OREGON TECH 2019-2020 TEAMWORK ASSESSMENT REPORT

Teamwork Committee: Trevor Petersen, Josie Hudspeth, Kevin Brown, Don Lee, Don McDonnell

STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS

- 19-question Qualtrics survey
- Designed by creating questions based on the Teamwork Rubric
  - Questions regarding all 7 domains of effective teamwork were present
    - Identify and achieve goal/purpose, assume roles and responsibilities, communicate effectively, reconcile disagreement, contribute appropriately, develop strategies for effective action, adjust for differences)
- A scale from (1) "Strongly Disagree" to (4) "Strongly Agree" or N/A was used, with descriptions for each
- Students rated how their team functioned in each domain
- Administered in classes with team projects
- Administered during fall, winter, & spring terms of 2019-2020
- 412 students participated
- N/A responses were eliminated from the results

STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS

Answer Key

- Please select which level best represents how your group functioned over the time you worked together.

- 1) Strongly Disagree: Your group rarely achieved objectives in this area, and usually the group struggled. Regular instructor support was needed.

- 2) Disagree: Your group sometimes achieved objectives in this area, but often had times when they did not.

- 3) Agree: Your group usually achieved objectives in this area, but occasionally had times when they do not.

- 4) Strongly Agree: Your group almost always achieved objectives in this area. No instructor support was needed.

- N/A: Please only use not applicable if there was no way to assess your group in the given performance area.

Question	Mean	SD	n
1) Realistic, prioritized and measurable goals were agreed upon and documented by your group.	3.55	.58	381
2) All team members shared a common objective/purpose and group achieved goal.	3.57	.63	386
3) Members consistently and effectively fulfilled roles and responsibilities.	3.37	.74	382
4) Leadership roles were clearly defined and/or shared.	3.33	.70	380
5) Members moved team toward the goal by giving and seeking information or opinions, and assessing ideas and arguments critically.	3.47	.64	381
6) Members were all self-motivated and completed assignments on time.	3.41	.69	382
7) Most members attended all meetings.	3.53	.64	373
8) Members reflected on group processes, provided feedback to other group members and made changes as necessary.	3.38	.73	379
9) Members were motivated and assignments were completed in a timely manner.	3.46	.66	383
10) All members contributed significantly to discussions, decision making, and work.	3.32	.82	384
11) Members supported and encouraged each other, and communication patterns encouraged a positive environment that motivated the team and built unity and trust.	3.43	.72	375
12) All members welcomed disagreement and used difference to improve decisions (without just voting).	3.35	.64	377
13) All members respected and accepted disagreements and employed effective conflict resolution skills.	3.42	.64	374
14) Subgroups were absent.	3.26	.84	276
15) The work product was a combined coordinated effort; team members had both individual and mutual accountability for the successful completion of a work product with even quality throughout.	3.40	.72	383
16) Members used effective decision making processes to decide on action.	3.44	.60	381
17) Group shared a clear set of norms and expectations for results.	3.45	.68	380
18) Group reached consensus on decisions and produced detailed plans for actions.	3.47	.61	376
19) Members always recognized and adapted to differences in the background and communication style of other group members.	3.47	.62	374

INSTRUCTOR SURVEY RESULTS

- 19-question Qualtrics survey

- Designed by creating questions based on the Teamwork Rubric
  - Questions regarding all 7 domains of effective teamwork were present
    - Identify and achieve goal/purpose, assume roles and responsibilities, communicate effectively, reconcile disagreement, contribute appropriately, develop strategies for effective action, adjust for differences)

- A scale from (1) "Low Proficiency" to (4) "Highly Proficient" or N/A was used, with descriptions for each

- Instructors rated each team in their classes separately

- Administered in classes with team projects

- Administered during fall, winter, & spring terms of 2019-2020

- Data collected from 21 different classes

- N/A responses were eliminated from the results

INSTRUCTOR SURVEY RESULTS

Answer Key

▸ Please select which level best represents how the group functioned over the time they worked together.

▸ 1) Low Proficiency: Group rarely achieved objectives in this area, and usually the group struggled. Regular instructor support was needed.

▸ 2) Somewhat Proficient: Group sometimes achieved objectives in this area, but often had times when they did not.

▸ 3) Proficient: Group usually achieved objectives in this area, but occasionally had times when they do not.

▸ 4) Highly Proficient: Group almost always achieved objectives in this area. No instructor support was needed.

▸ N/A: Please only use not applicable if there was no way to assess the group in the given performance area.

Question	Mean	SD	n
1) Realistic, prioritized and measurable goals were agreed upon and documented by your group.	3.38	.80	76
2) All team members shared a common objective/purpose and group achieved goal.	3.44	.61	64
3) Members consistently and effectively fulfilled roles and responsibilities.	3.22	.71	64
4) Leadership roles were clearly defined and/or shared.	3.56	.57	52
5) Members moved team toward the goal by giving and seeking information or opinions, and assessing ideas and arguments critically.	3.35	.68	64
6) Members were all self-motivated and completed assignments on time.	3.35	.62	63
7) Most members attended all meetings.	3.48	.66	64
8) Members reflected on group processes, provided feedback to other group members and made changes as necessary.	3.42	.67	64
9) Members were motivated and assignments were completed in a timely manner.	3.31	.83	64
10) All members contributed significantly to discussions, decision making, and work.	3.31	.61	64
11) Members supported and encouraged each other, and communication patterns encouraged a positive environment that motivated the team and built unity and trust.	3.45	.58	64
12) All members welcomed disagreement and used difference to improve decisions (without just voting).	3.41	.71	59
13) All members respected and accepted disagreements and employed effective conflict resolution skills.	3.37	.73	64
14) Subgroups were absent.	3.45	.62	45
15) The work product was a combined coordinated effort; team members had both individual and mutual accountability for the successful completion of a work product with even quality throughout.	3.35	.60	62
16) Members used effective decision making processes to decide on action.	3.37	.77	63
17) Group shared a clear set of norms and expectations for results.	3.28	.81	64
18) Group reached consensus on decisions and produced detailed plans for actions.	3.38	.60	65
19) Members always recognized and adapted to differences in the background and communication style of other group members.	3.45	.68	64

COMMON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES BETWEEN STUDENT AND INSTRUCTOR SURVEYS

- Strengths:

  - 7) Most members attended all meetings.

  - 19) Members always recognized and adapted to differences in the background and communication style of other group members.

- Weaknesses:

  - 10) All members contributed significantly to discussions, decision making, and work.

FOCUS GROUP RESULTS

- What we learned from this qualitative data:
  - *There is considerable variance between classes*
    - *regarding how students groups are formed (e.g., self-selected, randomly, based on personality characteristics, based on knowledge/skill level, based on convenience),*
    - *how much structure and support/intervention is provided by the instructor (little vs. providing team charter template, team member initiation template, meeting agenda/minutes template, etc.),*
    - *sizes of groups,*
    - *length of group membership (weeks to years),*
    - *how groups are assessed (e.g., self-assessment, by their peers, by the instructor, by their final product, or by a combination of these),*
    - *and whether dismissal from a group is possible and how.*

FOCUS GROUP RESULTS

▸ From trends in this qualitative data, the following strengths were identified:

  ▸ *Delegation skills*

  ▸ *Conflict resolution skills*

  ▸ *Ability to compromise*

  ▸ *Leadership skills*

  ▸ *Organizational skills*

  ▸ *Peer camaraderie and support*

FOCUS GROUP RESULTS

- From trends in the qualitative data, the following weaknesses were identified:
  - *Individualistic pursuits instead of focus on team goal*
  - *Each taking on a different part of the project and working on it individually/separately instead of working together*
  - *Lack of cohesion of final product*
  - *Taking group differences personally*
  - *Inconsistent effort across time by group members*
  - *Certain group members take over group and do most of work*
  - *Certain group members engaging in social loafing*

REFLECTION QUESTIONS

- Do you provide instruction on effective teamwork skills?

- Do you review the Oregon Tech Teamwork Rubric with you students?

- Do you provide clear expectations?

- Are you intentional about how you form groups (e.g., self-selected, randomly, based on personality characteristics, based knowledge/skill level, or just based on convenience)?

- Do you have a rationale for the size of groups you form?

- Do you have teams work together for a long enough period of time to work through team stages (e.g., for the entire term or just for a week)?

- Do you provide the level of structure and support your students need based on their level of training and experience (e.g., little involvement or providing team charter template, team member initiation template, meeting agendas, etc.)?

- Do you assess teamwork in a variety of ways (e.g., self-assessment, peer assessment, direct observation, or just by their final product)?

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

▸ Being more intentional about providing teamwork instruction, expectations, reviewing the Teamwork Rubric, how groups are formed, size of groups, duration of group work, level of structure/support, and assessing teamwork in a variety of ways.

▸ We can also strive to further help students improve in the following areas:

  ▸ Students more consistently and effectively fulfilling roles and responsibilities.

  ▸ Having leadership roles more clearly defined and/or shared.

  ▸ All members contributing more substantially to discussions, decision making, and work.

  ▸ All members being more welcoming to disagreement and using this difference to improve decisions (without just voting).

  ▸ Reducing subgroups.

  ▸ Members being more motivated and completing assignments in a timely manner.

  ▸ Groups sharing a clearer set of norms and expectations for results.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

▶ We can also strive to further help students improve in the following areas:

  ▶ *Focusing more on team goals instead of individualistic pursuits*

  ▶ *Working more interdependently instead of each student just taking on a different part of the project and working on it individually/separately*

  ▶ *Improving cohesion of final product*

  ▶ *Not taking group differences personally*

  ▶ *Students providing more consistent effort across time*

  ▶ *Preventing a group member from taking over a group and doing most of the work alone*

  ▶ *Reducing engagement in social loafing by group members*