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ABSTRACT

The OSU Extension System utilizes teams to combine the efforts of several persons with expertise on a given subject to produce better products or services with more efficient use of time and resources. The purpose of this study was to identify team behaviors, outcomes, and impacts appropriate to use as indicators of team success.

A Modified Delphi technique, which is a descriptive-survey research design, was utilized for this exploratory study. A purposeful sample of Extension professionals from across the United States was identified as the panel of experts who participated in three rounds of the Modified Delphi. Round one statements were based upon the review of literature and researcher expertise. The study was conducted utilizing a Web based survey instrument, which allowed prompt responses to statements and the ability to analyze data in real time.

The study identified 25 indicators of success for Extension program teams when those items achieved a consensus rating of 80% agreement of survey respondents between two response categories on the six-point Likert type scale. Four statements were rated as having critical importance as they achieved a mean on a six-point Likert-type scale between 5.5 and 6.0. Twenty items were rated as
having high importance achieving a consensus rating between 4.5 and 5.4. One item achieved a rating of moderately high importance with a consensus rating between 4.0 and 4.5. No items achieved consensus in the disagree categories.

Ten indicators of success related to team outcomes and impacts which were external team deliverables. The remaining fifteen items were related to team member behaviors, interactions, and processes which affect how team members work together. Discussion of the indicators of success and recommendations were based on organizational readiness and support of teams, organizational expectations of teams and teamwork practices. The indicators of success can be used by Extension organizations to improve performance of program team and as criteria for yearly performance appraisal of team members.
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Successful Extension program teams are important in carrying out the land grant university mission, which pledges universities to provide outreach and engagement to benefit the public. The Ohio State University (OSU) has defined teams as a commitment to a meaningful and mutually beneficial collaboration with partners in education, business, public and social service. Teams represent “an aspect of teaching that, enables learning beyond the campus walls, that aspect of research that makes what we discover useful beyond the academic community, and that aspect of service directly benefiting the public” (Presidents’ Council for Outreach and Engagement, 1995, ¶ 1). A decade ago, Boone, (1990, Power of Teamwork, ¶2) in referring to Extension stated, “Make no mistake, I’m stating that now-and into the 21st Century our continued recognition among the American populace as the most respected and valued force for people-oriented change will depend on our ability to function in teams with significant others.” Team behaviors have been identified as a contributor to the effectiveness of teams by many researchers (Cohen & Ledford, 1996; Levy and Steelman, 1996; Sundstrom, DeMeuse & Futrell, 1990).
However, limited research related directly to the effectiveness or success of Extension program teams and what indicators should be measured or quantified as a measure of success has been done.

**Background of the Problem**

OSU Extension teams as a part of the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences have been identified as a priority by the college “Reinvent” process. Project Reinvent developed a long range strategic plan for the College and continues to receive support from administration as a priority. In the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences’ vision statement the following mission supported the College’s belief in the importance of teamwork:

We discover and distribute knowledge, which is used to wisely manage and add value to natural and biological resources. We strive to balance science, social concerns as well as rural and urban interests. We identify priority issues at the local, national, and international levels through free and open discussion among ourselves and our partners. We reward the integration of vibrant teaching, forward-thinking research, creative problem solving and nourishment of the human spirit. (College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, 1996, p 10).

As part of the framework to support this mission the College aspires “to achieve preeminence as a College while delivering the highest value to our customers” (College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, 1996, p. 10).
One value that was identified as a means to providing internal and external clientele with high quality services is to foster “teamwork among ourselves and with our partners” (College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences, 1996, p. 10).

OSU Extension first adopted the concept of teamwork from business and industry during the mid-eighties when budget cuts caused Extension systems across the nation to put freezes on hiring. The inability to fill vacant positions presented complex problems for state and county faculty and administration, while program delivery in some subject matter areas was affected by lack of faculty with needed expertise. Many county and state positions vacated due to natural attrition were not filled, including county agent positions in all program areas and program specialist positions at the state and district levels. Clientele were not able to get information about specific problems and began to ask OSU Extension administration to find solutions to staffing. OSU Extension administration piloted several approaches to find a solution to the challenge and to realign the organization to meet client needs and provide services with the remaining resources in a more effective manner. Counties were offered financial assistance if they agreed to share agents with neighboring counties. The shared positions were called multi-county agents.

Another solution tried was forming the first subject matter or program team in agriculture. Since the only two state specialists in horticulture had retired, a horticulture team was formed to fill the need of the landscapers and nursery owners who desired answers to specific horticulture questions. The
horticulture team was made up of OSU Extension agriculture agents with special interest, in-depth training and experience in horticulture. The environment in OSU Extension was supportive and employees with creative solutions were given the opportunity to try their ideas.

The multi-county position assignments were not deemed successful because agents were not able to serve clientele in two counties effectively resulting in lack of clientele support for this concept. Most of these were abandoned once funding was available to replace county agent positions. One successful idea that evolved from this time of transition was the concept of program teams. OSU Extension program teams were successful in the late eighties and early nineties for several reasons, one being, the newly adopted national initiatives from the United States Department of Agriculture. These initiatives were “most effectively addressed through programming that crossed lines. These programs required teamwork. Environmental issues and the economic and social needs of individuals and families can’t be reduced to compartmentalized disciplines” (Yates, 1990, p. 1). The notion that Extension workers in traditional program areas, disciplines and administration should cross lines and function as teams to address issues was supported by many Extension leaders (Baker & Verma, 1993; Boone, 1990; Fehlis, 1992; Henson, 1987; Holder, 1990; Meier, 1989; Tondl, 1991; and Yates, 1990).

OSU Extension had success with teamwork. All four-program areas, i.e. agriculture and natural resources, family consumer sciences, 4-H youth development, and community and economic development, had utilized this
structure to address issues of concern so OSU Extension sought to expand the use of teams to address additional program issues at the local, state, and district levels. Extension agents had been accustomed to developing and serving as members of committees so it seemed the concept of teamwork would not be very different. However, the rules that worked for committees and the familiar committee structure did not necessarily work for the teams on which Extension agents were becoming members. Extension program teams not only crossed traditional programs but they crossed county and district lines in order to assemble the best minds on a specific subject or issue. In addition to Extension created teams, partnerships that required teams were created due to funding opportunities from funding sources that encouraged agencies to become partners as part of a grant request.

The interest in teams by OSU Extension did not disappear when funding became available for agents and specialists to be rehired. Currently program teams in Extension are maintained by choice and not because of budget restraints. However, the reappearance of budget constraints in the beginning of the 21st century brought the importance of effective teams to the forefront again. All OSU Extension program areas sponsor special teams. These teams, which are subject matter or issue oriented, create special programs and investigate solutions to problems that face agents and their clients across the state.

Community Development currently sponsors seven teams: Land Use Team, Tourism Team, Small Business Management Excel Team, Community


*The 4-H Youth Development* program area has 11 teams. The 4-H Youth Development teams are: Workforce Preparation, Developing Measurable Outcomes, Policy and Procedures Work Team, Specialization and Professional Development, Data Base and Reporting Team, Communications Team, Volunteer Development Team, Seamless Programming Team, Cloverbud /Preadolescent Team, Small Animal Team and the Leadership Team. Some of the teams have short term goals and are likely to be disbanded once their goals are reached.

The *Family Consumer Sciences* teams are based on critical issues. There are currently five teams: Build Strong Families Through Better Parenting
Skills; Conflict Management Skills and Shared Values; Improve Nutrition and Lifestyle Choices from Infancy through Retirement; Manage Time, Money and Other Resources; and Address Community Health and Environmental Concerns and Managing Multiple Roles.

Other teams created by OSU Extension that focus on administrative topics and leadership issues were not included in this study. Membership on many of these teams cross all programs. Examples of these teams are Strengthening Ohio’s Leadership Team (SOL), and the OSU CARES Team, (a team that is developing linkages across the University community to enhance outreach efforts between Extension and other departments). Additional teams not included are the Human Resources Team and Communications and Technology Team, which are examples of units seeking to develop self-directed work teams as they strive to better serve all faculty and staff.

The majority of teams at the state level are issue or subject matter related. In addition to the 50 - 60 state level teams, Extension professionals have developed a number of county and district teams that work to identify and address local needs. OSU Extension like most Extension systems in the United States has adopted teams as a way of working for the 21st century.

One reason teams have become so popular in business and industry and OSU Extension is as simple as Wellins’ thought, “perhaps the biggest reason for the movement toward work teams is the fact that teams work.” (Wellins, Byham & Wilson, 1991, p.13). The motivation for developing effective teams and assuring support at all levels of the organization for agents, specialists and faculty
serving on program and issue teams was based on the need to utilize human and capital resources in the most efficient and effective manner. The need for timely research based answers and solutions to clientele needs and the organization’s desire to effectively respond to stakeholders’ requests was a concern in all programs.

During interviews conducted by this researcher and OSU Assistant Director for Agriculture and Natural Resources, team leaders identified the need for skilled team leaders who are able to help the teams develop a clear understanding of the expectations of teams and team members. They stressed the importance of adequate human and financial resources to carry out the goals and objectives of the team. Finally, they identified the need for consistent support of immediate supervisors, a method for reporting the impacts of the team, and a way to recognize the contributions of individual members.

Both team members and team leaders wanted to have a sense that the members were accountable for their roles on the team and that their contribution to a team was evaluated in a positive manner during their performance appraisals. Team members who were faculty of the College felt their contribution to a team needed to support or contribute to their scholarly work for promotion and tenure requirements.

It was evident in the teamwork literature that measures used by business and industry to evaluate effective teamwork and indicators identified in the literature did not directly translate to the program teams in Extension. Before appropriate training and support for teams can be designed and delivered,
standards of measurement must be developed. Teams can then be assessed to allow for timely and appropriate training as needed. Before standards of measurement for teams in Extension could be designed a process where experts in Extension teamwork could identify the appropriate indicators of success was needed.

Preliminary findings of an OSU Extension study to explore teams (Conklin, Gunderson & Jones, 1996) recommended that training be established for Extension faculty who are part of teams or who wish to join a team. Boone (1990) indicated that all Extension personnel need staff development in basic concepts and skills critical to functioning on a team. These skills are necessary if Extension professionals are to cross program lines to lead and facilitate change through issues programming. Boone’s (1990) belief that staff development is crucial to developing teams was based on five observations: (1) Extension workers are secure working in their respective disciplines; (2) the performance appraisal system does not cover interdisciplinary activities; (3) many new staff have highly developed technical skills and need to understand the Extension system as a human process in which technical, scientific and human knowledge needs to be integrated to help other team members as well as clients achieve their aspirations and potentials; (4) crossing lines requires expertise, personal capabilities and intellectual skills that differ from those traditionally used in Extension and no tested model accompanied the recommendation to work in teams; and (5) change in daily functions will occur only if everyone affected is involved in the decision making process and given opportunities to understand,
accept and practice the new work behaviors. In contrast to the belief that every
Extension team member needs training, Yates (1990) indicated teamwork can be
supported by recognizing and addressing individual training and motivational
needs of staff. Since some Extension teams have been functioning effectively for
10 years, it needs to be understood that not all teams are at the same level or will
require the same training and support. This speaks to the importance of
developing a set of assessments or measures for Extension teams to use.

A culture that supports teams should include a performance measurement
system to help teams evaluate their effectiveness. The measurement system
should help team members have a better understanding of how team members
work together and how to improve their self-management to create a higher level
of productivity and effectiveness.

In order to gain a better understanding of teamwork and what makes
teams successful, a system of competency assessment is recommended (Lee,
1999; Levy & Steelman, 1966). Competency assessment is the process of
identifying the competencies necessary for teams to be effective. Competency
assessments are used by organizations to manage performance of teams, to
determine appropriate compensation and rewards for individuals and teams and
to guide team development (Lee, 1999). Levy & Steelman (1966) indicated
companies should use performance measurement to help control and plan, and
to manage performance including goal setting, developmental feedback and
compensation. Measurement systems should be linked to the organization’s
strategies and structures; should align with organizational structure; and should
integrate team performance and behaviors into existing evaluation systems for individuals (Harrington-Macklin, 1994; Zobal & Wilkins, 1998).

Measurement of performance of knowledge-work teams is difficult. Since knowledge work is on the rise with the shift from jobs that produce products to jobs that produce information and knowledge, efforts to develop appropriate performance measurement systems is needed. The cost of professionals in knowledge-work is now greater than any other work sector. Documenting the impact or quantifying knowledge gain of programs designed to share information and knowledge is difficult. It is suggested that knowledge and information waste exceeds more traditional product waste. Thus, businesses, including educational institutions, must seek ways to increase the performance of knowledge-teams with measurement as the first step. With continued downsizing threats and the increased number of programs supported by grant funding (which require measurement and accountability), workers need to be able to demonstrate their time is used effectively (Jones & Schilling, 2000).

Ideal measurement systems are developed and operated based on identified needs of the organization. Purposes for measurement include individual and team development needs and for compensation. Performance measurement for development should provide information that helps a team monitor goal progress, assess job performance and provide information needed to design individual and team training to develop skills and competencies. Team members need to be involved in the development of measurement systems because the system needs to reflect how team members think about their
collective work. If the strategies of the team are captured in the instrument, the team members will be interested in the outcome. They will work to make the improvements in performance measures they value (Jones & Schilling, 2000). The main purpose of team performance measurement is to stimulate problem solving that leads to improved performance. If the focus of the measurement system is on continuous improvement, teams will avoid measures that are too complex, measures that are of interest strictly to managers, measures that cannot lead to team improvements, and problem solving meetings where members do not participate. Internal and external customers should also be involved in developing measurement systems. When a customer is asked what indicates when the team is doing a good job, the customers’ responses provide information about what customers expect and strengthen relationships with them.

**Problem Statement**

The success of teams and the need for the continued support of the team approach to address current clientele issues has been well documented in the literature (Baker & Verma, 1993; Boone, 1990; DeVries, 1997; Fehlis, 1992; Henson, 1987; Holder, 1990; Meier, 1989; Tondl, 1991; Ukaga, Reichenbach, Blinn, Zak, Hutchison & Hegland, 2002; and Yates, 1990). However, it is known that some teams developed in the College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences are identified by their sponsors and administrators to be highly successful while other teams indicate they struggle with mere existence. This study was designed to identify the indicators of success of OSU Extension program teams. These indicators, which are the hallmarks of teamwork are
important as the college continues to strive to improve customer satisfaction, improve productivity, and improve product and service quality (Gross, 1995; Johnson, 1993). In times when funding for future OSU Extension programs may be tied to soft dollars rather than line items in Federal, State and County budgets, are the ability for an organization to increase staff flexibility, to reduce or reassign personnel, and to improve employee satisfaction (Zobal & Wilkins, 1998).

**Objectives of the study**

Based on this researcher’s experience serving on the OSU Extension’s team on Team Development and based on in-depth interviews with 19 Agricultural and Natural Resources team leaders, this researcher determined that indicators of team success need to be identified before other support activities are addressed. The objective of this study was to identify indicators of success that are perceived by a panel of experts as fulfilling the goals of program teams within an Extension System. These indicators can be used to measure team success, assess individual contributions and be incorporated in performance reviews.

**Definition of terms**

The following terms and concepts are defined operationally as they were used in this study and as used by OSU Extension in the development and support of teams.

*Delphi technique*- is characterized as a method of developing a structured group communication process that allows a group of individuals or panel of experts to deal with a complex issue or problem and create general agreement
about the dynamics of that issue. For this study of the indicators of success for Extension program teams, the panel was asked to identify and come to agreement on the critical indicators of success.

**OSU Extension** - The Ohio State University (OSU) is a land grant institution, which includes Extension, a publicly funded nonformal educational system that links the public to educational and research resources and activities of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and land grant universities to Extension’s mission which is to provide educational programs and processes, based upon scientific information, to address issues and needs of communities and to help people to improve their lives.

**Indicators of success** - any of a group of statistical values when taken together give an indication of the outcomes, products and impacts that are used as evidence of a team’s goal attainment.

**Teams** - a group of people who work together to achieve a desired outcome. People become a team when they work together interdependently and synergistically to accomplish a goal.

**Teamwork** – complementary and reinforcing behaviors completed by a group (Snow, 1992).

**Project Team** - a group formed to complete a defined task in a specified time period between several months to several years. These teams quickly disband once the project has been completed (Zigon, 1997; & Wilkins, 1998).

**Work teams** - a group that works together and interacts on a daily basis.
**Program Team** - for the purpose of this study, a program team is a group that is brought together to design and carry out a plan of work in order to discover new knowledge through research and to share subject matter information related to a specific topic or issue. These teams are not housed in one location. Members may or may not have part of their Extension or Department appointment assigned to serving on this team. The goals and objectives for the team may evolve over time. Team members may not be involved with all aspects of the team’s plan of work.

**Performance management system** - a system that consists of four functions: (1) an agreed upon definition of performance; (2) a system to measure that performance; (3) performance development strategies; and (4) performance reward systems. These systems allow for performance to be constantly defined, measured, developed and rewarded.

**Performance measurement** – a means by which individual and team behaviors or processes are evaluated in order to provide feedback to enhance individual, team and organizational performance.

**Performance development** – training for individuals and teams designed to provide skill and competency development that will allow the team to correct identified problems.

**Team performance** - definitions or measures of success or performance needed to produce the desired results, which are agreed upon by the team and organization. Team goals always should be in line with the needs and mission of the organization as a whole.
**Stakeholders** - all people or groups of people who have an interest in the products or services that an organization provides. All parts of an organization must keep stakeholder needs in mind when defining and selecting measures for evaluation of performance. Stakeholders may include customers, executives, middle management and other team members.

**Individual evaluation** – performance review system designed to give employees feedback on all aspects of their position based on their individual position description and the percentage of their OSU Extension appointment.

**Team evaluation** – performance review system designed to give teams and individual members feedback on their contributions to the team and of the team to the organization.

**Limitations of Study**

Program teams have many different structures and may be interpreted differently by individuals based upon their personal experiences on teams as well as by the knowledge they have of teamwork. Different states may have different definitions and expectations of program teams; therefore, identified indicators of success may vary from state to state. A purposeful sample was used in the selection of the panel of experts; however, not all states chose to nominate a participant. Therefore, some states with a strong emphasis on teams may not have been represented in the sample.

**Importance of Study**

As Extension Systems across the country struggle with reduced funding levels from federal, state and local governments different ways of funding and implementing educational programs and research must be explored. New networks among countries, states, counties, and businesses and more efficient
use of human and capital resources continue to necessitate professionals to work together in teams that allow Extension professionals to find innovative ways to meet the needs of clientele. Teams have been proven to be effective in program design and delivery. Teams have created new ways to reach clientele with programs that are timely and technologically supported with multi-media that best serve diverse audiences. Using a variety of delivery modes allows Extension educators to deliver programs in a cost effective manner while capitalizing on the technology. Thus, audiences from a more diverse background and geographic location will utilize the resources of Extension. Along with these changes in delivery mode come many challenges with not only content, but with developing teams that can function across time and space to develop the Extension of the future. Knowing that the synergy of teamwork allows Extension professionals to develop the capacity to deliver effective programming in the information age, administration and clientele have continued to stress the importance of maintaining teams to address program issues in OSU Extension. Therefore it is, vital that we understand how to best develop teams, support their work and foster an environment that continues to provide team members with the rewards and incentives that motivate them to be a part of a program team. Success indicators will allow us to accomplish this.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The OSU Extension System adopted teams to develop and deliver excellent programs in subject matter areas and to address inter-disciplinary issues. The College of Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences at OSU clearly identified teams as a vehicle for faculty to carry out the mission of the College. Members on these program teams include full time Extension personnel, some with faculty appointments; Extension specialists serving in District and State roles; faculty with split appointments between other departments or colleges and Extension; and faculty with full time appointments in other departments of the college or in other colleges. Job descriptions may or may not have included their team responsibilities and some faculty indicated they received mixed messages from their superiors about the importance and professional value of the work of teams and the time they should contribute to those efforts. Professionals serving on teams needed to have a clear understanding of the expectations of the organization and administrative support to be able to function effectively. In order to clarify the expectations of professionals serving on teams and to assure consistent expectations were understood by persons at all levels of the University,
consensus about the expectations of teams and team membership was needed. The exploration of indicators of success was required in order to clarify the expectations of Extension organizations and to answer the underlying question team leaders, members and supervisors were asking: What are the behaviors or products that indicate a team is successful? Another frequently asked question was, how do we know if a team member is contributing to the team, and how do we then reward or compensate a person or team for their contributions? After review of the literature this researcher defined possible indicators of success for Extension program teams. If teams and team members were to be measured, evaluated, and rewarded based on the supervisors’ or administrators’ observations then team members needed to know the “indicators of success” that were to be used in that evaluation. Indicators of success needed to be established for the specific organization for which they were used. The purpose of this study was to identify individual and team behaviors and impacts and outcomes that were appropriate to use as indicators of success for Extension program teams.

The purpose of a program team is to be able to produce a product or service through combined efforts of several persons with expertise on a given subject. The combined efforts should lead to better end products and more efficient use of time and resources across an organization. The knowledge that many other states were also using teams to develop and deliver strong internationally recognized programs led the researcher to question if other states had similar questions and to believe there would be value in establishing a
broader consensus about the indicators of success for program teams in Extension.

**Historical Perspective of Teamwork in Extension**

Team formation has taken place from top to bottom and across every department and function in most organizations as they responded to the demand to build customer satisfaction, improve work processes and improve performance of suppliers (Kinlaw, 1991,1992). Teams seem to be an appropriate solution since tasks or job processes that need teams of professional and managerial level employees are ones that require the continuous integration of knowledge, experience or perspective that cannot be held by one person but is distributed among several people (Donnellon, 1996).

In addition to Extension created teams, partnerships that require teamwork skills are created due to funding opportunities from foundations or other funders that encourage agencies to become partners in grant requests. These partnerships help Extension to see their role as members of coalitions and teams, and to see an opportunity to serve in a leadership role by helping others learn how to create and build strong working relationships. Coalitions help Extension and other service organizations avoid duplication of services and encourage each agency to bring its special skills, experiences, resources and perspectives to a project. Although some of the same concerns are present for developing strong teams that exist in developing coalitions, Extension has not automatically transferred the knowledge gained from being partners with other organizations to help with the internal development of teamwork or in
structuring strong work teams. Mueller (1988) questioned the move toward issue programming as a responsive way to address change in the future, but still supported the empowerment of all staff by involvement in teamwork.

Michigan has used area of expertise teams as their response to a challenge to link Extension and research functions of the University to meet the land grant mission. They felt self-directed work teams had the potential of making a seamless interface between Extension and research to meet the future needs of an information-based society. Organizational development literature suggested self-directed work teams can benefit Extension-type organizations.

It enhances staff motivation and retention; develops the organization’s credibility with stakeholders, provides a larger pool of skills from which to draw statewide, allows programming on current issues, supplements but does not replace the role of specialists, increases networking among staff members and increases organizational self-esteem (Leholm, Hamm, Suvedi, Gray & Poston, 1999, p.3).

Students of organizational behavior have stated that organizations will need to be more temporary, adaptive, flexible, team-based and responsive to deal with the new demands and opportunities in work environments characterized by rapid change (Barnett, 1963; Schmidt, 1996).

Preliminary findings of an OSU Extension study to explore team development recommended training be established for Extension faculty who are part of teams or who wish to join a team (Conklin, Gunderson, & Jones, 1996).
Other research supporting the need for training for teams suggested, recognizing the training and motivational needs of staff encourages teamwork (Yates, 1990). Boone (1990) indicated that staff development is needed to assist Extension to cross lines and indicated that staff development was important to Extension personnel at all levels of the organization if they are to function in teams. Boone indicated these skills and concepts were critical for teams to lead and facilitate change through issues programming. For the same reasons that teams have become popular in business and industry, OSU Extension embraces this concept.

For the teams to become effective a culture that supports teams must be developed. To help teams evaluate their effectiveness and to develop into effective working teams the team members, leaders and administrators need to hold teams accountable and need to have a better understanding of how individual team members and teams work. Team performance measurement gives information to teams that allow them to identify strengths and weaknesses of the team’s performances and give them a basis for problem solving (Jones & Schilling, 2000). Performance measurement also helps a team identify and monitor overall processes and outcomes. Zobal and Wilkins (1998) input on this subject stated:

Measurement information, in the form of feedback and feed-forward, assists teams in identifying their overall purpose, specifying their task at hand, outlining their work processes, and defining team member responsibilities. Additionally, a performance measurement system functions as a catalyst in
developing a common language and understanding across team members (p. 12).

Teamwork and the characteristics required for a group to function effectively as a team are difficult concepts to define in a manner appropriate or inclusive for all businesses and organizations that employ teams. The fact that a variety of team types exist to accomplish different tasks (Heller, 1998) contributes to different characteristics being identified as important for those teams. Understanding the role of teams in the organization, the structure of the team, the nature of the team’s leadership and the objectives of the team are necessary for identification of the important characteristics for a specific team. The characteristics and skills that members need to possess in highly functioning teams appear to be specific to the organization and the team’s vision and mission. Thus, researchers need to clarify the population carefully in any study of characteristics needed by team members and be careful not to generalize those to teams which may function in a different manner. The nature of the team similarly affects what measures or indicators of success should be used to evaluate the effectiveness or success of a team.

**The Constructs and Characteristics That Constitute Teamwork**

To understand the characteristics a highly functioning team has, it is important to understand the definitions of teamwork found in the business and leadership literature. Teamwork is a concept represented by a few characteristics that apply to all types of teams. Beyond those few similarities the literature is not
consistent in identifying the same skills and elements for teams to be considered as highly functioning or successful.

A team is a group of people who work together to achieve a desired outcome. People become a team when they work together interdependently and synergistically to accomplish something. Effective teams are self-directed and are made up of small groups of people empowered to manage themselves and the work they do on a daily basis (Wellins, Byham & Wilson, 1991).

Empowerment of teams is defined as becoming responsible for a complete work process or segment that delivers a product or service to an internal or external customer (Wellins, Byham & Wilson, 1991). Kelly (1991) defined an empowered team as “a group of workers, which has a high degree of decision making and problem solving responsibility and essentially manages itself” (p. 3). Donnelon (1996) further indicated that an empowered team requires the expertise of team members to be continuously integrated into team efforts. Finally, Kinlaw (1991, 1992) suggested a team is not only the primary unit of performance but an untapped source for new ideas, innovation and continuous improvement in organizations.

Teamwork is a series of complementary and mutually reinforcing behaviors completed in a group (Snow, 1992). Attributes of effective teams include: honesty (trust enough to discuss feelings and concepts openly and promptly); belongingness (sense of belonging or teamness); quality of relationships (high quality relationships lead to satisfaction and stability as a group); and participation (contributions of all members are encouraged and
acknowledged) (Wellins, Byham & Wilson, 1991). Team members work together to improve their operations, handle day-to-day problems, and plan and control their work. They not only get the work done but also manage themselves. Teamwork achieves synergy that occurs by having a group of highly motivated employees work together to accomplish goals. One of the most basic elements of teamwork is for each member to be good at what they do (Pritchett, 1977). A high-powered team will not exist without having strong talented members.

Work teams are not special groups brought together for a task or purpose, but a group that works together and interacts on a daily basis. Empowered work teams have become associated with high productivity levels and the means to find solutions to problems, improve quality, and increase participation of all participants.

The belief that work teams are effective is based on three assumptions: a) those closest to the work know how to perform and improve the job they are doing; b) most employees want to feel ownership for their jobs and want to make meaningful contributions to their organization; and c) teams empower individual employees (Wellins, et al. 1991). The literature on teamwork indicates that effective work teams are different than teamwork. Frederick Taylor, the father of industrial engineering, recommended that the best way to manage manufacturing organizations was to standardize the activity of general workers into simple, repetitive tasks and then closely supervise them (Taylor, 1947). It was noted that the assembly line idea was good for an American work force composed of poorly educated immigrants who in many cases did not speak English. Factories were
looked at as large machines and the workers were just small cogs that helped keep production at a standard level set by the machine pace. Power was in the hands of a few leaders. This system resulted in a loss of empowerment of workers. The end result has been that high-control management has led to a loss of a competitive edge (Lawler, 1986). Changes in the workforce, the nature of work that is being done today and the high level of competition among businesses have brought about a need to change the way people are managed.

It is difficult to find agreement in the literature or from individuals who work on or with teams about what behaviors, outcomes, impacts or success indicators should be used to evaluate or assess teams within an organization. The answer to the question may vary because of type of business within which a team functions.

In research the behaviors and processes that allow a team to do their work are called team behaviors. The teamwork literature has many different terms, which are used to identify these critical characteristics or team processes. An understanding of team behaviors and the group processes that are identified in the literature, as necessary precursors for teams to be able to produce or work together effectively, must be gained before one can differentiate those behaviors and processes from team outcomes, outputs and impacts. Then the question raised is, which of these contribute to the success of teams and what should be reviewed, measured or examined when evaluating teams and team member successes?
Team development or team building requires each team member to have a notion or constant improvement in order for a company or team to continually improve (Byham, 1990). Providing training for teams on ways to work effectively is critical. The teamwork literature indicated effective teams have a focus on accomplishing the tasks of the team and strong relationships among team members through developing a sense of teamness among the members. This evolution can come about through the work of the team as well as the team’s adoption of team building strategies. The best teambuilding happens when selected activities meet identified needs of the team or address “as needed” skills and competencies. Training needs can be identified by having the teams adopt a performance management system. “Teambuilding can be simply defined as a structured attempt to improve/develop the effectiveness of a group of people who work (temporarily or permanently) together” (Clark, 1994, p. 5). Moxon (1993, p.28) goes on to say that, “teambuilding is designed to help people who work together to function more effectively in teams and to assist the team itself to work more effectively as a whole.” Finally, Woodcock & Francis (1994) suggest, teambuilding is a deliberate process of facilitating the evolution of a close and effective work group so that: (a) team leadership is coherent, visionary and acceptable; (b) the team’s roles, functions and ‘deliverables’ are clearly understood; (c) members of the team have emotionally ‘signed up’ and dedicated their efforts to collective achievement; (d) there is a positive, energetic and empowering climate in the work group; (e) meetings...
both informal and formal, are efficient and make good use of time and available resources; and (f) weaknesses in team capability have been diagnosed and their negative effects mitigated or eliminated (p. 1).

At times teambuilding is considered a relationship-oriented activity, however, Moxon (1993) wrote, “teambuilding in a workplace is a task-oriented activity. The task alone provides the context in which it becomes appropriate to discuss processes, procedures and individual behavior” (p. 30).

Team behaviors or processes that allow the teams to work together effectively to accomplish the work of the team require team members to have knowledge and skills in both subject matter expertise and team behavior skills. Team members need to maintain and improve their knowledge, skills and abilities to do the work of a team effectively. At some time during a team’s existence, it will undergo change. If the change is due to personnel changes, strong leadership and the ability to look at information, situations and problems differently are required. Adaptive leadership is needed to be able to think about information differently and discernment allows a person to be more responsive to the beginnings of change (Zinger, Musselwhite, Hurson & Perrin, 1994). Change is only adapted to by changing. Thus, it is important to integrate new members into a team as quickly as possible. In order to integrate a new member, team members should engage in asking the new person a series of questions to learn about the skills and attributes the member brings to the team. The mission and vision of the team must be communicated to the new team member by team
members. Every aspect of a team’s development and performance can be managed by the team members if the team members have clear cognitive models of the team. Teams can help organizations that have a commitment to minimizing overhead and running lean. When first introduced, team support takes immense effort during the development phase. Once teams develop and the organizational structure develops to support teamwork, teams found in most organizations can become responsible for their own performance (Kinlaw, 1991, 1992).

**Characteristics for Effective Teams**

A number of models have been developed to present the necessary characteristics of effective teams. In order to discuss those characteristics they have been grouped into six categories: team leadership; team direction; adequate resources including physical, financial, human and time; information; team processes and clear roles and responsibilities.

**Team leadership**

The leadership of a team is critical to its success whether the leader is appointed by an organization or selected by team members. MacMillian (2001) indicated that the leadership must be accepted by the team members. A leader’s ability to serve as a facilitator is critical to the success of team (Holpp, 1999). A leader, whether designated by management or elected by the team members, that pulls out initiative, creativity and motivates exceptional levels of individual and collective performance from all team members leads to an effective team (Kelly, 1991). As teams evolve many become self-directed and if those teams are to be
successful it is recommended that all team members should have the same leadership skills and attributes as the team leaders (Campion, Medsker & Higgs, 1993; Hackmann & Walton, 1986; Holpp 1999; Mohrman, Cohen & Mohrman, 1995; and Yancey, 2001).

**Team Direction**

A team needs to have clear and engaging direction and develop a common purpose (Donnellon, 1996, Hackman, 1987, Hackman & Walton, 1986; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Katzenbach, 1998; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; Parker, 1994; MacMillian, 2001). The team’s direction must be supported with clear goals, common compelling tasks, and specific expectations. Success of a team is likely when there is alignment of team members around the task and team members have the determination to accomplish the team objectives (Donnellon, 1996, Hackman, 1987, Hackman & Walton, 1986; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Katzenbach, 1998; Kelly, 1991; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; Parker, 1994).

Brill & Worth (1997) stress the importance of being vision directed with a clear set of values focusing on total quality. If a team maintains a stakeholder focus they create value for internal and external customers and provide faster and more effective efforts to understand customer needs and concerns.

**Adequate Resources**

The presence of appropriate resources for a team in any kind of work is considered a key factor to their success (Donnellon, 1996; Hackman, 1987; Hackman & Walton, 1986; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Katzenbach, 1998; Kline, 1999; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; Parker, 1994). Having adequate resources may be
considered as the responsibility of the team or the organization within which the team functions but the way the team obtains and distributes those resources is critical to its success. Teams need to be networked to allow the team to pull in resources as needed (Brill & Worth, 1997). Hackman (1987) and Kline (1999) have categorized resources into the four groups of physical, financial, human and time.

Physical resources include such items as computers, physical space, storage room and anything that can be seen or touched (Kline, 1999). Financial resources are cash or other resources that can be turned into cash, which is used by the team to purchase goods and services to complete their work. A team held accountable for its spending practices is more likely to see themselves as a team.

Human resources are the personnel available to the team to complete the work of the team and the individual skills, knowledge, experience, and abilities these team members contribute to the team. Members need to continue to develop technical skills and functional expertise (Heller, 1998; Katzenbach, 1998; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Kelly, 1991).

Having the appropriate membership on the team is considered a critical characteristic of teams (Donnellon, 1996, Hackman, 1987, Hackman & Walton, 1986; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Katzenbach, 1998; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; Parker, 1994). The exact number of members needed to be effective however is not clear. Kelly (1991) suggested that a team be a manageable size of between three and 30 members with the average being between five and 15. Others recommended a small number of members with fewer than 10 persons.
considered optimal for performance (Katzenbach, 1998; Katzenbach & Smith 1993).

Sufficient time to meet formally and informally is a critical characteristic of successful teams (Kelly, 1991). When calculating the time needed for team efforts the number of persons serving on the team is multiplied by the percentage of their work time or number of hours they are able to make available for the work of the team (Kline, 1999). It is important not only to allot time for the work of the team but to be time based in the approach to problem solving and trouble shooting (Brill & Worth 1997).

**Clear roles and responsibilities**

Another important characteristic of effective teams is clear roles and responsibilities of team members. Roles that clearly delineate responsibilities from the beginning to the end of the tasks assigned help team members work together effectively (Kelly 1991). Team members need to understand their role in maintaining or supporting the team processes based on their function on the team and how they are expected to contribute the skills and expertise they bring to the team (MacMillian, 2001).

**Team Information**

Team members must have the appropriate information to carry out their role and responsibilities on a team (Donnellon, 1996, Hackman, 1987, Hackman & Walton, 1986; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Katzenbach, 1998; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; Parker, 1994). To be information and technology based is a characteristic of effective teams with computer literacy and just-in-time learning
being core competencies for all team members (Brill & Worth, 1997). In order to have the appropriate information team members must engage in continuous learning (Kelly, 1991). It also is recommended that all team members develop core competencies for effective team work (Brill & Worth 1997). The education of team members to keep them updated in their area of expertise is viewed as necessary but also is viewed as a reward for team participation (Donnellon, 1996; Hackman, 1987; Hackman & Walton, 1986; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Katzenbach, 1998; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; Parker, 1994).

**Team Processes**

It is important for teams to develop clearly identified and defined team processes for how the work of the team is to be done and evaluate their success by asking how did we do, what did we learn and was there a way we could have done our tasks better (MacMillian, 2001). Kelly (1991) elaborated by suggesting guidelines for behavior and ground rules. A common working approach allows a team to capitalize on the unique skills each member brings to the group (Katzenbach, 1998; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). Brill & Worth (1997) pointed out the approach needs to be flexible, adaptive and innovative in finding solutions from many sources and suggested a cross functional focus on process and results instead of a hierarchy (Brill & Worth, 1997). “A diversity of perspectives allowed a team to surround problems, decisions and issues with a brighter collective IQ” (MacMillian, 2001, p. 37).

Teams need to ensure excellent communication among members (Brill & Worth, 1997; Donnellon, 1996; Kelly, 1991; & MacMillian 2001). Development of
a system to share all information and reports with all employees is strongly recommended (Katzenbach, 1998; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993).

Process skills are characteristics, which are also included in many of the models for effective teams. It is important for a team to have members with decision making, conflict resolution, problem solving and administrative skills (Heller, 1998; Katzenbach, 1998, Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; & Kelly, 1991).

Interpersonal skills are the final ingredient included in many of the models (Heller, 1998; Katzenbach, 1998, Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Kelly, 1991). MacMillian (2001) and Kelly (1991) stressed the importance of team members developing solid relationships based on trust, acceptance, respect, courtesy and understanding. Interpersonal skills lead to unselfishness and generosity among team members (Wellins & George, 1991).

An effective team must have responsible team membership, which was defined as the contribution of whatever the team requires. This definition ran contrary to two ideas about teamwork that most organizations held: (1) the theory that roles and responsibilities of team members needed to be clearly defined so that every task was covered, every team member knew what was expected of him or her, and there was no wasted motion; and (2) the leader had the right and responsibility to monitor the team and intervene when appropriate. the opposite of these two beliefs was that team members then had the right and responsibility to: (1) not have their time and talent wasted, (2) speak their mind, (3) be heard, (4) lobby to have their perspective considered, (5) contribute what he/she believed the team needed to achieve its common goal, regardless of the
specific role or responsibilities assigned and regardless of his/her own position relative to others in the group, and (6) speak up when they felt the team was not on course to achieve team goals (Wellins & George, 1997).

The Nature of Teams

Teams need to be matched to the task. There are different types of teams and some are more suited to fulfilling particular tasks. The team leader needs to understand the broad objectives and goals of the team clearly in order to structure the team in a manner to accomplish goals most effectively. The literature on teamwork indicated that specific indicators of success would not necessarily be the same for all types of teams found in an organization.

To assure clear differentiation of Extension program teams from other teams found within the Extension organization brief description of teams that could fall within the definition of program teams follows:

Cross Functional Team is a multi-disciplinary, interdepartmental team, found at any level of the organization designed to address program development or issues.

Project Team is a team selected and kept together for the duration of a project, such as the planning of a specific conference, or development of a single publication or workshop.

Area of Expertise Team/Program Team is a team selected and maintained to address a subject or issue about which the team members have specialized knowledge, experience, or interest. The team designs, develops and implements a variety of programs to gain more knowledge about the subject and to share that
knowledge with appropriate stakeholders. Program teams can engage in research, development of informational resources and disseminate resources related to the issue or subject.

**Establishing Teams in Extension**

Establishment of a team has occurred in a number of ways in Extension in Ohio and in other states. The literature indicated that clarity about the mission of the team and how it fits within an organization is important to how it functions. Teams test new ideas leading to development of team leadership and a management style that leads to efficiency, and successful exploration of ways to address programs and issues. Team members define the roles and develop a system that allows those roles to change over time as the nature of the team evolves. Team members learn to solve problems and work together. The teams learn to set challenging goals and develop working methods that allow the team to meet the goals and evaluate their successes or failures in a manner that improves future performance.

When an organization is going to launch new teams it is advised that management and staff be prepared for the changes and have employees involved in the process of creating the future vision of the organization. Kelly (1991) recommended an eight-step process for developing a new team which begins with forming a steering committee which can analyze the present state, and envision the future and role of the proposed team in helping to create that future. The steering committee would help establish a design team which would make recommendations and develop transition plans that take the organization from
the present system to that of the future organization. The design team would take the necessary steps to bring about implementation of the recommendations and evaluation of the results.

Organizational support is often grouped with team behaviors or characteristics, which allow teams to succeed within an organization. This dimension includes: assuring that team goals are aligned with the organization; providing a performance management system; providing an atmosphere that supports and enables teams to work effectively; providing appropriate resources; and establishing a system of recognition and rewards that support teams.

Organizational forces are considered the most potent shaper of team dynamics. Donnelon (1996) indicated the way team members were selected or assigned to teams, the functional culture, and performance systems that emphasized individual performance; and the functional manager’s role were factors that placed limits on what teams could be and do.

Robbins and Finley (1995) shared that causes of team failure were indications that an organization was not ready for teams or did not totally support them. Those organizations may have an anti-team culture within the team or organization, provide insufficient feedback on team performance, develop an ill conceived reward system, demonstrate an unwillingness to change, or provide the wrong tools to complete the tasks assigned to the team.

Building teams and developing an environment that supports teams so they become more effective is an important role for administration. Providing training for team members was suggested as a vital component of making teams
work. Several techniques have been documented as effective for training including understanding the goals and values of the team, benchmarking, and recording and evaluating team talk (Donnellon, 1996). Training provided by an organization should help teams develop the ability to have effective meetings, support creation of resource teams to help coordinate major projects, assist in team problem solving activities and help teams when needed (Kelly, 1991). Basic education in helping team members identify and appreciate team player styles and increase personal effectiveness through workshops helps team members improve their interactions (Parker, 1990). An organization can further support teams by providing technology that allows teams to convene when they cannot be in the same place at the same time (Robbins and Finley, 1995).

**Philosophy for Team Development**

Tuckman’s (1965) model of team developmental stages was based on 50 studies of teams in businesses. The stages of development each included important team performance behaviors. The start up or forming stage is the time when members receive orientation and learn the expectations and tasks they are expected to perform. The team sets goals for what they want to accomplish and begin to establish how they will work together to accomplish the goals. During orientation it is important for the members to share the mission and philosophy of the team and the organization and establish common values.

The next stage is called conflict or storming; a time when team members experience frustration and disagreement about issues of leadership, power, control and influence. During this time it is important to clarify the roles of each
team member and the sphere of influence for which they assume responsibility. After team members begin to resolve conflicts, the stage of teamwork emerges where behaviors are normed, the individual strengths are identified and each person is valued for his or her contribution to the team.

The team begins to perform during the stage called achievement. During this stage the team members have realistic expectations and members work in constructive ways to achieve common goals. The last stage of team development is called transforming, which is a period of change. The stage is brought about by a change in membership or a need to redefine the team’s mission. Either loss or addition of members causes a transformation to occur. During the transforming stage a team often regresses to a previous stage (Parker, 1990; Tuckman, 1965).

The output of a team is not what makes it a team, it is how they work together that makes a team successful. Improved communication leading to intensified focus on the business at hand allows team members with different knowledge and perspectives to come together and capitalize on the expertise of each individual. Teams generally save an organization money and are valued because they increase productivity, are closer to the customer and see opportunities for improving efficiencies. In a proper team, members are stakeholders in their own success. Teams better utilize resources; and generally make higher quality decisions resulting in better quality goods and services (Bower, 2000). Workgroups or teams need to understand how the team works together and most teams find the knowledge motivational; people want to know their boundaries, resources and expectations.
Training for teams is one of the vital roles that an organization assumes if they want teams to operate at a high performance level. Kelly (1991) reported on the development of resource teams or training teams that assisted teams in developing a variety of team skills. These resource teams utilized members from existing teams with good technical, social, leadership, and management skills; persons who exhibited positive attitudes to train new teams. Members on the resource teams needed to be willing to travel and deal with the external environment or to be relocated to help other teams build their skills and improve their productivity.

Training of team members can be reduced to a 10-step process. The team should define the mission, communicate the vision, develop a code of ethics, establish roles, blend individual styles, manage team performance, evaluate success criteria, market the team, celebrate and provide recognition and make action plan (Dee, 1995).

**Team Measurement & Compensation**

One complaint of team members in a study on team evaluation found that they felt they did not receive enough performance feedback (Kline 1999). For teams to perform well an explicit, detailed and fair evaluation system for teams must be in place, both to evaluate performance management and organizational effectiveness. In a study by Kline and McGrath (1998) 26 team members, team facilitators and team supervisors selected measures that they categorized into five dimensions of team performance including problem solving, quality of work, workload allocation, meeting objectives and team attitude.
The dimensions for measurement need to be aligned with the performance behaviors that surround how team members do the work of the team. One of the main considerations for determining who should have done performance ratings is the extent to which the evaluator had access to the team and its outputs. Some scales allow the rater to indicate the amount of the rater’s contact with the team, which then influences the weight of the ratings (Jones & Schilling, 2000).

Another performance management system consisted of four functions (1) an agreed upon definition of performance, (2) a system to measure performance, (3) performance development strategies, and (4) performance reward systems (Foote, 1997). These systems allowed for performance to be constantly defined, measured, developed and rewarded.

Team measurement is used to determine team effectiveness. Team member involvement in selection of criteria is considered important in gaining employee commitment and buy-in to the evaluation system. Ideal team measurement systems include team involvement as they are developed and administered because team members raised key questions and issues that lead to higher levels of understanding and better measures of both team outcomes and processes (Zobel & Wilkins, 1998).

When should teams be measured and compensated? Lawler (1988, 1990) and Gross (1995) suggested the frequency and interval of team measures be tied to the nature of the team and the level of the team within the organization and that the team evaluation be tied to the compensation cycle. Measurement of teams is most effective when it flows from the work of the team and is aligned
with the fiscal period or completed tasks (Covey, 1994; Lawler, 1990; & Zigon, 1997). Companies with the most successful teams measure performance more frequently, consistently, and in more than one manner.

Team assessment should be designed to accomplish more than one goal. Team assessment should be designed to identify a team’s final results or accomplishments, the process steps used by the teams to accomplish and support workflow, and to analyze individual contributions to the team effort and handoffs between members. When team assessments are used to identify team development needs they are best if regularly scheduled at a time deemed appropriate in relation to the team’s goals and at a time other than when members feel the results will influence pay and compensation decisions. These assessments were used to identify team development needs and led to higher levels of understanding and better measures of team outcomes and processes (Zobel & Wilkins, 1998).

Types of measures include instruments designed to direct team development and instruments that identify appropriate compensation and rewards for teams and individuals (Zobel & Wilkins, 1998). Team measures related to team performance should be based on team goals, which are set or determined by team members. The team’s strategy needs to be captured in the measurement system and that strategy needs to be aligned with the organization’s business strategy. Measurements of team performance leading to improved performance includes simple measures that consist of a few selected
items important to the team and items which team members have identified as critical to team success.

It is important for the team to view raters or evaluators as competent to provide appropriate and useful feedback. To help prepare raters’ frame of reference (FOR) training was recommended by Bernardin & Buckley, (1982); Klein, (1999); Sulsky & Day, (1992) and Noonan, (1996). The benefits of “Frame of Reference” training are that it provides raters with a common perspective on performance, it identifies the relevant dimensions of work performance, and instrument development allows all raters to agree on the level of performance associated with each rated component or dimension. This measure has been used for individual performance and should hold true for team ratings of performance.

Who will determine the performance ratings? In deciding who should be the raters, the raters experience with the team must be considered. The raters should have had the opportunity to observe the team as it worked and be a recipient of the outputs of the team. Rater issues from similar research indicated supervisor performance ratings usually do not agree with team member ratings. Kline (1999) claimed a reasonable agreement rate between supervisor performance ratings and team member ratings would be in the .80 ranges or better when zero agreement is .00 and perfect positive agreement is 1.00.

The frame-of-reference procedures (FOR) training format discussed earlier also relates to measurement. Kline (1999) reported:
In this format definitions of each performance dimension and the descriptions of each of the levels of performance were discussed. As many examples as possible were generated in these discussions to enable the team members to understand what the performance dimensions were and what a particular level of performance means. In addition, there were detailed discussions about which behaviors or outcomes go with which dimension or component. Through these discussions, a common frame of reference for the particular team’s performance in the particular organizational context was defined. All parties that were going to use the rating forms were present at these discussions and had been full participants. In typical FOR training procedures, videotapes of either scripted or actual performance were shown; participants rated behavior and received feedback on the accuracy of their ratings (p. 109).

Although the frame-of-reference procedures were developed for use in rating individual performance, Kline (1999) recommended that they can and should be used with teams. He cautioned that, “given the complex nature of teams and teamwork the development of training materials will be time consuming” (Kline, 1999, p. 109).

The literature suggested that teams were more receptive to measurement systems that they have the opportunity to help develop (Zobel & Wilkins, 1998). Team measures related to team performance must be based on team goals, which are set or determined by team members. The team’s strategy must be captured in the measurement system and the strategy must be aligned with the organization’s business strategy. Measurements of team performance should lead to improved performance so the measures should be simple and consist of a few selected items.
important to the team and which team members have identified as critical to team success.

An important step in developing a performance management system is to determine who should sponsor the team and hold it accountable. The team sponsor should be an administrative person who can promote the team’s work, communicate with the team on a regular basis to track the team’s progress and hold the team accountable to its mission, vision and goals. The sponsor should be the person who is the liaison between the team and the larger organization. This person is the team’s external contact and should be a diplomatic person who is a good judge of the needs of the team members, has a reassuring but authoritative presence, has an effective overall picture of the teams work, and has the ability to be discreet when handling confidential information or providing direction to team members or leaders. This person does not regularly attend meetings but when asked may serve as a reviewer of the team’s successes and progress on goals and tasks. This person is often requested to observe the team process skills and make recommendations on how the team might improve their effectiveness or increase their impacts. The external sponsor can help the team conduct the annual review of the team goals and determine if the team should continue, reform or adjourn.

Alternative views exist on whether organizational set-up can be resolved before interpersonal problems are be addressed. Rivera (1977) felt that when team members understood how they personally impacted each other then it became easier for them to see how the organizational set-up impacted them. Human nature and organizational set-up of teams are the most common causes of problems within teams (Bodner, 1997).
Recognition and reward of team members has been identified as another needed aspect of organizational support. Some systems of reward can be maintained or supported by the team internally, while other systems are linked to salary and must be supported by the total organization. Compensation systems include all types of pay and the effectiveness of these systems vary with the type of organization. Base pay can impact everyone in an organization and provides little flexibility. Thus, it is not suggested as the primary tool for rewarding teams. Other rewards and compensation systems offer many advantages including quick start up time, fewer process changes, and a reduction in long-term salary commitments. Non-financial rewards and compensation include items, such as celebrations, recognize extraordinary individual and team accomplishments in a personal, flexible and cost effective manner. Research supported that these can provide long term motivation (Zobel & Wilkins, 1998).

Organizations with self directed teams are usually leaner and have fewer layers of management. The reward system tends to be skill or team based in organizations that develop strong work teams. The leader is more coach than planner or controller, and develops a system to share all information and reports with all employees (Wellins & George, 1991).

**Team Processes and Behaviors**

How a team is established and works together has an effect on the success of the team and with the satisfaction of members who serve on it. A number of factors are related to how a team works together and these are addressed in the literature in different ways. Background on the processes that are considered to be important to team development and success are presented below.
Team member selection

Since selecting the right team members has been identified as an important team behavior of effective teams, it is important that teams adopt a process for team member selection (Pritchett, 1977; Donnellon, 1996; Hackman, 1987, Hackman and Walton, 1986; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Katzenbach, 1998; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; and Parker, 1994). Traditional selection of employees has been based on two premises. First, a person will perform a job and have control over the results of that job and secondly that a person works for some other person or persons (Kinlaw, 1998). Selection processes for hiring people to be successful in a team environment should include the three characteristics of consideration of the fitness of the team member or team leader in the team, involvement of the team members in the interview process, and final authority of team members to accept or reject the prospect. People that are successful in team environments should be carefully selected and oriented (Zenger, et al. 1994). People who have a tendency to be excited about what they do, who like and work well with other people, who appreciate the organization, and people who are open, willing and able to change make good team members. Careful interviewing should be done before a new team member is hired. The potential team member should be told clearly what the values of the team are, and how things are done on the team. The applicant should make it very clear what it means to them to work on a team and how they like to work. Orientation for new hires should highlight team values, day-to-day working norms and the evolutionary character of the team environment.

When selecting team members it is important to look for people who can perform specific tasks that the team needs completed. A friendly open
personality and the ability and willingness to work with a group are important and necessary if a person is to become a contributing team member.

The first step in selection of team members is to determine who has interest in the topic. Once potential members are identified the next step is to select members with subject matter expertise who also have skills in team leadership to be the team’s leader. Some organizations may even adopt a system of having two or three team leaders simultaneously to assure the skills of the team are strong in both leadership and subject matter expertise. In Extension, team members are most often invited or self-appointed to serve on teams. Others by nature of their job description and role within the University find themselves serving as a key member of a subject or issue team. When teams are established it is common for the leadership to be identified by the sponsor. It is recommended that the team develop a clear understanding about the responsibilities of the leader and about how and when the leadership roles will be reviewed (MacMillan, 2001). If the leadership role is one that may rotate among members it is important that the selection of leaders be related to the functions of the team, succession planning or career pathing (Mohrman, Cohen & Mohrman, 1995).

**Clear direction and understanding of mission**

All team members need to reach a clear understanding and agree on what it is the team is working toward. Holpp (1999) indicated a team must create it’s mission, vision and values. The team’s vision should state the purpose for the team and what they expect to achieve. As a team works toward achieving their mission through meeting their goals and objectives the values the team holds help them to function effectively. The values of a team are often motivating and
speculative like achievement, imagination, creativity and excitement, or they inspire leadership, which empowers team members to do their best work.

**Clear role definition**

Another team behavior identified in the literature was providing members with clear role definitions. For a team to function effectively there are several roles that should be filled. The number of roles can vary depending on the type of team and its purpose in the organization but Robbins and Finley (1995) believed it is vital to have a team leader, a coordinator, and a recorder. There is no single reason that teams do not work but there are several issues or problems that can lead to failure of teams. Lack of team vision, confused or unclear goals, and unresolved or unclear roles are issues that can lead to team failure and show members’ real lack of understanding about the role of the team in the organization and their personal role on the team (Robbins & Finnley, 1995).

Over time teams change in the way they work together and the abilities and skills of members are enhanced through shared experiences. Members learn how to work together to successfully solve problems and at each stage of the team’s development there is a need for individuals to assume roles that enhance the processing capacity of the team. Team members should not be fitted into a role and expected to always serve in that manner on the team, as some members can contribute in different capacities as the team needs them to function in a different role. It should not be expected that a member only perform one function. If the team has a small number of members, doubling or tripling up the roles is recommended as long as all the needs of the team are being covered and team members feel comfortable with the roles. As team members’ skills develop they are often willing to assume leadership roles or the team may move to a less
hierarchical structure where members interact on a more level field (Robbins & Finnley, 1995).

Team members in the process of learning to work together will learn about the style and approach each team member brings to the various tasks of the team. It is important for team members to realize that the team roles can be subdivided into leadership and management roles, task roles, process roles, and dysfunctional team roles.

**Leadership and management in the team setting**

Skilled team leaders are at the center of everything that happens in teams and without specially trained and skilled leaders teams run the risk of failing. Thus, a great deal of attention should be given to training and support of team leaders. Leaders of teams quickly realize they need new team-leadership skills. Even where there is shared leadership within the team the team still reports to someone who needs more advanced skills. Team leaders who see themselves as either the top leader or just a member with a few extra things to do can increase the likelihood of failure (Zenger et al. 1994).

All members of a shared leadership team need team-leadership skills (Zenger, et al. 1994). It is suggested that a team leader build trust among all team members by focusing the team on its mission, goals, and measurements. The team leader also should keep the team energized and forward thinking and encourage innovation and calculated risk taking at the same time they help the team set boundaries. A team leader can expand the team’s effectiveness by making team members partners through sharing information with them that helps the team utilize team problem solving skills, learn and grow from their mistakes, and build the commitment of the team to its own success and to the success of other teams and the whole organization. Heller (1998) indicated that
team leadership must possess the strengths of vision, courage, integrity, self-belief and be results-oriented and that the outer signs of these qualities are seen in communication, commitment, attentiveness, visibility and teamwork. The style of leadership practiced by a team leader will evolve as the team becomes more self-directed. As the team evolves, more responsibility will be shared by team members for making decisions, planning, problem solving, and interfacing with other teams. The team members better utilize their skills and work together to accomplish the expectations of the team. An effective team leader will move from directing people to building trust and inspiring teamwork; from explaining decisions to facilitating and supporting team decisions; from training individuals to expanding team capabilities; from managing one-on-one to creating a team identity; from containing conflict to making the most of team differences; and finally from reacting to change to foreseeing and influencing change (Zenger, et al. 1994).

The following role definitions of team leaders and members describe positions and specific behaviors a team must maintain to be effective. Each role does not always have to be filled by different individuals but the behaviors need to be assumed by a member of every team. Careful consideration should be given to assigning team roles as some needed behaviors are inherently conflicting and should not be maintained by the same individual (Parker, 1990).

**Meeting Leader** is the person who schedules the meeting, sets the agenda, shares the agenda, handles the logistics of getting the room, provides the necessary equipment, other materials and resources, and invites people not on the team, if needed. The leader is expected to see that the meeting runs on
schedule, makes or clarifies assignments and follows up on agreements reached
during the meeting.

**Facilitator** is the person responsible for the meeting process and the
interaction of team members and other participants. This role allows the leader
to focus on what happens before and after the meeting. The facilitator makes sure
everyone participates, the group keeps to the agenda and schedule, participants
show respect for each other and the scribe or note-taker is able to keep pace.

**Sponsor** is the individual or individuals who launch the team and supervise the
team’s progress. This person(s) will support the team and advocate for the team
when needed.

**Coach** is an external person who is trained to provide guidance and support to
the team. This person may communicate with several team members and will
help them to determine if they need additional training or support and if the
team would benefit from employment of team management strategies.

**Reviewer** is a person who is not a regular member of the team but is
responsible for a regularly occurring performance evaluation of the team’s
performance. This person should follow a set of guidelines for evaluating
individual and team accomplishments and should be able to determine the
contribution of the individuals and the team’s delivery of agreed upon
performance measures.

**Analyst** is the guardian and critic of the team’s long-term effectiveness. This
person brings the drive to strive for the best possible solutions. He/she insists
faults be corrected and needs to develop the art of constructively pointing a way
to possible remedies. This person is an expert at analyzing solutions to find weaknesses within them and is very analytical.

**Implementer** is a person who has a can-do mentality and ensures the momentum and smooth running of the teams actions. This person will overcome defeatist attitudes of others and anticipates delays in schedule in time to prevent them.

**Initiator** is a person who proposes team tasks, goals or actions, defines group problems and suggests procedures for meeting. “Our job seems like...” “Can we make a list of...?”

**Idea Person** is a person with an enthusiasm for new ideas. This person is eager and receptive to the ideas of others; sees problems as opportunities for successful innovation rather than as disasters. This person is never at a loss for suggestions.

**Information Giver** provides data or facts. Offers an interpretation or opinion on the facts. “Our research discovered...” “My opinion is...”

**Information Seeker** requests data, facts and opinions. “Where’s the data to support this conclusion?” “I want to hear how other people are thinking about this.”

**Clarifier** interprets information or elaborates on ideas. He/she asks questions in an effort to understand or promote understanding. “Here’s how I see the situation...” “Help us understand. . .”

**Summarizer** pulls together related ideas, restates suggestions and offers a conclusion or possible decisions for consideration. “It looks like we agree that...” “One possible way to do this, is”
**Evaluator/Reality Tester** makes a critical analysis of a recommendation and tests any idea against some data, constraint or policy. “We need to take a look at...” “We need to examine this strategy...”

**Inspector** is the evaluator of team performance and judge of other people’s contribution. He/she is able to recognize success as well as find problems in performance. This person also enforces standards within the team.

**Recorder** is the note-taker, records discussions and decisions. Since the scribe records only input, the recorder is relieved of secretarial duty to record every detail. The note-taker is responsible for keeping track of who makes what points during discussions, decisions that are made, and who will take charge of what actions. The recorder should be able to write quickly, accurately and objectively. After the meeting the recorder must turn the notes into a report and distribute them to all participants. The recorder facilitates communication by keeping a written record of team meetings and communications.

**Scribe** records participation, writing out ideas, suggestions, questions and other input on a flip chart or blackboard. This frees the facilitator to interact with other participants. The scribe must listen attentively, rework rapidly and accurately and if necessary, write quickly and clearly. The scribe facilitates communication by keeping a written record of team meetings and communications.

According to MacMillian’s model (2001) team members must balance leading and being led. A theory supporting a balanced leadership model describes Tao as a behavior desirable among team members. The essence of Tao or team power is to know who you are as a person, live in the world around you and
understand fully your experiences (Torres, 1994). According to the concept of Tao, team members should not depend on the opinions of others for to do so robs them of the opportunity to better understand themselves. The individual must trust their own intuition, know the limits of his or her personal power and use it to direct events without using force. By using this essence of team power an individual can lead others by example, allowing people to manage themselves. The team member or leader can cultivate a strong vision of how to resolve conflict, practice the least complex things in life and recognize that every journey begins with the first step. The Tao model proposes that powerful team members do not need to show power, because they radiate force with the knowledge that allowing force to move through them will allow them to receive the same energy in a different form. The team process allows members to build upon each other’s ideas and experiences. This is often referred to as synergy or “the whole became more than the sum of its parts” (Wellins, et al. 1991, p. xxvii).

**How teams work and meeting norms**

It is important for team members to understand how the team works together to accomplish the work of the team. Basic agreement on how meetings are conducted and the expectations for member behaviors can best be communicated in a charter or team by-laws, which should be developed to include organizational information that needs to be understood by the charter members and potential member of the team. The charter should include information about how and when the team meets including the location, length, and frequency of meetings, expectations for member commitment, organizational
and team expectations, team processes and procedures including written and oral communication, leadership selection and duration, finance or budget procedures, and overall team structure including sub groups.

Meeting process behaviors are identified as critical to team success (Holpp, 1999; & Kelly 1991). Team meetings should be informal and strict parliamentary procedures are not supportive of teamwork. Team meetings demand participation and commitment from every member. Each person has responsibility to make every meeting successful. Freedom is important but it should not detract from the sense of purpose, direction and accomplishment.

Several team members should have responsibility for a meeting as this provides a sense of ownership and cooperation and distributes the workload. Some problems can stop the progress of team meetings so it is helpful if a team establishes norms for meeting behavior. The team leader should learn skills to foster a positive balanced atmosphere and should lead the group in establishing a basic understanding of how team members should interact during meetings. Some basics that might be included are sharing ideas, listening to understand, compromising and taking responsibility for your share of the work. Strategies to assist a team leader solve team meeting problems should create an approach that can be used to effectively deal with situations that arise in the functioning of a team (Holpp, 1999). Most problem solving strategies emphasize a systematic approach that consists of three essentials: define the nature of the problem, identify the potential causes and seek solutions. Holpp (1999) recommended a four-part strategy called STOP, which stands for Situation - Target - Options -
Plan. STOP utilizes brainstorming as the first step to identify the problem. The target step is to visualize what the process would be like if there were no problem. The third step allows team members to develop creative ideas that will end the problem. The fourth step is to rank the ideas according to their impact on the problem and the effort needed to implement them and to make an action plan to incorporate the best idea or solutions into the way the team functions.

Total performance of teams is influenced by quality and success of their meetings. Teams can improve their work by improving their meetings through team managed facilitation. Facilitation can be judged only by its results. In order to accomplish appropriate results, facilitators should be concerned with more than the process. Facilitation of meetings should be viewed as an element of team performance whose over-arching function is to contribute to team formation, development and self-sufficiency (Dee, 1995).

Regular formal and informal meetings help to establish open avenues of communication and build trust. Full team access to information, facts, figures, agendas, and minutes relevant to the team’s responsibilities and projects help team members feel they are trusted and are equal partners. Techniques to get ideas on the table and for creating an atmosphere of acceptance help members feel comfortable sharing thoughts. Brainstorming, a technique for recording everyone’s ideas and not evaluating them until a later time, encourages positive contributions from all team members. Team meetings need to be the responsibility of every team member. The team leader should begin by making sure that members understand the purpose of the meeting, know what needs to
be accomplished at the meeting, what potential problems will be faced and how potential problems could be solved. Team members need to know which members will have specific responsibilities in the meeting. Finally they also need to know what resources such as, people, equipment, materials, and information will be needed at the meeting.

Team managed facilitation training was suggested by Kinlaw (1993). According to Kinlaw training should last a minimum of two days and should include training in developing team member skills on how to facilitate meetings and group processes. It should include modules on payoffs, content, and objectives; the meaning of team-managed facilitation; the model of successful team meetings; the review of behavioral dramatization; core competencies; and practice and feedback.

The importance of team members having different styles and being adaptive is supported by the summarized findings from instruments developed by Parker (1990), which survey team player styles and team development styles. From the summaries, action plans are developed to assist teams as they go through the stages of team development. The leadership roles of members include the contributor, collaborator, challenger and the communicator. Parker (1990) indicated the most effective teams have a balance of team player styles and that the style of leadership needed at a particular time is situational and based upon the stage of team development. Team players all need to be equally concerned with completing high quality work, reaching their goals, developing and maintaining a positive team, and continuing to question the team’s goals and
methods. According to this model it is important to maintain a balance on the
team of members who have each of the leadership styles (contributor,
collaborator, challenger and communicator). The training component of this
model would suggest as its first step assessing the team-player styles and
increasing personal effectiveness. The other important training component is to
help team members develop skills to increase team effectiveness in 12 areas with
successive modules on planning and goal setting, meeting management,
listening, resolving conflict, consensus building, presentations, risk taking,
problem solving, role clarification, mentorship, ethics, assertiveness, feedback,
monitoring and evaluation, dealing with ineffective team players and rewards
and recognition (Parker, 1990).

The concept of teamwork has matured as more companies and businesses
have adopted teamwork and a second generation of teams which are more self-
directed have emerged. Organizations that have been able to change their culture
are developing more self-directed teams and with the advent of these teams
strong training of team members at the outset is even more important (Dee,
1995). With training, teams develop more interdependence and become self-
empowered with an emphasis on rekindling enthusiasm.

A key factor to maintaining high quality teamwork is the development of a
code of ethics and the values upheld by team members. The code of ethics should
include the attributes of honesty, belongingness, respect for other team members
and regard for contributions of others.
Another method for improving communications suggested by Dee (1995) was benchmarking, which is the study of the practices of another organization or organizations, known as partners, in order to improve the quality of processes and increase competitiveness. Benchmarking is a cooperative effort and teams are generally employed to carry out this lengthy and complex process. Training for better team meetings leads to increased team performance and teaching all members to be facilitators allows them to interact more effectively.

**Communication**

Talk is central to the work of teams since it is the way information is exchanged, decisions are made and plans are formulated. The way a team talks or communicates reveals where the team is coming from and where it is headed. Team talk can be used to intervene and shape team dynamics to bring about more effective team productivity. Team members can conduct a team talk audit in which members share their observations, and work toward better understandings and ways of working together (Donnellon, 1996).

Communication is a key factor for effective team interactions. It would seem logical to conclude that communication is essential for teams to be successful (Bodner, 1997). Team communication is often overlooked or viewed as nonessential. In her summary of experiential training as a method of teambuilding, Bodner indicated that if teams do not communicate during the team activities the team will fail. Bodner indicated the lesson about communications needed to accomplish a task always makes an impact on every group and the team members have a greater appreciation for the importance of
communication in their ability to perform tasks and overcome challenges the team faces.

According to MacMillian (2001), communication is the means of cooperation. Fast, clear and accurate written and oral communications that demonstrate members are capable of straight talk and quick sharing of ideas are the key to thinking collectively and finding team cohesiveness and synergy. Communication among top performing teams is approached with a determined intentionality.

After determining the learning strategies of team members and selecting teaching methodologies that should work best with a team, the first type of training that should be conducted for adults in teams is communication and dialogue instruction (Payne-Anderson, 1998). Team learning begins with “dialogue which is the capacity of members of a team to suspend assumptions and enter into a genuine thinking together (Senge, 1994). The Greek word dialogos means a flowing of meaning through a group and it is when this level of communication is achieved that teamwork is at a well-developed stage (Payne-Anderson, 1998). Senge (1990) identified three necessary conditions for dialogue as (1) participants must suspend their assumptions, (2) participants must show regard for one another as colleagues, and (3) a person who can hold the context of dialogue must act as the facilitator. “These three conditions allow meaning to flow through the group and on to the individual” (Payne-Anderson, 1998, p. 6). With the presence of these three conditions, new views are learned and information is discovered in a way that allows for deeper understanding. The
knowledge gained is processed more quickly and is retained longer. This level of communication helps team members recognize and value their differences and build trust among them (Donnellon, 1996). Lack of good communication or team talk can lead to ineffective or fragile teams in which team members and managers all feel skepticism, conflict, stress, and confusion.

Teams whose members are not co-located must adopt methods of communication that allow teams to work across time and space. Utilization of telecommuting to allow a team from a global company to work across time zones and continents has been suggested by Robbins and Finley (1995). Some of the network and shareware technology available do not allow for this type of communication; however, there are four types of groupware available. The first type of technology allows teams to meet at the same time/same place. At the low end of this type of software, teams can get their thoughts in order, prioritize them and then vote on whatever action is to be taken. The second type of technology is same time/different place, which allows people to communicate across distance. The third type of software is for different time/same place. These programs allow members to plug into a site at a time of their choosing. This software might allow three shifts of workers to be in constant communication. The fourth type of software allows for different time/different place communication. The technologies for teamwork are still young and with continued development they could become a dominant force in the way teams use computers to advance communications among teams. If technology is going to be effective, the right
combination of technology is necessary and team members must be well trained in how to use the technology to its best advantage (Robbins and Finley, 1995).

**Establishing Team Trust**

An essential feature of successful teamwork is trust. Members thrive on mutual trust so it is important to work to achieve it early in the life of a team. Mutual trust can be developed by having open communication and a free exchange of ideas. A team where members are free to make their own decisions and where some of the work is delegated to individuals and small groups can lead to gaining trust when members deliver what is expected. The delegation of authority allows for members to share the power and the responsibility for the outcomes of the team. Members with knowledge and expertise appreciate being trusted to follow through on assignments and are not opposed to a regular reporting system, which keeps others on the team updated on the progress.

Some of the issues that can cause team failure are related to the group’s inability to work together. Issues that arise are often due to poor decision making processes; mismatched needs or agendas of individuals on a team; policies, rules and procedures that do not work for the team structure; poor leadership; and lack of team trust. Similar reasons for poor team success or failure identified by Dee, (1995) include breakdown of information collecting, promotional leadership, intra-team conflict, a shortage of alternatives, lack of frankness, pointless meetings, lack of self-criticism, and the failure to cycle downward and outward members that do not fit in the team.
Delphi Technique

The Delphi technique is commonly used to obtain collective judgments about a particular topic by a panel of experts on that topic through a set of carefully designed sequential questionnaires from which summarized information and feedback of opinions derived from earlier responses are compiled and sent to the respondents again. The process continues with additional input from the panel of experts until the panel reaches consensus. The Delphi does not require face-to-face contact between participants and individuals respond anonymously interacting with other participants in the study only by the summarized responses on each successive questionnaire. The Delphi is designed to allow anonymity, controlled feedback and a statistical representation of the group’s responses, which allows for the best of individual thought to be incorporated with group interaction (Dalkey, Rourke, Lewis, & Snyder, 1972).

Delphi panelists are motivated to actively participate only if they feel they will gain from the information generated as a result of the process. Turoff and Hiltz (1996) indicated that the value received should be perceived to be equal to the value of the effort expended.

Dalkey and Helmer (1963) at Rand Corporation did the original studies using the Delphi technique in the 1950s to forecast likely scenarios related to national defense issues (Dalkey, 1969; Dalkey & Rourke, 1971; and Helmer, 1967, 1976). Panels of experts provided opinions about possible courses of action by other nations related to our defense. Opinion statements were synthesized and sent to the panel until a consensus was reached. The Delphi technique has been
used for forecasting, planning, predicting policy impact and exchanging current scientific information in a variety of fields (Dalkey, 1972; Delbecq, Van de Ven, Gustafson, 1975; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; and Weaver, 1972). The Delphi technique can be applied to a wide range of administrative and program planning issues (Delbecq, et al. 1986). The Delphi technique also has been used for long range planning, curriculum development, goal setting, policy determination, program development and issue clarification (Bell 1997; Cyphert & Gant, 1971; Judd, 1972; Skutsch, 1972; Ulschak, 1983; Weaver, 1972; and Ziglio, 1996).

In original Delphi methodology the first round of the survey is open-ended allowing each participant to provide unique input. The ideas and items generated are then used to develop the next round of the survey. Ludwig (1994) used a modified method where the researcher created the first round statements based on a thorough review of the literature and expertise in the subject area.

Delbecq et al. (1975) indicated at least 45 days are needed to complete the Modified Delphi process and each round should take the respondent no longer than 30 minutes to complete. Adler & Ziglio (1996) indicated the advantages of using the Delphi technique include cost and time savings. It is possible to bring several people with expertise on a subject together by use of a method that does not require assembly of a group. The Delphi process allows think time and requires participants to write their ideas down prior to sharing them, which promotes careful and in-depth thinking. The Delphi process allows participants time to digest comments and input from others thoroughly before responding, which reduces misinterpretation. Assuring anonymity allows persons to express
opinions and take positions, which they might otherwise not express due to their organizational positions. Finally, the Delphi technique has a proven track record of effectiveness in a variety of problems and situations (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).

Anonymity often associated or considered to be a characteristic of the Delphi technique should not be considered a hard and fast rule for all aspects of a Delphi exercise. Computers make possible a number of variations on anonymity including the use of pen names and having members assume required roles and allowing panelists to assume multiple roles. Studies where participants have the option of using a code name associated with their comments and input is one option. Other options include allowing the respondents to select when they wish to be identified by a code name, remain anonymous or even elect to use their own name. Knowing who is part of the panel of experts and valuing the other respondents as a peer group is also considered vital to maintaining participation and commitment by panel members (Turoff and Hiltz, 1996).

Adler and Ziglio (1996) recommended a process for building rapport among team members. Their process indicated barriers between members that prohibit open and in-depth conversation can be broken down by establishing a semi-structured conversation using either computers, teleconference or a face-to-face meeting. They also suggested providing a biographical sketch, which includes general background information, a summary of the reasons why each member was chosen and a description of their expertise. The panel members can be assigned a code name so participants can follow the line of reasoning and better understand the train of thought of each participant. The level of
anonominity desirable can depend upon the sensitivity of the topic and use of code names can have potential problems since participants may be able to link a person’s statements to him or her due to his or her writing style or way of phrasing his/her responses. However, some situations have benefited from reducing or eliminating anonymity. Some Delphi studies have been conducted where participants remain anonymous so they feel free to share opinions or thoughts, which they feel could jeopardize their position or credibility.

As an addition to asking panel members to complete the Delphi questionnaires, use of a separate computer based conference site devoted to socialization among group members was recommended (Turoff and Hiltz, 1966). This site can allow for member interactions, side conversations and social/emotional exchanges, which can lead to consensus development and eliminate potential misinterpretation of responses.

This literature review has summarized the concepts surrounding indicators of success for program teams. They provide the framework for the design of the research study described in chapter three.
Figure 2.1 Framework for the exploration of indicators of success based upon the review of literature
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Using a descriptive-survey research design, a panel of experts on Extension program teams was surveyed to identify critical indicators of success of programs teams within an Extension System. A multiphase Modified Delphi technique was used in this exploratory study. The objective was to identify indicators of success perceived by experts as fulfilling the goals of the team. The indicators of success will be used to measure team success, assess individuals contributions, and could be reported to supervisors for consideration in performance reviews. The researcher gathered input from a purposeful sample that comprised a panel of experts who were knowledgeable individuals from all levels of Extension organizations in the United States.

Delphi technique is a method designed to structure group communications so the process allows a group of individuals to deal with a complex problem (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). The Delphi method generally uses a panel of experts (see appendix A) who are selected based on their knowledge and expertise of the subject being explored. Utilization of a nomination process, where the researcher selects individuals based on criteria set for the topic being explored provides
participants who meet the specific qualifications pertinent to the topic (Jones & Twiss, 1978). Linstone and Turoff (1975) recommended seeking nominations from respected and well known persons within the target group. The Delphi technique is usually characterized by: (1) an opportunity for people to make individual contributions of information and knowledge; (2) an assessment or evaluation of the group opinions or views; (3) an opportunity for individuals to revise their views based upon input of other participants or newly gained knowledge; and (4) the opportunity for persons to remain anonymous. An instrument utilizing open-ended statements with a six-step agree/disagree Likert type scale was utilized. The typical steps for a Delphi study were taken to accomplish the objectives of the study: (a) selection of the participants; (b) instrument development; (c) data collection by surveying the panel over three rounds, which allowed the panel of experts to come to a consensus on the items in the survey; and d) analysis and interpretation.

Delphi is considered an appropriate research method when one or more of the following conditions exist: subjective opinions on a collective basis are more appropriate for the exploration of the problem than precise analytical techniques; the individuals needed to contribute to a collective opinion are geographically dispersed and have diverse backgrounds with respect to experience or expertise; individuals cannot meet face-to-face efficiently due to time and expense of travel; anonymity and assurance that no individual opinion is allowed to dominate due to the strength of an individual or personality is desired and to assure the input and consideration of the opinions of all contributors’ ideas (Linstone & Turoff,
Since all of these criteria were present in the problem to be studied, the Delphi was considered to be an appropriate methodology.

The methodology chapter has been divided into four sections to present the steps used to accomplish the objectives of the study. The sections are: selection of panel members, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis.

**Selection of Delphi Panel Members**

Determining the number of experts needed for a qualitative study using a purposeful sample should be judged on the basis of the purpose and rationale of the study and the sampling strategy used to achieve the study’s purpose (Patton, 1990). The validity, meaningfulness and insights generated from a panel of experts in a qualitative inquiry have more to do with the expertise of the persons selected for the panel and the ability of the researcher to capture the full scope of each individual’s perspective through analytical capabilities than with sample size.

This research was conducted using Extension faculty from land grant universities in the United States. An effort was made to identify experts who had knowledge of program teams in the four program areas common to most Extension organizations. These program areas include agriculture and natural resources, family and consumer sciences, 4-H youth development, and community and economic development. During February 2003, state directors of Extension identified 25 individuals as experts on teamwork. These individuals were identified as experts based on meeting one or more of the following criteria: (a) a high level of knowledge and understanding related to the philosophy of
teamwork, (b) experience related to research or scholarly work in the area of teamwork, (c) experience training or coaching teams within Extension, (d) experience as an administrator or sponsor of teams within Extension, (e) a clear and thorough understanding of the standards used within their state system for recognition and reward of teams, and (f) a clear and thorough understanding of the standards used to promote and grant tenure to individuals within their department or college. From the 25 nominated individuals, 25 panel members were selected for the study.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommended selecting a sample large enough to ensure that all perspectives, ideas and opinions be included in the responses of the panel members selected for the study. In purposeful sampling the size of the sample is determined by informational considerations. This researcher invited directors of Extension organizations across the country with program teams to nominate one or two persons who met the aforementioned criteria. The researcher felt that including representation from all of the states that chose to nominate a person for the study would be beneficial. Maintaining as many of the 25 nominated individuals as possible in the sample assured the differences in Extension Systems and that a full spectrum of ideas were represented in the process. Selection of an adequate sample size in qualitative research can be left open to determination as the research process evolves. Limits of time and resources as well as the need to outline and justify procedural methods for sample selection led to the need to make this decision in the design phase. Since 25 persons were nominated on the first request, it was determined the states
responding would be those with the most interest in the outcome of the research. Thus, their representatives would likely follow through with the in-depth process of participation in the multiphase Delphi study. Personal contact information was provided to the researcher about each panel member by the nominator along with a short justification for the nomination.

During February 2003, the identified experts were telephoned requesting their participation in the study. E-mails were sent to the identified experts not readily available by phone requesting a convenient time to call or, if preferred, an agreement to participate based upon information in the e-mail explaining the process. A confirmation telephone contact was made by the researcher with each panel member to clarify the objectives of the study and to stress the importance of their participation. A script was used to review the nature of the panel, the obligations of the participant, the expected length of time the Delphi process would take and the procedures that would be used to communicate and participate in the Delphi study. Personal commitment was sought from each participant. They were informed about how the information would be shared among participants. The 25 individuals, who had been nominated, agreed to participate as members of the panel of experts. Information verified by panel members included address, telephone number, fax number, e-mail address and the telephone number of a person who could be contacted if the panel member was not available. Each panel member also was asked to share dates they would not be available to allow for timing of rounds to best suit the majority of the members. Due to the widespread geographic dispersement of the panel members
the researcher requested participants introduce themselves to the group. They were asked to give a brief description of themselves that told others what they themselves would want to know about other panel members. The panel members shared their expectations for the Delphi project and any concerns about the outcomes they might have. The biographical sketches were not attached to the code names but were provided so participants had an understanding of the expertise levels of all participants in the study, which leads to greater member participation and satisfaction (Rotondi & Gustafson 1996; Turoff & Hiltz, 1996). Adler & Ziglio (1996) also indicated introductions increase participant enthusiasm for a project. The assigned code names were available for use by the respondents on the OSU web site if they desired or they could choose to remain anonymous. The OSU website use of code names allowed respondents to share ideas or thoughts without revealing their identity but allowed other participants to link to a respondent’s comments and train of thought. This forum allowed for open discussion where panel members had the option of identifying themselves with their real name, code name or choosing to remain anonymous. Procedures followed for use of a separate web based forum for open discussion were identified in Adler & Ziglio (1996.)

The questionnaires for the three rounds of the Delphi study were posted on Zoomerang. This web based survey instrument did not allow for use of code names, thus all summarized lists of responses were anonymous. Zoomerang (2002) is an internet service for business and individual surveys. It provided features, which allowed for prompt responses to questions and the ability to
analyze data in real time. Zoomerang allowed for data to be recorded for the
duration of the subscription period and for results to be anonymously shared
with all participants. The panel of experts was essential in accomplishing the
objectives of the study, which were to identify behaviors and outcomes of
Extension program teams that could be identified as indicators of a team’s
success in Extension.

**Instrumentation**

A review of the literature identified indicators of team success in
businesses, industry and organizations in general. Additional items were gleaned
from program team leader interviews conducted by Bartsche and Kelbaugh
(2001). The indicators used by business and industry as well as those identified
during the team leader interviews were used in the development of statements for
the 29 items on the first instrument. Three rounds of the Delphi were planned.
An instrument was developed for each round. Three rounds provided panel
members the ability to come to consensus on the issues or problems (Altschuld,
Thomas, McClosky, Smith, Wiseman & Lower, 1992; Cyphert and Gant, 1971;
and Delbecq, et al., 1975). Additional rounds do not yield enough new
information to justify the cost and recommended using as few rounds as possible
to achieve consensus (Dalkey, 1972). Instruments II and III were each developed
based on responses to the preceding instrument.

The instrument used in step one (the first round of the Delphi to identify
indicators of successful Extension program teams) (see appendix D) included 29
behaviors and outcomes and a six-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree,
2 = disagree, 3 = mildly disagree, 4 = mildly agree, 5 = agree, and 6 = strongly agree) on which the experts were asked to indicate their level of agreement regarding each individual and team behavior and outcome being considered as a major contributor or indicator of team success.

Content and face validity of the team indicators of success used in Round I were field tested with a review panel of six OSU Extension faculty considered to be knowledgeable about teams and team terminology (see Appendix B for list of panel members). The panel was informed that the purpose of the instrument was to identify indicators of team success in Extension. The panel was asked to review the instrument for clarity and content to achieve this purpose and to make suggestions for fine tuning the instrument. Neither construct validity nor criterion related validity is necessary with the Delphi technique, which seeks to assess what should be with regard to team success indicators. The nature of the Delphi technique does not necessitate additional types of validity. Neither construct nor criterion-related validity is concerned with the predictive relationship of items to external criterion (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996). No attempt should be made to generalize the results of the Delphi panel to any other population or situation. Therefore neither ecological nor population validity are important to consider in this study. Reliability cannot be measured using conventional procedures of estimation with a Delphi study. Since reliability procedures look at the stability in measurement over time or across forms, it does not apply to the Delphi technique where panel members are seeking consensus and the instrument is modified in each round based on panel member input. Use
of the same approach with different experts could be considered to play somewhat the same role as reliability (Delbecq, et al., 1975; Dalkey, et al., 1972). Dalkey (1969) reported an increase in reliability of group responses with increasing group size. Reliability with a correlation coefficient of .9 was found with a group size of 13 (Dakley, 1969).

Instrument II (see Appendix E) was developed based on responses to the first instrument (see Appendix G) and suggestions for new statements made by the Delphi panel of experts. Consensus was achieved on 15 items in Round I and were not included in Round II. The instrument used in Round II repeated 14 items from Round I. The items for which consensus was not achieved were edited as deemed appropriate from Round I feedback and included in Instrument II. Consensus on a statement was considered to have been reached when 80% of the ratings from the Delphi panel of experts, who responded to each questionnaire, fell within two rating categories on the six-point Likert-type scale (Ulschak, 1983).

The instrument in Round II contained eight additional items derived from suggestions received from the Delphi panel in Round I. A researcher sounding board (see Appendix C) reviewed new or revised statements to be included in the Round II instrument based on input from the Delphi panel of experts. The sounding board consisted of the researcher and three OSU Extension faculty familiar with teamwork principles and terminology. The panel reviewed the summary of the input from the Delphi panel and the reworded statements which
the researcher had developed based on the steps suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Thomas (2001):

• Identify and group together common ideas
• Identify key phrases or words in each new group of ideas or suggestions
• Identify each new group with a label
• Develop a written statement for each new idea or suggestion

After making any suggested revisions, the new statements were then incorporated into the next round. The written comments added value to the quantitative data obtained from the modified Delphi technique used in this study. The descriptive statements were written to reflect the new category with an effort to maintain the original wording suggested by Delphi panel members where possible (Altschuld, et al., 1992; Meyer, 1992). A total of 22 items, including eight new statements were identified on the Round II instrument (see Appendix E).

Instrument III (see Appendix F) was developed based on responses to the second instrument and suggestions made by the Delphi panel (see Appendix H). The Round III instrument contained 17 items on which consensus was not achieved in Round II. Consensus was achieved on five items in Round II and were not repeated in Round III. The researcher sounding board, (see Appendix B) reviewed new or revised statements to be included in the Round III instrument based on input from the Delphi panel of experts. The descriptive statements were written to reflect the new category with an effort to maintain the original wording suggested by Delphi panel members where possible (Altschuld,
et al., 1992; Meyer, 1992). A total of 21 items with three new items, identified from written responses to Round II, were on the Round III instrument.

Two types of feedback were used in Rounds II and III. The first was statistical feedback for each statement in Rounds I and II respectively in the form of the reported measures of central tendency. Secondly, all comments by the Delphi panel for each statement in Rounds I and II were reported anonymously. The individual’s own response to each statement was included in the personal e-mail, which invited participation in Rounds II and III. In Round III the Delphi panel was asked to review each statement, evaluate their position on those statements where consensus was not reached and re-rate using the same six point Likert-type scale where one indicated strongly disagree, and six indicated strongly agree. On items where a person’s rating varied two or more points from the rest of the panel, he or she was asked to provide rationale for the rating.

Data Collection

Verification was received on February 4, 2003, from The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) that this study was determined to be exempt from review by the IRB Board. The following protocol number, 2003E0036, was assigned to the study and permission was granted for the study to be conducted. Data collection began on February 24 and ended on April 10.

To maximize response rates of the potential panel of experts, they were telephoned individually to confirm their intent to take part in the study, clarify the objectives and stress the importance of their participation. A pre-notice was sent three days prior to the e-mail announcing availability of the questionnaire on
the Web. Three days after sending the e-mail, the panel members were e-mailed a note of inquiry to assure they received the invitation to complete the survey and were able to access the Web site from the link. An automatic response thanking participants for their participation was sent following submission of their responses to each round of the process (Dillman, 2000). An additional note of appreciation was included in the pre-notice for the instruments used in Rounds II and III of the study. A concern Dillman (2000) presented in using a Web-based questionnaire is the importance of familiarity with computer use and the ability to apply computer logic while focusing on the logic required to respond to the questionnaire. The nature of the panel of experts, a non-random sample of professionals, whose jobs necessitate frequent use of computers was felt to address this issue.

All correspondence was sent utilizing e-mail messages with hot links to an OSU web site developed for this research project and to the survey instruments on Zoomerang, a survey tool created by MarketTools (1999). Participants responded to the survey instruments using the six point Likert type scale and were provided space to include written feedback on each individual item. Results were downloaded to an Excel spreadsheet, allowing the data to be utilized in the Statistical Program for Research in the Social Sciences (SPSS) (2003), which was used for data analysis. Once panel members had submitted their responses to the questionnaire on Zoomerang, they could link directly to the OSU Web site using a code name to post additional thoughts about each statement or share other ideas on teamwork in Extension.
The e-mails consisted of a participant invitation, which was similar to a conventional cover letter and information on how to respond to the items on the Delphi Survey and how to submit the responses in a manner that allowed for anonymity. Panelists were given two weeks from the date of the e-mail to respond. Each e-mail required a message to be sent back to the researcher indicating receipt of the message. A special fax transmittal sheet was designed for use if any respondent needed an alternative form of communication at any time during the three rounds of the research study. In instances where a fax was used, the panelist’s responses were entered into the Zoomerang database on the respondents behalf by the researcher or a volunteer retained for data entry. Reminder notices were sent within two days of the due date to panel members who had not responded on each round. These panel members were contacted by e-mail or by telephone to encourage them to complete and return their responses to the questionnaire. The data collection process took approximately two months to complete.

During Round I, the researcher contacted each panel member the day after the instrument was received to verify that they could access the Web site from the link and were able to respond to the instrument. Also, they were given an opportunity to have any questions answered and encouraged to complete and return their responses promptly. A package of note cards with a teamwork theme was sent to each participant between Rounds II and III as an incentive to complete the Round III instrument and to thank the panel of expert participants. Letters of appreciation were mailed or transmitted electronically following each
round to maintain interest and confirm the arrival date of the next instrument. Turoff & Hiltz (1996) revealed that loss of interest by participants due to the repetitive nature of the measures is one of the negative aspects of the Delphi technique and recommended frequent correspondence and positive reinforcement of panel members to assure their continued participation for the duration of the study. Appendix J contains examples of the correspondence used.

**Data Analysis**

The responses on the Likert-type scale were converted to numerical values for analytical purposes (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *mildly disagree*, 4 = *mildly agree*, 5 = *agree* and 6 = *strongly agree*). Measures of variance and central tendency were computed using SPSS for each statement. Those indicators of team success receiving a mean score of 4.5 or more were considered to be vital behaviors to team effectiveness. A mean of 4.5 was selected based on the rationale that a behavior should receive a rating above agree to be identified as an important or critical behavior to team success. Items at the lower end of the scale 1.5 or below were examined to determine if they might be considered barriers to team effectiveness and success. Since no items achieved consensus on the lower end of the likert-type scale there were none to be discussed.

For interpretation and reporting, the items were grouped into four levels based on the median response. Those that received ratings of strongly disagree, or disagree were grouped to become the strong disagreement range. Items that received a mildly disagree response were considered to be in the moderate disagreement range. Items that received a moderately agree response were
considered to be in the moderate agreement range. Items that received median responses of agree or strongly agree were grouped to become the strong agreement range.

The variance for responses to each item was interpreted based on the middle range of responses. The amount of convergence of responses that result from the repeated process is a measure of how much more agreement is achieved on succeeding rounds of the Delphi (Jones, 1975). In Delphi experiments the spread between the lower and upper quartile values generally show considerable reduction during the course of the data collection but this varies considerable from group to group (Jones, 1975 and Linstone & Turoff, 1975). Consensus on a statement was agreed upon when 80% of the ratings, for respondents to each of the three researcher developed questionnaires, fell within two categories on a six-point Likert scale. Frequency counts and percentages, along with the mode, median, mean, and standard deviation were reviewed in determining consensus. These criteria were established based on similar research as well as examination of the data and comments provided by the panel members. Those items meeting the criteria were supported in the literature. Items not meeting criteria for consensus were included in the following round as well as new items were generated from suggestions. Suggested items were created and content analysis conducted following the procedures explained in the instrumentation section. All written responses for support or disagreement with items on each round were reprinted in the next round. The Round III data was analyzed descriptively. Those items for which consensus was reached were identified.
each item on which consensus was reached was calculated and variability was reported using the standard deviation. The mean was used to indicate the level of importance of the item as an indicator of team success in Extension program teams. Items that were supported as indicators of team success and accompanying statistical descriptions are reported in Chapter IV.

**Summary of Procedures**

In summary, a modified Delphi technique was used in this descriptive-survey research. The Delphi Panel consisted of 25 experts, nominated by directors of Extension Systems in the United States. They were selected to identify indicators of success for program teams in Extension. A process using three researcher-developed instruments to collect opinions of the panel was used. Panel members were sent a statistical summary as well as written responses from all respondents along with a list of their own responses on each item created from reworded items not achieving consensus on the previous questionnaire. The information was provided to encourage panel members to consider their responses and the comments of other experts as they rated the item on successive questionnaires.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The Extension System in Ohio and many others across the country have adopted teams as a way of developing and delivering excellent programs in subject matter areas and as a way to address interdisciplinary issues. Members of program teams have included full time Extension personnel with faculty appointments, Extension specialists who serve in district and state roles, faculty with split appointments between other departments or colleges and Extension faculty with full time appointments in other departments of the college of Food Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences or in other colleges within Ohio State University (OSU). Job descriptions may or may not have included team responsibilities. Some faculty in team interviews conducted by Bartsche & Kelbaugh (2001) indicated they receive mixed messages from their superiors about the importance and professional value of the work of teams and the time they should be contributing to these efforts. Professionals serving on teams need to have a clear understanding of the expectations of the organization and administrative support to be able to function effectively. In order to clarify the expectations for those professionals and to assure consistent expectations are understood by persons at all levels of the University, consensus about the expectations of teams and team membership is needed. The exploration of
indicators of success for Extension program teams was needed in order to clarify the expectations of Extension organizations and to answer the underlying question team leaders, members and supervisors were asking. If teams and team members are to be measured, evaluated and rewarded based on the supervisor’s or administrator’s observations then team members ask what are the indicators of success that will be used in that evaluation. Those indicators of success should be established for the specific organization for which they will be used. The purpose of this study was to identify individual and team behaviors and impacts and outcomes that are appropriate to use as indicators of success. The purpose of program teams is to be able to produce a product or service through combined efforts of several persons with expertise on a given subject. The combined efforts should lead to better end products and more efficient use of time and resources across an organization.

The study used a three round modified Delphi technique to collect qualitative and quantitative information to explore and describe the characteristics that are identified as indicators of success for program teams in Extension organizations. A panel of 25 experts, purposefully selected following a nomination process, was used to identify the indicators of success.

The results reported in this chapter are presented in chronological order. All three rounds of the Modified Delphi instrument are discussed. Each round is represented by a summary of each question and whether the question reached consensus, descriptive statistics, (mean, frequency, standard deviation) and written comments by the panel of experts.
Results: Round I

The results reported on Round I are based on usable responses of 21 panel members to the Round I instrument. One member of the panel was unsuccessful at entering data to the Web based system and another member submitted data twice. One of this person’s response sets was eliminated from the data analysis. The researcher calculated the acceptance rates for all items on Round I with each set of responses from the panel member who responded two times to find that there was no difference in the items which achieved consensus using the criteria that 80% of the responses must fall within two response categories on the Likert type scale. Another panel member notified the researcher that she had not responded because of a need to deal with unexpected urgent budgetary issues, which had prevented her from taking the time to respond. The final non-respondent did not acknowledge receipt of the invitation to participate in this round of the survey. The instrument contained 29 literature based statements related to indicators of success of program teams. Table 4.1 contains the descriptive statistics for each statement. The panel reached consensus on 15 of the 29 statements. Once a statement achieved consensus it was removed from further rounds of the modified Delphi questionnaire. Consensus was reached when 80% of the responses fell within two points on a six point Likert-type scale. Written responses led to the creation of four additional statements. A summary of each statement from Round I follows. Appendix G includes all written comments received in Round I.
### Table 4.1 Distribution of Ratings of Significance by Delphi Panel for Each Item on Round I-frequency, mean and standard deviation  
(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Written guidelines for selection or appointment of team members</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  1  1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Agreed upon methods of selection of effective leaders for a program team</td>
<td></td>
<td>2  2  0  2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Teams that provide adequate material resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,4 3,4 1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for their members are most likely to be successful</td>
<td></td>
<td>5  5  3  5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The number of programs delivered to clientele</td>
<td></td>
<td>5  5  3  5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round II & III. Likert type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4-1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item # Rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The impact of programs delivered to clientele</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) The number of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases) produced</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) The quality of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases)</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Inservice training provided to Extension agents related to a team's area of expertise</td>
<td>7 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II & III. Likert type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
**Table 4-1 Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Team and/or Team members providing workshops, seminars or research reports at national meetings pertaining to the teams area of expertise</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) The personal and professional satisfaction of team members with the team</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) The teams use of technology to share the combined knowledge of the teams research and scholarly activity (examples: having a web site, providing an on-line interactive site for accessing information, having a newsletter on-line)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II & III. Likert type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.*

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) Documenting and analyzing participants level of satisfaction with information provided on team’s website, and in newsletters or other publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Generating and utilizing evaluation data on inservices, workshops, and seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Documenting the economic impact of the team’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served, including businesses and industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round II & III. Likert type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4-1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15) An established method of tracking team performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Team success at securing external dollars through grants, contracts and contributions from business or industry to support the activities and programs of the team</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Team members being recognized for their contribution to the body of knowledge which is related to the team's area of expertise (examples: awards, recognition, publication of refereed journal articles)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II & III. Likert type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4-1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18) An established method of reporting outcomes to the teams stakeholders</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) An established process for communication among team members that allows for efficient and open information sharing in a timely manner</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Team members engaged in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II & III. Likert type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
### Table 4-1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rounds</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) A clear vision of where the team is going, and agreed upon and</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understood goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Evidence that team members have a clear understanding of their role</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the roles of other team members</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Evidence that team members are committed to the work of the team and</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow through with their agreed upon roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II & III. Likert type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4-1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Established work and meeting processes for conducting the business of the team before, during and following team meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) An established method to resolve conflict, make decisions or handle other key process skills that relate to the work of the team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Regularly reviewing goals and measuring attainment of those goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round II & III. Likert type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4-1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) Reporting team accomplishments in an appropriate and timely manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to immediate supervisors and administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Team member's ability to utilize team contributions in the promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and tenure process, or for yearly performance reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Ability to utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advocate of the team's accomplishments and organizational importance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round II & III. Likert type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Statement 1: *Written guidelines for selection or appointment of team members.* This statement did not achieve consensus. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question with answers ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Most of respondents selected responses in the agreement categories. Written comments indicated that guidelines might be helpful in some cases but may not always be needed. “This depends on the nature and purpose of the team.” One respondent stated “teams can be self-selecting and the process for appointment need not be formal.” Another respondent supported this view indicating “Guidelines help both those given the task of selecting or appointing the team...and help those interested in the team have a clearer understanding of the responsibilities associated with being a member of the team.”

Statement 2: *Agreed upon methods of selection of effective leaders for a program team.* This statement did not achieve consensus. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question with responses ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Slightly over three-fourths of the responses fell in the agree categories. Written comments showing general support included, “Having a standard and following that standard prevents others from perceiving that some are ‘favored’.” Another respondent indicated “agreed upon selection methods can prevent friction and tension within a group.” However, a few comments pointed to the need to assure that the system used allows for persons who are interested and effective to be selected, individual
“leaders need to be clearly engaged in the subject/issue area, and in positions of subject/issue leadership, whether that be on campus or off.” Finally one cautioned that methods should not limit the participants “if steps are taken to assure all methods are surfaced and decision making isn’t dominated by one or few.”

Statement 3: Teams that provide adequate material resources (computers, audio-visual equipment and subject matter resource materials) for their members are most likely to be successful. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This item did not achieve consensus. Slightly over three-fourths of the responses fell in the agree categories. Written comments represented a range of thoughts and interpretations of the need or benefit of having teams provide material resources and what resources would be considered appropriate for a team to supply. “Computers and audio-visual equipment are different needs than subject matter resources. I would strongly disagree that teams should provide computers and audio visual equipment, yet ...agree that subject matter resource material is crucial.” A contrasting view was contributed by two other respondents who wrote “gotta have the proper tools to do the work” and “teams are expected to bring their own equipment and subject resources to team activities and deliberations.” One respondent recognized the responsibility for providing resources might vary based on the team’s project with his statement “this might depend on the nature of the
project and the expectations of team members.” Another respondent that supported the importance of resources stated “Most teams have research and development functions. They need resources in order to be successful.” One respondent expressed a conflicting view as indicated by this statement “Has nothing to do with success. People make a difference not materials.”

Statement 4: The number of programs delivered to clientele. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question with responses equally distributed over five points of the Likert-type scale, between strongly disagree and agree. Consensus was not achieved on this item. Written comments stress the importance of quality and caution that numbers alone are not adequate information. “It is not so much the number of programs delivered...but was there an impact on the target audience.” A second response states “numbers are important if they also yield impact.” Another response states “sometimes quality is more important than quantity.” One respondent indicated, “We must focus programming based upon most critical needs...we cannot be everything to everyone. Make sure we are meeting most critical needs.” Another panelist stated “a single but innovative and impactful program is enough.” One respondent statement did seem to indicate that the numbers are important “by the team and others who have adopted program efforts as a result of the team’s efforts.” One respondent cautioned that “Teams may have functions other than direct program delivery.”
Statement 5: The impact of programs delivered to clientele  
This statement achieved consensus. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question with all responses falling within the agree and strongly agree categories. One respondent indicated, “the programs presented by teams need to answer the question ‘so what’? What happened as a result of this program.” Another respondent indicated it is important to gain information on impact “by the team and others who have adopted program efforts as a result of the team’s efforts.” There were a couple statements that talked about both quantity and quality with one respondent indicating “quality is more important than quantity.”

Statement 6: The number of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases) produced. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree categories. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Several respondents cautioned that development of new publications should be based on need “selection of publication is more important than producing.” Another respondent contributed “why devote resources to something for which there is no need? Must be relevant.” Another respondent stated “use of available publications is also appropriate.” However, one respondent pointed out, “we live in a result oriented society and we must produce to get funding.” Another comment stated “difficult to say until you know the goals of the team and what they are working toward.”
Finally a respondent offered “materials that are relevant, responsive and get results are the indicators of successful design and delivery.”

Statement 7: The quality of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases). This statement achieved consensus. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question with most of the responses falling in three agree categories. Written responses raised questions about measurement of quality and the fact that quality materials might be an outcome of even poorly functioning teams. “Measuring quality is subjective: More important to me is to judge frequency of use, effectiveness in providing answers to questions or timeliness.” A respondent questioned “are we assuming that product development is the main goal of the team?”

Statement 8: Inservice training provided to Extension agents related to a team's area of expertise. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question with most of the responses falling within three agree categories. This question did not achieve consensus although responses indicated general agreement that training of some sort needed to be provided by the team to other professionals, paraprofessionals and to those outside Extension. Questions seemed to exist about the meaning of the term in-service which was defined by the researcher as education provided by an organization to the employees of that organization with no limit or assumptions about the delivery systems used for the educational content of that training. One respondent stated “if it fits within the priority programming area(s) of the agents being
trained.” Another panelist offered “I don’t believe agents need to become experts in every given subject matter area but they should know how to present the material provided by specialists.” Another comment stated “to be productive one must stay current in their subject matter expertise.”

Statement 9: *Team and/or team members providing workshops, seminars or research reports at national meetings pertaining to the team’s area of expertise.* Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question with the majority of responses falling in the three agreement categories. Consensus was not reached but comments such as “great means of reaping intrinsic rewards and sharing programs with others,” “one of the things Extension does well is sharing ideas that work,” “opportunities to showcase work...other professionals... gather excellent ideas and programs,” show strong support for the statement. One respondent said “this is dissemination and has very little to do with the work of the team” and questioned the relevance of this item to the study.

Statement 10: *The personal and professional satisfaction of team members with the team.* This item achieved consensus with 21 of 21 respondents answering the question. The majority responded with category responses *agree* and *strongly agree*. Written responses of agreement such as “Absolutely!” and “the team won’t function well unless members feel they are gaining something from their participation” indicated strong support. One
panelist noted “to be most productive team members need to garner satisfaction from working on and with the team”.

Statement 11: *The team’s use of technology to share the combined knowledge of the team’s research and scholarly activity (examples: having a web site, providing an on-line interactive site for accessing information, having a newsletter on-line).* Twenty-one of 21 respondents responded to this question, however, consensus was not reached. Responses predominately fell in the three agree categories and although written responses generally supported use of technology, caution to use it only to enhance communication was shared along with one respondent’s concerns about how use of technology is to be supported by asking, “who maintains? When does it stop? How do you know when?”

Statement 12: *Documenting and analyzing participant’s level of satisfaction with information provided on team's website, and in newsletters or other publications.* Twenty of the 21 respondents answered this question. This item achieved consensus with all respondents rating it in one of the three agree categories. The majority of the responses fell in the mildly agree to agree categories. There seemed to be a desire for clarification that the term “participant” was being used to identify members of the target audience. Respondents stressed the importance of evaluation and accountability in their written responses to this item by stating “must be accountable.” Another respondent contributed “evaluation is always important for documenting the
impact our work has” and “evaluation of effectiveness of the team’s programs... is very important.”

Statement 13: *Generating and utilizing evaluation data on in-services, workshops, and seminars.* Twenty-one of the 21 panelists answered this question. This statement achieved consensus with the majority of responses falling in the three agreement categories. Written responses affirmed the importance of using information generated from evaluations to validate program effectiveness. One respondent stated “documenting the impact and sharing that information is important to sustain the team and the organization.”

Statement 14: *Documenting the economic impact of the team’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served, including businesses and industry.* Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. A little over three-quarters responded in the three agree categories. This statement did not gain consensus although several statements seemed to place a positive value on documenting economic impact even though it is sometimes difficult to do. One respondent mentioned that economic impact is only one measure that should be considered as “there is [sic] environmental, social and political dimensions, too.” Caution that “information ...be gathered in a cost-effective and culturally appropriate manner” was provided in one written response.

Statement 15: *An established method of tracking team performance.* This statement did not achieve consensus although most of the responses were in
the three agree categories. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents to Round I answered this question. Written responses supported the importance of tracking team performance when tracking was defined like this respondent suggested, “reporting, outputs, outcomes, and impacts provide necessary tracking.” One response questioned the clarity of the item and asked if it meant “outcomes/end results or does it mean the presentation performances of team members?”

Statement 16: Team success at securing external dollars through grants, contracts and contributions from business or industry to support the activities and programs of the team. Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question. This statement did not achieve consensus. Responses ranged from disagree to the strongly agree categories with a little over three-fourths of the responses in the agree categories. Written responses were generally positive but several statements suggested caution such as “Extension runs the risk of losing its unbiased edge if we chase dollars from the corporate world.” A similar concern was offered “this will need to be looked at very closely to make sure grant programs meet local needs.” Other comments indicated some teams may not need or be able to access external dollars and “for these teams, the lack of external dollars is not an indication of a lack of success by the team.”

Statement 17: Team members being recognized for their contribution to the body of knowledge which is related to the teams area of expertise (examples:
awards, recognition, publication of refereed journal articles). Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question. This statement achieved consensus with most of the responses falling in the agree and strongly agree response categories. However, written responses such as the one that follows support recognition is, “all well and good, but not necessary as indicators of a successful team effort.”

Statement 18: An established method of reporting outcomes to the team’s stakeholders. This statement achieved consensus with twenty-one of the 21 respondents answering this question. Most of the responses were in the three agree categories. Written responses stressed the importance but suggested “a variety of methods” be “available for teams to choose from.”

Statement 19: An established process for communication among team members that allows for efficient and open information sharing in a timely manner. This statement achieved consensus with most of the responses falling within the agree to strongly agree categories. One participant noted that “established processes allow for easier and faster communications.”

Statement 20: Team members engaged in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team. This statement achieved consensus with 21 of the 21 respondents answering this question. All of the responses fell within the three agree categories and most were split between the agree and strongly agree response categories. Written responses supported that ongoing learning was essential or “the entire team
suffers and lags behind.” One written response noted that “actually serving on the team itself could be considered a learning opportunity. It has been suggested that 70% of professional development comes from a challenging assignment.”

Statement 21: A clear vision of where the team is going, and agreed upon and understood goals. This statement achieved consensus. Twenty of the 21 respondents answered this question with 80% of the responses in the strongly agree category. Written responses noted there “are really two separate and specific items” within the statement. One respondent noted, “teams need short-term and long-term goals and the ability to adjust these as necessary.”

Statement 22: Evidence that team members have a clear understanding of their role and the roles of other team members. This statement achieved consensus. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question with most of the responses in the agree and strongly agree categories. Written responses stressed the importance of clear roles and one participant noted “without this clear understanding goals cannot be reached, misunderstandings abound, and the team does not function in the most effective manner.” One respondent asked several questions pertaining to this item. “What would “evidence” look like? They are prepared for meetings? They make valid contributions to the discussion, they stay focused on the goals?”

Statement 23: Evidence that team members are committed to the work of the team and follow through with their agreed upon roles and responsibilities.
This item achieved consensus with 21 of the 21 respondents answering this question. All of the responses were in the three agree categories with over 80% in the *strongly agree* category. Although strong agreement was achieved one respondent noted that the item represented “two separate concepts (i.e. commitment and follow-through). Both are very important, in my mind, but they are not the same thing.” Two respondents addressed the disappointment, and demoralizing effect “if members who do not fulfill the agreed upon roles and responsibilities” and one indicated “anger and resentment build among the other team members...and can block the work of the team.” Another participant pointed out the importance “that team members recognize the ebb and flow in each other’s work” and not put undue stress on each other.

**Statement 24:** *Established work and meeting processes for conducting the business of the team before, during and following team meetings.* Twenty of the 21 respondents answered this question with most of the responses in the three agree categories. This statement did not achieve consensus and written responses such as “the importance placed upon the established work and meeting processes could be very different depending upon the personalities involved,” suggested flexibility might be important.

**Statement 25:** *An established method to resolve conflict, make decisions or handle other key process skills that relate to the work of the team.* Twenty-one of the 21 respondents answered this question. Consensus was not achieved on this statement with answers ranging from the *disagree* to the *strongly*
agree categories. All but two responses were in the agree categories. Written responses indicated that three separate ideas were included within this statement. Comments represented a split in thinking about the need for established methods to resolve conflict, make decisions or handle key team process skills. A respondent supporting the need for having written process skills commented “teams need a method for handling conflict as well as handling the order of business, because conflict often surfaces and needs to be addressed.” Another supporter of written guidelines stated, “this is when it gets dicey. It seems like Extension professionals are uncomfortable with this level of group process.” Finally one panelist said “still, there needs to be leadership and some set policies/procedures.” Other comments suggested “some teams seem to develop a rapport and working relationship that they work these things out naturally; for others an identified method is needed and helpful.”

Statement 26: Regularly reviewing goals and measuring attainment of those goals. This statement achieved consensus with 21 of 21 respondents answering this question. All but one response fell within the agree categories with over three-fourths of the responses in the agree and strongly agree categories. One written response indicated “this helps the team stay focused.”

Statement 27: Reporting team accomplishments in an appropriate and timely manner to immediate supervisors and administration. This statement achieved consensus with 21 of 21 respondents answering this question. All but
one response fell within the agree categories with over three-fourths of the
responses in the agree and strongly agree categories. Written responses
indicated “this helps the team stay focused, on track, and working toward their
goals in a timely manner.” Another added, “this is a strong motivator for the
teams I work on.” One respondent felt we must not allow this to create
competition between teams and was not certain that administrators look at
team reports.

Statement 28: Team member’s ability to utilize team contributions in the
promotion and tenure process, or for yearly performance reviews. This
statement achieved consensus with 21 of 21 respondents answering this
question. All but one response fell within the agree categories with over three-
fourths of the responses in the agree and strongly agree categories. Written
comments were concerned with the need for people to report on the area of the
team’s work on which they had an active role and that supervisors and
administrators have a way to know what weight that effort should be given in
the annual tenure review or evaluation. “Sure, recognition should be
consistent with contribution.” Another response stated “those people that see
the value and quality of work that can be produced in teams are doing it for
that reason, not for P&T [sic promotion and tenure]....It seems...that those
working in teams and doing it well are not concerned about its effect on their
portfolio. It usually takes care of itself.”
Statement 29: *Ability to utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the team’s accomplishments and organizational importance.*

Twenty one of 21 respondents answered this question with all but one of the responses falling in the agree categories. This statement did not achieve consensus; however, written comments generally supported its importance such as “it would be useful to have someone at all levels advocating for the group;” and “this can be critically important in helping to get the team’s work communicated to individuals and organizations which need to know and which have the financial resources and/or political power to help forward the programmatic goals of the team.”

Statement 30: *Please provide additional comments, suggestions of other indicators of success you consider important in the comment box below.*

Written comments suggested that more emphasis should be placed on how a team functions and less in the area of producing outputs. One respondent felt this was a reminder “that team members are constantly changing. Training for new teams/team members should be an ongoing function provided by this program area.” Emphasis on the differences in personality of team members was mentioned along with a need for team members to understand cooperation, appreciate cultural differences and have an understanding of what is expected of the team by administration.
**Results: Round 2**

The second round of the study contained 22 statements. Twenty-two of the 25 panelists responded to the second questionnaire. One panel member did not respond because of a death in her family and withdrew from further participation. The panel member with budget issues did not respond to this round and withdrew from the panel. Five statements achieved consensus in this round using the *a priori* criteria that 80% of the responses must fall within two response categories on the six point Likert type scale. Table 4.2 contains the frequencies and measures of central tendency for Round II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Identified criteria for selection or appointment of team members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Selection or appointment of an effective facilitator to serve as team leader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Teams that provide adequate subject matter resources for their members are most likely to be successful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Teams that provide access to adequate material resources (computers, audio-visual equipment, etc) to all team members to carry out their role on the team</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round I & III. Likert type scale response rates represented by percent over frequency.

Table 4.2 Indicators of Success: Distribution of Ratings of Significance by Delphi Panel for Each Item on Round II-frequency, mean and standard deviation. (Continued)
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Reports on the number of programs delivered are accompanied by information on the impact of those programs on target audiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Team development of subject matter publications or resources (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites, or databases) are in response to identified needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Teams consistent delivers of updates, educational resources, training and support for other extension professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Teams and/or team members being selected to share workshops, seminars or research reports that pertain to the team’s area of expertise at national meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round1 & III. Likert type scale response rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9) The use of technology to share the team’s research and scholarly activity and enhance timely communication in a cost effective manner (examples: Having a website; providing an ongoing interactive site for accessing information; having a newsletter on-line)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Documenting relevant and appropriate economic impact of the team’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Documenting appropriate and relevant environmental or ecological impact of the team’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round I & III. Likert type scale response rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12) The organization and team members have agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outcomes</td>
<td>15 13</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree 1 Disagree 2 Mildly Disagree 3 Mildly Agree 4 Agree 5 Strongly Agree 6</td>
<td>5.0% 0% 5.0% 23.0% 41.0% 27.0%</td>
<td>4.77 1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) The organization and team members have agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outputs</td>
<td>15 14</td>
<td>Item 1 Disagree 2</td>
<td>9.0% 0% 5.0% 32.0% 41.0% 14.0%</td>
<td>4.36 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Team’s success at securing external dollars when needed and considered appropriate through grants, contracts and contributions from business or industry to support the activities and programs of the team</td>
<td>16 15</td>
<td>Item 1 Disagree 2</td>
<td>0% 14.0% 0% 27.0% 50.0% 9.0%</td>
<td>4.41 1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round1 & III. Likert type scale response rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.2 Continued

(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15) Established processes for conducting the business of the team that assure follow through and good communication before, during and following team meetings</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Team should have an agreed upon method for resolving conflict</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Team has agreed upon system or method for decision making</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Team has agreed upon process skills for conducting the work and business of the team</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Team members exhibit passionate interest in the work of the team</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round1 & III. Likert type scale response rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20) Team members practice a respectful and caring way of working together</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree 1 0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.23 .61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree 2 0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mildly Disagree 3 0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mildly Agree 4 9.0%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree 5 59.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree 6 32.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Team members enjoy working together</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.82. 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>team’s accomplishments and organizational importance</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round I & III. Likert type scale response rates represented by percent over frequency.
Appendix H contains all written responses to Round II. The quantitative and qualitative responses to the statements are summarized below.

Statement 1: *Identified criteria for selection or appointment of team members.* Twenty-two of 22 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from *disagree to strongly agree* with slightly over 80% of the responses falling within the three agree categories. Consensus was not achieved. Written comments indicated criteria for selection might be helpful “when formal teams are being formed” and “in most instances, team members want specifics so written guidelines serve as a framework.” However, another panel member stated, “some very successful teams are formed through self-selection.” Finally, a respondent indicated “flexibility to appoint without rigid plans” is needed by teams.

Statement 2: *Selection or appointment of an effective facilitator to serve as team leader.* Twenty-one of 22 respondents answered this question. This statement did not achieve consensus even though all but one response fell in the three agree categories. One respondent’s comment expressed the importance of an effective facilitator indicating that a facilitator insures, “that everyone is heard and that the discussion stays on topic.” This respondent also suggested the facilitator should be able to stay neutral yet have some knowledge of the subject.

Statement 3: *Teams that provide adequate subject matter resources for their members are most likely to be successful.* Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this question. Slightly over 80% of the responses fell within the agree categories although consensus was not achieved. One respondent felt that providing subject matter resources “seems to be an...administrative or systemic
support for teams not an indicator of success for team members.” Another
response suggested “membership on a team should not be based solely on what
skills/equipment they already have.” Finally one respondent offered, “if this is a
new and emerging issue and the team member needed...information...then such
resources would be beneficial.”

Statement 4: Teams that provide access to adequate material resources
(computers, audio-visual equipment, etc.) to all team members to carry out
their role on the team. Twenty-one of 22 respondents answered this question
with responses ranging from disagree to strongly agree. Slightly over 80% of the
responses fell within the agree categories; however, consensus was not achieved.
General agreement was supported with written comments such as “those that are
provided needed resources feel valued and are better able to complete their
duties” which indicated that this can be motivating to team members. Another
panel member stated “putting all team members on a common playing field so
that everyone has the capacity to participate equally and fully...is important.”
Another panel member stated, “our teams are program development teams not
necessarily program delivery...provision of equipment is not a team responsibility
and should not be used as an evaluative standard.”

Statement 5: Reports on the number of programs delivered are accompanied by
information on the impact of those programs on target audience. Twenty-two of
22 respondents answered this question with responses ranging from strongly
disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was not reached on this statement. One
panel member stressed, “outcomes should be reported but are currently under
reported in Extension.” Another respondent indicated “I don’t believe the number of programs has direct correlation on outcomes or impacts.”

Statement 6: Team development of subject matter publications or resources (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites, or databases) are in response to identified needs. Twenty-two of 22 respondents answered this question. This item did not achieve consensus even though 85% of the responses were almost evenly divided among the three agree categories. Written comments cautioned, “production of ‘products’ is not always tied to needs or desired results.” Another comment stated, “not all teams...organize to develop resources.” Another panel member went on to say, “resources... that are developed by a team effort are usually more thought out and address clientele needs effectively.”

Statement 7: Team’s consistent delivery of updates, educational resources, training and support for other Extension professionals. Twenty-two of 22 respondents answered this question with all but one answer falling within the agree categories. This statement did not achieve consensus. One respondent stated, “if there is a need for updates, resources, training and support, then this could be a helpful indicator of success.” Another response stated that, “timely delivery is more important even if that is only annually.”

Statement 8: Team and/or team members being selected to share workshops, seminars, or research reports, that pertain to the team’s area of expertise, at national meetings. Twenty-two of 22 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree resulting in a lack of consensus. Three fourths of the responses fell within the agree categories.
Written comments suggested, “part of the definition of scholarship is to share the knowledge with others...sometimes, you have to come up with your own...means of sharing the knowledge” Other respondents statements stressed “being recognized by peers is...important and in the University setting is a must, so that those creating and leading teams can become tenured” and “Given that Extension faculty...have to meet the same criteria for research...as other faculty members.” Finally one comment suggested “presenting at national meetings, especially professional society meetings, doesn’t say much about how effective a team may have been in addressing a need relevant to external stakeholders.”

Statement 9: The use of technology to share the team’s research and scholarly activity and enhance timely communication in a cost effective manner (examples: having a web-site, providing an on-line interactive site for accessing information, having a newsletter online). Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this question with all but one response falling in the agree categories. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Written comments included, “whatever we can do to enhance communication, we should do.” Another respondent suggested, “technology can be helpful, but not for all topics or audiences” and cautioned “if a team has limited technology resources, ...it would be inappropriate to use this as a criterion.”

Statement 10: Documenting relevant and appropriate economic impact of the team’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served. Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this questions with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Over 85% of the responses fell within the agree
categories however, consensus was not achieved. The written comments suggested, “documenting outcomes, economic or not, is important.” Several comments suggested concern such as, “this statement is too narrow in focus. What about other types of valuable impacts?” and “economic impact should not be singled out as more valuable than other forms of impact.”

Statement 11: Documenting appropriate and relevant environmental or ecological impact of the team’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served. Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was not achieved although over three-fourths of the responses fell within the three agree categories. Written comments cautioned, “this depends on the team and what the purpose of the team is.” Several other respondents suggested, “a broader or more inclusive view of impacts” is needed and “I don’t think anything is gained by singling out one form of impact as being more important than another.”

Statement 12: The organization and team members have agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outcomes. Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this question with all but two answers falling within the agree categories. This item did not achieve consensus. One respondent cautioned, “some outcomes may not occur for several years. So long as progress toward a desired outcome is tracked, this should still work for measurement.” Another respondent offered, “outcomes are used to measure team success...in other words what’s being tracked is outcomes.”
Statement 13: *The organization and team members have agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outputs.* Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree.* This statement did not achieve consensus although over 85% of the responses fell within the three agree categories. Written comments suggested, “the team should have a vision and goals in mind” and “our...reporting procedures make this implicit.” One response stated, “there has to be...output during the course of activity...but that should not be measured in terms of number of programs or activities offered.” Finally, one respondent indicated “teams should be tracking outputs, but I don’t think this is an indicator of success.”

Statement 14: *Team’s success at securing external dollars when needed and considered appropriate, through grants, contracts, and contributions from business and industry to support the activities and programs of the team.* Twenty-two of 22 respondents answered this question, with responses ranging from *disagree* to *strongly agree.* Over 85% of the responses fell within the three agree categories; however, consensus was not achieved. One written response stated, “this is an indicator of success in our state. However, a team that had desired program outcomes without outside funding would not be penalized.”

Statement 15: *Established processes for conducting the business of the team that assure follow through and good communication before, during and following team meetings.* Twenty-two of 22 respondents answered this question with all responses falling within the three agree categories. This statement achieved
consensus. One written comment suggested, “teams tend to be very different in their approaches to conducting their business and program development.”

Statement 16: Team should have an agreed upon method for resolving conflict. Twenty-one of 22 respondents answered this question. This statement achieved consensus. All but two responses fell within the agree categories. Written comments included the “facilitator should be able to address conflict.” One response suggested, “there may be more than one method to apply to the team...perhaps ground rules for behavior or establishing protocol for resolving conflict would be more helpful.”

Statement 17: Team has an agreed upon system or method for decision making. Twenty-two of 22 respondents answered this question. Consensus was not achieved on this statement since responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. However, slightly over 85% of the responses fell within the agree categories. Written comments suggested, “deciding upfront what the process will be is important.” Another comment stated, “you cannot lock a group of professionals into one way of doing things—consensus is always great but it may occasionally come down to a majority rule or team leader decision.”

Statement 18: Team has agreed upon process skills for conducting the work and business of the team. Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree with slightly over three-fourths of the responses falling within the agree categories. This item did not achieve consensus. Written comments included “this becomes the responsibility of the facilitator of the group.” Another suggested that wording this as
“establishing ground rules for conducting business” would give clearer meaning to the statement.

Statement 19: *Team members exhibit passionate interest in the work of the team.* Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this question. This item did not achieve consensus although slightly over 85% of the responses fell within the three agree categories. Written responses indicated, “team members will have different levels of commitment to any given task.” Another person stated, “it is unrealistic to feel that we would be ‘passionate’ about...multiple teams and projects. It would be...inaccurate to feel a good job cannot be done unless one is ‘passionate’ about the topic or tasks.”

Statement 20: *Team members practice a respectful and caring way of working together.* Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this question with all responses falling within the three agree categories. This statement achieved consensus. One statement summarized, “there has to be a mutual regard for other team members and what they bring to the team.”

Statement 21: *Team members enjoy working together.* Twenty-two of the 22 respondents answered this question. This statement did not achieve consensus although all but one response fell within the agree categories. Written comments cautioned, “all team members do not have to like other members to be effective. Part of having a good team is the diverse input” and “sometimes teams don’t have the best relationships between each other but if they agree to the goal, and compromise, they can still get work done and meet the goal.” Other comments suggested, “a positive and comfortable environment ..doesn’t hurt the cause.”
Statement 22: *Utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the team’s accomplishments and organizational importance.* Twenty-one of the 22 respondents answered this question. This statement achieved consensus. All but one response fell within the agree categories. Written comments included, “this might be helpful to the team, but I’m not sure it should be used as a measure of the team’s success.” Another respondent stated that, “all team members become advocates if the team is effective.”

Statement 23: *Please provide additional comments, suggestions or other indicators of success you consider important in the comment box below.* Additional statements pointed out “there is a mix of process indicators and outcome indicators.” One respondent summarized by stating, “those outside a team, (Administrators, other stakeholders) are primarily interested in outcomes; the team itself is interested in process as well as outcomes.” The same person went on to indicate, “the more smoothly the process functions, the more likely that programs will have desired outcomes and impacts on audiences. The process indicators are often the ‘ingredients’ likely to lead to successful outcomes.”

**Results: Round 3**

The third round of the study contained 20 statements. Twenty-one of the 25 panelists responded to the third questionnaire. Seven statements achieved consensus in this round using the *a priori* criteria that 80% of the responses would fall within two response categories on the six point Likert type scale. Table 4.3 contains the frequencies and measures of central tendency for Round III.
## Table 4.3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percentages and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Written guidelines for selection or appointment of team members</td>
<td>Item # Round I II</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>4.0% 24.0% 10.0% 14.0% 48.0% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Selection or appointment of an effective team leader</td>
<td>2 2 1 0 1 5 9 5 4.71 1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Team secures adequate subject matter resources</td>
<td>3 3 0 1 3 6 10 1 4.33 0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Team secures adequate material resources</td>
<td>3 4 0 1 4 3 9 4 4.52 1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Team reports include information about the number of programs conducted</td>
<td>4 5 1 2 4 8 5 1 3.81 1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Team reports include information about the number of persons reached</td>
<td>4 5 1 1 1 8 8 2 4.28 1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round I & II. Likert type scale responses represented by percent over frequency.

*Table 4.3 Distribution of ratings of significance by Delphi Panel for Round III-percentages, frequency, mean and standard deviation. (Continued)*
Table 4.3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Team develops quality publications in response to identified needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Team delivers timely updates, educational resources, training and</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support for other extension professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Teams and/or individual team members share their expertise at national</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant economic</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 10</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impact of it’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round I & II. Likert type scale responses represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11) When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant environmental or ecological impact of it’s work and scholarly activity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant social impact of it’s work and scholarly activity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Team has agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outcomes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Team has agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outputs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Team secures external funding when needed and considered appropriate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round I & II. Likert type scale responses represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Percentages and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Team agrees upon decision making methods</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0% 5.0% 0% 29.0% 56.0% 10.0%</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Team established ground rules for conducting their work</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0% 5.0% 0% 25.0% 50.0% 15.0%</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Team members are committed to their work</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0% 0% 5.0% 10.0% 56.0% 29.0%</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Team members enjoy working together</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0% 10.0% 5.0% 10.0% 66.0% 10.0%</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Team members practice mutual respect in working together</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0% 0% 0% 0% 57.0% 43.0%</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round I & II. Likert type scale responses represented by percent over frequency.
Appendix I contains all written responses to Round III. The quantitative and qualitative responses to the statements are summarized below.

Statement 1: Written guidelines for selection or appointment of team members.
Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from strongly disagree to agree. This item did not achieve consensus. Written comments suggested that guidelines may be important to a team but should not be considered an indicator of success. One panelist wrote “if guidelines are written before the team is formed, then why would the team use the guidelines as evidence of success?” Another theme that emerged is that some formal committees may need guidelines but that many informal teams may not need them to be successful.

Statement 2: Selection or appointment of an effective team leader.
Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. Ninety percent of the responses fell within the agree categories but this statement did not achieve consensus. Responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Written comments show support for an effective leader but one statement seemed to summarize most of the responses, “so, while I agree that an effective team leader will help the team move towards its goals, this criterion sounds more helpful for process evaluation than for evidence of success of the team and its members.” Another respondent pointed out “shared leadership is really the most effective leadership in a team.”

Statement 3: Team secures adequate subject matter resources.
Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. Answers ranged from disagree to strongly
agree with almost three-fourths of the responses falling within the mildly agree and agree categories. This statement did not achieve consensus. Concern with interpretation of the statement’s meaning was raised by the comment “provision of subject matter resources (an input) would result in success of the team.” The respondent seemed to agree with the first concept but expressed disagreement with the reworded statement, “securing adequate subject matter resources would be an indicator of the teams’ success (an outcome).”

Statement 4: Team secures adequate material resources. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. This statement did not achieve consensus. Responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree with slightly over 75% of the responses falling in the agree categories. Written comments supported the need for adequate material resources but seemed to question whose responsibility it is to provide those resources and why this would be a factor that entered into rating the team success. One respondent commented, “our teams are program development teams... provision of equipment is not a team responsibility and should not be used as an evaluative standard.” Another respondent felt that if measured as an input that results in the success of the team then they would be in agreement but if the meaning was that securing adequate material resources was considered a team outcome they would tend to disagree with the statement. A third respondent stated “generally it is assumed that staff/team members have the equipment/supplies that they need.”

Statement 5: Team reports include information about the number of programs conducted. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. Responses
ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This statement did not achieve consensus and only 68% of the responses fell within the agree categories. Written comments cautioned that numbers are not a good indicator of success and might negatively influence how programs are carried out if used as a criterion for evaluation. Comments included, “in cases where the goal of the program is to provide intensive educational programming over a long period of time to prevent problems in high-risk audiences, then one would expect to reach fewer people with greater intensity. If all teams were judged by this criterion, it could shape behavior in unproductive ways.” Another comment suggested including the results of teaching efforts by those trained by the team as well as the direct contacts of team members as being appropriate. Respondents stressed the importance of impact information to accompany numbers in comments such as, “as long as this information is accompanied by data representing...impacts I would agree with this statement.”

Statement 6: Team reports include information about the number of persons reached. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This statement did not achieve consensus although 86% of the responses fell within the agree categories of the scale. Written comments suggested that numbers reached, although important, do not mean anything without impact data. “Again, this information is an important piece of the report but needs impact information to complete the value for the effort.” Another comment “include number of programs, but more
importantly, include information about impact” supported that numbers are not enough information.

Statement 7: Team develops quality publications in response to identified needs. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree with 95% of the responses falling in the agree categories. This item achieved consensus. Written comments that indicate the importance of this item include “need-based programming ...is what Extension is really about.” Another panelist indicated “our teams must proclaim their program issues or needs and address them as a team.”

Statement 8: Team delivers timely updates, educational resources, training and support for other Extension professionals. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question with responses ranging from disagree to strongly agree. This item did not achieve consensus even though all but one response fell in the agree categories. Some concern with this as an indicator of success led one panelists to comment, “I assume that this means that the team is providing in-service/education for other professionals? I think that in some cases this is appropriate, but probably not for all teams.” Another comment suggested caution of this item as an indicator. “In some cases, there are no other Extension professionals to be trained since everyone connected with a program area serves on the program team.”

Statement 9: Team and/or individual team members share their expertise at national meetings. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. This item achieved
consensus with 85% of the responses falling within the agree categories. Consensus was achieved with the responses in the mildly agree and agree range. Written comments suggested the focus of this item may be too narrow. “There are many other ways to share expertise besides national meetings. Boyer’s model doesn’t specify ‘national meetings’ but instead creating, validating and communicating.” Another comment showing agreement was “Extension educators are expected to look for effective ways to disseminate information, National meetings provide this opportunity.” Caution was suggested with the comment, “presentations at national and/or professional society meetings doesn’t necessarily reflect on the impact of the team’s work.” Another issue that surfaced was represented by this panelist’s comment, “there is a problem with the newly worded statement because it does not specify that individual team members are representing the work of the team.”

Statement 10: When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant economic impact of it’s work and scholarly activity. Twenty of the 21 respondents answered this question with 90% of the responses in the agree categories. Responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree with only two responses falling within the disagree categories. This statement did not achieve consensus but written comments suggested its importance. “Economic impacts are very impressive, especially to policy makers, and public officials but are not the only impacts that should be documented.” One comment indicated a preference for less specific wording of impact indicators. “I would feel more comfortable if ‘economic’ was removed as the type of impact. All types of
impacts are important to report and not all impacts are relative to economics.” A similar concern was expressed by the comment, “as appropriate.” Another respondent expressed strong support with the word, “definitely!”

Statement 11: When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant environmental and ecological social impact of it’s work and scholarly activity. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question with all but two responses falling within the agree categories. Responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. This item achieved consensus with over 80% of the responses falling within the mildly agree and agree categories. Written responses suggested that removal of the type of impact would be preferred. “Criteria 10 and 11 could be combined if you simply removed the type of impact you are asking for.” Another respondent cautioned that this criteria be used “as appropriate.” Strong agreement was again indicated by one person’s one word response “definitely.”

Statement 12: When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant social impact of it’s work and scholarly activity. Twenty of the 21 respondents answered this question with responses ranging from mildly disagree to strongly agree. This item did not achieve consensus even though 85% of the responses fell within the agree categories. Again it was suggested that this item could be combined with the previous two items and not specify the specific type of indicator. Caution that one only use social impact as an indicator when appropriate was suggested by one comment. Strong agreement was again indicated by one person’s one word statement “definitely!”
Statement 13: *Team has agreed upon methods of tracking performance as measured by outcomes.* Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Consensus was not achieved on this item even though 85% of the responses fell within the agree categories. Written comments stressed the importance of tracking performance but one panelist was more specific and stated “it seems that a team needs methods for tracking performance in a variety of ways, not just as measured by outcomes.” One respondent also indicated “if ‘tracking performance’ means sound evaluation strategies, then I agree.” Another respondent indicated a preference for tracking outcomes without a tie to team performance. “To me, if the outcomes are significant, performance has also been positive and significant.” A statement of support suggested “agreement on these methods leads to the data collected for reporting impacts.”

Statement 14: *Team has agreed upon methods of tracking team performance as measured by outputs.* Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question with responses ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. This item did not achieve consensus although 80% of the responses fell within the agree categories. Written comments suggested this is a step in the process for getting impact data. “Outputs, to me are more an indication of progress toward a measurable goal/outcome than they are performance.” Another respondent showed a similar thought with “there methods will lead to the collection of data that verifies output production.”
Statement 15: Team secures external funding when needed and considered appropriate. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question with all responses falling in the agree categories ranging from mildly agree to strongly agree. This item achieved consensus with over 85% of the responses falling within mildly agree to agree categories. Some caution was still suggested based upon the concern for need of the team to seek resources. “Sometimes this is practical, other times not, depending on the subject matter and the project being worked on” and “given the qualifiers...when needed and appropriate....I would agree to this statement.”

Statement 16: Team agrees upon decision making methods. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree with all but one response falling within the agree categories. This item achieved consensus with over 85% of the responses falling within the mildly agree and agree categories. The only written comment for this round that still questioned this item as an indicator of team success was, “this seems to be a variable that will help teams function smoothly, but it is hard to imagine that someone outside the team would evaluate the team and its members for having or not having such an agreement. In many of these statements, it seems that there are indicators that would help strengthen teams but would be less helpful as criteria with which to judge team effectiveness.”

Statement 17: Team establishes ground rules for conducting their work. Twenty of the 21 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree with 90% of the responses falling in the agree
categories. This item did not achieve consensus. Written comments do not support ground rules as an indicator of success. “Ground rules trivialize the process” according to one respondent. Another panelist indicated, “ground rules are helpful to team functioning and could be used in a process evaluation. However, team success would be determined by outcomes, outputs, publications, grants funded and so forth rather than by the establishment of ground rules.” One final comment also questioned ground rules as a success indicator. “The processes used to conduct the team’s work and business will vary widely and on a case-by-case basis. Hard to agree upon these a priori.”

Statement 18: Team members are committed to their work. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this questions with responses ranging from mildly disagree to strongly agree. All but one response fell within the agree categories. This item did achieve consensus with 86% of the responses falling within the agree and strongly agree categories. Written comments questioned this item as an indicator of success. “Motherhood and apple pie. Omit as suggested.” Another respondent stated “this criterion might be used to judge an individual, and if all team members were committed, it would reflect positively on the team as a whole.”

Statement 19: Team members enjoy working together. Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question. Responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree with 85% of the responses falling in the agree categories. This item did not achieve consensus. Written comments still suggested this is not a necessary condition for successful teams. “I am still not convinced this it critical
to team success.” Another respondent shared, “not always necessary, but is often the case for a productive good-working team.” And still a third respondent offered, “this criterion helps reinforce teamwork, but it would be difficult to use an indicator of team success. Again, it’s probably an ingredient of teamwork.” The comment of one respondent also questioned this item as an indicator of success when the panelist stated, “team members should respect the opinions and input of other team members but they do not have to enjoy working together to be successful.”

Statement 20: *Team members exhibit mutual respect in working together.*

Twenty-one of 21 respondents answered this question with all responses falling in the *agree* and *strongly agree* categories. This item did achieve consensus. The only written comment questioned the use of this item as an indicator of team success. “This could be used to evaluate individuals, but it isn’t clear how you would hold the entire team responsible if some members did not exhibit mutual respect in working with others.”

Statement 21: *Please provide additional comments, suggestions or other indicators of success you consider important in the comment box below.* No additional comments were provided by respondents in the third round.

**Indicators Achieving Consensus**

Twenty-seven of the 40 items in Round I, II and III questionnaires achieved consensus. Consensus was gained on 15 statements in Round I, five in Round II and seven in Round III. Of the 27 statements which gained consensus two of the reworded statements in the last round were determined to have the
same meaning as a statement that achieved consensus in Round I or II and were combined with the earlier statement resulting in a total of 25 distinct statements achieving consensus. Of the 25, four had mean scores of 5.5 or above on a 6 point Likert type scale. These four are listed in table 4.4 that lists statements which achieved consensus in descending order of importance from those that achieved the highest mean rating to those statements that were scored lower, but still had 80% agreement between two categories on the Likert-type scale. Table 4.4 also lists statistics of central tendency for each item.

Indicators of success which were considered to have critical importance are those whose mean rating score was 5.5 or above on the six point Likert-type scale where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 6 indicated strongly agree to the item being an important indicator of success for program teams in Extension. Those indicators were:

- Evidence that team members are committed to the work of the team and follow through with their agreed upon roles and responsibilities
- A clear vision of where the team is going, and agreed upon and understood goals
- The impact of programs delivered to clientele
- An established process for communication among team members that allows for efficient and open information sharing in a timely manner
Indicators having high importance are those items whose mean rating score was between 4.50 and 5.49 on the six point Likert-type scale used where 1 indicated strongly disagree and 6 indicated strongly agree. Twenty statements gained consensus and achieved a rating of high importance. The items are listed in Table 4.4 with their associated descriptive statistics.

- Team members engaged in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team
- Evidence that team members have a clear understanding of their role and the roles of other team members
- Team members exhibit mutual respect in working together
- The personal and professional satisfaction of team members with the team
- The quality of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases)
- Established processes for conducting the business of the team that assure follow through and good communication before, during, and following team meetings
- Team member’s ability to utilize team contributions in the promotion and tenure process, or for yearly performance reviews
• Regularly reviewing goals and measuring attainment of those goals

• Reporting team accomplishments in an appropriate and timely manner to immediate supervisors and administration

• An established method of reporting outcomes to the team's stakeholders

• Generating and utilizing evaluation data on inservices, workshops and seminars

• Team members being recognized for their contribution to the body of knowledge which is related to the team’s area of expertise (examples: awards, recognition, publication of refereed journal articles)

• Utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the team’s accomplishments and organizational importance

• Documenting and analyzing participants level of satisfaction with information provided on team’s website, and in newsletters or other publications

• Team secures external funding when needed and considered appropriate

• Team develops quality publications in response to identified needs
• Team agrees upon decision making methods

• The use of technology to share the team’s research and scholarly activity and enhance timely communication in a cost effective manner (examples, having a web site; providing ongoing interactive site for accessing information; having a newsletter on-line)

• When appropriate and meaningful, team documents environmental and ecological impact of its work and scholarly activity

• Team should have an agreed upon method for resolving conflict

Characteristics having moderately high importance are items whose mean rating was between 3.5 and 4.49 on the six-point Likert-type scale used. Only one item achieved consensus at this level. Consensus was achieved with 80% agreement falling within two response categories. This item is listed in Table 4.4 with the associated descriptive statistics.

• Team and/or individual team members share their expertise at national meetings

The Web site on the OSU Extension server where the members of the panel of experts were asked to post a brief biography and to post issues of concern or interest for discussion was provided starting with the launch of the first round of the Delphi Questionnaire. Ten of the 25 panel of experts posted their biography on this web site and logged onto the site one to three times to
review other biographies. None of the participants posted any items to the discussion forum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success (with 80% of responses falling within two answer categories)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that team members are committed to the work of the team and follow through with their agreed upon roles and responsibilities (^a)</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>Critical importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clear vision of where the team is going, and agreed upon and understood goals (^a)</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>Critical importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of programs delivered to clientele (^a)</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>Critical importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An established process for communication among team members that allows for efficient and open information sharing in a timely manner (^a)</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Critical importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members engaged in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team (^a)</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>High importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that team members have a clear understanding of their role and the roles of other team members (^a)</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>High importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members practice mutual respect in working together (^c)</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>High importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The personal and professional satisfaction of team members with the team (^a)</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>High importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases) (^a)</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>High importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established processes for conducting the business of the team that assure follow through and good communication before, during, and following team meetings (^b)</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>High importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team member’s ability to utilize team contributions in the promotion and tenure process, or for yearly performance reviews (^a)</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>High importance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) = reached consensus in Round I
\(^b\) = reached consensus in Round II
\(^c\) = reached consensus in round II

Table 4.4 Consensus Table: Indicators of Success in descending order of significance.
(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regularly reviewing goals and measuring attainment of those goals</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting team accomplishments in an appropriate and timely manner to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediate supervisors and administration</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An established method of reporting outcomes to the teams stakeholders</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating and utilizing evaluation data on inservices, workshops and seminars</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members being recognized for their contribution to the body of knowledge which is related to the team's area of expertise (examples: awards, recognition, publication of refereed journal articles)</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the team's accomplishments and organizational importance</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting and analyzing participants level of satisfaction with information provided on team's website, and in newsletters or other publications</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team secures external funding when needed and considered appropriate</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team develops quality publications in response to identified needs</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team agrees upon decision making methods</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of technology to share the team's research and scholarly activity and enhance timely communication in a cost effective manner (examples: having a web site; providing ongoing interactive site for accessing information; having a newsletter on-line).</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a = reached consensus in Round I  
*b = reached consensus in Round II  
*c = reached consensus in Round III
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant environmental or ecological impact of it’s work and scholarly activity</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>High importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team should have an agreed upon method for resolving conflict</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>High importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team and/or individual team members share their expertise at national meetings</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Moderately high importance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = reached consensus in round I  
b = reached consensus in Round II  
c = reached consensus in Round III
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Program teams in Extension are often used to develop and deliver programs in all subject matter areas, as well as a method to address national, state and local issues. The importance of teams in Extension has been said to be ever increasing as the team model has been adopted by many state Extension systems in the United States. A need to examine and improve the effectiveness of teams, how they function and what makes them effective became apparent through the review of the literature and interviews with team leaders in OSU Extension. The review of literature revealed several articles on teamwork in Extension but no effort had been made to clearly identify the individual and team behaviors or impacts and outcomes considered to be indicators of success for Extension program teams.

As Extension Systems across the country struggle with reduced funding levels from federal, state and local governments, different ways of funding and implementing educational programs and research must be explored. New networks among countries, states, counties, and businesses as well as more
efficient use of human and capital resources continue to necessitate professionals to work together in teams, allowing Extension professionals to find innovative ways to meet the needs of clientele. Teams have proven to be effective in program design and delivery and have created new ways to reach clientele with programs, which are timely and technologically supported with multi-media to help serve diverse audiences. Using a variety of delivery modes allows Extension educators to deliver programs in a cost effective manner while capitalizing on new technology. This allows audiences from a more diverse background and geographic location to utilize the resources of Extension. Along with these changes in delivery mode come many challenges not only with content, but with developing teams that can function across time and space to develop the Extension of the future. Knowing that the synergy of teamwork allows Extension professionals to develop the capacity to deliver effective programming in the information age, administration and clientele have continued to stress the importance of maintaining teams to address program issues in OSU Extension. Therefore, it is vital that Extension understands how to best develop those teams, support their work and foster an environment that continues to provide team members with the rewards and incentives that motivate them to be a part of a program team. Success indicators would allow this to accomplished. Twenty-five indicators of success for program teams in Extension systems in the United States were identified in this research study.
Methodology

A modified Delphi study using a panel of 25 experts was conducted to identify indicators of success for program teams in Extension. The Delphi panel members were purposefully selected following a nomination process. Criteria for selection was described in chapter three. The Modified-Delphi technique was a group process, utilizing individual written responses to three researcher developed instruments. The Modified Delphi instrument allowed a panel of experts to rate items on a six point Likert-type scale. The levels of the scale were: 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = mildly disagree; 4 = mildly agree; 5 = agree and 6 = strongly agree. The Delphi panel identified the degree to which they felt the item was an indicator of team success for program teams in Extension. The instrument developed for Round I contained 29 statements derived from the literature and interviews with team leaders of agricultural and natural resources program teams in OSU Extension.

Respondents received feedback following each round designed to help bring about convergence of opinion. For Rounds II and III, a statistical summary for each item not achieving consensus on the previous round, and participant comments were sent to each panel member. Providing this information along with a copy of the panel member’s own responses encouraged reassessment of initial judgments. Anonymity of the respondents and their specific comments was maintained during the study.
The instruments developed for Rounds II and III contained items on which a predetermined level of consensus was not achieved during the previous round. Consensus on an item was considered to have been reached when 80% of the ratings fell within two categories on the six-point Likert-type scale. All comments made by panel members during the prior round were anonymously reported. For Round II, based on suggestions from the Delphi Panel, eight new items were added to 14 items, that were retained and reworded based upon responses from Round I. Descriptive statistics were calculated for each round. The computer program SPSS was used for data analysis. Following each of the three rounds statistics of central tendency and variability were calculated for all items on each questionnaire. The mean was used to describe the level of importance of the item as an indicator of team success for program teams in Extension. For items where consensus was not reached, the frequency distribution of ratings was reported and statistics of central tendency were also reviewed.

The primary goal of the Modified Delphi technique was to determine which statements achieved consensus with the expert panel. Statements were reviewed to determine if panelists reached a level of consensus. Any statement that achieved consensus was dropped from future rounds of the study.

Content and face validity were tested by a six-person review panel. The panel consisted of six Extension professionals familiar with teamwork and the web based survey tool being used for questionnaire development and data
collection. Suggestions from the review panel were incorporated into the instrument as deemed appropriate by the researcher.

Traditional reliability is not a concern with the Modified Delphi technique due to its goal of obtaining consensus on statements. Dalkey et al. (1972) indicated that reliability can be gained by replication. According to Dalkey et al, a panel size of 13 persons produced a .9 reliability. There were 20, 21 and 21 respondents, respectively, who submitted usable data for each round of this Modified Delphi research.

**Findings**

The findings of the study represented the collective opinion of the panel of experts who participated in the Modified Delphi questionnaires at this point in time and cannot be representative of any other population. Consensus is specific to individual items and related to the opinions of knowledgeable individuals who served on the Delphi panel of experts. Forty items were considered during the three rounds of the Modified Delphi study. Consensus was achieved on 27 items. These twenty-seven items were considered to have critical, high and moderately high importance as indicators of success for program teams in Extension. Examination of the final results revealed two statements which had been reworded and gained consensus in Round III. This resulted in statements with meanings close enough to previously agreed upon statements to warrant combining them in the final list of 25 indicators of
success. The first four statements on the following list were identified as critical success factors.

- Evidence that team members are committed to the work of the team and follow through with their agreed upon roles and responsibilities
- A clear vision of where the team is going, and agreed upon and understood goals
- The impact of programs delivered to clientele
- An established process for communication among team members that allows for efficient and open information sharing in a timely manner

The next 20 indicators of success were identified at the high importance level for team success.

- Team members engaged in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team
- Evidence that team members have a clear understanding of their role and the roles of other team members
- Team members practice a respectful and caring way of working together
• The personal and professional satisfaction of team members with the team
• The quality of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases)
• Established processes for conducting the business of the team assure follow through and good communication before, during, and following team meetings
• Team member’s ability to utilize team contributions in the promotion and tenure process, or for yearly performance reviews
• Regularly reviewing goals and measuring attainment of those goals
• Reporting team accomplishments in an appropriate and timely manner to immediate supervisors and administration
• An established method of reporting outcomes to the team’s stakeholders
• Generating and utilizing evaluation data on inservices, workshops and seminars
• Team members being recognized for their contribution to the body of knowledge which is related to the team’s area of
expertise (examples: awards, recognition, publication of refereed journal articles)

- Utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the team’s accomplishments and organizational importance

- Documenting and analyzing participants level of satisfaction with information provided on team’s website, and in newsletters or other publications

- Team secures external funding when needed and considered appropriate

- Team develops quality publications in response to identified needs

- Team agrees upon decision making methods

- The use of technology to share the team’s research and scholarly activity and enhance timely communication in a cost effective manner (examples, having a web site; providing ongoing interactive site for accessing information; having a newsletter on-line)

- When appropriate and meaningful, team documents environmental and ecological impact of its work and scholarly activity
• Team should have an agreed upon method for resolving conflict

• The following statement was the only one of the indicators of success that was in the moderately high level of importance.

• Team and/or individual team members share their expertise at national meetings

As Extension considers the indicators of success that were identified as critical, they would appear to be applicable to all program teams. A team that does not focus on these fundamental elements of teamwork would have a difficult time succeeding. As a result of a team’s goals and objectives, a team may not find each of the indicators of success appropriate and applicable. A major concern was voiced by the panel of experts related to evaluating all teams using the entire list of potential indicators rather than selecting indicators most appropriate to a specific team. One of the concerns was that teams might begin to plan and conduct their work based on how they would be evaluated rather than on the program focus they were established to address.

Consensus was not reached on the importance of the following items as critical indicators of Extension program team success.

• Written guidelines for selection or appointment of team members

• Selection or appointment of an effective team leader

• Team secures adequate subject matter resources
• Team secures adequate material resources

• Team reports include information about the number of programs conducted

• Team reports include information about the number of persons reached

• Team delivers timely updates, educational resources, training and support for other extension professionals

• When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant economic impact of it’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served.

• When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant social impact of its work and scholarly activity for clientele served

• Team has agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outcomes

• Team has agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outputs

• Team established ground rules for conducting their work

• Team members enjoy working together
Discussion

As one begins to speculate about the findings of this study, three major areas surfaced for discussion. They are organizational readiness and support for teams, organizational expectations of teams, and behaviors and team work practices. Many of the indicators are related to the internal functions of the team and the effect of the work on the individuals serving on those teams. Panel members referred to items affecting the workings of a team or behaviors and attitudes of team members as ingredients or team processes needed or desired by teams to achieve high levels of success. The items related to implementation of team action plans could be viewed as external functions that have an impact on programs and clientele. Indicators of success that achieved consensus included items that many respondents identified as impacts and outcomes that should be used to evaluate or assess the success of a team. Many of the items achieving consensus as well as those that did not, received contrasting written comments from respondents.

Organizational Readiness and Support for Teams

It is hard to oppose teamwork within an Extension organization; however, the missing component is often an organization’s readiness to support the infrastructure of teams. Two of the indicators of success requiring organizational support include:

- Team members engage in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team
• The use of technology to share the team’s research and scholarly activity and enhance timely communication in a cost effective manner

As one reviews these items, it is noted the training and technology needs of teams present a significant expense to an organization. Some of the needs can easily be met with existing resources. However, some of the needs are specific to teamwork and have often been supplied with specialized funding. As resources become tight, training dollars and staff development professionals are often times the first to be eliminated. Organizations need to consider what impact these decisions will have on program teams. One could speculate as training dollars decrease team effectiveness could also decrease.

Some of the items not achieving consensus were not supported because of a difference of opinion about whether a team should expect certain resources be provided by the organization or whether the team would be expected to secure those resources. The differing opinions of panel members seemed to be related to how they had experienced teams in their professional work. Some respondents indicated their state expected individual team members to come to the team with subject matter expertise and resources, while others suggested teams in their state were expected to find external funding to support the work of the team. The following rewording helped to bring panel members closer to agreement: ‘when appropriate and applicable’ teams were expected to find external dollars to support the teams work including ongoing training of team
members. It is not important from whence the teams resources originate, but that Extension administration assures a team has adequate resources to perform their functions.

Organizational Expectations of Teams

Teams do not function within a vacuum but must function within their organization. The work of the team and its goals need to be in alignment with the mission, vision and values of an organization. “A clear vision of where the team is going and agreed upon and understood goals,” was one of the identified indicators of success in this study. Comments from the panel of experts and the review of literature support the importance of teams periodically reviewing their performance in relationship to both their vision and goals, as well as those of their organization.

Three indicators of success deal with outcomes and impacts of the team and how those are reported to internal and external stakeholders. One expert panel member summarized the importance of these indicators in the following statement: “This helps the team to stay focused, on track, and working toward their goals in a timely manner.”

It was interesting to note that several indicators relating to an organization’s expectations such as securing resources, training of Extension professionals, and reporting of economic and social impact, numbers of persons reached and programs conducted did not achieve consensus. The panel members discussed the importance of indicators being linked to the team’s
goals and objectives and did not seem willing to agree with these items as indicators since they did not appear appropriate to all teams. The concern raised about numbers of programs and persons reached was based on the belief that this information was not truly a measure of success unless combined with programmatic impact.

**Behaviors and Teamwork Practices**

Of the 25 indicators of success, the one that received the highest degree of consensus was “evidence that team members are committed to the work of the team and follow through with their agreed upon roles and responsibilities.” This would support the need for roles and responsibilities to be clearly defined for team members. It might be suggested that team members have clearly written job descriptions and that a strategic plan be developed, which outlines the action steps for the team and identifies who is responsible for each of the tasks and by what date they have agreed to complete their contribution.

Another of the critically important indicators of success as rated by the panel of experts was, “An established process for communication among team members that allows for efficient and open information sharing in a timely manner.” Only two statements regarding this statement were provided by panel members. Both were supportive but one indicated that this represents a team process. Several responses to statements question the inclusion of team processes as indicators of success to be used by a team or supervisors to measure success of the team.
Several other items were identified as team processes or behaviors that were described as ingredients of good teamwork by some members of the panel of experts but were supported favorably by ratings and comments of other panel members. Comments suggested that although these processes or behaviors might make teamwork more enjoyable, they were not prerequisites of success and would not be something that an evaluator could easily measure. These include:

- Established processes for conducting the business of the team that assure follow through and good communication before, during, and following team meetings
- Team agrees upon decision making methods
- Team should have agreed upon method for resolving conflict

The following items were considered by panel members to be related to individual behavior and attitudes of team members:

- The personal and professional satisfaction of team members with the team
- Team members practice a respectful and caring way of working together

Program teams are often times comprised of team members with training in multidisciplines with the goal of blending their expertise into an interdisciplinary approach to a problem or issue. The different
perspectives and biases in the way they view the issue results in challenges for a teams ability to work together. If team members can learn to practice behaviors related to the indicator of success, mutual respect, this should result in members understanding and appreciating the expertise of other team members.

It was noted that the following processes or behaviors did not achieve consensus as indicators of success:

- Team members enjoy working together
- Team established ground rules for conducting their work
- Selection or appointment of an effective team leader
- Written guidelines for selection or appointment of team members

From the panel of expert’s written comments it would seem their major reason for not coming to consensus on the above items as indicators of success was a polarization of attitudes toward the need for formal structures and policies that guide teams. Some comments indicated a more formal structure was needed during the start up of teams but that it could become less formal as teams matured. Since OSU Extension has many established teams with a successful track record the organization may be slow to address the needs of other teams for training development and support. Without ongoing training an organization would run the risk of not effectively integrating new professionals into teams
Implications

The findings of this study suggest implications in the areas of (a) organizational support of teams, (b) performance appraisal of teams and team members, (c) team member behaviors, and (d) team programming.

Organizational Support of Teams

Three indicators of success support the need for an organization to help maintain the momentum of program teams. These relate to the areas of (a) providing awards and recognition to team and or team members, (b) providing a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the teams accomplishments and (c) offering learning opportunities for teams to enhance their skills and knowledge. Learning and cultural change require structural adaptation and a commitment to training everyone who will be on a team as well as the managers and executives who will interact with and seek to influence the teams (Donnellon, 1996). Assistant directors, specialists, district directors, department chairs and county office chair persons that are acting as supervisors of other Extension program faculty should take part in experiential learning about the demands of teamwork. Ongoing seminars will allow them to share their experiences with other managers and will help them develop strategies to perform in their new roles (Manz, Keating & Donnellon, 1986). Managers can lead, empower and remove the roadblocks for individual members and teams, and act as a coach to help teams mature in their job (Kelly, 1991).
According to Kelly (1991), several organizational systems must undergo change or transformation to support teamwork. The organization must be sure their mission, management philosophy, goals and objectives and strategies are in alignment with the concept of teams. The organization must be able to answer positively to several questions. Are the technical systems in place to support teamwork including tasks, technologies and facilities? Do structural systems including how people are organized both formally and informally support teamwork? Do procedures for training, evaluating and promoting and rewarding employees reflect team concepts? Based on the literature, the responses from panel members and interviews with team leaders in OSU Extension this researcher recognizes steps need to be taken for these questions to be answered with a resounding “yes.” These questions may need to be answered differently in other states.

Since OSU Extension team members are widely dispersed geographically issues of technological support and how people are organized formally and informally can be roadblocks to effective teamwork. Technological support for teams can overcome some of the distance barriers and become critical in the quality of team member interactions. Technology support will also allow teams to deliver programs in new ways reaching the ever changing demands of clientele.

A concern expressed by Extension professionals is being evaluated on individual accomplishments with little attention given to their role and the
value of their contribution to a program team. For accomplishments of teams to be valued performance appraisals, promotion and tenure criteria and rewards given within an organization need to reflect the value an organization places on program teams. Some departments and administrators who evaluate faculty view teamwork as a service to the University rather than a scholarly endeavor. It would be important to develop a reporting system that quantifies the nature of the team contribution and the significance of the impact of the teams work on clientele.

*Performance Appraisal of Teams and Team Members*

One indicator of success received a rating of high importance related to performance appraisal. The statement stressed the importance of a team member's ability to utilize team contributions in the promotion and tenure process, or for yearly performance reviews. This implies to an organization that a person's contribution to a team must be a part of performance appraisals and the promotion and tenure criteria. There is disharmony if there is not congruency between performance appraisal and the organizational culture of teamwork. Since OSU Extension recently adopted a policy where performance appraisal of county program professionals will be conducted by county chairpersons, it is critical that these individuals appreciate the importance of teamwork, understand the indicators of success of teams and learn to factor an individual’s contributions to teams into an employee’s overall performance
appraisal. Extension administration in Ohio will need to consider the above mentioned needs as they plan county chair training.

**Team Member Behaviors**

A theme that ran through the indicators of success related to team member behaviors was communications. It is apparent, from the responses of the panel of experts as well as the literature review, that without effective communications team success is diminished. Indicators related to communications include decision making, resolving conflict, sharing of information and team member interactions. These indicators contribute to a team member’s personal and professional satisfaction with the team. Thus, they could lead to Extension focusing training on areas of teamwork. Woodcock & Francis (1994) suggested team training should include team leadership, understanding of team roles, functions and deliverables, commitment, positive work environment, meeting management skills, and problem solving.

In addition Moxon (1993) emphasized, “effective teambuilding is concerned with the following functions: (1) improving performance and results; (2) making greater use of both individual and team strengths-not simply concentrating on weaknesses, and (3) Resolving problems about which something can and must be done, and which are within the responsibilities of the particular team involved” (p.29).
**Team Programming**

The end results of program teams are quality programs delivered to Extension clientele. Three of the indicators of success addressed programming, including: “the quality of subject matter publications,” “documenting and analyzing participant level of satisfaction,” and “the impact of programs delivered to clientele.” The bottom line is Extension professionals need to learn if there are changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills and aspirations of program participants. Developing an evaluation instrument to answer the “so what” question should be incorporated into the program planning phase of a team’s work. The implication this has for Extension is the importance of providing training and support in developing effective teaching strategies, program evaluation techniques and cutting edge technology for program development and dissemination.

**Recommendations for Extension**

The following recommendations are being made to Extension Systems based on the previously discussed implications.

1. Create a vision and culture conducive to developing teams.
2. Implement organizational policies and guidelines that support teamwork.
3. Provide team development or teambuilding activities for team leaders and team members.
4. Integrate the indicators of success for team performance measurements into the criteria for performance appraisal and promotion and tenure guidelines.

5. Require training for assistant directors, specialists, district directors, department chairs and county office chair persons acting as supervisors of other Extension program faculty to help them understand, foster, and assess team efforts.

6. OSU Extension administration should peruse the indicators not gaining consensus and determine if there are any essential to Ohio based upon its unique needs or circumstances (i.e. indicators related to social and economic impact).

**Recommendations for Further Research**

1. A follow up study to explore program team members reactions to the indicators of success identified in this study. It would be interesting to determine if persons serving as team members would place the same importance on the indicators of team success as did the panel of experts.

2. A study to examine the correlation between team behaviors and processes and the indicators of success identified by this research.

3. A replication of the study using Ohio Extension professionals who have experience with teamwork similar to the panel of experts.
used. A comparison of the results with those from the national sample would be interesting.

4. Select current program teams interested in focusing on the “Indicators of Success” identified in this study. Use the case study methodology to observe and capture changes in behavior, outcomes and reported impacts of teams and their members.

5. Although the literature recommended having panel of expert members post biographical information on a separate Web site, the participants in this study chose to not so. Therefore it is recommended in future Delphi studies that the researcher collect and post the biographical information for panel of expert members.

6. It would be interesting to compare the Modified Delphi technique with the traditional Modified Delphi technique and compare and contrast the results.
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APPENDIX D
ROUND I QUESTIONNAIRE
Indicators of Success for Program Teams in Extension Organizations

Round I

Thank you for participating in my survey on program teams.

Your feedback is important. Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each item and contribute comments in the comment box that follows each item. Additional items can be submitted in the final question comment box.
**Round I Questionnaire**

**Indicators of Success for Program Teams in Extension Organizations**

1. Written guidelines for selection or appointment of team members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

2. Agreed upon methods of selection of effective leaders for a program team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

3. Teams that provide adequate material resources (computers, audio-visual equipment and subject matter resource materials) for their members are most likely to be successful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The number of programs delivered to clientele

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The impact of programs delivered to clientele

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The number of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases) produced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
7. The quality of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

8. Inservice training provided to Extension agents related to a team's area of expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

9. Team and/or Team members providing workshops, seminars or research reports at national meetings pertaining to the teams area of expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

10. The personal and professional satisfaction of team members with the team
11. The teams use of technology to share the combined knowledge of the teams research and scholarly activity (examples: having a web site, providing an on-line interactive site for accessing information, having a newsletter on-line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

12. Documenting and analyzing participants level of satisfaction with information provided on team's website, and in newsletters or other publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

13. Generating and utilizing evaluation data on inservices, workshops, and seminars
### 14. Documenting the economic impact of the team's work and scholarly activity for clientele served, including businesses and industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

### 15. An established method of tracking team performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

### 16. Team success at securing external dollars through grants, contracts and contributions from business or industry to support the activities and programs of the team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
17. Team members being recognized for their contribution to the body of knowledge which is related to the teams area of expertise (examples: awards, recognition, publication of refereed journal articles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. An established method of reporting outcomes to the teams stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. An established process for communication among team members that allows for efficient and open information sharing in a timely manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Comments:

20. Team members engaged in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

21. A clear vision of where the team is going, and agreed upon and understood goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

22. Evidence that team members have a clear understanding of their role and the roles of other team members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:
23. Evidence that team members are committed to the work of the team and follow through with their agreed upon roles and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

24. Established work and meeting processes for conducting the business of the team before, during and following team meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

25. An established method to resolve conflict, make decisions or handle other key process skills that relate to the work of the team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

26. Regularly reviewing goals and measuring attainment of those goals
### 27. Reporting team accomplishments in an appropriate and timely manner to immediate supervisors and administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

### 28. Team member's ability to utilize team contributions in the promotion and tenure process, or for yearly performance reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments:

### 29. Ability to utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the team's accomplishments and organizational importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Comments:

30. Please provide additional comments, suggestions or other indicators of success you consider important in the comment box below
APPENDIX E

ROUND II QUESTIONNAIRE
Indicators of Success For Program Teams in Extension Organizations

Round II

Thank you for participating in my survey on program teams.

Your feedback is important. Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each item and contribute comments in the comment box that follows each item. Additional items can be submitted in the final question comment box.
Round II Questionnaire

Indicators of Success for Program Teams in Extension

Q.1. Written Guidelines for selection or appointment of team members. Round I Responses follow: SD=1, D=3, MD=1, MA=9, A=5, SA=2. Note comments from round 1 below. Please Read the statement again and rate the reworded item, which appears in all capital letters:

1. Are you asking if I believe that having written guidelines is a "key indicator of a successful team"? That is how I have chosen to interpret the statement. 2 Teams can be self-selecting, and the process for appointment need not be formal. 3 This depends on the nature and purpose of the team. I don't think written guidelines are always necessary. However, they are particularly helpful when forming teams to address interdisciplinary issues or new and emerging issues. 4 Team members are more likely to understand and to follow through with commitments if they can read those and can agree or support them before joining the team. 5 Guidelines help both those given the task of selecting or appointing the team, and guideline help those interested in the team have a clearer understanding of the responsibilities associated with being a member of a team. 6 Written guidelines sounds very formal and doesn't seem as important as general criteria for selection. 7 In comparison to other states, we have relatively few Extension personnel. Usually everyone who is connected with a particular program or theme is invited to participate. We prefer to be inclusive, but we do not have large groups of people who would be interested. IDENTIFIED CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OR APPOINTMENT OF TEAM MEMBERS:

Additional Comments
Q.2. Agreed upon methods of selection of effective leaders for a program team. Round I responses follow: SD=1, D=2, MD=2, MA=6, A=9, SA=1. Note Round I responses below and then rate the reworded statement which appears in all capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q1. If steps are taken to assure all methods are surfaced and decision-making isn't dominated by one or few. 2. Leaders need to be clearly engaged in the subject/issue area, and in positions of subject/issue leadership, whether that be on campus or off. 3. Having a standard and following that standard prevents others from perceiving that some are "favored." 4. Agreed upon selection methods can prevent friction and tension within a group. 5. Maybe this is more what you were getting at in the above item. 6. Again, there are a relatively small number of people involved on program teams. We tend not to be hierarchical, so we would be looking for an effective facilitator. SELECTION OR APPOINTMENT OF AN EFFECTIVE FACILITATOR TO SERVE AS TEAM LEADER

Additional Comment

Q.3. Teams that provide adequate material resources (computers, audio-visual equipment and subject matter resources) for their members are most likely to be successful. Round I responses follow: SD=1, D=1, MD=3, MA=5, A=5, SA=5. Note the responses from Round I below. Read the reworded statement which appears in all capital letters carefully and rate the new item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. And also officially provide team members dedicated time for the team effort so that it doesn't become an add-on to all there current work. 2. Given that some
you want to be included will come prepared with personal equipment because of familiarity and comfort. 3. Computers and audio visual equipment are different needs that subject matter resources. I would strongly disagree that teams should provide computers and audio visual equipment yet I wanted to agree that subject matter resource material is crucial. 4. Gotta have the proper tools to do the work. 5. Team are expected to bring their own equipment and subject resources to team activities and deliberations, and in fact DEVELOP new resources materials. 6. This might depend on the nature of the project and the expectations of team members. Obviously, if members are told they should expect resources as a perk for getting involved, then the resources need to be there. However, the availability of resources does not guarantee success. 7. Most teams have Research & Development functions. They need resources in order to be successful. Resources are not the only criteria for success. 8. A team needs physical resources, but more importantly, from my viewpoint, a team needs the administrative backing to do the tasks assigned to them; as well as a synergistic relationship among its members. 9. Has nothing to do with success. People make a difference not materials. 10. Material resources that are likely to make members more successful would seem to be computers, including electronic technologies, support for telephone and video conferencing along with subject matter materials. Teams that provide adequate material resources (computers, audio-visual equipment and subject matter resource materials) for their members are most likely to be successful. TEAMS THAT PROVIDE ADEQUATE SUBJECT MATTER RESOURCES FOR THEIR MEMBERS ARE MOST LIKELY TO BE SUCCESSFUL

Additional Comment

Q.4. Teams that provide adequate material resources (computers, audio-visual equipment and subject matter resource materials) for their members are most likely to be successful. Round I responses follow: SD=1, D=1, MD=3, MA=5, A=5, SA=5. The item that appears is based on responses to the previous question. Read and rate the reworded statement below which appears in all capital letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TEAMS THAT PROVIDE ACCESS TO ADEQUATE MATERIAL RESOURCES (COMPUTERS, AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT, ETC.) TO ASSURE THAT ALL
TEAM MEMBERS HAVE ACCESS TO NEEDED EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES TO CARRY OUT THEIR ROLE ON THE TEAM.

Additional Comment

Q.5. The number of programs delivered to clientele. Round I responses follow: SD=4, D=5, MD=4, MA=4, A=4, SA=0. Note comments from Round 1 below. Please read and rate the reworded statement which appears in all capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. By the team AND by others who have adopted program efforts as a result of the team's efforts. 2. We must focus programming based upon most critical needs within our mission. We cannot be everything to everyone. Make sure we are meeting most critical needs with high quality programming. 3. Sometimes quality is more important than quantity. 4 single but innovative and impactful program is enough. 5. This question is vague. Do you mean the value of the team, or the success of the team, should be based on the number of programs delivered? 6. Teams may have functions other than direct program delivery. 7. Numbers are important if they also yield impact. 8. Poor indicator of anything. How this sentence is completed drives response. 9. It is not so much the number of programs delivered to clientele but was there an impact on the target audience. (I see that that is the next statement!) It may be an internal or external client. REPORTS ON THE NUMBER OF PROGRAMS DELIVERED ARE ACCOMPANIED BY INFORMATION ON THE IMPACT OF THOSE PROGRAMS ON TARGET AUDIENCE.

Additional Comment

Q.6. The number of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases) produced. Round I Responses follow: SD=1, D=4, MD=2, MA=9, A=4, SA=1. Note the responses to Round I below. Please read and rate the reworded item, which appears in all capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. Why devote resources to something for which there is no need? Must be relevant. 2. I do not believe in re-inventing the wheel. Use of available publications is also appropriate. 3. Quality is more important than quality. Selection of publications is more important than producing. 4. We live in a result oriented society and we must produce to get funding. 5. Difficult to say until you know the goals of the team and what they are working towards. The number of subject matter publications and the examples listed are an old model. Materials that are relevant, responsive and get results are the indicators of successful design and delivery. This could happen even if the team was not functionally well together. TEAM DEVELOPMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER PUBLICATIONS OR RESOURCES (FACT SHEETS, BULLETINS, NEWSLETTERS, WEBSITES, OR DATABASES) ARE IN RESPONSE TO IDENTIFIED NEEDS.

Additional Comment

Q. 7. Inservice training provided to Extension agents related to a team's area of expertise. Round I responses follow: SD=1, D=2, MD=3, MA=4, A=5, SA=6. Please read the responded to Round I below. Please read and rate the reworded items which appear in all capital letters.

1. If it fits within the priority programming area(s) of the agents being trained. 2. I don't believe agents need to become experts in every given subject matter area but they should know how to present the material provided by specialists. 3. Top quality state specialists come to play here and can really affect team's ability to be current and accurate. 4. To be productive one must stay current in their subject matter expertise. 5. Doesn't have to be provided by Extension as long as they can attend. 6. Yes, I would agree that training of some kind is important. Training can occur in a number of different formats, self-directed, mentoring and coaching. I don't know how the term "inservice" is used in this case. It implies face to face training to me. If that is the case, I don't think it is an indicator of success. Some type of learning or training is important if the group is to be successful. 7. Often, everyone in our system who is related to the team's program focus is on the team.
We sometimes provide training to paraprofessionals and those outside Extension. TEAMS CONSISTENT DELIVERY OF UPDATES, EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, TRAINING AND SUPPORT FOR OTHER EXTENSION PROFESSIONALS

Additional Comment

Q.8. Team and/or Team members providing workshops, seminars or research reports at national meetings pertaining to the teams area of expertise. Round I responses follow: SD=0, D=1, MD=1, MA=8, A=6, SA=5. Note comments from Round I below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Great means of reaping intrinsic rewards and sharing programs with others. 2. One of the things Extension does well is sharing ideas that work. 3. This is a worthy goal but with existing budgets might not be practical. 4. Offers teams opportunities to showcase their work and gives other professionals an opportunity to gather excellent ideas and programs which they can incorporate into their programming. 5. This is dissemination and has very little to do with the work of the team. It’s affirming to the team and communicates their work but isn’t relevant to this study. TEAM AND/OR TEAM MEMBERS BEING SELECTED TO SHARE WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS OR RESEARCH REPORTS THAT PERTAIN TO THE TEAMS AREA OF EXPERTISE AT NATIONAL MEETINGS.

Additional Comment

Q9. The teams use of technology to share the combined knowledge of the teams research and scholarly activity (examples: having a web site, providing an on-line interactive site for accessing information, having a newsletter on-line). Round I responses follow: SD= 0, D=1, MD=3, MA=6, A=10, SA=3. Note comments to this items from Round I below. Please read and rate the reworded item below which appears in all capital letters following item:
1. Questions: who maintains? When does it stop? how do you know when? 2. Use of technology is important only to the degree it enhances communication. 3. An excellent method for reaching other professionals in a timely and less costly manner. 4. We often used compressed video for meetings. THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY TO SHARE THE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY TO ENHANCE TIMELY COMMUNICATION IN A COST EFFECTIVE MANNER (EXAMPLES: HAVING A WEB SITE; PROVIDING AN ON-LINE INTERACTIVE SITE FOR ACCESSING INFORMATION, HAVING A NEWSLETTER ON-LINE).

Additional Comment

Q 10. Documenting the economic impact of the team's work and scholarly activity for clientele served, including businesses and industry. Round I responses follow: SD=0, D=1, MD=3, MA=8, A=6, SA=3. Note comments from Round I below. Please read and rate the reworded item, which appears in all capital letters.

1. Impacts are not always correlated with economic benefits. 2. It is worth a try if the information can be gathered in a cost-effective and culturally appropriate manner. 3. Documenting impact is important, but defining an economic value is difficult for some teams. 4. Documenting the impact and sharing that information with funders and stakeholders is important to sustain the team and the organization. 5. Economic impact is only one measure. There is environmental, social and political dimensions, too. But it’s probably most useful to document economic impact for accountability purposes. DOCUMENTING RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE TEAM’S WORK AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY FOR CLIENTELE SERVED

Additional Comments:
Q.11. Rate the following item. This is a new item developed from input from the previous question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOCUMENTING APPROPRIATE AND RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL OR ECOLOGICAL IMPACT OF THE TEAM'S WORK AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY FOR CLIENTELE SERVED

Additional Comment

Q.12. An established method of tracking team performance. Round I responses follow: SD=0, D=0, MD=2, MA=6, A=8, SA=5. Note the comments from Round I below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I'm not exactly sure what this item means. Does performance mean outcomes/end results or does it mean the presentation performances of team members? My response is based on my interpretation of performance being the former. If I was interpreting the item as referring to presentation performances of the team members, my response would be a 4. 2. Reporting Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts provide the necessary tracking. 3. Believe our annual team report would do this as all teams were to submit them. 4. Teams, like people, can vary widely in how they operate, and how they approach a task or goal. Formal means of tracking and evaluating extension work of any kind has been a difficult challenge historically. 5. Agreed upon methods that are clearly understood from the beginning are important for documenting success. 6. Now this seems more like an indicator of success than the others. It seems that you are mixing content and process. There are outputs and outcomes associated with both the team and its performance and the program to which they have been appointed/invited to serve. THE
ORGANIZATION AND TEAM MEMBERS HAVE AGREED UPON METHODS FOR TRACKING TEAM PERFORMANCE AS MEASURED BY OUTCOMES

Additional Comments:

Q. 13 Please rate the following item. This is a new item based on responses to the previous item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE ORGANIZATION AND TEAM MEMBERS HAVE AGREED UPON METHODS FOR TRACKING TEAM PERFORMANCE AS MASURED BY OUTPUTS

Additional Comment

Q. 14. Team success at securing external dollars through grants, contracts and contributions from business or industry to support the activities and programs of the team. Round I responses follow: SD=0, D=1, MD=3, MA=5, A=9, SA=3. Note the comments from Round I below. Please read rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In some cases this is the way that a team can continue to exist. In these situations, external dollars are indications of success. However, teams working in some areas may not have access to external dollars and must depend on organizational resources to function. For these teams, the lack of external dollars is not an indication of a lack of success by the team. 2. Marketing and salesmanship are key components to program longevity. 3. This will need to be
look at very closely to make sure grant programs meet local needs. 4. The team should be actively seeking funding if external funding is necessary but I am not sure would use it as a measure of success. 5. Garnering grants is increasingly important as direct sources of revenue dwindle, but I feel Extension runs the risk of losing its unbiased edge if we chase dollars from the cooperate world. TEAM’S SUCCESS AT SECURING EXTERNAL DOLLARS WHEN NEEDED AND CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE THROUGH GRANTS, CONTRACTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS FROM BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY TO SUPPORT THE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS OF THE TEAM.

Additional Comments

Q. 15. Established work and meeting processes for conducting the business of the team before, during and following team meetings. Round I responses follow: SD= 0, D=0, MD=1, MA=6, A=4, SA=6. Note comments from Round I below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters:

1. Including built-in flexibility to be able to address unforeseen situations. 2. Structure is important--but the importance placed upon the established work and meeting processes will be very different depending upon the personalities involved. ESTABLISHED PROCESSES FOR CONDUCTING THE BUSINESS OF THE TEAM THAT ASSURE FOLLOW THROUGH AND GOOD COMMUNICATION BEFORE, DURING AND FOLLOWING TEAM MEETINGS

Additional Comment

Q.16. An established method to resolve conflict, make decisions or handle other key process skills that relate to the work of the team. Round I responded
follow: SD=0, D=1, MD=1, MA =5, A= 9, SA=5. Note the Round 1 comments below. Read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. These are three separate ideas. I am not sure what you mean by the phrase "key process skills" and how one would "handle" them. 2. No one can know ahead of time what method or which team member may be best suited to resolve a conflict. Still, there needs to be leadership and some set policies/procedures. 3. As our teams are affinity groups and self-selecting in membership, are established conflict resolution methods really necessary? 4. Teams need a method for handling conflict as will as handing the order of business, because conflict often surfaces and needs to be addressed. 5. This is when it gets dicey. It seems like Extension professionals are uncomfortable with this level of group process. 6. Some teams seem to develop a rapport and working relationship that they work these things out naturally; for others an identified method is needed and helpful. TEAM SHOULD HAVE AN AGREED UPON METHOD FOR RESOLVING CONFLICT

Additional Comment

Q.17. Please rate the following item. This is a new item based upon input from the previous item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TEAM HAS AN AGREED UPON SYSTEMS OR METHOD FOR DECISION MAKING.

Additional Comment
Q.18. Please rate the following item. This is a new item based upon feedback from the previous item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEAM HAS AGREED UPON PROCESS SKILLS FOR CONDUCTING THE WORK AND BUSINESS OF THE TEAM

Additional Comment

Q.19. Please rate the following item. This is a new item based upon input from Round I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEAM MEMBERS EXHIBIT PASSIONATE INTEREST IN THE WORK OF THE TEAM.

Additional Comments:

Q 20. Please rate the following item. This is a new item based upon input from Round I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEAM MEMBERS PRACTICE A RESPECTFUL AND CARING WAY OF WORKING TOGETHER
Additional Comments:

Q.21. Please rate the following item. This is a new item based upon input from Round I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEAM MEMBERS ENJOY WORKING TOGETHER

Additional comments:

Q.22. Ability to utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the team's accomplishments and organizational importance. Round I responses follow: SD=0, D=1, MD=0, MA=8, A=4, SA=8. Note comments from Round I below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This can be critically important in helping to get the team's work communicated to individuals and organizations which need to know and which have the financial resources and/or political power to help forward the programmatic goals of the team. 2. Not sure what you mean here. Is the team leader or org. leader external to the team? Its seems like it would be useful to have someone at all levels advocating for the group but not sure if that's what you are referring to here. 3. We rarely have this opportunity. UTILIZE A TEAM COACH OR ORGANIZATIONAL LEADER AS AN ADVOCATE OF THE TEAM'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONAL IMPORTANCE

Additional Comment
Q.23. Please provide additional comments, suggestions or other indicators of success you consider important in the comment box below:

Thank you for your thoughtful responses to Round II of the Modified Delphi Questionnaire—“Indicators of Success for Extension Program Teams.” You will receive a message requesting your continued participation with the results of this round about three days after all panel members have responded. Remember that you may link to the team study website to post a short biography so that other panel of experts members may know something about the persons serving on this panel. I also welcome you to participate in the discussion forum. Also please watch your mail box as I will be sending you a small token of my appreciation for your participation in this research study.
APPENDIX F

ROUND III QUESTIONNAIRE
Indicators of Success For Program Teams in Extension Organizations

Round III

Thank you for participating in my survey on program teams.

Your feedback is important. Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each item and contribute comments in the comment box that follows each item. Additional items can be submitted in the final question comment box.
Round III Questionnaire

Indicators of Success for Program Teams in Extension

1. IDENTIFIED CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OR APPOINTMENT OF TEAM MEMBERS: Round II Responses follow: SD=0, D=2, MD=2, MA=5, A=12, SA=1. Note comments from Round II below. Please Read the statement again and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This seems to be a sentence fragment with no complete idea or meaning. Need to put this as well as many other questions in some type of context or there isn’t much substance to results even with 80% agreement. 2. In most instances, team members want specifics so written guidelines serve as a framework. 3. Our teams are affinity groups who should recruit folks only from broad categories of staff, i.e. tenured faculty, extension agents, external stakeholders. 4. Yes, when formal teams are being formed. However, some very successful teams are formed through self-selection. 5. Important to have but also need flexibility to appoint without rigid plans. WRITTEN GUIDELINES FOR SELECTION OR APPOINTMENT OF TEAM MEMBERS

Additional Comments

2. SELECTION OR APPOINTMENT OF AN EFFECTIVE FACILITATOR TO SERVE AS TEAM LEADER: Round II responses follow: SD=1, D=0, MD=0, MA=5, A=10, SA=5. Note Round II responses below and then rate the reworded statement which appears in all capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. An effective facilitator insures that everyone is heard and that the discussion stays on topic. This person should be as neutral as possible yet have some knowledge of the subject. SELECTION OR APPOINTMENT OF AN EFFECTIVE TEAM LEADER

Additional Comment

3. TEAMS THAT PROVIDE ADEQUATE SUBJECT MATTER RESOURCES FOR THEIR MEMBERS ARE MOST LIKELY TO BE SUCCESSFUL. Round II responses follow: SD=0, D=0, MD=4, MA=4, A=9, SA=5. Note the responses from Round II below. Read the reworded statement which appears in all capital letters carefully and rate the new item

1. Appropriate subject matter background information allows the team to move forward at a faster pace and to become more efficient in their discussion especially in the beginning. 2. As I reread the statement, it seems to be an indicator of administrative or systemic support for team efforts rather than an indicator of success for the team members. Are you suggesting that if a team is successful in procuring resources, then this is an indicator of team success. 3. Adequate, necessary training and or materials for team members is a defined role of a supervisor-it would hold true for a team leader as well. Membership on a team should not be based solely on what skills, equipment they already have. 4. I don't know how critical this is to successful teams. Team members often bring the subject matter resources, expertise with them. However, if this is a new and emerging issue and team members need additional background information as preparation for their work then such resources would be beneficial. TEAM SECURES ADEQUATE SUBJECT MATTER RESOURCES

Additional Comment

3. TEAMS THAT PROVIDE ACCESS TO ADEQUATE MATERIAL RESOURCES(COMPUTERS, AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT, ETC.) TO ALL TEAM MEMBERS TO CARRY OUT THEIR ROLE ON THE TEAM. Round II responses follow: SD=0, D=1, MD=3, MA=2, A=11, SA=4. The item that appears is based on responses to the previous question. Read and rate the reworded statement below which appears in all capital letters
1. Those that are provided the needed resources feel valued and are better able to complete their duties. We have found that volunteers and paid staff alike are motivated when they are provided the necessary resources. 2. Our teams are program development teams not necessarily program delivery teams. As such, provision of equipment is not a team responsibility and should not be used as an evaluative standard. 3. I am not voting here, because this appears to be a repeat of #3. 4. I take this to mean that you are putting all team members on a common playing field so that everyone has the capacity to participate equally and fully. This is important put people may also need training on how to use the equipment. 5. The number of programs delivered to clientele. TEAM SECURES ADEQUATE MATERIAL RESOURCES.

Additional Comment

5. REPORTS ON THE NUMBER OF PROGRAMS DELIVERED ARE ACCOMPANIED BY INFORMATION ON THE IMPACT OF THOSE PROGRAMS ON TARGET AUDIENCE. Round II responses follow: SD=1, D=2, MD =2, MA=4, A=8, SA=5. Note comments from Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded statement, which appears in all capital letters.

1. Outcomes should be reported but are currently under reported in Extension. It is extremely important that we continue to improve outcome based reporting. 2. The reworded statement is much improved. 3. I still don't believe the number of programs has and direct correlation on outcomes or impacts. Reports on impacts are useful, however. 4. I am not sure the above statement is a critical indicator of successful teams. Reporting results and impact are important. Since you already have a question on measuring impact, I am not sure this statement is needed. If it is, I think this statement should be worded in the following manner -- Reports that provide information about impact on target audiences include information about number of programs conducted. Reports that provide information about impact on target audiences include information
about number of programs conducted. TEAM REPORTS INCLUDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE NUMBER OF PROGRAMS CONDUCTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comment

6. Please rate the following item. It was based upon responses to Round II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEAM REPORTS INCLUDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE NUMBER OF PERSONS REACHED

Additional Comment

7. TEAM DEVELOPMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER PUBLICATIONS OR RESOURCES (FACT SHEETS, BULLETINS, NEWSLETTERS, WEBSITES, OR DATABASES) ARE IN RESPONSE TO IDENTIFIED NEEDS. Round II Responses follow: SD=0, D=2, MD=1, MA=6, A=6, SA=7. Note the responses to Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Many specialists still develop resources in a vacuum. Those that are developed by a team effort are usually more thought out and address clientele needs effectively. However, not all teams will organize to develop resources. 2. A slightly different approach would be that "team develops quality publications in response
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to identified needs." 3. Production of "products" is not always tied to needs or desired results. TEAM DEVELOPS QUALITY PUBLICATIONS IN RESPONSE TO IDENTIFIED NEEDS

Additional Comment

8. TEAMS CONSISTENT DELIVERY OF UPDATES, EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, TRAINING AND SUPPORT FOR OTHER EXTENSION PROFESSIONALS. Round II responses follow: SD=0, D=0, MD=1, MA=5, A=9, SA=7. Please read the responded to Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded items that appears in all capital letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 StrONGLY DISAGREe</th>
<th>2 DISAgree</th>
<th>3 MILDly diSAGRee</th>
<th>4 MILDly agree</th>
<th>5 agree</th>
<th>6 STRONGLY agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Teams must be kept informed and up-to-date to be effective. Training should be provided for volunteers and paid staff. Opportunities can be provided outside Extension or within Extension. 2. If there is a need for updates, resources, training, and support, then this could be a helpful indicator of success. 3. I don't know about "consistent delivery"—I translate that to mean, "frequent" and to me, timely delivery is more important even if that is only annually. TEAMS DELIVERS TIMELY UPDATES, EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, TRAINING AND SUPPORT FOR OTHER EXTENSION PROFESSIONALS.

Additional Comment

9. TEAM AND/OR TEAM MEMBERS BEING SELECTED TO SHARE WORKSHOPS, SEMINARS OR RESEARCH REPORTS THAT PERTAIN TO THE TEAM'S AREA OF EXPERTISE AT NATIONAL MEETINGS. Round II responses follow: SD=0, D=2, MD=3, MA=5, A=8, SA=4. Note comments from Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 STRONGLY DISAGREe</th>
<th>2 DISAgree</th>
<th>3 MILDly diSAGRee</th>
<th>4 MILDly agree</th>
<th>5 agree</th>
<th>6 STRONGLY agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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1. Provides great motivation to those involved as team members. Being recognized by peers is very important and in the University setting it is a must so that those creating and leading teams can become tenured and continue to do so. 2. Presenting at national meetings, especially professional society meetings, doesn't say much about how effective a team may have been in addressing a need relevant to external stakeholders. 3. Given that Extension faculty in our state have to meet the same criteria for research as other faculty members, this is an important indicator of team success. 4. I do not like the new wording of this item. Part of the definition of scholarship is to share the knowledge with others. Sometimes, you have to come up with your own methods or means of sharing the knowledge and not always depend on a selection process. 5. Budgets may constrain this as an activity but being selected provides recognition, which is important to eminence of successful teams. When feasible, participation in national meetings also promotes collaboration across state-lines, which is important. 6. This has become an expectation of Extension Educators by the Administration. It is important to individuals within a team because it is recognized as scholarly work, which is expected of all of us. TEAM AND/OR INDIVIDUAL TEAM MEMBERS SHARE THEIR EXPERIENCE AT NATIONAL MEETINGS.

Additional Comment

10. DOCUMENTING RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE TEAM'S WORK AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY FOR CLIENTELE SERVED Round II responses follow: SD=1, D=1, MD=1, MA=8, A=3, SA=3. Note comments from Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Economic impact is not always a relevant indicator. 2. Documenting outcomes, economic or not, is important. 3. Economic impacts are important, but not the only kind of impacts. 4. Perhaps using the phrase, "when appropriate and meaningful, documenting relevant economic impacts...". 5. This statement still has too narrow a focus. What about other types of valuable impacts? 6. Economic impact should not be singled out as more valuable than other forms of impact. An indicator of team success is that it measures impact whether is be social, political, environmental, ecological or economic. WHEN APPROPRIATE AND MEANINGFUL, TEAM DOCUMENTS RELEVANT ECONOMIC IMPACT OF IT'S WORK AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY
Additional Comment

11. DOCUMENTING APPROPRIATE AND RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL OR ECOLOGICAL IMPACT OF THE TEAM’S WORK AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY FOR CLIENTELE SERVED. Round II Responses Follow SD=2, D=2, MD=1, MA=6, A=8, SA=3. Note comments from Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters.

|---|----------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|

1. Ditto. 2. This depends on the team and what the purpose of the team is. 3. When appropriate, documenting...In other words, if the team's goal is to have an environmental or ecological impact, then this would be helpful to document. 4. Categories only apply to a limited number of teams. You need to indicate a broader or more inclusive view of impacts. 5. Measuring impact is crucial but I don't think anything is gained by singling out one form of impact as being more important than another. 6. I would include social in this statement to complete a balance of values held. WHEN APPROPRIATE AND MEANINGFUL, TEAM DOCUMENTS ENVIRONMENTAL OR ECOLOGICAL IMPACT OF ITS WORK AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Additional Comment

12. Please rate the following item. This is a new item based upon responses to Round II

|---|----------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|---------|------------------|

WHEN APPROPRIATE AND MEANINGFUL, TEAM DOCUMENTS RELEVANT SOCIAL IMPACT OF ITS WORK AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY.

Additional Comments:
13. THE ORGANIZATION AND TEAM MEMBERS HAVE AGREED UPON METHODS FOR TRACKING TEAM PERFORMANCE AS MEASURED BY OUTCOMES. Round II responses follow: SD=1, D=0, MD=1, MA=5, A=9, SA=6. Note the comments from Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Affinity group teams are required to say (in their establishing petition) what they will do to address key issues, integrate research and extension, adopt multidisciplinary approaches, seek external support, etc. These criteria should make tracking of progress easier. 2. As someone noted earlier, outcomes are used to measure team success in our state. In other words, what's being tracked is outcomes. 3. Some outcomes may not occur for several years. So long as progress toward a desired outcome is tracked, this should still work as a measurement. TEAM HAS AGREED UPON METHODS FOR TRACKING TEAM PERFORMANCE AS MEASURED BY OUTCOMES.

Additional Comments:

14. THE ORGANIZATION AND TEAM MEMBERS HAVE AGREED UPON METHODS FOR TRACKING TEAM PERFORMANCE AS MEASURED BY OUTPUTS. Round II responses follow: SD=2, D=0, MD=1, MA=7, A=9, SA=3. Note the comments from Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. The team should have a vision and goals in mind. 2. Our petitioning process and annual reporting procedures make this implicit. 3. Outputs as well as outcomes would be important indicators of team performance. 4. There has to be some output during the course of activity of the team but outputs should not be measured in terms of number of programs or activities offered. 5. Teams should be tracking outputs, but I don't think this is an indicator of success. 6. Scholarly work is discussed annually in P&T on individual basis. Team performance is separate issue that would need addressed. TEAM HAS AGREED UPON METHODS OF TRACKING TEAM PERFORMANCE AS MEASURED BY OUTPUTS.
15. TEAM'S SUCCESS AT SECURING EXTERNAL DOLLARS WHEN NEEDED AND CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE THROUGH GRANTS, CONTRACTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS FROM BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY TO SUPPORT THE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS OF THE TEAM. Round II responses follow: SD=0, D=3, MD=0, MA=6, A=11, SA=2. Note the comments from Round II below. Please read rate the reworded item which appears in all capital letters.

1. Effective teams identify and secure additional resources as needed. 2. This is an indicator of success in our state. However, a team that had desired program outcomes without outside funding would not be penalized. 3. The qualifier "when needed" does help me support this statement more. TEAM SECURES EXTERNAL FUNDING WHEN NEEDED AND CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE

16. TEAM HAS AN AGREED UPON SYSTEM OR METHOD FOR DECISION MAKING. Round II responses follow: SD=0, D=1, MD=2, MA=5, A=12, SA=2. Note comments from Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded item, which appears in all capital letters.

1. Deciding upfront what the process will be is important. 2. This can help the committee function more smoothly. 3. You cannot lock a group of professionals into one way of doing things-- consensus is always great but it may occasionally come down to a majority rule or team leader decision. TEAM AGREES UPON DECISION MAKING METHODS.
17. TEAM HAS AGREED UPON PROCESS SKILLS FOR CONDUCTING THE WORK AND BUSINESS OF THE TEAM. Round II responses follow: SD=0, D=2, MD=3, MA=6, A=8, SA=3. Note comments from Round II below. Please read and re-rate the reworded item, which appears in capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I’m not sure that I understand this statement. What is meant by agreed upon process skills? Without the word "skills," this would make more sense to me. 2. I don’t like the term "process skills". Again, perhaps establishing ground rules for conducting business would be more appropriate. 3. I feel that much of this becomes the responsibility of the facilitator of the group. TEAM ESTABLISHES GROUND RULES FOR CONDUCTING THEIR WORK

Additional Comment

18. TEAM MEMBERS EXHIBIT PASSIONATE INTEREST IN THE WORK OF THE TEAM. Round II responses follow: SD=0, D=2; MD=1, MA=3, A=14, SA=2. Note comments from Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded item which appears in capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Must develop and then have shared ownership of a shared mission/vision. 2. I don't think this needs to be singled out as an indicator of success. In might a criteria of selection. 3. It varies from Team to Team. Greatly depends on members respect for the Team leader and the value that team members gain from the development of Team products and delivery of programs. 4. This certainly helps but given the fact that most of us have multiple teams and projects that we are involved with, it is unrealistic to feel that we would be 'passionate' about all of them. It would be equally inaccurate to feel that a good job cannot be done unless one is 'passionate' about the topic or tasks. 5. Not sure passionate is the best word choice. 6. Team members will have different levels of
commitment to any given task. TEAM MEMBERS ARE COMMITTED TO THEIR WORK.

Additional Comment

19. TEAM MEMBERS ENJOY WORKING TOGETHER. Round II responses follow: SD=0, D=1, MD=0, MA=7, A=8, SA=6. Note comments from Round II below. Please read and rate the reworded item, which appears in capital letters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If the work is productive, team members enjoy working together. All team members do not have to like other members to be effective. Part of having a good team is the diverse input. 2. I'm not sure that an outsider should or could use this criterion, but I believe that this is an important ingredient. 3. Sometimes teams don't have the best relationships between each other but if they agree to the goal, and compromise, they can still get work done and meet the goal. 4. It certainly helps to like each other but demonstrating mutual respect may be more important. 5. A positive and comfortable environment certainly doesn't hurt the cause. 6. Everyone will not enjoy all members to produce good work. TEAM MEMBERS ENJOY WORKING TOGETHER.

Additional Comment

20. Please rate this item. This is a new item based upon feedback from Round II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEAM MEMBERS EXHIBIT MUTUAL RESPECT IN WORKING TOGETHER.

Additional Comments:

21. Please provide additional comments, suggestions or other indicators of success you consider important in the comment box below:
APPENDIX G

WRITTEN COMMENTS ROUND I
Statement 1: **Written guidelines for selection or appointment of team members**

1. Are you asking if I believe that having written guidelines is a "key indicator of a successful team"? That is how I have chosen to interpret the statement.
2. Teams can be self-selecting, and the process for appointment need not be formal.
3. This depends on the nature and purpose of the team. I don't think written guidelines are always necessary. However, they are particularly helpful when forming teams to address interdisciplinary issues or new and emerging issues.
4. Team members are more likely to understand and to follow through with commitments if they can read those and can agree or support them before joining the team.
5. Guidelines help both those given the task of selecting or appointing the team, and guideline help those interested in the team have a clearer understanding of the responsibilities associated with being a member of a team.
6. Written guidelines sounds very formal and doesn't seem as important as general criteria for selection.
7. In comparison to other states, we have relatively few Extension personnel. Usually everyone who is connected with a particular program or theme is invited to participate. We prefer to be inclusive, but we do not have large groups of people who would be interested.

Statement 2: **Agreed upon methods of selection of effective leaders for a program team**

1. If steps are taken to assure all methods are surfaced and decision-making isn't dominated by one or few.
2. Leaders need to be clearly engaged in the subject/issue area, and in positions of subject/issue leadership, whether that be on campus or off.
3. Having a standard and following that standard prevents others from perceiving that some are "favored."
4. Agreed upon selection methods can prevent friction and tension within a group.
5. Maybe this is more what you were getting at in the above item.
6. Again, there are a relatively small number of people involved on program teams. We tend not to be hierarchical, so we would be looking for an effective facilitator.

Statement 3: Teams that provide adequate material resources (computers, audio-visual equipment and subject matter resource materials) for their members are most likely to be successful

1. And also officially provide team members dedicated time for the team effort so that it doesn't become an add-on to all there current work.
2. Given that some you want to be included will come prepared with personal equipment because of familiarity and comfort.
3. Computers & audio visual equipment are different needs that subject matter resources.
4. would strongly disagree that teams should provide computers and audio visual equipment yet I wanted to agree that subject matter resource material is crucial.
5. Gotta have the proper tools to do the work.
6. Team are expected to bring their own equipment and subject resources to team activities and deliberations, and in fact DEVELOP new resources materials.
7. This might depend on the nature of the project and the expectations of team members. Obviously, if members are told they should expect resources as a perk for getting involved, then the resources need to be there. However, the availability of resources does not guarantee success.
8. Most teams have Research & Development functions. They need resources in order to be successful. Resources are not the only criteria for success.
9. A team needs physical resources, but more importantly, from my viewpoint, a team needs the administrative backing to do the tasks assigned to them; as well as a synergistic relationship among it's members.
10. Has nothing to do with success. People make a difference not materials.
11. Material resources that are likely to make members more successful would seem to be computers, including electronic technologies, support for telephone and video conferencing along with subject matter materials.
12. While our teams would find and share subject matter materials and research, it would be unusual that a team would supply equipment.

Statement 4: The number of programs delivered to clientele

1. By the team AND by others who have adopted program efforts as a result of the team's efforts.
2. We must focus programming based upon most critical needs within our mission. We cannot be everything to everyone. Make sure we are meeting most critical needs with high quality programming.
3. Sometimes quality is more important than quantity.
4. A single but innovative and impactful program is enough.
5. This question is vague. Do you mean the value of the team, or the success of the team, should be based on the number of programs delivered?
6. Teams may have functions other than direct program delivery.
7. Numbers are important if they also yield impact.
8. Poor indicator of anything. How this sentence is completed drives response.
9. It is not so much the number of programs delivered to clientele but was there an impact on the target audience. (I see that that is the next statement!) It may be an internal or external client.

Statement 5: **The impact of programs delivered to clientele**

1. By the team AND by others who have adopted program efforts as a result of the team’s efforts.
2. Not numbers so much as impact! But agree numbers are important too but should not be major measuring tool of program success.
3. Same comment as question 4.
4. The impact of programs delivered to clientele. The programs presented by teams need to answer the question “so what”? We did the program — "so what"? What happened as a result of this program.

Statement 6: **The number of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases) produced.**

1. Why devote resources to something for which there is no need? Must be relevant.
2. I do not believe in re-inventing the wheel. Use of available publications is also appropriate.
3. Quality is more important than quality. Selection of publications is more important than producing.
4. We live in a result oriented society and we must produce to get funding.
5. Difficult to say until you know the goals of the team and what they are working towards. The number of subject matter publications and the examples listed are an old model. Materials that are relevant, responsive and get results are the indicators of successful design and delivery. This could happen even if the team was not functionally well together.

Statement 7: **The quality of subject matter publications (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites and databases)**
1. If there is a need for the program the publication(s) support.
2. Measuring quality is subjective. More important to me is to judge frequency of use, effectiveness in providing answers to questions, or timeliness.
3. Are we assuming that product development is the main goal of the team?
4. Gotta have quality, which is where peer review comes into play, must be done.
5. Quality versus quantity--but quantity is not impressive without quality.
6. See above comments. Although producing quality materials is more likely to occur if the team works well together, I'm not sure it is an indicator of success for the team itself. Quality materials are an output.

Statement 8: **Inservice training provided to Extension agents related to a team's area of expertise**

1. If it fits within the priority programming area(s) of the agents being trained.
2. I don't believe agents need to become experts in every given subject matter area but they should know how to present the material provided by specialists.
3. Top quality state specialists come to play here and can really affect team's ability to be current and accurate.
4. To be productive one must stay current in their subject matter expertise.
5. Doesn't have to be provided by Extension as long as they can attend.
6. Yes, I would agree that training of some kind is important. Training can occur in a number of different formats, self-directed, mentoring and coaching. I don't know how the term "inservice" is used in this case. It implies face to face training to me. If that is the case, I don't think it is an indicator of success. Some type of learning or training is important if the group is to be successful.
7. Often, everyone in our system who is related to the team's program focus is on the team. We sometimes provide training to paraprofessionals and those outside Extension.

Statement 9: **Team and/or Team members providing workshops, seminars or research reports at national meetings pertaining to the teams area of expertise**

1. Great means of reaping intrinsic rewards and sharing programs with others.
2. One of the things Extension does well is sharing ideas that work.
3. This is a worthy goal but with existing budgets might not be practical.
4. Offers teams opportunities to showcase their work and gives other professionals an opportunity to gather excellent ideas and programs which they can incorporate into their programming.
5. This is dissemination and has very little to do with the work of the team. It's affirming to the team and communicates their work but isn't relevant to this study.
Statement 10: The personal and professional satisfaction of team members with the team.

1. Absolutely! If there is no longer any satisfaction, it is time to move on to something else.
2. The team won’t function well unless members feel they are gaining something from their participation.
3. To be most productive team members need to garner satisfaction from working on and with the team. Having stated that, different persons will garner satisfaction in different ways.
4. Contented cows give better milk.

Statement 11: The teams use of technology to share the combined knowledge of the teams research and scholarly activity (examples: having a web site, providing an on-line interactive site for accessing information, having a newsletter on-line)

1. Questions: who maintains? When does it stop? how do you know when?
2. Use of technology is important only to the degree it enhances communication.
3. An excellent method for reaching other professionals in a timely and less costly manner.
4. We often used compressed video for meetings.

Statement 12: Documenting and analyzing participants level of satisfaction with information provided on team's website, and in newsletters or other publications

1. Must be accountable. Maybe this answers question in #11.
2. Satisfaction may not be the key variable we wish to measure.
3. This is important to all of extension work not just the work of teams.
4. Evaluation is always important for documenting the impact our work has.
5. By participants do you mean target audience members or team members?
6. If this question is asking about evaluation of effectiveness of the team’s programs, then it is very important.

Statement 13: Generating and utilizing evaluation data on inservices, workshops, and seminars

1. This information is useful validate program effectiveness.
2. Documenting the impact and sharing that information is important to sustain the team and the organization.

Statement 14: Documenting the economic impact of the team's work and scholarly activity for clientele served, including businesses and industry
1. Impacts are not always correlated with economic benefits.
2. It is worth a try if the information can be gathered in a cost-effective and culturally appropriate manner.
3. Documenting impact is important, but defining an economic value is difficult for some teams.
4. Documenting the impact and sharing that information with funders and stakeholders is important to sustain the team and the organization.
5. Economic impact is only one measure. There is environmental, social and political dimensions, too. But it’s probably most useful to document economic impact for accountability purposes.

Statement 15: **An established method of tracking team performance.**

1. I’m not exactly sure what this item means. Does performance mean outcomes/end results or does it mean the presentation performances of team members? My response is based on my interpretation of performance being the former. If I was interpreting the item as referring to presentation performances of the team members, my response would be a 4.
2. Reporting Outputs, Outcomes, and Impacts provide the necessary tracking.
3. Believe our annual team report would do this as all teams were to submit them.
4. Teams, like people, can vary widely in how they operate, and how they approach a task or goal. Formal means of tracking and evaluating extension work of any kind has been a difficult challenge historically.
5. Agreed upon methods that are clearly understood from the beginning are important for documenting success.
6. Now this seems more like an indicator of success than the others. It seems that you are mixing content and process. There are outputs and outcomes associated with both the team and its performance and the program to which they have been appointed/invited to serve.

Statement 16: **Team success at securing external dollars through grants, contracts and contributions from business or industry to support the activities and programs of the team**

1. In some cases this is the way that a team can continue to exist. In these situations, external dollars are indications of success. However, teams working in some areas may not have access to external dollars and must depend on organizational resources to function. For these teams, the lack of external dollars is not an indication of a lack of success by the team.
2. Marketing and salesmanship are key components to program longevity.
3. This will need to be look at very closely to make sure grant programs meet local needs.
4. The team should be actively seeking funding if external funding is necessary but I am not sure would use it as a measure of success.
5. Garnering grants is increasingly important as direct sources of revenue dwindle, but I feel Extension runs the risk of losing its unbiased edge if we chase dollars from the cooperate world.

Statement 17: **Team members being recognized for their contribution to the body of knowledge which is related to the team’s area of expertise (examples: awards, recognition, publication of refereed journal articles)**

1. All of these things are well and good, but not necessary as indicators of a successful team effort.
2. This definitely contributes to team satisfaction.
3. Different personalities prefer different types of recognition, but some form of acknowledgment allows team members to know that others recognize the quality of the work they have done.

Statement 18: **An established method of reporting outcomes to the teams stakeholders**

1. There should be a variety of methods available for teams to choose from. Not all stakeholders respond the same way to one set method.
2. Very important!
3. This makes the job easier.

Statement 19: **An established process for communication among team members that allows for efficient and open information sharing in a timely manner**

1. Intra-team communication vehicles can vary widely. processes/
2. Established processes allow for easier and faster communications.

Statement 20: **Team members engaged in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team**

1. Most effective team members will be continual learners.
2. Team members engaged in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team. Team members MUST stay up-to-date in their subject matter expertise or the entire team suffers and lags behind.
3. Team members engaged in ongoing learning opportunities to enhance their skills and knowledge related to the work of the team. Actually serving on the team itself could be considered a learning opportunities. It has been suggested that 70% of professional development comes from a challenging assignment.
Statement 21: **A clear vision of where the team is going, and agreed upon and understood goals**

1. These are really two separate and specific items.
2. A clear vision of where the team is going, and agreed upon and understood goals. Teams need short-term and long-term goals and the ability to adjust these as necessary.
3. Teams need to work from the outset on establishing their goals and having a clear vision of what they want to accomplish. This allows for everyone to know the goals, share the vision, and work towards those shared ideas.
4. A clear vision of where the team is going, and agreed upon and understood goals. Absolutely. When teams aren't working or they get off track, it is usually because the goals of the team have been compromised.

Statement 22: **Evidence that team members have a clear understanding of their role and the roles of other team members**

1. What does "Evidence" mean? Evidence for whom?
2. I am a very structured individual so this seems a natural to me but I have learned (often the hard way) that it is important to maintain flexibility because you learn all the time and environments are seldom static.
3. So long as there are no mavericks in the group. There has to be a willingness to learn from others in the group and consider their input.
4. Team members need a clear understanding of their roles and the roles each member of the team is to fulfill. Without this clear understanding goals cannot be reached, misunderstandings abound, and the team does not function in the most effective manner.
5. What would "evidence" look like? They are prepared for the meetings? They make valid contributions to the discussion, they stay focused on the goals? Just curious.

Statement 23: **Evidence that team members are committed to the work of the team and follow through with their agreed upon roles and responsibilities**

1. Again, two separate concepts (i.e., commitment and follow-through). Both are very important, in my mind, but they are not the same thing.
2. Very disappointing for effectiveness to be limited by one or more who does not perform. Will demoralize entire team if not addressed.
3. If members of a team do not fulfill their agreed upon roles and responsibilities, anger and resentment build among the other members of the team. This anger and resentment can block the work of the team from being accomplished.
4. This is important; it's also important that team members recognize the ebb and flow in each other's work and do not put undue stress on each other. In other
words, the work of the team has to be balanced with the demands on individual team members.

Statement 24: **Established work and meeting processes for conducting the business of the team before, during and following team meetings**

1. Including built-in flexibility to be able to address unforeseen situations.
2. Structure is important--but the importance placed upon the established work and meeting processes will be very different depending upon the personalities involved.
3. ?

Statement 25: **An established method to resolve conflict, make decisions or handle other key process skills that relate to the work of the team**

1. These are three separate ideas. I am not sure what you mean by the phrase "key process skills" and how one would "handle" them.
2. No one can know ahead of time what method or which team member may be best suited to resolve a conflict. Still, there needs to be leadership and some set policies/procedures.
3. As our teams are affinity groups and self-selecting in membership, are established conflict resolution methods really necessary?
4. Teams need a method for handling conflict as well as handing the order of business, because conflict often surfaces and needs to be addressed.
5. This is when it gets dicey. It seems like Extension professionals are uncomfortable with this level of group process.
6. Some teams seem to develop a rapport and working relationship that they work these things out naturally; for others an identified method is needed and helpful.

Statement 26: **Regularly reviewing goals and measuring attainment of those goals**

1. This helps the team to stay focused.

Statement 27: **Reporting team accomplishments in an appropriate and timely manner to immediate supervisors and administration.**

1. I question administration looks at team reports? Not felt that this has been looked at but I could be incorrect on this...I think this could be a good thing but not if it creates competition between teams. Many of us work on more than ONE team with our extension work so this could be counter-productive.
2. This helps the team to stay focused, on tract, and working toward their goals in a timely manner.
3. This is a strong motivator for the teams I work on. Not just accomplishments but data and recommendations generated from the team’s work so that supervisors and administrators can use it for decision making.

Statement 28: Team member's ability to utilize team contributions in the promotion and tenure process, or for yearly performance reviews

1. And for supervisors and administrators to give these efforts appropriate weight in the evaluation/promotion and tenure processes.
2. Some teams are not made up exclusively of Extension professionals.
3. Members should be encouraged to include team contributions in their monthly and yearly reports for promotion and review.
4. Team members need to be able to utilize those team "contributions" of which they truly had a part.
5. Team member's ability to utilize team contributions in the promotion and tenure process, or for yearly performance reviews. Sure, recognition should be consistent with contribution. Those people that see the value and quality of work that can be produced in teams are doing it for that reason, not for P&T. When people bring up the P & T issue, I think it is mostly for "station identification". It seems to me that those that are working in teams and doing it well are not concerned about its effect on their portfolio. It usually takes care of itself.

Statement 29: Ability to utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the team's accomplishments and organizational importance

1. This can be critically important in helping to get the team's work communicated to individuals and organizations which need to know and which have the financial resources and/or political power to help forward the programmatic goals of the team.
2. Not sure what you mean here. Is the team leader or org. leader external to the team? Its seems like it would be useful to have someone at all levels advocating for the group but not sure if that's what you are referring to here.
3. We rarely have this opportunity.

Statement 30: Please provide additional comments, suggestions or other indicators of success you consider important in the comment box below: 6 Responses

1. I think how the team functions is the most important aspect. When team's function all else falls into place. I would like to see more emphasis in this area. Less in the area of producing outputs.
2. I think it would have been helpful to include a beginning statement to keep in mind while responding to each question. It took me a few questions before I caught on to how to respond.
3. This was a reminder that team members are constantly changing. Training for new teams/team members should be an ongoing function provided by this program area.

4. --Team members need to understand the importance of personality differences within the team.
--Team members need to understand cooperation.
--Team members need to know what is expected of them by administration.
--Team members need to appreciate cultural differences as they work within the team.

5. It would have helped to have a description of what you wanted from us on the opening page. Instructions were provided in the accompanying e-mail but it didn't describe the big picture. A very brief opening statement describing the use of teams in Extension organizational and programmatic), and their value to the future of Extension and how this study will contribute to that. Define what you mean by program teams. You made the assumption that we are familiar with this term and have them in our state. I also got steadily more confused. Was this modified Delphi to determine the indicators of success from both a programmatic and a process perspective? What does a good team looks when they working together like a well oiled machine? What does a team like this produce in the ways of educational programs? They are both outputs but one is related to process and the other is products.

6. It is helpful if team members have a passionate interest in their work, are caring and respectful of each other, and enjoy working together.
APPENDIX H

WRITTEN COMMENTS ROUND II
APPENDIX H

WRITTEN COMMENTS ROUND II

Statement 1: Identified criteria for selection or appointment of team members

1. This seems to be a sentence fragment with no complete idea or meaning. Need to put this as well as many other questions in some type of context or there isn’t much substance to results even with 80% agreement.
2. In most instances, team members want specifics so written guidelines serve as a framework.
3. Our teams are affinity groups who should recruit folks only from broad categories of staff, i.e. tenured faculty, extension agents, external stakeholders.
4. Yes, when formal teams are being formed. However, some very successful teams are formed through self-selection.
5. Important to have but also need flexibility to appoint without rigid plans.

Statement 2: Selection or appointment of an effective facilitator to serve as team leader.

1. An effective facilitator insures that everyone is heard and that the discussion stays on topic. This person should be as neutral as possible yet have some knowledge of the subject.

Statement 3: Teams that provide adequate subject matter resources for their members are most likely to be successful.

1. Appropriate subject matter background information allows the team to move forward at a faster pace and to become more efficient in their discussion especially in the beginning.
2. As I reread the statement, it seems to be an indicator of administrative or systemic support for team efforts rather than an indicator of success for the team members. Are you suggesting that if a team is successful in procuring resources, then this is an indicator of team success?
3. Adequate/necessary training and/or materials for team members is a defined role of a supervisor--it would hold true for a team leader as well. Membership on a team should not be based solely on what skills/equipment they already have.
4. I don’t know how critical this is to successful teams. Team members often bring the subject matter resources/expertise with them. However, if this is a new and emergency issue and team members need additional background information as preparation for their work than such resources would be beneficial.

Statement 4: **Teams that provide access to adequate material resources (computers, audio-visual equipment, etc.) to all team members to carry out their role on the team.**

1. Those that are provided the needed resources feel valued and are better able to complete their duties. We have found that volunteers and paid staff alike are motivated when they are provided the necessary resources.
2. Our teams are program development teams not necessarily program delivery teams. As such, provision of equipment is not a team responsibility and should not be used as an evaluative standard.
3. I am not voting here, because this appears to be a repeat of #3.
4. I take this to mean that you are putting all team members on a common playing field so that everyone has the capacity to participate equally and fully. This is important put people may also need training on how to use the equipment.
5. The number of programs delivered to clientele.

Statement 5: **Reports on the number of programs delivered are accompanied by information on the impact of those programs on target audience.**

1. Outcomes should be reported but are currently under reported in Extension. It is extremely important that we continue to improve outcome based reporting.
2. The reworded statement is much improved.
3. I still don’t believe the number of programs has a direct correlation on outcomes or impacts. Reports on impacts are useful, however.
4. I am not sure the above statement is a critical indicator of successful teams. Reporting results and impact are important. Since you already have a question on measuring impact, I am not sure this statement is needed. If it is, I think this statement should be worded in the following manner -- Reports that provide information about impact on target audiences include information about number of programs conducted.

Statement 6: **Team development of subject matter publications or resources (fact sheets, bulletins, newsletters, websites, or databases) are in response to identified needs**
1. Many specialists still develop resources in a vacuum. Those that are developed by a team effort are usually more thought out and address clientele needs effectively. However, not all teams will organize to develop resources.
2. A slightly different approach would be that "team develops quality publications in response to identified needs."
3. Production of "products" is not always tied to needs or desired results.

Statement 7: **Teams consistent delivery of updates, educational resources, training and support for other Extension professionals.**

1. Teams must be kept informed and up-to-date to be effective. Training should be provided for volunteers and paid staff. Opportunities can be provided outside Extension or within Extension.
2. If there is a need for updates, resources, training, and support, then this could be a helpful indicator of success.
3. I don’t know about "consistent delivery"-- I translate that to mean, "frequent" and to me, timely delivery is more important even if that is only annually.

Statement 8: **Team and/or team members being selected to share workshops, seminars or research reports that pertain to the team’s area of expertise at national meetings.**

1. Provides great motivation to those involved as team members. Being recognized by peers is very important and in the University setting it is a must so that those creating and leading teams can become tenured and continue to do so.
2. Presenting at national meetings, especially professional society meetings, doesn’t say much about how effective a team may have been in addressing a need relevant to external stakeholders.
3. Given that Extension faculty in our state have to meet the same criteria for research as other faculty members, this is an important indicator of team success.
4. I do not like the new wording of this item. Part of the definition of scholarship is to share the knowledge with others. Sometimes, you have to come up with your own methods or means of sharing the knowledge and not always depend on a selection process.
5. Budgets may constrain this as an activity but being selected provides recognition, which is important to eminence of successful teams. When feasible, participation in national meetings also promotes collaboration across state-lines, which is important.
6. This has become an expectation of Extension Educators by the Administration. It is important to individuals within a team because it is recognized as scholarly work, which is expected of all of us.

Statement 9: **The use of technology to share the team’s research and scholarly activity and enhance timely communication in a cost**
effective manner (examples: having a web site, providing an on-line interactive site for accessing information, having a newsletter on-line).

1. Communication is very important to the success of the team. Whatever we can do to enhance communication, we should do.
2. If a team has limited technology resources, then it would seem inappropriate to use this as a criterion. Clearly, technology can be helpful, but not for all topics or audiences.

Statement 10: **Documenting relevant and appropriate economic impact of the team’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served.**

1. Economic impact is not always a relevant indicator.
2. Documenting outcomes, economic or not, is important.
3. Economic impacts are important, but not the only kind of impacts.
4. Perhaps using the phrase, "when appropriate and meaningful, documenting relevant economic impacts...".
5. This statement still has too narrow a focus. What about other types of valuable impacts?
6. Economic impact should not be singled out as more valuable than other forms of impact. An indicator of team success is that it measures impact whether is be social, political, environmental, ecological or economic.

Statement 11: **Documenting appropriate and relevant environmental or ecological impact of the team’s work and scholarly activity for clientele served.**

1. Ditto.
2. This depends on the team and what the purpose of the team is.
3. When appropriate, documenting,... In other words, if the team’s goal is to have an environmental or ecological impact, then this would be helpful to document.
4. Categories only apply to a limited number of teams. You need to indicate a broader or more inclusive view of impacts.
5. Measuring impact is crucial but I don't think anything is gained by singling out one form of impact as being more important than another.
6. I would include social in this statement to complete a balance of values held.

Statement 12: **Organization and team members have agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outcomes.**

1. Affinity group teams are required to say (in their establishing petition) what they will do to address key issues, integrate research and extension, adopt multidisciplinary approaches, seek external support, etc. These criteria should make tracking of progress easier.
2. As someone noted earlier, outcomes are used to measure team success in our state. In other words, what’s being tracked is outcomes.
3. Some outcomes may not occur for several years. So long as progress toward a desired outcome is tracked, this should still work as a measurement.

Statement 13. **The organization and team members have agreed upon methods for tracking team performance as measured by outputs**

1. The team should have a vision and goals in mind.
2. Our petitioning process and annual reporting procedures make this implicit.
3. Outputs as well as outcomes would be important indicators of team performance.
4. There has to be some output during the course of activity of the team but outputs should not be measured in terms of number of programs or activities offered.
5. Teams should be tracking outputs, but I don't think this is an indicator of success.
6. Scholarly work is discussed annually in P&T on individual basis. Team performance is separate issue that would need addressed.

Statement 14: **Team’s success at securing external dollars when needed and considered appropriate through grants, contracts and contributions from business or industry to support the activities and programs of the team**

1. Effective teams identify and secure additional resources as needed.
2. This is an indicator of success in our state. However, a team that had desired program outcomes without outside funding would not be penalized.
3. The qualifier "when needed" does help me support this statement more.

Statement 15: **Established processes for conducting the business of the team that assure follow through and good communication before, during and following team meetings**

1. Very important to have ground rules established by the team members.
2. Teams tend to be very different in their approaches to conducting their business and program development.

Statement 16: **Team should have an agreed upon method for resolving conflict**

1. The facilitator should be able to address conflict creatively.
2. The team chair may not follow or require established methods of conflict resolution. Resolution must depend upon the chair’s process skills and abilities and the chair’s familiarity with individuals on the team.
3. It certainly is helpful if teams can successfully deal with conflict when and if it arises.
4. There may be more than one method to apply to the team. Perhaps ground rules for behavior or establishing protocol for resolving conflict would be more helpful than applying one method or another.

Statement 17: **Team has an agreed upon system or method for decision making**

1. Deciding upfront what the process will be is important.
2. This can help the committee function more smoothly.
3. You cannot lock a group of professionals into one way of doing things--consensus is always great but it may occasionally come down to a majority rule or team leader decision.

Statement 18: **Team has agreed upon process skills for conducting the work and business of the team**

1. I'm not sure that I understand this statement. What is meant by agreed upon process skills? Without the word "skills," this would make more sense to me.
2. I don't like the term "process skills". Again, perhaps establishing ground rules for conducting business would be more appropriate.
3. I feel that much of this becomes the responsibility of the facilitator of the group.

Statement 19: **Team members exhibit passionate interest in the work of the team**

1. Must develop and then have shared ownership of a shared mission/vision.
2. I don't think this needs to be singled out as an indicator of success. In might a criteria of selection.
3. It varies from Team to Team. Greatly depends on members respect for the Team leader and the value that team members gain from the development of Team products and delivery of programs.
4. This certainly helps but given the fact that most of us have multiple teams and projects that we are involved with, it is unrealistic to feel that we would be 'passionate' about all of them. It would be equally inaccurate to feel that a good job cannot be done unless one is 'passionate' about the topic or tasks.
5. Not sure passionate is the best word choice.
6. Team members will have different levels of commitment to any given task.

Statement 20: **Team members practice a respectful and caring way of working together**

1. Mutual respect is important and the ability to listen.
2. There has to be a mutual regard for other team members and what they bring to the team.

Statement 21: **Team members enjoy working together**

1. If the work is productive, team members enjoy working together. All team members do not have to like other members to be effective. Part of having a good team is the diverse input.
2. I'm not sure that an outsider should or could use this criterion, but I believe that this is an important ingredient.
3. Sometimes teams don't have the best relationships between each other but if they agree to the goal, and compromise, they can still get work done and meet the goal.
4. It certainly helps to like each other but demonstrating mutual respect may be more important.
5. A positive and comfortable environment certainly doesn't hurt the cause.
6. Everyone will not enjoy all members to produce good work.

Statement 22: **Utilize a team coach or organizational leader as an advocate of the team's accomplishments and organizational importance.**

1. All team members become advocates if the team is effective. It may be helpful to appoint a particular person.
2. This might be helpful to the team, but I'm not sure it should be used as a measure of the team's success.

Statement 23: **Please provide additional comments, suggestions or other indicators of success you consider important in the comment box below:**

1. As I reflected on the items, it seems that there is a mix of process indicators and outcome indicators. In my state, those outside a team (Administrators, other stakeholders) are primarily interested in outcomes; the team itself is interested in process as well as outcomes. It's been my experience that the more smoothly the process functions, the more likely that programs will have desired outcomes and impacts on audiences. The process indicators are often the "ingredients" likely to lead to successful outcomes.
2. Re-wording questions made it less-clear what the intention was on some of the items.
APPENDIX I

WRITTEN COMMENTS ROUND III
Round III Written Comments

Modified Delphi Study
Indicators of Success for Program Teams in Extension

Statement 1: **Written guidelines for selection or appointment of team members.**

1. I think that self-selection can be an effective means of forming teams. Staff tend to be more dedicated to "the cause" if they are the one's who decided to join a group.
2. The basic question is who would write such guidelines and at what point in time - before or after a team is formed. For example, if a self-selected team formed and then wrote guidelines about the selection or appointment of team members reflecting its self-selected membership, that would seem a bit backwards. Rather, it seems that this is a decision that would be made before the team was formed - either by administrators or by CE personnel. If the guidelines are written before the team is formed, then why would the team use the guidelines as evidence of success?
3. Self-selection (affinity teams) does not lend for use of formal criteria
4. For formal committees. Some committees may not need.
5. I agree with #1 statements...this sentence fragment is too vague.
6. People who are asked want to know why they are being asked to participate in a team.

Statement 2: **Selection or appointment of an effective team leader.**

1. Often shared leadership is really the most effective leadership in a team.
2. Who would select or appoint the team leader? Selection sounds like a team might have an opportunity to choose the team leader. But, would the team be evaluated positively if their selected person was effective? It is hard to imagine a situation where a team would appoint a team leader; the word "appointment" doesn't seem as if it would be in the purview of a team. So while I agree that an effective team leader will help the team move towards its goals, this criterion
sounds more helpful for process evaluation than for evidence of success of the
team and its members.
3. The team leader needs to be visionary in addition to being a facilitator.

Statement 3: **Team secures adequate subject matter resources**

1. Often I count on other team members bringing their subject matter expertise to the table.
2. Teams members can be information providers OR information receivers. The targets of team programming may not be members of the teams.
3. The statement, as re-worded for Round III, totally changes the meaning from the Round II statement. The Round II statement indicated that the provision of subject matter resources (an input) would result in success of the team. The Round III statement seems to be saying that securing adequate subject matter resources would be an indicator of the team's success (an outcome). Did you mean to change the meaning of this statement? It certainly changed my response.
4. Background information on the topic is very helpful in the success of the team.

Statement 4: **Team secures adequate material resources.**

1. Generally it is assumed that staff/team members have the equipment/supplies that they need.
2. While having adequate material resources clearly will support the work of the team, it is not clear that teams have equal access to such resources. Who has responsibility for securing adequate resources – the team or those who have control of budgets? In our states, most teams have to compete for outside grants to carry out their work. What about a team that accomplishes its goals without adequate resources? Should such a team be rated as less or more successful?
3. Our teams are program development teams not necessarily program delivery teams. As such, provision of equipment is not a team responsibility and should not be used as an evaluative standard.
4. My comment about this item would be the same as that for statement 3. You have changed the meaning of the statement. (Resources, not resources.)
5. To be effective, the team must have the necessary resources available to them.

Statement 5: **Team reports include information about the number of programs conducted**

1. The impact is important – not so sure about numbers of programs.
2. For a team whose goal is to conduct programs, this could be an indicator of success. In our state, however, it would be more important to also indicate numbers of people reached by the program, not just number of programs conducted. In addition, for programs that are grant funded, the criterion would be conducting the number of programs or reaching the number of people specified in the grant. In cases where the goal of the program is to provide
intensive educational programming over a long period of time to prevent problems in high-risk audiences, then one would expect to reach fewer people with greater intensity. In other words, if all teams are judged by this criterion, it could shape behavior in unproductive ways.

3. As long as this information is accompanied by data representing Statements 10, 11 and 12 (impacts), I would agree with this statement. If statements 10, 11 and 12 were not included, I would have preferred the Round II wording. A big question would be, when reporting the number of programs conducted, programs conducted by whom? By the team or team members? By Extension educators who have been trained by the team or team members? Both? I would agree most with the latter.

4. Include number of programs but, more importantly, include information about impact.

5. Effective outcome reporting does not necessarily mean number of programs. One program can be wildly successful if it meets the target audience’s needs.

6. I believe that the number of programs and participants are only one indicator. It is important to report the outcome of team efforts.

Statement 6: **Team reports include information about the number of persons reached.**

1. Yes, I agree that team reports should include information about the number of persons reached. The degree to which this would be an appropriate indicator of success depends on the goals of the team.

2. I would repeat the same thoughts and comments I gave for Statement 5.

3. Again, this information is an important piece of the report but needs impact information to complete for value of effort.

4. Again, the numbers are one indicator. Without, the outcomes, or impact that the program has had, the numbers are meaningless. So what???

Statement 7: **Team develops quality publications in response to identified needs**

1. Need-based programming (including things like fact sheets, newsletters, etc.) is what Extension is really all about.

2. Our teams must proclaim their program issues or needs and address them as a team.

3. As appropriate, the team develops quality educational resources.

Statement 8: **Team delivers timely updates, educational resources, training and support for other Extension professionals.**

1. I assume that this means that the team is providing in-service/education for other professionals? I think that in some cases this is appropriate, but probably not for all teams.
2. In some cases, there are no "other Extension professionals" to be trained. Everyone connected with a program area is on the team. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to use this as an indicator of success. When there are other Extension professionals who need training and educational resources, then this seems like a reasonable indicator of team accomplishments.

3. Teams are looked to by administrators and extension educators, as "providers" of educational programming, so updates are important.

4. This is what most programmatic team efforts should be about.

5. Communication lines must go both ways. Team should be responsive.

Statement 9: **Team and/or individual team members share their expertise at national meetings.**

1. How about "Teams and or individual team members broadly communicate their work to their peers." There are many other ways to share expertise besides national meetings. Boyer's model doesn't specify "national meetings" but instead creating, validating and communicating.

2. There is a problem with the newly worded statement because it does not specify that individual team members are representing the work of the team. One would think that all team members would be "authors" of the presentation even though just one or two do the actual presentation.

3. Again, presentations at national and/or professional society meetings doesn't necessarily reflect on the impact of the team's work

4. Extension educators are expected to look for effective ways to disseminate information, National meetings provide this opportunity.

5. I would add state and regional meetings as well

Statement 10: **When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant economic impact or its work and scholarly activity**

1. Seems like scholarly activity belongs in the previous statement.

2. As appropriate.

3. The new statement is an improvement.

4. Economic impacts are very impressive, especially to policy makers and public officials but are not the only impacts that should be documented

5. I would feel more comfortable if “economic" was removed as the type of impact. All types of impacts are important to report and not all impacts are relative to economics.

6. Definitely!

7. it's is a contraction meaning it is... the statement should use the pronoun, its.

8. Agree with comment #1

9. Economic impact is one indicator but certainly not the only one.
Statement 11: **When appropriate and meaningful, team documents environmental and ecological impact of its work and scholarly activity.**

1. As appropriate.
2. Criteria 10 and 11 could be combined if you simply removed the type of impact you are asking for.
3. Definitely!
4. Again, a statement about measuring program impacts/outcomes is better than selecting single indicators as being most important. The outcomes should be based on the objectives of the program.

Statement 12: **When appropriate and meaningful, team documents relevant social impact of its work and scholarly activity.**

1. As appropriate.
2. See comment for criteria 11.
3. Definitely!
4. Again, hard to measure social impacts.
5. Define social impact.

Statement 13: **Team has agreed upon methods of tracking performance as measured by outcomes.**

1. It seems that a team needs methods for tracking performance in a variety of ways, not just as measured by outcomes. If "tracking performance" means sound evaluation strategies, then I agree.
2. I would prefer to track outcomes without a tie to team performance. To me, if the outcomes are significant, performance has also been positive and significant.
3. Agreement on these methods leads to the data collected for reporting impacts.

Statement 14: **Team had agreed upon methods of tracking performance as measured by outputs.**

1. Any reason why this statement and the statement above are separated? One leads to the other.
2. Outputs, to me, are more an indication of progress toward a measurable goal/outcome than they are performance.
3. These methods will lead to the collection of data that verifies output production.
4. Outputs are generated to achieve outcomes. Outputs should be reported but not without the outcomes which occur because of the inputs and outputs.

Statement 15: **Team secures external funding when needed and considered appropriate.**
1. Sometimes this is practical, other times not, depending on the subject matter and the project being worked on.
2. Given the qualifiers, "...when needed and appropriate...," I would agree to this statement.
3. I would add “private sources” since some teams benefit from donations and charity.

Statement 16: **Team agrees upon decision-making methods.**

1. This seems to be a variable that will help teams function smoothly, but it is hard to imagine that someone outside the team would evaluate the team and its members for having or not having such an agreement. In many of these statements, it seems that there are indicators that would help strengthen teams but would be less helpful as criteria with which to judge team effectiveness.
2. The key here is that the team selects and agrees on the method.

Statement 17: **Team established ground rules for conducting their work.**

1. Ground rules trivialize the process. How about "Team operates under a set of assumptions and guidelines about how they will conduct their work."
2. Ground rules are helpful to team functioning and could be used in a process evaluation. However, team success would be determined by outcomes, outputs, publications, grants funded and so forth rather than by the establishment of ground rules.
3. The processes used to conduct the teams work and business will vary widely and on a case-by-case basis. Hard to agree upon these a priori.
4. I prefer establishes ground rules rather than process skills.

Statement 18: **Team member are committed to their work.**

1. Motherhood and apple pie. Omit as suggested.
2. I’m not sure how one exhibits "passionate interest"? And, perhaps this would vary from person to person?
3. This criterion might be used to judge an individual, and it all team members were committed, it would reflect positively on the team as a whole. But it would be difficult to hold the team responsible for an individual’s lack of commitment. There are too many variables outside the team’s control.
4. This is a much better wording of this statement!
5. Team members have an interest in the work of the team. I think the work passionate could be removed. Having a shared vision for the team is important. Many gain more interest as the work progresses.

Statement 19: **Team members enjoy working together.**
1. In my own experience, some teams that enjoy working together are "in the zone" and getting lots accomplished with great personal satisfaction. Others are out goofing off together, getting nothing accomplished. This criterion helps reinforce teamwork, but it would be difficult to use as an indicator of team success. Again, it's probably an ingredient of teamwork.

2. I am still not convinced this is critical to team success. I agree with the comment above - demonstrating mutual respect is probably more important.

3. Not always necessary, but is often the case for a productive, good-working team.

4. still agree with #3 comment

5. Team members should respect the opinions and input of other team members but they do not have to enjoy working together to be successful.

Statement 20: 

**Team members exhibit mutual respect in working together.**

1. This could be used to evaluate individuals, but it isn't clear how you would hold the entire team responsible if some members did not exhibit mutual respect in working with others.

Additional Comments:
APPENDIX J

CORRESPONDENCE
Letter to Validity Panel

Mary Kershaw, 
Jerry Thomas, 
Ron Overmyer, 
Larry Miller, 
Linda Kutilek 
Jack Kerriigan,

Dear Mary, Jerry, Ron, Larry, Linda and Jack

This note is to request your assistance in the next month to serve on the review panel for content and face validity for a Delphi Study on program teams in Extension. The purpose of this study is to identify indicators of success appropriate for Extension program teams. A panel of experts from across the United States will be utilized as the Delphi Panel for this research study. Please email me if you can or cannot help me at this time.

You will be asked to review the initial instrument designed for Round 1 for content and face validity and to provide written feedback and suggestions. I will then use your suggestions to modify any items for which you have concern. The instrument will be available online for your review as this is the manner which is being utilized with the panel of experts. A box for your comments and suggestion will appear under each item.

Face validity as you remember considers if the item appears to measure what it is intended to measure. Content validity is a check on if the items are representative of all the concepts that should be measured. Is the list complete? Are any items included that should be omitted because they do not measure the right thing or are items omitted that should have been included. Please also review the instrument for clarity of directions and terminology used (i.e. do you understand the directions or statements?)

I am also asking you to give me feedback on the ease of using Zoomerang for this study and to report any difficulty you encounter in accessing or responding to each item and to let me know how long it takes you to complete the instrument.
My goal is to have the Round I instrument completed by the mid February at the latest and to complete data collection by the mid to late April. Please let me know if you have time and interest in assisting me with this research project. Once you are notified by e-mail that the instrument is on line for your review please feel free to contact me personally if you have any additional questions or have difficulty with the instrument at 740-695-1455 or email me at Kelbaugh.1@osu.edu. Thanks in advance for your support and assistance.

Sincerely,

Beverly Kelbaugh
Extension Agent 4-H Youth Development
Nomination letter and form:

Dear Extension Director,

Your assistance is requested to nominate one or two persons from your state to serve on a panel of experts for a study of program teams using the modified Delphi technique.

If your Extension System has teams which have been established to design, develop and deliver programs and conduct research on specific issues or program topics or you have experience with professionals who have worked with teams in any of four general program areas to include Agriculture and Natural Resources, Community and Economic Development, 4-H Youth Development or Family Consumer Sciences you may know people who you should nominate to serve as a panel member for this study.

To be considered for the panel of experts for this study the person should meet one or more of the following criteria: a) have a high level of knowledge and understanding related to the philosophy of teamwork; b) have conducted research or scholarly work in the area of teamwork; c) have conducted training or coaching to teams within Extension; d) have performed as an administrator or sponsor of teams within Extension; e) have a clear and thorough understanding of the standards used within your system for recognition, reward of teams; and f) have an clear and thorough understanding of the standards used to promote and grant tenure to individuals within your Department or College.

The objective of this study is to reach a consensus of the indicators of success for program teams that should be used to evaluate the team and individuals serving on those teams. Participants will be asked to respond to three rounds of statements related to teams and will be given an opportunity to contribute their ideas and comments. All rounds of this study are to be completed on-line so nominees will not be asked to travel or have any financial expenses related to their participation. Persons committed to participation who have a strong interest in adding to our knowledge about teams in a University or academic setting will be selected from those nominated to serve on the panel.

Should you desire an executive summary of this study, upon its completion, please indicate by checking the box on the nomination form and returning it to This research is part of Beverly’s doctoral dissertation, so you may contact her advisor Dr. Jo Jones at (614)292-1084 with any comments or concerns.
Please complete the attached questionnaire and nomination form.

Sincerely,

Keith Smith  
Director of OSUExtension  
Vice President of Agriculture Admin.  
Ohio State University

Beverly Kelbaugh  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Extension Agent 4-H Youth Development  
Ohio State University Extension
Please return by November 15, 2002 to Kelbaugh.1@osu.edu

1. Name of Nominator:
2. Institution:
3. State:
3. Approximate Number of Program Teams in Extension _______
   None _______ 1-10 _______
   11-20 _______ 21-30 _______
   more than 30_______

Yes I would like to receive an executive summary of this research study.

Nominee:_____________________________________________
Title:  ______________________________________________
Contact Information____________________________________
__________________________________________________
Street Address
_________________________________________________
   city       state       zip code
__________________________________________________
Phone Number_________ Fax Number_______________
email address_________________________________________

Justification for Nomination (@50 words or less)

Nominee:_____________________________________________
Title:  ______________________________________________
Street Address
_________________________________________________
   city       state       zip code
__________________________________________________
Phone Number_________ Fax Number_______________
email address_________________________________________

Justification for Nomination (@50 words or less)
Correspondence: Phone Call Script

January 23, 2002

Hello Dr. ~

You were nominated by the Director of Extension in ______ to participate in a special Delphi Study on teamwork. Your knowledge and expertise is needed for this important study to help identify indicators of success for program teams.

If you agree to serve on the Panel of Experts for this modified Delphi study to determine the Indicators of Success of Extension Program Teams you will within the next week receive an e-mail with information on the process that will be involved with this computer assisted modified Delphi technique, the timeline for participation and a request for your commitment to participate in a study about Extension Program Teams. I was assured of your expertise through the nomination process by the Extension Director in your state because of your expertise and experience with Extension Program Teams. But to allow you and others on the Panel of Experts to have a sense of the combined expertise that this panel represents I am seeking your permission to post a brief biographical sketch for you on the supplemental web site which will be maintained for additional side conversations, questions and discussion throughout the duration of this study. All team members will be able to post to this site either anonymously, using your code name or using your true identity. Responses to
the survey instrument on Zoomerang will be anonymous or will allow you to use a code name.

This survey is being conducted to identify the indicators of team success that are felt to be necessary to justify the work of program teams and to provide the appropriate accountability to team stakeholders. Participants involved in this study include persons nominated by Extension Directors from all states that support and maintain Extension program teams in Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family Consumer Sciences, Community and Economic Development and 4-H Youth Development.

The criteria used by Extension Directors for the nomination process follows: To be considered for the panel of experts for this study the person was to have met one or more of the following criteria: a) have a high level of knowledge and understanding related to the philosophy of teamwork; b) have conducted research or scholarly work in the area of teamwork; c) have conducted training or coaching to teams within Extension; d) have performed as an administrator or sponsor of teams within Extension; e) have a clear and thorough understanding of the standards used within your system for recognition, reward of teams; and f) have a clear and thorough understanding of the standards used to promote and grant tenure to individuals within their Department or College.

Once you confirm with me today that you are willing to participate I will send you an e-mail with directions for participation; notification that the survey
instrument has been posted on the web site; the web site link; and an indicator of the time frame you are requested to adhere to for contributing your input.

The computer based Delphi process using Zoomerang allows for you to respond to the questions on the survey just one time per round. Any additional questions of discussion can take place on the special OSU web site and any change in your thinking can be reflected on the next round of the Delphi Study. The Employee Development Network, Ohio State University Extension, is supporting this research and Dr. Jo Jones the Chair of my Committee can be reached at jones.20@osu.edu or by calling 614-292-1084 if you have any questions or concerns during the duration of this study. I may be reached by calling 740-695-1455 or by email at Kelbaugh.1@osu.edu.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and cooperation.

Beverly M. Kelbaugh,
Graduate Student in Human and Community Resource Development
Email Invitation

Directions for participation in the Ohio State University Study of Extension Program Teams using the Modified Delphi Technique.

Date

Dear______,

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a member of the Panel of Experts for this study to identify the Indicators of Success for Extension Program Teams in the United States.

The modified Delphi will be conducted using computer conferencing software which allows for asynchronous participation. The objective of the study is to identify characteristics and behaviors of teams that are considered indicators of team success for program teams within Extension in the areas of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family Consumer Sciences, 4-H Youth Development and Economic and Community Development.

The first survey is posted on the web site and this link < > will take you to the instrument to allow you to respond to the items. Please use the following steps to complete your survey;

1) Rate each statement in the survey. Ratings are scaled from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The goal of the modified Delphi is to allow a panel of experts to generate detailed critical examination and discussion of an issue from many different perspectives and then to come to agreement with a statement about that item. Space is provided with each statement to allow you to add comments to any statement to clarify the item and to argue for or against inclusion of that item as an important indicator of team success.

2) Please use the space provided at the end of the survey to add additional comments, including items that you feel should be included in the next round of the survey. All written comments will be summarized and included anonymously in the next round of the survey. Individual results are confidential and a code name will be used to relay comments of individuals in the feedback process. Use of the code name attached to each person’s comments when synthesis is not appropriate will allow all participants to follow the train of thought of individuals.
3) In order for panel members to have a sense of the expertise on the panel of experts, and to allow dialog among panel members a separate computer site is available for ongoing dialog and conversation.

The site allows for a forum where you will be able to share anomalously thoughts on any of the items on the survey. If you are interested in conducting a side conversation with a respondent prior to responding to the survey or a final vote on the items contact the research investigator at Kelbaugh.1@osu.edu to have the communication forwarded to that person. The conversation or outcomes can then be shared with all panel members if this if relevant to the process and desired by participants.

4) Each panel member was asked to send a short biography that shares with other panel member’s information that they want to know about the expertise and experience of other panel members with teams. This information will be posted on the following site http://www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~teamstudy where you will then use your code name or be able to post messages anomalously to a discussion forum.

Please complete your survey and return it by February 28. Your prompt return is needed to compile results for the next round of the survey. Because a small number of experts have been selected for participation in this survey it is important that everyone attempts to complete each round of the survey and return it on time. I will be calling you within a few days to make sure that you are having no difficulty with the link to the instrument and responding to it online and to answer any additional questions that you may have. In the meantime, do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or comments at (740) 695-1455. By e-mail at Kelbaugh.1@osu.edu. This research is part of my doctoral dissertation so you may also want to contact my advisor, Dr. Jo Jones at jones.20@osu.edu with any comments or concerns.

Sincerely,

Beverly Kelbaugh
Ph.D. Candidate College of Human and Community Resource Development
Extension Agent 4-H Youth Development
Ohio State University Extension
Invitation and instructions to log onto OSU Website

Date: Tue, 25 Feb 2003 13:27:27 -0500
Subject: Login information for teamstudy website for panel of experts
From: Robyn Ness
To: B. Kelbaugh
X-Mailer: Apple Mail (2.551)

Dear Expert,

As a member on the Delphi panel for the study on indicators of success for program teams, you have been asked to submit a short biography for the study's discussion forum website. This biography will be shared with the other experts on the panels.

When you first login to the discussion forum website, a form will open where you can enter your biography and create a screen alias, which can be displayed with messages you post in the discussion forum. (On this same form, you will also have the option to change your username and password to something more easily remembered.) After you have added your biography and screen alias, you will have the opportunity to participate in the discussion forum on the website.

Below you will find the website URL and your initial username and password.

URL: http://www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~teamstudy/
username: 
password:

Thank you for your participation. Please contact me if you have questions, or email Robyn Ness (ness16@postoffice.ag.ohio-state.edu) if you need technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Beverly Kelbaugh

Extension Agent 4-H Youth Development
68323 Bannock Road
St. Clairsville, OH, 43950
phone 740-695-1455
fax 740-695-5614
kelbaugh.1@osu.edu
Pre-Round Invitation

e-mail addresses of panel of experts

Notice of announcement for study on

Indicators of Success for Extension Program Teams

You will receive an e-mail within 2 days from Tom Archer with
instructions and a hotlink to Zoomerang where you will be able to
complete the questionnaire for Round I

(Tom is the OSU Extension faculty member with Zoomerang Management Authorization)

Please try to complete this questionnaire within one week or by February 28, 2003

At the end of the instrument you will see the link to the website on
the OSU server where you have been requested to post your short
biography and will be able to participate in the discussion forum.

http://www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~teamstudy
If you have any additional questions or concerns you may contact
my advisor Jo Jones at jones.20@osu.edu or 614-292-1084 or
contact me Beverly Kelbaugh at Kelbaugh.1@osu.edu or by calling
740-695-1455
E-Mail Message Summarizing Results Of Round I

To: <panel of experts>
From: "B. Kelbaugh"
Subject: Results from Round I- Study on the Indicators of Success for Program Teams in Extension
Cc: Jones, Ludwig, Earnest, Kelbaugh, Kutilek

Dear Panel of Experts Respondents:

Thank you so much for the responses to round I of the Delphi Study on Indicators of Success for Program Teams in Extension.

Participant responses for each item on the questionnaire may be read by clicking on the view button below each item. (I personally have had difficulty with these screens due to overlapping of the text; however, responses can be cut and pasted to a word file and printed to allow you to read each response.

Due to this possible problem I am attaching a file which contains an unedited copy of responses converted to a Microsoft Word file which I think you will find much easier to review.

The panel of experts reached consensus on 15 of the 29 items that appeared on the Round I questionnaire. (5,7,10,12,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,26,27, and 28) These items have been removed from the Round II questionnaire. Feel free make additional comments on any of these in the comment box at the end of the Round II questionnaire or on the discussion forum.

A priori criteria set for consensus or acceptance was that 80% of the responses should fall within two categories on a six point Likert scale. A mean of 4.5 was identified as the level of agreement needed for the item to be considered as an indicator of success. Any item which received a mean of 1.5 or below with 80% of the responses falling within two categories on a six point likert scale will be examined as a possible barrier to team success.

More about the 15 items which achieved consensus:
Item #12 achieved consensus by having 80% of the responses fall within the two categories mildly agree and agree. The remaining fourteen items that achieved consensus had 80% of the responses fall within the two categories agree and strongly agree.

See the attachment for the print out with written responses or click on the web site below for the zoomerang version of the responses to Round I.

Sincerely,
Beverly Kelbaugh

The following web address will take you to the results of the study at the close of Round I

E-Mail Individual Responses And Pre-Round II Invitation

Dear ,

I have just launched the Round II questionnaire "Indicators of Team Success." Before you complete that form please note that I have included your responses to questions from Round I that have been retained in Round II. If you would like to know how you responded to the corresponding item in Round I as you consider the comments and reworded items you will find your responses below.

Please try to respond to the Round II Questionnaire no later than March 21st.

Since it has been a couple weeks since we began this process I want to remind you that:
This study is focused on exploring "indicators of success" for "Extension Program Teams"

Program teams for the purpose of this study were defined as teams established to design, develop and deliver programs and conduct research on specific issues or program topics. These teams may be specific to one of your Extension Systems areas of programming (i.e. Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family Consumer Sciences, 4-H Youth Development or Community Development) or could be an interdisciplinary team focused on an issue relevant across several programs.

Indicators of success are defined as those things that can be used as evidence of success, things that can or should be used to evaluate teams and individuals serving on teams. It is not within the scope of this study to determine levels of success or suggest appropriate measures to be used, but to gain a consensus upon those items which are appropriate to examine when we review the work of Extension program teams. It would indeed be my hope to use the results of this study for future research of teamwork in Extension.

statement 1 = #
statement 2 = #
statement 3 = #
statement 4 = /
statement 5 = #
statement 6 = #
statement 7 = #
statement 8 = #
statement 9 = #
statement 10 = #
statement 11 = /
statement 12 = #
statement 13 = /
statement 14 = #
statement 15 = #
statement 16 = #
statement 17 = /
statement 18 = /
statement 19 = *
statement 20 = *
statement 21 = *
statement 22 = #

* means that the item is a new item developed from Round I comments
/ means that the item is a new item based upon revisions from the previous item in the questionnaire

Thanks again,

Bev Kelbaugh

( # represents the number which each individual respondent marked on their questionnaire—emails were personalized with each panel member’s individual responses from Round I being placed in an email addressed to them.)
**Invitation to respond to Round II questionnaire**

Delivered-To: <panel of experts>
Date: Sun, 16 Mar 2003 21:15:20 -0500
From: Thomas Michael Archer
Subject: Fwd: Your Zoomerang Survey Has Launched
To: Kelbaugh
X-Mailer: CommuniGate Pro Web Mailer v.4.0.6

Delivered-To: orb-kelbaugh
Date: Wed, 19 Mar 2003 14:43:20 -0800
From:
Subject: Round II - Identifying Indicators of Success Using a Modified Delphi Study (from Beverly Kelbaugh)
To: kelbaugh
Reply-to: archer

Thanks for completing the questionnaire "Indicators of Team Success" by March 21st. I hope we can stay on schedule.

Following these steps:
1) Rate each statement in the questionnaire. Ratings are scaled from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The goal of the scale is to establish if there is general agreement among panel members with the statement. Comments and suggestions about the statements should be provided in the space below the rating scale. The comments will allow for clarification of items, and your arguments for or against them. Any suggestions are welcome. If participants agree on a statement, that statement will be excluded from future discussions. Consensus will be achieved when 80% of the ratings fall within two categories on a six-point Likert scale.

2) Please use the space at the end of the survey to add additional comments, including items that you believe should be added to the next round of the survey. All written comments will be used to rewrite or reword statements where appropriate and additional items based on panel of expert suggestions will be added to the next round of the questionnaire.

3) You are permitted to respond to the questions on each round only one time. A statistical summary of the responses and all comments and responses of all panel members will be listed below each item on Round III. You will receive a copy of your own responses with the email announcing that the Round III instrument is available for your responses. Once votes are tallied the items will
be reworked and panel members will be asked to begin the next round of response.

4) A separate discussion forum will be available on an OSU website which can be hotlinked from the end of the questionnaire or by going to the following url: http://www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~teamstudy/ with other panel members on any aspect of teamwork or the questions on indicators of success during the process of data collection that is encouraged. You may use a code name or post things to this site anonymously. The Forum Site will have the posting of biographical summaries of the entire Panel of Experts. You will see the link to the web site at the end of this questionnaire.

Please click on the hot link below, and you will be taken to the questionnaire.

If you have any questions please fee free to contact Jo Jones my advisor at 614-292-1084 or jones.20@osu.edu or contact me at 740-695-1455 or by e-mail at Kelbaugh.1@osu.edu
Notice from Zoomerang that Round II was launched successfully

Go to:

http://www.zoomerang.com/survey.zgi?B18CF4E54WCTQWVPMJ5FH6WF</a>

Please click this link now (or go online and retype the address into your Web browser). If you do not want to take this or other surveys, please click "reply" and ask the survey creator to remove you from the email list.

For More Info, Go to: http://www.zoomerang.com/privacy/invitations.htm

Delivered-To: orb-Kelbaugh
Date: Sun, 16 Mar 2003 21:15:20 -0500

Your Zoomerang survey "Round II Questionnaire -- Indicators of Success For Program Teams in Extension Organizations (1)" has just been emailed and soon you will be receiving feedback from your questions. The responses, which will be automatically compiled into graphs and tables, can be found in the "My Surveys" section of the site - just click the "View Results" arrow.

For more options and opportunities regarding your survey, please read on:

Do you want more responses to your survey? Click "Survey Management" in the "My Surveys" section, where you'll discover links to "Invite Additional Respondents." Send your survey to additional recipients or find directions on how to post the survey to a Web site.

Would you like to do more in-depth analysis of the results? Zoomerang offers extra features, such as cross referencing one response to another or the ability to download the results into an Excel document. If you are a zPro subscriber, get more out of your feedback by clicking "Survey Management" in the "My Surveys" section and try the Cross Tabulate function. If you are not yet a zPro subscriber, look into the additional features on the website: www.zoomerang.com or email: customerservice@zoomerang.com for details.
Do you need people to answer your survey? If you want to validate your findings by using a true random sample, send an email to sample@zoomerang.com to get more information about purchasing a survey sample from Zoomerang. Click on this link http://www.zoomerang.com/panelpurchase/Index.htm to learn more.
Zoomerang notice, with link to survey results from Round II

Delivered-To: <panel of experts>
Date: Sat, 22 Mar 2003 04:33:37 -0800
From: archer
Subject: Requested Survey Results from Zoomerang
To: kelbaugh
Reply-to: archer

Spreadsheet Formatted Results for Round II Questionnaire -- Indicators of Success For Program Teams in Extension Organizations

Attached is the CSV file of your survey results, which you recently requested from Zoomerang. For best results, save the attachment with the given file name.

□ spreadsheet105601581.csv
Email invitation to participate in Round III with individualized with Round II responses

To: <Panel of Experts>
From: Kelbaugh
Date: Monday, March 24, 2003

I am about to launch the Round III questionnaire "Indicators of Team Success."
Before you complete that form please note that I have included your responses
to questions from
Round II that have been retained in Round III. If you would like to know how
you responded to the corresponding item in Round II as you consider the
comments and reworded items you will find your responses below.

Please try to respond to the Round II Questionnaire no later than
April 4th.

A final reminder:
This study is focused on exploring "indicators of success" for "Extension
Program Teams"

Program teams for the purpose of this study were defined as teams established
to design, develop and deliver programs and conduct research on specific issues
or program topics. These teams may be specific to one of your Extension
Systems areas of programming (i.e. Agriculture and Natural Resources, Family
Consumer Sciences, 4-H Youth Development or Community Development) or
could be an interdisciplinary team focused on an issue relevant across several
programs.

Indicators of success are defined as those things that can be used as evidence of
success, things that can or should be used to evaluate teams and individuals
serving on teams. It is not within the scope of this study to determine levels of
success or suggest appropriate measures to be used, but to gain a consensus
upon those items, which are appropriate to examine when we review the work of
Extension program teams. It would indeed be my hope to use the results of this
study for future research of teamwork in Extension.

statement 1 =
statement 2 =
statement 3 =
statement 4 =
statement 5 =
statement 6.=/
statement 7 =
statement 8 =
statement 9 =
statement 10 =
statement 11 =
statement 12 =/
statement 13 =
statement 14 =
statement 15 =
statement 16 =
statement 17 =
statement 18 =
statement 19 =/
statement 20 =
statement 21 =/
statement 22 =

* means that the item is a new item developed from Round II comments
/ means that the item is a new item based upon revisions from the previous item in the questionnaire

Thanks again, Bev Kelbaugh
Email invitation to panel of experts to complete Round III questionnaire

Thanks for completing the questionnaire Round III "Indicators of Team Success" by April 4th.

Again, I ask you to follow these steps:
1) Rate each statement in the questionnaire. Ratings are scaled from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The goal of the scale is to establish if there is general agreement among panel members with the statement. Comments and suggestions about the statements should be provided in the space below the rating scale. The comments will allow for clarification of items, and your arguments for or against them. Any suggestions are welcome. Consensus will be achieved when 80% of the ratings fall within two categories on a six-point Likert scale.

2) Please use the space at the end of the survey to add additional comments. All written comments will be used as I analyze the results and write a summary of the responses to this study and make recommendations for further research.

3) You are permitted to respond to the questions on each round only one time. A statistical summary of the responses and all comments and responses of all panel members will be listed below each item on Round III in the summary of the results of this round which you will receive.

4) A separate discussion forum is still available on an OSU website which can be hotlinked from the end of the questionnaire or by going to the following url: http://www.ag.ohio-state.edu/~teamstudy/
This site will allow you to discuss any aspect of teamwork or the statement on indicators of success, which have been included in this questionnaire. You may use a code name or post things to this site anonymously. The Forum Site will have the posting of biographical summaries of the entire Panel of Experts. You will see the link to the web site at the end of this questionnaire.

Please click on the hot link below, and you will be taken to the questionnaire.

I want to thank you for completing this questionnaire one more time and taking your time to contribute written comments, which will assist in analyzing and summarizing the results of this study.

If you have any questions please free to contact Jo Jones my advisor at 614-292-1084 or jones.20@osu.edu or contact me at 740-695-1455 or by e-mail at Kelbaugh.1@osu.edu
Go to:
http://www.zoomerang.com/survey.zgi?00243AV519XN3MT3Q0V3BJRG


Please click this link now (or go online and retype the address into your Web browser). If you do not want to take this or other surveys, please click "reply" and ask the survey creator to remove you from the email list.

For More Info, Go to: http://www.zoomerang.com/privacy/invitations.htm
Zoomerang notice that Round III was launched successfully

Delivered-To: orb-Kelbaugh
Date: Tue, 25 Mar 2003 10:58:56 -0500
From: Thomas Michael Archer
Subject: Fwd: Your Zoomerang Survey Has Launched
To: Kelbaugh
X-Mailer:

--- the forwarded message follows ---

Your Zoomerang survey "Round III Questionnaire -- Indicators of Success For Program Teams in Extension Organizations " has just been emailed and soon you will be receiving feedback from your questions. The responses, which will be automatically compiled into graphs and tables, can be found in the "My Surveys" section of the site - just click the "View Results" arrow.

For more options and opportunities regarding your survey, please read on:

- Do you want more responses to your survey? Click "Survey Management" in the "My Surveys" section, where you'll discover links to "Invite Additional Respondents." Send your survey to additional recipients or find directions on how to post the survey to a Web site.

- Would you like to do more in-depth analysis of the results? Zoomerang offers extra features, such as cross referencing one response to another or the ability to download the results into an Excel document. If you are a zPro subscriber, get more out of your feedback by clicking "Survey Management" in the "My Surveys" section and try the Cross Tabulate function. If you are not yet a zPro subscriber, look into the additional features on the website: www.zoomerang.com or email: customerservice@zoomerang.com for details.

  Do you need people to answer your survey? If you want to validate your findings by using a true random sample, send an email to sample@zoomerang.com to get more information about purchasing a survey sample from Zoomerang. Click on this link http://www.zoomerang.com/panelpurchase/Index.htm to learn more.
RE: Modified Delphi Study on Indicators of Program Team Success

To: Name:____________________ From: Beverly Kelbaugh
Title:_______________________              Extension Agent 4-H Youth Dev.
Address:_____________________  Ohio State University Extension
___________________________  68323 Bannock Road
City:________State:___Zip Code___             St. Clairsville, OH, 43950
Phone: ______________________  Phone: 740-695-1455
Fax:________________________             Fax: 743-695-5614
e-mail: ______________________             e-mail: Kelbaugh.1@osu.edu

IMPORTANT MESSAGE: RESPONSE REQUESTED

COMMENTS: