Teambuilding Effectiveness
Feedback Report

Sample Report
6/19/2008 6:22:20 PM
Introduction

The following information is provided to help you navigate the information this is included in your Teambuilding Effectiveness report.

1. Overall summary chart
The summary results chart provides a quick visual representation of your scores in seven competencies that make up the Teambuilding Effectiveness profile. The scores to concentrate on are those above 3.5 (strong) and below 2.75 (need further development). Please note that these competency scores are averages; individual question scores can be viewed by clicking on the individual competency link.

2. Category description pages
This report contains three sections for each of the seven competencies. The first of these three sections explains the category, lists average scores, and then provides high and low score interpretation notes. The second section provides a graphical representation of individual question scores. The third section provides broadly-based improvement actions for those individuals wanting to develop their competencies.

3. 10/10 Report
The "10/10" Report page provides the raw scores for the 10 highest scoring questions and the 10 lowest scoring questions out of the 84. It also identifies which competency each question is from.

4. Course and Reading suggestions
Development suggestions for the two lowest scoring competencies, including training courses and specific books that may provide some useful additional information, are included here.

5. Development Plan
The development plan aggregates the five lowest scoring questions and puts them into a one page template. Individuals can use this template to record actions they plan to take, as a result of their feedback, over the next twelve months. Individuals may draw upon the general guidance offered in their feedback report, or draw upon the "coaching tips" (see next section).

6. Coaching tips
The overall output report includes detailed coaching tips for the five lowest scoring questions. These coaching tips provide not only information about the particular questions, but provide some specific advice on what individuals might do to improve their skills or learn new behaviors in the future.
Norm bars shown on this chart are the progressive average scores of all individuals rating themselves on this questionnaire.
Teambuilding effectiveness Profile

ALIGNMENT OF VALUES

Alignment of Values looks at the extent to which the values of individuals in the team and in the organization are understood, and effort has been made to ensure consistency. It asks the question: "How much effort have you invested in the process of appreciating both what the wider organization (or team) and the individual team member values to ensure that as much alignment as possible is brought about?"

AGGREGATE SELF SCORE (4.50)

Interpretation

LOW (less than 2.75)
Scales predominantly in the ones and twos ("occasionally" and "almost never") are likely to mean that you are unclear or even confused about the values held dear by the organization or your work colleagues. In addition, you might either keep your personal beliefs to yourself and/or avoid spending any time in discussing the values of others or intervening to help reconcile any obvious difference between people.

A low score person will be likely to see their personal attitudes, beliefs, and values as not to be shared or discussed in any way with others. In the same way, the collective values of the team or organization are either hidden from view or become known only accidentally. As a result, any misalignment of values is either accepted or potentially entirely ignored.

HIGH (greater than 3.5)
Scales predominantly in the fours and fives ("almost always" and "very frequently") are likely to mean that you understand your personal values well and are prepared to discuss these with others openly. In addition, you look to discover the values of your colleagues and the wider organization as a whole. This is done in order to deal with any direct clashes in discussion and to align a set of values for the team wherever possible.

A high score person will be more likely to actively explore and develop an understanding of the relative consistency and alignment of their own values and those of the wider team or organization. Consequently, they are likely to encourage regular and open debate about values until broad clarity has been established.
1. I am aware of the ongoing purpose of my team.

2. I share my thoughts about future direction with my fellow teammates.

3. My team pulls together in the same broad general direction.

4. I ask questions to clarify the goal if I do not understand or I am confused.
5. I check that my personal goals are consistent with the team and the wider organization.

6. I translate the overall vision of the organization into goals that are meaningful to me.

7. I know exactly where the milestones are in trying to reach each team target.

8. I reflect on general strategies and discuss how we might get there with my teammates.
9. I actively use the vision as a “binding force” to help the team work together.

10. I challenge any short-term actions that seem to be inconsistent with long-term goals.

11. I use task milestones to check overall direction and adjust if necessary.

12. I avoid working on tasks or projects unless they are broadly in line with overall team direction.

Norm bars shown on this chart are the progressive average scores of all individuals rating themselves on this questionnaire.
Alignment of Values looks at the extent to which the values of individuals in the team and in the organization are understood, and effort has been made to ensure consistency. It asks the question: "How much effort have you invested in the process of appreciating both what the wider organization (or team) and the individual team member values to ensure that as much alignment as possible is brought about?"

**Improvement actions**

Low scorers need to reflect upon what they see to be important in terms of their beliefs, or what they personally value most, and look to see whether these beliefs and values are mirrored in the wider team or organization. Where different values exist, low scorers can look to discover more about why people or the team hold these views through more open discussion and debate.

**Alignment of Values**

- Flush out hidden agendas or unnecessary secrecy by asking people to be open with one another.
- Spend time asking colleagues what they believe should happen in terms of work practices, and share your thoughts with them.
- Avoid pre-judging, whether you agree or disagree with individual or collective views, until you have fully understood why people hold these beliefs or values.
- Try to understand people's stronger feelings or emotions about issues.
- Look for discrepancies between what you or others say, and what you (or others) do; talk about the issues openly.
BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT

Boundary Management looks at how well individuals recognize the ongoing presence of threats and opportunities at, or beyond, team boundaries, and how well the team understands its role in the supplier-to-customer chain. It asks the question: “How well do you and the team understand the processes that lie at the edge of the team’s ‘normal’ boundaries that might have a significant and uncontrolled impact if not assessed and coordinated properly?”

AGGREGATE SELF SCORE (4.42)

Interpretation

LOW (less than 2.75)
Scales predominantly in the ones and twos ("occasionally" and "almost never") are likely to mean that you have limited interest or involvement in how resources and/or information is fed to your team, or how your team’s efforts are converted into value for the "downstream" customer. As a result, you might focus only on the specific tasks for which your team is directly responsible and ignore wider organizational issues or processes.

A low score person will be likely to perform their job within a narrow perspective, largely oblivious to whom and how their suppliers operate, and/or with little interest or involvement in the needs or expectations of internal or external customers. They might therefore have to contend with unexpected events or issues more than necessary.

HIGH (greater than 3.5)
Scales predominantly in the fours and fives ("almost always" and "very frequently") are likely to mean that you fully appreciate that the journey from supplier to final customer satisfaction is often a twisting one that might not be entirely controllable by the team or even an entire functional group in the organization. As such, you naturally take an interest in all indirect workplace events and activities (including threats and opportunities) at the edge or beyond team boundaries, in order to be informed and in control.

A high score person will be likely to spend quality time networking with other teams and people inside and outside the organization (including suppliers and customers) in order to gain early knowledge about possible threats or opportunities.
13. I am absolutely clear about my own personal beliefs and views.

14. I understand the values that are important to the wider organization or team.

15. I discuss differences in values or beliefs openly.

16. I like to ask people how they feel about decisions or actions that are taken.
17. I question important organizational values to ensure personal clarity.

18. I listen to the views of other people around me to appreciate their perspective.

19. I share my own values and opinions openly with others.

20. I invest a lot of personal time and effort in talking about different beliefs and opinions.
21. I do not pre-judge what people might think or believe.
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22. I challenge actions that appear to be inconsistent with organizational values.

Self Score: [Graph]
Supervisor: [Graph]
Peer: [Graph]
Direct Report: [Graph]
Client: [Graph]
Vendor: [Graph]
Other: [Graph]
Norm: [Graph]

23. I discourage secrecy and hidden agendas among team members.
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24. I try to reconcile differences between individual and organizational values.
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Realm of Best Practice

Norm bars shown on this chart are the progressive average scores of all individuals rating themselves on this questionnaire.

Boundaries Management looks at how well individuals recognize the ongoing presence of threats and opportunities at, or beyond, team boundaries, and how well the team understands its role in the supplier-to-customer chain. It asks the question: "How well do you and the team understand the processes that lie at the edge of the team's 'normal' boundaries that might have a significant and uncontrolled impact if not assessed and coordinated properly?"

**Improvement actions**

Low scorers need to "map" the entire process chain or cycle for their part of the enterprise, from external and internal suppliers of information and/or resources to internal and external customers. An assessment should then be made of how much of the process flows the team can control or influence and what will require coordination by others.

**Boundary Management**

- Develop an active and open interest in talking to other people in teams both inside and outside the organization (to better understand how processes to deliver products and services flow across the enterprise).
- Carefully note where potential problems or bottlenecks can occur (that might have an impact on the performance of your team, and need to be managed).
- Regularly invite the team's customers to comment on the performance they are getting.
- Review major processes that the team is accountable for managing, and build contingency plans to handle future problems that could arise.
GROUND RULES DETERMINATION

Ground Rules Determination looks at the extent to which decision-making, problem-solving, and team action procedures and systems have been pre-agreed and are consistently and fairly deployed. It asks the question: "How well do you understand the behavioral standards and boundaries that should prevail when the team makes decisions or takes action in any given situation?"

AGGREGATE SELF SCORE (4.67)

Interpretation

LOW (less than 2.75)
Scales predominantly in the ones and twos ("occasionally" and "almost never") are likely to mean that team ground rules are either not in existence or your knowledge and understanding about what they might be is low or even non-existent. In either case, you are likely to have an ineffective frame of reference for many of your own actions and behaviors and those of your colleagues around you.

A low score person will be likely to look to solve problems in unique or different ways in each and every situation that they face, with little or no understanding of any agreed processes or approaches to make decisions or involve others when necessary. This can often lead to individuals making decisions that may not be in their long-term interests, or the interests of the team as a whole. These decisions can often have low levels of ownership by the team.

HIGH (greater than 3.5)
Scales predominantly in the fours and fives ("almost always" and "very frequently") are likely to mean that you quickly look to discover the team's overall operating ground rules, or engage colleagues in discussion about procedures and systems that would help the team to run more efficiently and effectively. This will include ground rules for the whole range of major decisions that the team is likely to face.

A high score person will be likely to seek behavioral standards and boundaries before engaging in major decision-making, and look to use these standards as a frame of reference for their future actions. Low scorers will also look to discuss better systems and methods that can aid individual and team decision-making in the future.
25. I am clear about my own personal work style and preferences.

26. I know my own strengths and weaknesses well in terms of capability.

27. I can identify the work preferences of other people in my team.

28. I familiarize myself with the general skills that others have around me.
29. I actively look to discover other people's more hidden talents.

30. I understand the responsibilities of every member of my team.

31. I am fully aware of my own accountabilities as well as those of others on the team.

32. I can quickly identify people who have similar or complementary skills or abilities.
33. I am clear about tasks that require joint skills or effort from several people.

Norm bars shown on this chart are the progressive average scores of all individuals rating themselves on this questionnaire.

34. I readily identify people's capabilities to perform specific tasks.

35. I delegate tasks carefully, keeping in mind an individual's capability and preferences.

36. I encourage team discussion on responsibilities to ensure minimal conflict or overlap.
Ground Rules Determination looks at the extent to which decision-making, problem-solving, and team action procedures and systems have been pre-agreed and are consistently and fairly deployed. It asks the question: "How well do you understand the behavioral standards and boundaries that should prevail when the team makes decisions or takes action in any given situation?"

**Improvement actions**

Low scorers need to discover how the team collectively prefers to make decisions, solve problems, and generally work together to engage in a range of actions and to achieve their goals successfully. This will include more formal procedural or more system-oriented ground rules, as well as ground rules about what is seen to be helpful and positive behavior.

**Ground Rules Determination**

- Write down your own personal list of team ground rules that you would like to see in operation to help guide actions and behavior (preferably in the rank order of those that are the most important to you).
- Use this list to talk to colleagues in the team and as a basis to agree on useful boundaries and standards that are common.
- Openly list all those behaviors that are unacceptable to the team and agree on the most appropriate actions to take in the event that they occur.
- Work out who is responsible for what, how, where, and when in the team, and look to minimize gaps and overlaps.
- Agree on ways in which the team will reward or recognize itself as a whole for good performance, as well as recognize individuals within it.
PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL EFFECTIVENESS

Performance Appraisal Effectiveness looks at the extent to which individuals and the team measure or track their own progress against objectives and both rewards and corrects performance according to appraisal feedback. It asks the question: "How honestly, fairly, and consistently do you and the team assess individual and group performance and make the necessary adjustments quickly and straightforwardly?"

AGGREGATE SELF SCORE (4.42)

Interpretation
LOW (less than 2.75)
Scales predominantly in the ones and twos ("occasionally" and "almost never") are likely to mean that you rarely concern yourself with carefully measuring or tracking your own performance or the performance of the team as a whole. Where performance changes are noticed (good or bad), you are likely to respond without consistency.

A low score person will be likely to set few goals, and even when they do, the goals will lack focus and clarity. As a result, general progress might be difficult to measure, and individual actions might have little alignment to the efforts of other team members. Low scorers might consequently operate independently from the team and might be surprised at any comments about performance at the end of any appraisal period.

HIGH (greater than 3.5)
Scales predominantly in the fours and fives ("almost always" and "very frequently") are likely to mean that you recognize the importance of setting clear and realistic goals for yourself and others, and the importance of reviewing performance progressively to make sure that you remain on track. You will also be consistent in quickly addressing performance shortfalls and in celebrating any performance successes.

A high score person will be likely to be clear and focused about their own work objectives and take an interest in the progressive performance of both themselves and those of the team as a whole. They are also likely to quickly recognize personal or team shortfalls (and act to correct the situation) as well as show open support for performance successes, wherever they occur.
37. I understand and support the way in which the team prefers to solve problems.

38. I can identify behaviors and actions that would be unacceptable to my wider team.

39. I encourage discussion about how decisions should be made and communicated.

40. I know what behaviors are valued by the team.
41. Everyone knows what sanctions exist for unacceptable behavior or performance.

42. I seek to empower others to make decisions based on a clear framework for action.

43. I encourage team leadership practices to be pre-agreed.

44. When the pressure is on, I know exactly what myself and others have to do.
45. The rewards and recognition for individual effort and success in the team are fair.

46. I appreciate when I should take individual responsibility or ask for a team meeting.

47. I avoid publicly criticizing other people's opinions in team meetings.

48. I understand how the team's delegation processes work.

Norm bars shown on this chart are the progressive average scores of all individuals rating themselves on this questionnaire.
Performance Appraisal Effectiveness looks at the extent to which individuals and the team measure or track their own progress against objectives and both rewards and corrects performance according to appraisal feedback. It asks the question: "How honestly, fairly, and consistently do you and the team assess individual and group performance and make the necessary adjustments quickly and straightforwardly?"

Improvement actions

Low scorers need to seek out the overall goals of the organization and team before developing their own personal set of linked, clearly written, and measurable performance objectives. High scorers should also spend more time in tracking their overall team performance on a regular basis and respond to relative success and failure in positive ways on a shared basis.

Performance Appraisal Effectiveness

- Review whether your goals are written in "SMART" language: Specific, Measurable, Action-oriented, Realistic, and Time Bound.
- Look to carefully align strategies fully with the overall goals and direction of the team.
- Review your own progress regularly and take an active interest in the performance of the team, both good and bad.
- Challenge mediocrity at every opportunity; avoid accepting second rate performance.
- Go out of your way to recognize outstanding performance, so as to encourage your colleagues to do something similar in the future.
TEAM LEARNING AND RESULTS FOCUS

Team Learning and Results Focus looks at the extent to which the team engages in a planned process to capture ongoing learning and identifies the most optimal ways to achieve the outcomes it seeks. It asks the question: “How efficiently do you and the team learn from your successes and mistakes in order to make tactical changes that help to achieve results more effectively?”

AGGREGATE SELF SCORE (4.08)

Interpretation

LOW (less than 2.75)
Scales predominantly in the ones and twos (“occasionally” and “almost never”) are likely to mean that you might often miss the opportunity to learn from the past in order to make improvements for the future. As such, you might not involve yourself in post project brainstorming sessions or meetings, or make any systematic effort to discover what actions were effective and ineffective in order to design a better method or an easier approach.

A low score person will be likely to spend little time reflecting on past experiences before they undertake a task or a project. As a result, they are likely to repeat previous mistakes or miss the opportunity to use past lessons learned to improve or to achieve a higher standard of performance.

HIGH (greater than 3.5)
Scales predominantly in the fours and fives (“almost always” and “very frequently”) are likely to mean that you see the ability of yourself and the team to learn from its successes and mistakes to be a critical skill that needs to be nurtured and developed. As such, you invite your colleagues to openly discuss their experiences and agree where improvements could be planned for the future.

A high score person will be likely to capture the important lessons from their experience in a planned and systematic way, and encourage the whole team to discuss success and failure openly, in order to identify specific strategies to improve or “lift the bar” in the future.
49. I set clear, specific, and concise goals for myself and/or others.

50. I agree to appropriate milestone points at which task progress can be discussed.

51. I develop appropriately relevant and effective measures for each objective.

52. I regularly engage in progressive performance discussion to avoid end-of-year surprises.
53. I understand how my performance and the performance of others will be assessed.

54. Performance appraisal is honestly and fairly carried out in the team.

55. Outstanding individual or group performance is appreciated and/or rewarded.

56. Performance shortfalls are quickly recognized and acted upon.
57. I look to ensure consistency of approach in measuring overall performance.

58. I suggest performance indicators that might apply more accurately, where necessary.

59. I do not accept poor or mediocre performance in myself or others.

60. I openly recognize and applaud the performance successes of others.

Norm bars shown on this chart are the progressive average scores of all individuals rating themselves on this questionnaire.
Team Learning and Results Focus looks at the extent to which the team engages in a planned process to capture ongoing learning and identifies the most optimal ways to achieve the outcomes it seeks. It asks the question: "How efficiently do you and the team learn from your successes and mistakes in order to make tactical changes that help to achieve results more effectively?"

**Improvement actions**

Low scorers need to allocate time for reflection and develop a more systematic approach to assessing their ongoing work activities or efforts, and those of the wider team. They also need be clear and direct about what was successful and what could be improved upon. In addition, targets for improvement (based on post-auditing past experience) can be set to more often produce results that add high value for the team and the organization as a whole.

**Team Learning and Results Focus**

- Think about and build a systematic process for all of your individual and team learning, both positive and negative. Then, this can be captured and analyzed.
- Look to ensure that mistakes are avoided as much as possible in the future, or improved approaches are planned.
- Get every individual in the team to learn how to add value to their own growth and development, and to the growth of the organization.
- Make sure that at least one person is accountable for recording all the useful lessons learned at every formal or informal meeting.
- Let people make mistakes, occasionally, and get them to analyze why.
TEAM ROLE AND COMPETENCY CLARITY

Team Role and Competency Clarity looks at the extent to which the specific job roles and skills of individual team members are fully appreciated and effectively drawn upon. It asks the question: "How clear are you about the job accountabilities and competencies of other team members to ensure that people are best matched to tasks and tasks are best matched to people?"

AGGREGATE SELF SCORE (3.67)

Interpretation

LOW (less than 2.75)
Scales predominantly in the ones and twos ("occasionally" and "almost never") are likely to mean that you are not entirely clear about the full responsibilities and potential skills of yourself and others around you, and have spent little or no time or effort in improving your knowledge. You will therefore have little ability to recognize how different people in the team might share their skills or work together to achieve a goal or to achieve a better outcome.

A low score person will be likely to have invested little time and effort in reviewing the skills and responsibilities of every team member (including themselves) and assessing whether tasks and people are well matched. They will also have few insights as to who might be in a position to perform new or different tasks, or to work together in a complementary way.

HIGH (greater than 3.5)
Scales predominantly in the fours and fives ("almost always" and "very frequently") are likely to mean that you invest time and effort in making sure that you understand the broad responsibilities and skills of other team members. You also clearly let them know what you do and what you are capable of doing. This often extends to probing colleagues to discover their less obvious talents and abilities.

A high score person will be likely to extensively communicate with every team member in order to discover individual responsibilities and skills, and then use this knowledge to help the team minimize wasted effort and overlaps. This includes offering suggestions about how different people might work together or collaborate successfully.
61. I understand my own and the team's learning style preferences.

62. I carefully plan how group and individual learning will take place.

63. I invite others to share their experiences to help us improve.

64. I support a culture of letting people learn from their mistakes to get a better result.
65. I participate in debriefings and post project focus groups and brainstorming sessions.

66. I note down and share the lessons I learn from projects that I handle.

67. I actively engage people in debate about what would have created a better outcome.

68. I carry out a formal assessment after major projects are complete.
69. I challenge others in the team to ask whether value has really been added.

70. I offer guidance and coaching to people to help them achieve a better result.

71. I encourage the team to look for the underlying causes of its successes and mistakes.

72. I look to incorporate lessons learned into standard operating methods.

Norm bars shown on this chart are the progressive average scores of all individuals rating themselves on this questionnaire.
Team Role and Competency Clarity looks at the extent to which the specific job roles and skills of individual team members are fully appreciated and effectively drawn upon. It asks the question: "How clear are you about the job accountabilities and competencies of other team members to ensure that people are best matched to tasks and tasks are best matched to people?"

**Improvement actions**

Low scorers need to reflect carefully upon their own range of skills or competencies and to rank them in terms of both strength and relative enjoyment. This can be used as a basis to share with other team members and to help understand their skills and any gaps that might subsequently exist in performing overall team roles successfully.

**Team Role and Competency Clarity**

- Write down your own strengths and weaknesses as realistically as you can, and check the accuracy with others whose judgment you trust.
- Take an interest in finding out more about what fellow team members are responsible for doing and achieving, and where their skills are strongest.
- Engage colleagues in debate about your own responsibilities, skills, and preferences.
- Try to discover what roles people may have outside the organization.
- Look to delegate to colleagues more frequently to better understand people's real capabilities.
VISION AND DIRECTIONAL FOCUS

Vision and Directional Focus looks at the extent to which individuals have clear and coherent ideas about where the team is heading, why, and what milestones exist along the way. It asks the question: "How well do you and the team understand your purpose and direction and how effectively is this knowledge used to set an appropriate course to reach relevant targets or goals?"

AGGREGATE SELF SCORE (4.42)

Interpretation

LOW (less than 2.75)
Scales predominantly in the ones and twos ("occasionally" and "almost never") are likely to mean that you either work individually or are capable of operating quite independently from other team members (intentionally or unintentionally). The vision is likely to play little or no part in shaping your personal goals, and you might therefore be "pulling" in a different direction than others, for at least some of the time.

A low score person will be likely to do what is asked or expected of them without concerning themselves with where this might be heading or whether they are working toward a particular goal or target. They might also spend little or no time in personal planning and organizing to ensure that their actions are coordinated with other team members, and their efforts.

HIGH (greater than 3.5)
Scales predominantly in the fours and fives ("almost always" and "very frequently") are likely to mean that you have a clear view of your team's vision and overall direction, and use it as a guide for yourself and others in the team to work together purposefully. You also use the vision to set goals and appropriate milestones, and share these with team members to ensure consistency of effort.

A high score person will be likely to engage other team members in conversation about the overall team vision or direction, and work together to plan their actions and the most appropriate milestones to stay on track. High scorers will tackle their tasks openly and regularly check to ensure that their actions are always taking the team forward positively.
73. I understand who I depend on to supply me with what I need to do my job well.

74. I appreciate what customers may need beyond what my team can control or provide.

75. I take an interest in what happens in processes when they pass beyond the team.

76. I actively discuss what "early warning" processes need to be in place to avoid surprises.
77. The team and I are well prepared to handle the unexpected.

78. I build in contingency plans for events that occur outside the team's control.

79. I know where to go to get help when unusual team problems or threats arise.

80. I actively solicit feedback from my team's suppliers and customers.
81. I look for ways to collaborate with other individuals and other groups.

82. I reflect on the forward consequences of the actions of myself and the team.

83. I network actively outside my team to understand the wider organizational processes.

84. I make sure that at least one member of the team is looking at the big picture rather than the day-to-day issues.

Norm bars shown on this chart are the progressive average scores of all individuals rating themselves on this questionnaire.
Vision and Directional Focus looks at the extent to which individuals have clear and coherent ideas about where the team is heading, why, and what milestones exist along the way. It asks the question: "How well do you and the team understand your purpose and direction and how effectively is this knowledge used to set an appropriate course to reach relevant targets or goals?"

**Improvement actions**

Low scorers need to involve themselves more fully in understanding the team's overall purpose and direction and make sure that they set personal goals more in consultation with others. Any confusion about the vision should be addressed by talking to colleagues frequently and by regularly checking to make sure that progress is broadly consistent with team targets.

**Vision and Direction Focus**

- Actively engage several teammates in discussion about the future, and overall direction in general.
- Add team member comments to your own quiet reflections about what the team could strive to achieve.
- Write down your goals according to your thoughts and share these with the team to ensure consistency and alignment.
- Organize special team "get togethers" away from the workplace, to allow people time to reflect.
- Invite team members to informally submit ideas about future direction in many different ways.
THE 10/10 REPORT

Top 10 Strengths

Vision and Directional Focus
1. I am aware of the ongoing purpose of my team. 4.60

Team Role and Competency Clarity
31. I am fully aware of my own accountabilities as well as those of others on the team. 4.60
36. I encourage team discussion on responsibilities to ensure minimal conflict or overlap. 4.60

Performance Appraisal Effectiveness
60. I openly recognize and applaud the performance successes of others. 4.60

Top 10 Development Needs
15. I discuss differences in values or beliefs openly. 3.40

Team Learning and Results Focus
67. I actively engage people in debate about what would have created a better outcome. 3.50

Alignment of Values
16. I like to ask people how they feel about decisions or actions that are taken. 3.60

Team Learning and Results Focus
71. I encourage the team to look for the underlying causes of its successes and mistakes. 3.60

Boundary Management
73. I understand who I depend on to supply me with what I need to do my job well. 4.50

Ground Rules Determination
43. I encourage team leadership practices to be pre-agreed. 3.70

Alignement of Values
20. I invest a lot of personal time and effort in talking about different beliefs and opinions. 3.80

Ground Rules Determination
45. The rewards and recognition for individual effort and success in the team are fair. 3.80

Team Learning and Results Focus
62. I carefully plan how group and individual learning will take place. 3.80
63. I invite others to share their experiences to help us improve. 3.80

Boundary Management
75. I take an interest in what happens in processes when they pass beyond the team. 3.80
COURSE AND READING SUGGESTIONS

The following are general reading and course suggestions that may help you to better understand the two categories in which your scores were the lowest and to assist you in writing your development plan.

Alignment of Values

Alignment of Values looks at the extent to which the values of individuals in the team and in the organization are understood, and effort has been made to ensure consistency. It asks the question: “How much effort have you invested in the process of appreciating both what the wider organization (or team) and the individual team member values to ensure that as much alignment as possible is brought about?”

Course Suggestion
- Learning Styles
- Team Styles
- Value Added Management
- Results Orientation
- Benchmarking

Other Suggestion
- Complete the Team Publications 'Learning Styles' self scoring diagnostic instrument
- Identify and talk about an effective system that the team can use to learn from its mistakes and general experience.
- If you feel comfortable doing so, talk to your direct supervisor/manager or a training and development specialist about personal training, coaching, and specific projects, and other possible support they may be able to offer to improve your skills.

Reading Suggestion

Team Learning and Results Focus

Team Learning and Results Focus looks at the extent to which the team engages in a planned process to capture ongoing learning and identifies the most optimal ways to achieve the outcomes it seeks. It asks the question: "How efficiently do you and the team learn from your successes and mistakes in order to make tactical changes that help to achieve results more effectively?"

Course Suggestion
- Emotional Intelligence
- Building Empathy
- Discovering Values
- Building Trust
- Organizational Alignment

Other Suggestion
- Develop a written list of your own values and those you see to be important to the organization. Are there any direct clashes that need to be resolved?
- If you feel comfortable doing so, talk to your direct supervisor/manager or a training and development specialist about personal training, coaching, and specific projects, and other possible support they may be able to offer to improve your skills.

Reading Suggestion
- The ABC's of Successful Leadership: Proven Practical Attributes and Concepts Based on Core Values. Ray
DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Use the space below to write out your personal development plan for the next 12 months based on your results. Draw upon the general improvement actions in relevant areas of the report, and ideas that are suggested in the attached coaching tips.

15. I discuss differences in values or beliefs openly.  
   **Action to Take:**
   Score: 3.40

67. I actively engage people in debate about what would have created a better outcome.  
   **Action to Take:**
   Score: 3.50

16. I like to ask people how they feel about decisions or actions that are taken.  
   **Action to Take:**
   Score: 3.60

71. I encourage the team to look for the underlying causes of its successes and mistakes.  
   **Action to Take:**
   Score: 3.60

43. I encourage team leadership practices to be pre-agreed.  
   **Action to Take:**
   Score: 3.70
Alignment of Values

I discuss differences in values or beliefs openly.

Sometimes it is better to shut up, and not say what you really feel. However, in a work team the reverse might actually be the case. In most working group situations it pays to get opinions out on the table, and opinions are often largely expressions of values or beliefs. In doing this, it should be remembered that it is often very difficult for some people to be totally open and free with their comments. However, the team really has to work on making it possible—and in fact, making it openly desirable for individuals to speak their minds. You can often act as a role model in this regard, by openly discussing personal differences in values or beliefs and looking at ways in which they might be reconciled. Here’s how:

1. Practice expressing your views in an assertive way, not an aggressive way. Some of us bottle up our emotions so much that when we finally do express our thoughts, they get blurted out rather than stated calmly. Keep your voice calm, pace yourself relatively slowly, stick to issues and not personalities, stay cool, and use tact: remember, the old definition of tact is “making a point without making an enemy.”

2. Try to establish linkages between values and beliefs on the one hand, and the practical realities of the team’s tasks on the other. It’s all very well to say that “we put customers first” or “we take pride in our work,” but then refuse to talk to a “difficult” customer on the phone, or cut corners on quality “because it’s a lot less hassle.” Team members need to practice what they preach, or walk the walk as well as talk the talk.

3. Trying to establish linkages between the team’s values and beliefs and its actions is difficult at times, but it is easy compared to pointing out similar gaps to what the organization says and what the organization does. You need to evaluate the power situation carefully here, but if the organization says that it values openness and is not in the habit of shooting messengers bringing bad tidings or stringing up those who have the temerity to point out that the emperor is not wearing clothes, then you and/or your team might well consider taking the risk of discussing differences in values or beliefs at this wider level.
Team Learning and Results Focus

I actively engage people in debate about what would have created a better outcome.

Decisions are usually seen as final, and a good thing too: if we were always second-guessing or reneging on decisions, we would never get anywhere. Yet decisions are not always as solid and irreversible as we might like to believe. An American executive once remarked that “A decision is the action an executive must take when he has information so incomplete that the answer does not suggest itself.” In other words, decisions can sometimes be negative actions, or actions of default, rather than positive actions charged with certitude. A team can never have too many options; too few options might force a team to make decisions it will later regret (with the regret usually expressed in a sentence beginning “If we had only known about …”). Too few options will panic people into rash decisions and might lead to distortions in perception: if the only tool in your kit is a hammer, suddenly every problem begins to look like a nail. Effective team members then try to maximize options, not minimize them, and this process can be aided by actively engaging people in debate about what would have created a better outcome. Here’s how to do that:

1. Be completely up front about the goodness of your intentions and the purity of your motives in keeping the debate going. If the debate has been robust, or even destructive, then a number of people will still have strong feelings about the process of the debate and, presumably, a majority will be strongly committed to the decision reached. It is vital that all understand that the purpose of continuing the debate is to uncover lessons for the future, not to mischievously rake over the past with a view to manipulating the group into reversing the decision.

2. Steer the group away from wishful thinking and wallowing in regrets. This is not an easy task, however. Wishful thinking and wallowing in regrets often are expressed in sentences beginning “If only….” Yet “If only” thinking can be a useful tool, and one of the most prominent structured approach to “If only” thinking is scenarios.

3. Scenarios or alternative futures are now considered a standard planning tool, and scenarios are written possible futures—notice the plural, implying that there might be more than one future and that we might have a hand in creating one or several of them, rather than just passively accepting one.

For example, you could write a best-case and worst-case scenario for a situation that the team might encounter:

- The best-case situation is where resources are abundant, relationships are benign, and everything goes right
- The worst-case situation is where resources are scarce or non-existent, relationships are toxic, and everything follows Murphy’s Law: anything that can go wrong, will go wrong.

If you can conceive of two situations, then you have begun to take a more flexible approach to imagining the future and to planning, without fatalistically believing that everything is predestined and locked in. If you and the team can begin to imagine scenarios, then you might be able reverse the normal pattern of learning and learn from the future, and thus begin to reverse the paradox once noted by Vernon Law: “Experience is the worst teacher: it gives the test before presenting the lesson.”
Alignment of Values

I like to ask people how they feel about decisions or actions that are taken.

Effective team members are genuinely interested in getting opinions from other team members, particularly when decisions or actions are taken. Asking others how they feel about decisions or actions that are taken is not merely a form of pulse-taking, it helps to build real empathy between team members. Here’s how to do it, and why:

1. Ask others how they feel about decision or action outcomes. Not “What do you think about … ?” but “How do you feel about … ?” They are different questions, and they get different responses. In such circumstances, you want to know more about feelings than facts. This is particularly true if the person being asked feels defeated in some way by what has been decided. At the very least, they need a shoulder to cry on; more than that, they still have something to offer in terms of insight into processes, and that should be listened to. You need to make a judgment as to whether it is better to ask such questions in a group setting (for example, a team meeting), or whether it is better to ask when there are not so many others around. It all depends on what you are trying to achieve.

2. Don’t just pay attention to the official, verbal style of communication of the person you are asking. Pay attention to the non-verbal communication or body language as well. This means the gestures, posture, eye contact (or lack thereof), and voice inflection are important. For example, if the person says “I suppose that it will be OK,” but sighs, shakes his/her head, shrugs, is slumped over, and speaks in a depressive tone, you would be most unwise to place greater value on the words spoken than on the manner in which the words were spoken.

3. Effective decisions are usually based on the maximum amount of input. The best way to do this is to make sure that everyone gets a chance to pipe up and contribute. The quality of what people have to say can vary considerably, but sometimes quantity is quality if it means that people will be more committed to a decision they at least had a say in.

4. Effective decisions are also sometimes those that have gone through a second-chance or second-thoughts phase. This simply means that decision-making groups will—if there is time (and effective groups usually make sure that there is always enough time)—not put a decision into action right away, but will defer the decision, and reconsider it at a later stage. A critical part of second-chance decision-making is getting new perspectives from those in the decision-making group. Sometimes, new perspectives don’t emerge until some time has passed, circumstances have changed, and participants have actually articulated what it is that they believe. Second-chance processes like this are obviously open to abuse, especially if good ideas keep getting stalled and vetoed by inveterate nay-sayers. Nevertheless, if the process is robust, new input and perspectives can be gleaned by sensitive questioning of team members by other team members, and that can’t be a bad thing.
Team Learning and Results Focus

I encourage the team to look for the underlying causes of its successes and mistakes.

All teams have successes and mistakes, and these successes and mistakes are effects of causes. We can look for these causes in a shallow or superficial way, or we can dig deeper to find out what really happened. That digging can be most enlightening, not only for what it reveals about what we have done, but for what it reveals about ourselves as well. As Ralph Waldo Emerson once observed, “Shallow men believe in luck; strong men believe in cause and effect. The secret of the world is the tie between person and event. Person makes event and event person.” There will be numerous barriers to deeper digging, and not all of those will be non-human in origin. If we are to find out the truth, however, or even just accelerate learning within the team, then we need to persevere in our inquiries. Effective team members then encourage other members of the team to look for the root causes of the team’s successes and failures. Here’s how to do that:

1. Separate causes from symptoms. None of us would be particularly happy if, upon our becoming ill, our doctor was content to treat only our symptoms, and not look for the causes underlying the symptoms.

2. The best way to find underlying causes, and not be distracted by symptoms, is to put some time into the process. If we do a rush job, then we can’t expect good results. Sometimes we have to pore and mull over things for a long time before we begin to see patterns emerge. Patience is a bitter plant, but it has a sweet fruit. If we succumb to time pressure and only give our mistakes (and successes) the once over, then we might find that the little time we have saved turns out to be a lot of time lost when the root causes surface in the most dramatic (and expensive and destructive) manner. At that point, we might find ourselves beginning to chant one of the saddest mantras of time management: “Isn’t it amazing how there’s never time to do it right, but there’s always time to do it over?”

3. Point out that revelation of underlying causes of mistakes might create opportunities for learning that will prevent bigger mistakes. As the old proverb has it, a stumble might prevent a fall.

Point out also that mistakes are not always what they seem, and can be solutions as well as problems: penicillin cultures grew “by mistake” in a laboratory until someone worked out what they were; sticky notes were the by product of a “failed” glue that couldn’t hold slats of wood together; Columbus discovered America “by mistake”; any research laboratory worth its salt will automatically presume that there will be 100, 1,000, or 10,000 “mistakes” before a success is recorded, but almost certainly that success will be built on what is learned from the “mistakes.” Two more proverbs help attest to this:

• You can’t make an omelet without breaking eggs

• He who makes no mistakes does not usually make anything

4. Just as failure can have an upside, so too can success have a downside. Merely because we have been successful does not mean that we should not subject our successes to the same scrutiny we apply to our mistakes and failures. What we sometimes attribute to our superior skill and foresight is really only down to dumb luck. Sometimes our victories are Pyrrhic, or illusory. Sometimes when we succeed we find out too soon the bitter truth of the saying “Be careful what you wish for, you might just end up getting what you want.” Don’t just look that gift horse in the mouth—inspect and examine and scrutinize it.
Ground Rules Determination

I encourage team leadership practices to be pre-agreed.

The blame game is not a pretty one to watch—accusations made, fingers pointed, recriminations and counter-charges leveled, and everyone going to ground and denying all responsibility for and knowledge of the latest fiasco: “It’s your fault!” “No, it’s yours!” “No it’s not, it’s definitely yours” and so on. The blame game destroys trust and makes everyone so risk-averse that it seems as though no one will ever venture out on anything vaguely interesting or challenging ever again (because of a fear of the consequences, and a fear of being falsely—or perhaps fairly—accused). The blame game sometimes is played after there have been a number of communication breakdowns. Within teams, such breakdowns often occur because insufficient thought has been given to establishing the rules of decision-making and clarifying the knowledge of just who is in charge at a particular juncture of operations. One of the strengths of traditional authoritarian organizations is that leaders lead and make clear, unambiguous decisions (of course, this is also simultaneously one of the weaknesses of such organizations because such leaders are often wrong, making decisions that are not based on the quantity and quality of information that would have come with a more consultative style). Poorly structured teams never solve this question of who is in charge and why, yet these factors are absolutely fundamental and are critical to failure or success. Effective teams step around all of these traps, including the blame game, by encouraging all members to pre-agree on just what team leadership practices and approaches will be followed in a particular situation. Here’s how to start developing these skills:

1. Get the group or team together and invite every individual to talk about the subject of leadership and what they would like to see in terms of style and approach. Pool all the ideas and build on them to get to the core issues.

2. Respect the abilities of members and what each individual member does best. Each person has worked hard to build up a repertoire of skills and deserves to have others take note of such achievements. Mutual respect is what helps bind the team together.

3. Every team is confronted by a multiplicity of situations, and it might be that one single leader may not have the expertise to lead the team in decision-making in all of those situations. It makes sense, therefore, for team members to not get hung up about only one or several having leadership ability: it makes sense for the leadership role to be spread around, with one person acting as a leader in one situation, and another person acting as leader in the next situation.

4. Team members have a responsibility to defer to the ability, skills, and knowledge of a specialist member and be comfortable with that specialist member being the actual or de facto leader, or at least most influential person, for the duration of the situation where such specialist knowledge is necessary. Responsibility, however, is a two-way street: a specialist member given a leadership role has a responsibility to the rest of team to not blind people with science or confuse others with jargon or manipulative agenda-setting. Everyone in the team must have the right to say “Can we have that in plain English, please?” and get a meaningful response. Real leaders need to be able to translate words, concepts, and actions if they want to be followed.