’s members. When a good balance between the two is maintained, the team will not only accomplish its objectives, but will build a team better able to take on the challenges of the future.

**Task Behaviors:**
**Initiating:** Proposing tasks or goals. Defining a team problem, suggesting a procedure or idea for solving a problem.
**Seeking information or opinions:** Requesting facts. Seeking relevant information about a team concern. Asking for expressions of feelings. Seeking suggestions and ideas.
**Giving information or opinions:** Offering facts. Providing relevant information about a team concern. Stating one’s beliefs. Giving suggestions and ideas.
**Clarifying and elaborating:** Interpreting ideas or suggestions. Clearing up confusion. Defining terms. Indicating alternatives and issues before the team.
**Summarizing:** Pulling together related ideas. Restating suggestions after team discussion. Offering a decision or conclusion for team reaction.
**Consensus-testing:** Probing to see if the team can agree on a decision. Sending up a ‘trial balloon’ to test a possible conclusion.

**Maintenance Behaviors:**
**Listening:** Paying attention to other members; ideas, opinions and suggestions. Not interrupting others. Focusing on others when they speak.
**Harmonizing:** Attempting to reconcile disagreements. Reducing tension. Getting people to explore differences.
**Gatekeeping:** Helping to keep communication channels open. Facilitating the participation of others.
**Encouraging:** Being friendly, warm and responsive to others. Openly accepting others’ contributions.
**Compromising:** Settling differences through mutual concessions. Admitting error. Seeking workable alternatives.
**Standard setting and testing:** Checking to see whether the team is satisfied with its procedures. Suggesting alternative procedures. Testing whether team norms contribute to team cohesion and productivity.
FIGURE 14
Sample Meeting Norms

MEETING NORMS

MEETINGS WILL START AND END ON TIME.

OUTSIDE INTERRUPTIONS WILL BE LIMITED TO EMERGENCIES DURING MEETINGS.

EVERYONE WILL ARRIVE ON TIME.

EVERYONE WILL USE MOB’S AND TOB’S.

EVERYONE COMES TO MEETINGS PREPARED.

DYSFUNCTIONAL INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR WILL BE AVOIDED.

SIDE CONVERSATIONS WILL BE AVOIDED.
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