14 BUILDING EFFECTIVE EARLY INTERVENTION TEAMWORK

Corinne Welt Garland
Adrienne Frank

When the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments, PL 99-457, was enacted in 1986 and later reauthorized as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the legislation was influenced by strong support among families and within the professional community for a team approach to assessment, program planning, and service delivery. The ''multidisciplinary team'' defined by PL 99-457 required the ''involvement of two or more disciplines or professions in the provision of integrated and coordinated services, including evaluation and assessment activities and the development of the IFSP'' (IDEA Regulations, 34 CFR, Part 303.17).

However, the need to move beyond IDEA's definition of teamwork toward collaborative interaction among disciplines and agencies is clearly reflected in the professional literature of the late 1980s and early 1990s (Garland, 1994; McGonigel, Woodruff, & Roszmann-Millican, 1994; Rainforth & York-Barr, 1997) and, to a lesser extent, in the law itself. IDEA required states choosing to participate in the voluntary Part H Infants and Toddlers Grant Program to develop policies in support of interagency and interdisciplinary collaboration at state and local levels. Those policies, along with interagency agreements, have made it necessary for community-based health care, child development, education, social service, and other professionals to collaborate across agencies and disciplines and with families. The law also encouraged interdisciplinary approaches to preparing early intervention personnel (McCollum & Bailey, 1991).

This chapter offers a framework for building teamwork at both the inservice and preservice levels supported by practical resources that instructors can use. The chapter includes discussions of the nature of teamwork in early intervention, the need to prepare personnel to learn new roles on teams, and the individual and systemic characteristics that must be considered in planning for professional development. Although most of the activities included were developed for use with inservice audiences, their application to preservice settings is clear.

CHALLENGES FOR TEAM MEMBERS

Despite strong support for working as part of early intervention teams, providers are confronted by at least two obstacles to providing services. First, professionals frequently lack both the preservice and inservice preparation needed to be successful team members. Second, all too often the workplace itself serves as a barrier to interagency, interdisciplinary, family-centered services, making it difficult for even highly skilled professionals to engage in meaningful collaboration and teamwork.

Lack of Instructional Opportunities

Professionals in research, personnel preparation, and practice have all recognized that training in teamwork is ‘‘likely to yield the greatest immediate impact on the provision of quality early intervention services’’ (Bailey, Simeonsson, Yoder, & Huntington, 1990, p. 34). Even the crafters of IDEA encouraged preparation of early intervention personnel on an interdisciplinary basis (McCollum & Bailey, 1991) and required states to plan for comprehensive systems of professional development.

Without a well-prepared cadre of professionals, the intent of the legislation to ensure coordinated, collaborative services for young children with disabilities will be seriously impeded; however, preservice coursework does not typically incorporate instruction in the skills needed for teamwork. Bruder and McLean (1988) found that only 10% of personnel preparation programs required coursework in the process of teamwork. Bailey et al. (1990) reported that undergraduates from a variety of intervention disciplines—special education, occupational therapy, physical therapy, speech-language pathology, social work, nutrition, and nursing—received an average of only 8.6 clock hours in teamwork and the graduate students only 11.4 clock hours. The lack of preservice instruction in teamwork is mirrored by the absence of staff development opportunities in community-based programs that provide teams and interagency groups with a chance to learn together (Bailey, 1989).

Like their colleagues in education, allied health, and human services, few physicians are prepared to be active participants on community-based early intervention teams, even though their expertise is necessary to the tasks of Child Find, assessment, and program planning for infants and toddlers with disabilities. Despite initiatives by their professional organizations, many physicians remain unaware that the infants and toddlers program of IDEA exists, let alone that it has implications for their professional practice (Cohen, Kanthor, Meyer, & O’Hara, 1990). Blackman, Healy, and Ruppert (1992) reported results of a statewide survey of pediatricians conducted by the New York State Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics in which only 15% of the respondents believed that they were well-informed about the infants and toddlers part of IDEA, and only 8% saw themselves as being involved in the development of the individualized family service plan (IFSP), which must include a statement of the child’s physical development.

Universities struggle with internal barriers to reworking curricula to offer meaningful preparation for teamwork. Although notable exceptions exist, departmental differences in philosophies, curricula, degree requirements, competition for financial resources, and faculty positions frequently limit creative options for interdisciplinary degree programs that emphasize teamwork. Students and faculty alike ‘‘choose to enter their professions and maintain their choices based on . . . expectations about the chosen profession’’ (Krahn, Thom, Hale, & Williams, 1995, p. 6). Those expectations may limit their willingness to expand traditional roles in favor of teamwork. Increased specialization has created a body of professionals whom some see as being highly knowledgeable and skilled within narrow fields of study (McMahon, 1989).

Barriers to preservice preparation for teamwork are mirrored by obstacles to inservice staff development opportunities in community-based programs (Bailey, 1989). It is challenging for administrators and supervisors to plan staff development in teamwork that is appropriate to the range of knowledge and skills that both new and experienced team members bring as well as to individual learning needs and styles. Requirements for recertification and continuing education credits frequently force people into separate disciplinary channels for inservice education rather than into programs designed to bring professionals together across disciplines to learn new skills in working together.

Organizational Barriers to Teamwork

Families and children need coordinated, collaborative services from several agencies and disciplines; however, most human services organizations have hierarchical, departmental structures that frequently separate disciplines. Departmental structures often isolate practitioners from their colleagues in other disciplines, making it difficult to establish the time and procedures needed for collaboration and communication. A service delivery system that institutionalizes the parallel functions of individual agencies and disciplines also institutionalizes, inadvertently or by design, barriers to communication, shared values and resources, and meaningful collaborative teamwork. Agencies or interagency groups needing staff development in teamwork are often hindered by the logistical barriers of varied work schedules, professional responsibilities, isolated locations, and travel distances (Ludlow, 1994).

Struggles of turf, authority, and power that occur within and across agencies compound the barriers to promoting teamwork (Garner, 1994). Social and political changes have led to increased competition for resources that have the potential to reduce and divide services. It is difficult to predict whether the battle for increasingly scarce fiscal resources will heighten the emphasis on competition or whether agencies will be forced into new, more efficient collaborative models of interaction.

Increasingly large caseloads make it difficult for teams to find time for the staff development they need to change the nature of their interactions. Personnel shortages, particularly among physical, occupational, and speech-language therapists, create unreasonably high caseloads that limit time for staff development and nurture the belief that therapists, in short supply, must focus on their traditional therapy roles rather than on the broader responsibilities of team members. High levels of staff turnover in early intervention (Hebbeler, 1994) result from low pay, social mobility, and job stress.

Although the needs of children and families often require an interagency approach to service delivery, frequent changes in membership make it especially hard for teams to establish trust, ensure communication, transfer knowledge and skills, and work together to solve problems. As personnel change, teams must repeatedly reconstitute themselves around new members, teaching them the norms, culture, and procedures that characterize their teamwork. These changes make team development a spiraling rather than linear process as experienced team members leave and are replaced by new members who may lack the most basic information about teamwork. Team members who are anxious to move forward with the development of teamwork skills may lose patience with the pace of behavioral and programmatic change slowed by the repeated loss of experienced colleagues.

To illustrate some of these challenges, vignettes drawn from three different early intervention situations typical of many communities are presented.

A private therapy practice in one community has a contract with the local early intervention team for assessment and intervention. Therapists are expected by their administrators to treat high numbers of children and to write reports for third-party payers to ensure reimbursement. Their reports contain jargon that service coordinators and parents feel is not family friendly. The pressure to see many children limits their time to meet as a team, to share information and skills with parents and other providers, and to participate in staff development related to teamwork.

A health department nurse has service coordination responsibilities for 150 families in addition to her work as coordinator of a diagnostic clinic. Families and early childhood special educators providing early intervention services find her unwilling to give the time needed to establish the close relationship of trust with the family that characterizes successful service coordination.

A community mental health and mental retardation agency hires young, inexperienced service coordinators to serve as fiscal gatekeepers to the early intervention system, while a private, not-for-profit agency that has served children for 2 decades is responsible for implementation. Each finds the other lacking in willingness to collaborate or to share information, and both are engaged in a power struggle with child and family at the center. For these providers, team members in name only, staff development opportunities in teamwork are useless without an accompanying administrative vision of and support for the systems change that will be required.

In examining the factors that impede teamwork, and particularly the examples provided in the previous section, it is clear that professionals who are expected to work in new contexts with new skills and who must participate in organizational change to do so must be given opportunities to develop those skills through both the preservice and continuing staff development if they are to succeed. Preservice and inservice instruction cannot stand alone in support of new team approaches to early intervention. Preservice must prepare students for future roles as willing team members and as willing participants in organizational change. Inservice staff development must be part of a larger project of planned change in which families, service providers, and financial and programmatic decision makers work together to develop a vision for early intervention services and to set goals for systems and program change. When people feel competent to do what is expected of them, their resistance to change is diminished. Administrative support for the time it takes for staff to learn new skills is critical to the willingness and ability of people to implement change.

PLANNING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TEAMWORK

At both the preservice and inservice levels, the purpose of personnel preparation for teamwork is to give early intervention providers knowledge and understanding of key elements in the process of working as a team (Rosin, Whitehead, Tuchman, Jesien, & Begun, 1993). Observations, internships, and practicum placements provide preservice opportunities to see different teams at work, to examine the impact of team dynamics on task accomplishment, and to expand students' understanding of their future roles on early intervention teams. For community-based service providers who seek inservice opportunities to enhance their work together, both content and process of staff development should respond to their identified needs and to the status of their team interaction, to real team needs, and to circumstances. Whether they currently work on early intervention teams or plan to do so in the future, adult learners will need to gain understanding of models for team interaction; factors influencing teamwork; and strategies for decision making, problem solving, and conflict management. A simple problem-solving process can form a structure for planning and implementing professional development in teamwork. The process for designing customized staff development in teamwork includes the following important steps: 1) define the goal through needs assessment, 2) develop and negotiate the agenda, 3) obtain commitment to the agenda and to participation, 4) clarify expectations and structure the environment, 5) implement the staff development, and 6) evaluate the process and results. The last step serves as the needs assessment for continuing professional development. A discussion of each step in the process follows.

Define the Goal Through Needs Assessment

Setting the goal for professional development begins with determining its purpose. Have team members asked for help because of unresolved conflict on the team? Is it a new team that needs clarification of roles and procedures? Has an administrator decided that the team needs help in communication or decision making? Do preservice students need to acquire a basic understanding of concepts such as team or team dynamics? How do they perceive their own roles on early intervention teams?

One challenge for personnel developers is to use multiple measures and to tap multiple sources for needs assessment. When learning opportunities are designed for a group that already works, or wants to work, as a team, a description of current team norms is necessary. That description should include information about whether the team has a written mission statement, how the team sets and measures goals, how team members perceive the team and their individual roles, and prior staff development the team has had.

In gathering data, the instructor may collect written information from the team such as a mission statement, policies and procedures, and the program brochure. These can reveal important information about the ways in which team members work with one another and with families. Gathering information from multiple team members, including families who have received services from the team, will result in more accurate information about the participants' needs. Asking several team members about their teamwork increases their investment in staff development and its potential results. Broad participation in the needs assessment process helps teams begin the change process and decreases their hostility and resistance to proposed changes.

Several instruments can be used to assess the need for staff development in teamwork. The Team Development Scale (Dyer, 1987), the Team Effectiveness Rating Scale (Neugebauer, 1983), and the team assessment developed by Project BRIDGE (1986) can be used to measure teamwork. The Skills Inventory for Teams (SIFT) (Garland, Frank, Buck, & Seklemian, 1992) allows a team to rate its functioning in 12 areas of teamwork, using a 5-point scale (see Table 14.1). Once problem areas have been identified using the SIFT,

TABLE 14.1. SIFT categories

- Clarity of purpose
- Cohesion
- Clarity of roles
- Communication
- Effective use of resources
- Good decision making and problem solving
- Responsibility and implementation
- Conflict resolution
- Evaluation
- Internal support
- External support for teamwork

From Garland, C.W., Frank, A., Buck, D., & Seklemian, P. (1992). *Skills inventory for teams (SIFT),* pp. 4–8. Norge, VA: Child Development Resources; reprinted by permission.

a second section of the instrument helps the team to define needs more specifically by rating team behaviors and skills in any of the 12 categories perceived to be problematic. Simpler instruments can help the team identify needs by checking "yes," "no," or "I'm not sure" in response to statements such as "Our early intervention team needs help with . . . developing a family-centered, team assessment process" (Child Development Resources [CDR], 1995). The preservice instructor can use any of these same measures to help students rate their own skills in teamwork or to assess the teamwork observed at community programs.

Needs assessment ratings can be collected by team members or by an outside facilitator for summary and presentation as part of the inservice process. Relating the content of professional development events to needs that learners have identified creates a heightened sense of relevance for the participants. Using a needs assessment instrument both before and after a program of inservice education offers both teacher and learners a way of measuring change in how team members view the team and/or their own skills and the effectiveness of the professional development.

Needs assessments that yield numerical information offer clear summaries and are a relatively time-effective and nonthreatening approach to data collection. However, in sharing results, instructors should consider the limits of numerical data. Because mean scores may fail to represent sufficiently the perspectives of one or two strong dissenters, the presentation of a range or a distribution of scores may be helpful. For example, if a group rates the level of team cohesion as high but two members reflect that they feel little or no allegiance to the team, the team cannot ignore their alienation when planning for improved teamwork.

Numerical needs assessment data will not be as descriptive as data resulting from open-ended questionnaires, interviews, or team discussion. Simply asking each team member to identify one area for improvement and one strength of the team provides useful information on setting priorities for change. Several formats for such interviews are available for use or modification (Phillips & Elledge, 1989). Although on-site or telephone interviews can be time consuming, they offer the interviewer rich information that is especially helpful when the team is engaged in serious conflict. Transcriptions of responses can be compiled and presented to the group in such a way as to preserve confidentiality. The frequency with which major issues are identified provides information on the breadth of perceptions about teamwork.

Group interviews may be useful for teams whose members do not know each other well or do not have much time for interaction. However, only the most skilled instructor will be able to handle, in a group context, members' fears of reprisal for honesty in discussing team problems or an inclination to bypass team development activities in favor of finding immediate solutions to problems aired in the group interview.

The needs assessment allows the instructor to pinpoint and clarify learners' needs and to articulate goals for developing new skills in teamwork. For many teams, the needs assessment is an opportunity not only for planning professional development activities but also for practicing communication, decision making, and other skills needed for teamwork. Often, needs assessment and skill development, as well as process and content, are merged. (See Chapter 6 for additional discussion of these issues.)

Develop and Negotiate the Agenda

For some teams, the needs assessment process results in clearly defined agendas for team development, whereas for others priorities are divided among several team development needs. Content and methods will be influenced by needs and priorities, the length of time available for professional development, whether professional development can be provided by an individual internal to the organization or whether it requires an outside facilitator, and other logistical considerations.

The content of preservice preparation can be adjusted based on students' assessments of their needs for skill development and on their experiences with community teams. Case studies can be used to provide an inservice context to a preservice audience. Even relatively inexperienced students at the preservice level will have had some experience in teamwork—in sports; in an orchestra or band; in other extracurricular activities such as a church or synagogue group; through participating with their own families in group decision making; or in community civic, social, or political organizations. Acknowledging their experience and potential future use of teamwork skills creates relevance for adult learners who are not already part of early intervention teams (see also Chapter 11).

Obtain Commitment to the Agenda and to Participation

Inservice instructors, whether inside or external to the organization, will need to ensure that the administrators who have supervisory or programmatic responsibility for participants have sanctioned the purpose of the professional development activities and the participation of their staff and are committed to the actions that will be planned as sequelae. Instructors can submit written plans based on the needs assessment data for administrative signature across all participating agencies, or they can receive those assurances in less formal ways. A written staff development plan should specify responsibility for ensuring staff participation, including part-time staff and consultants; for authorizing and supporting, as appropriate, family participation as teachers and as learners; for supporting instructional costs; and for arranging logistics.

Having administrators participate in team development activities helps ensure their commitment and that of their staff. Their presence sends a message to service providers that administrators "endorse the activities being conducted and . . . are willing to work . . . to change program practices" (Bailey, McWilliam, & Winton, 1992, p. 75). Administrative interest can motivate participants and convey that the inservice events justify the expenditure of administrative time and resources and are important to the future of the organization. Instructors will need to ensure equal participation by all team members in activities and discussions even when administrators are present. At the same time, instructors will need to acknowledge the administrative decision-making parameters idiosyncratic to each organization and help teams cope with the realities of organizational structures. This is especially important as teams plan follow-up activities and changes in team functioning as a result of professional development activities (Winton, McWilliam, Harrison, Owens, & Bailey, 1992).

Teams will need to decide who should participate in their staff development. If the purpose is to build a team or improve team practices, participants who have the information and authority to make decisions about teamwork must be present. Teams will want to consider family members, staff from one or many agencies, and system planners at the state and local levels as potential participants. Although "ideally, the team consists of all those persons who affect or who are affected by the decisions that might be made" as a result of staff development (Winton et al., 1992, p. 50), group size affects the types of activities that can be used. Instructors will want to have some knowledge of the cultural norms and mores of the team so that expectations for participants are culturally appropriate.

The instructor at the preservice level will need to decide whose perspectives on teamwork students need to hear, considering all the sources of information that can be brought from the community into the classroom. It is as important for students entering the field to understand how administrators perceive the decision-making process as it is for them to hear from families about what they believe their role is and should be.

Bringing family members into the classroom as both instructors and learners enriches students' understanding of the early intervention team process (see Chapter 17 for more information on family participation in instruction). As team members expand their skills in airing and managing conflict productively, they can become less protective of themselves and their colleagues and more open to including families in conflict resolution. Skills in communication, decision making, and conflict resolution are essential to any team member who will participate in family-centered assessment and IFSP planning.

Groups frequently seek inservice training to identify sources of interpersonal, interdisciplinary, or interagency conflict and to improve their team relationships. Those groups may want to limit participants to those immediately involved in the conflict. Parents who are dealing with a number of stressors in their lives may experience heightened stress from participation in this kind of intense work on team building as did one Texas family who asked to be excused from a session on conflict resolution. An early intervention team in Pennsylvania decided to invite parents from another community to provide feedback on family-centered practice so that the team members would not expose the families with whom they worked to their team's conflicts.

Clarify Expectations and Structure the Environment

Successful preservice and inservice instructors will appreciate the importance of the physical and human environment and will create an atmosphere in which professional development in teamwork can succeed. The environment should be physically comfortable, setting the stage for the emotional comfort necessary for open communication. The room arrangement should be conducive to interaction so that participants can see and hear one another. When team members are in conflict, table arrangements can establish barriers and limit vulnerability. Unlike preservice education, inservice instruction is vulnerable to interruptions by beepers, telephones, and secretaries. Limiting those distractions by choosing an environment away from the workplace or by strictly honoring an agreement to refuse interruptions is important to the work of the team. Finding a site or classroom in neutral territory when conducting professional development activities with individuals from different agencies or from different disciplines may also need to be considered at both inservice and preservice levels.

Implement Professional Development Activities

The introduction to professional development can help participants understand what is expected of them and allay fears. The time in which the first participants enter the room and wait for activities to begin is typically wasted and can be altered to be more productive. This is a good time to display a flipchart or overhead with instructions such as "List five things you like about the team you work on" or "One thing I hope will change as a result of today's session is . . . ." For preservice, a statement such as "Two things that I like best about working with others are . . . " can accomplish the same purpose. Instructors can use this time to help participants focus on the task and on a positive view of their teams and themselves.

Icebreaker activities can establish a relaxed climate and help learners see their colleagues in new ways. Asking participants who do not know each other well to work in small groups to find three things they have in common and three differences among them helps people to get acquainted and to begin to see their colleagues both as unique individuals and as people not unlike themselves. Such activities work well at the beginning of a preservice course to set the tone for team learning.

Clarifying the agenda and expectations relieves anxiety and establishes a partnership of responsibility for what the instructor and the learners hope to accomplish together. The instructor is responsible not so much for ensuring that learning takes place but for what Stuart (1986) described as a facilitative role of promoting and helping the student take control of learning.

Professional development in teamwork has behavior change as its intended result. Stuart (1986) offered helpful guidelines for promoting learning that results in behavior change, including 1) acceptance by the facilitator for the climate of openness within the group, for guidance on codes of conduct, and for building group identity; 2) acceptance of the facilitator as a resource to be used by the group to clarify, organize, and promote learning; 3) awareness by the facilitator of the emotional needs of individuals within the group; 4) participation by each learner both as an individual and as a group member; and 5) acknowledgment that the learner is responsible for learning even though instructional objectives may have been determined elsewhere.

Drawing on principles of adult learning (discussed in Chapter 5), instructors will recognize that teamwork and the building of relationships cannot be taught through lecture. Although lecture can be used to present basic information or to reinforce concepts that learners may have fully or partially acquired, it must be accompanied by active-learning strategies that promote skill building and practice. In *Team Building at Its Best,* Spruell (1989) suggested the following guidelines to use in planning team-building activities: 1) choose activities that meet each team's objectives, 2) tailor activities to the conditions and needs of each team, 3) choose activities that can be managed given logistical arrangements and instructional support, 4) allow enough time not only for an activity but also for processing and discussing the results of the activity with the team, 5) try new activities before using them in training, and 6) anticipate the potential reactions of participants and be prepared for any necessary adaptations.

Several types of activities can be used to teach about teamwork. Paper-and-pencil activities that clarify team roles and values can be done by individual team members and followed by discussion in small or large groups. For example, "Who Decides" (Francis & Young, 1979), adapted by CDR's (1996) Trans/Team Outreach, provides participants with a list of decisions that early intervention teams frequently face. Participants work alone to determine how decisions are typically made by their team, ranging from authoritative to consensus-seeking modes. In the preservice context, students can use this activity to describe the methods used by teams they have observed or participated in within or outside of class. Following these activities with guided discussion in small or large groups can help learners clarify and understand their existing teamwork procedures. During discussion, the instructor may need to support the learner who is venting frustration, to manage emerging conflict, to elicit the participation of more reticent participants, and to keep the discussion focused on the agenda. Large-group discussion gives preservice students the opportunity to learn from the observations and experiences of their colleagues how a variety of community organizations make decisions.

Problem-based learning "is a teaching method that emphasizes active, student-centered learning in a small group format" (VanLeit, 1995, p. 349). Information is organized and presented as an integrated clinical problem or a case study in written form, on videotape, or in role play. For example, a written child assessment report can give a team the chance to practice reaching consensus through brainstorming, problem solving, and decision making to develop IFSP outcomes. The video *Creating a Vision: Individualized*

Family Service Plan (Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council & Colorado Department of Education, 1990) shows three short vignettes of IFSP meetings. The video can be used to have the group identify family-centered practices and brainstorm about how they might make the interactions more family centered. Project Copernicus also offers a videotape on the IFSP process that can be used in similar activities (Project Copernicus & Department for Individual and Family Resources, 1993).

Case studies in which team members engage in role play provide other opportunities for practicing the application of general principles of family-centered teamwork. McWilliam and Bailey (1993) provided more than 20 case studies in early intervention in their book *Working Together with Children and Families: Case Studies in Early Intervention*. The case "The Team Meeting" is particularly effective for generating discussion about characteristics of effective teams.

Regardless of methodology, the instructor's role is to engage participants through the use of varied learning opportunities by posing credible dilemmas and challenging the participants to respond. Instructors engage students by sharing their own knowledge to help the group clarify issues or problems, by using effective questioning skills, and by maintaining an environment that is stimulating and collegial. Bailey and colleagues (1992) observed that the skilled facilitator must be "flexible and able to think on his or her feet" (p. 79) when off-the-agenda problems arise or the emotional climate needs to be managed. Cartoons and other appropriate uses of humor can help diffuse tension and create a comfortable learning environment.

Evaluate the Instruction

Evaluating teamwork-related instruction must go beyond measuring participants' reactions. It is important to measure, over time, changes in the ways in which people work together as teams as a result of instruction (see also Chapter 7). The same instrumentation used for team needs assessment can also be used to measure outcomes. Team needs or performance before and after instruction can be examined.

Bruder and Nikitas (1992) described an inservice model that uses a variety of evaluative measures, including case studies, questionnaires, rating scales, consumer satisfaction scales, and others. Trans/Team Outreach closes each team training with the development, by the team, of a written change plan. Writing the change plan gives the team a chance to practice, with coaching and technical assistance from on-site instructors, new skills in making decisions. It provides an opportunity for the team to set priorities for improved teamwork and to choose specific strategies and time lines for implementation of its change plan. Informal follow-up interviews are helpful as are structured interviews both before and after staff development activities to measure tangible results or changes in specific team practices and to evaluate efficacy of the staff development.

Evaluation of instruction in teamwork is based on the understanding of continuing education as a catalyst for change. From its planning to its evaluation, successful professional development is based on the acknowledgment that "real change will occur only when a comprehensive, long-term, systematic approach is taken and when those who will be affected by change participate in decisions about its implementation" (Bailey et al., 1992, p. 74).

CONTENT AND RESOURCES FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN TEAMWORK

The remainder of this chapter includes a discussion of the major content areas that can be included in preparing personnel for teamwork, along with strategies and resources the instructor can use. Written needs assessments, observations of teams, interviews with key informants, and review of the team development literature have helped the authors identify six major areas in which instruction is frequently needed: 1) characteristics of an effective team; 2) definition of team mission, philosophy, and values; 3) clarification of member roles and responsibilities; 4) communication and conflict resolution; 5) decision making and problem solving; and 6) action planning and the change process.

Practical activities that can be used to teach new information and skills in each of these areas of teamwork are offered in the following sections. Many of these resources are found in the literature from the field of business leadership or organizational development and can be adapted or modified for use with early intervention teams.

Characteristics of an Effective Team

The mere existence of a group does not ensure effective teamwork. In preparing professionals and parents for teamwork, the instructor must give learners a vision of the qualities and characteristics of effective teams. Participants can often generate a lengthy list of characteristics that make a team effective, or the 12 general characteristics of effective teams used in the SIFT (Garland et al., 1992) can be used as the basis for a short lecture. Other information such as types of teams or stages of team development (Briggs, 1993) can help participants understand the complex, changing nature of teams. Activities 1–3 are designed to help learners define the characteristics of an effective team and to recognize stages in the development of teams.

Team Mission, Philosophy, and Values

Frequently, teams in the early stages of development or teams that have undergone substantial change in response to reconfiguring of service delivery systems lack a clear understanding of what it is they are to do together and what values and philosophical principles undergird their approach. Without a common understanding of mission and philosophy, the team lacks guidelines for making decisions and flounders in the critical tasks of teamwork. Questions of "Should we do this?" or "How can we do this best?" can be better answered by teams that make choices in the context of their team mission, instead, "Will this proposed action help us fill our mission of providing comprehensive early intervention services for families of children with disabilities?"

Activity 4 outlines a process for helping a team develop a mission statement. Students can examine a list of specific team or program practices for congruence with their written mission statements to learn how the mission statement can direct the work of a team.

Clarification of Member Roles and Responsibilities

Teamwork is enhanced when members understand their own and others' roles. As teams move toward more highly interactive provision of early intervention services, individual team members commit to teaching and learning from each other and to sharing roles and responsibilities based on the needs of the child and family and the skills of staff. This process is central (United Cerebral Palsy [UCP] National Collaborative Infant Project, 1976) to the transdisciplinary team model (McGonigel et al., 1994).

Team members need to know the characteristics of effective leadership and of effective team members. Parker and Kropp (1992) described an activity that asks participants to use a consensus decision-making process to rank the importance of 10 characteristics of effective team members, for example, "comes prepared," "supports other's contributions," "asks questions," or "shares ideas." Parker and Kropp also offered activities that involve asking small groups to observe behavior and provide feedback to each other. Team members work in pairs, rating their own teamwork skills and those of their partners, followed by a discussion about their roles on the team.

Dyer (1987) raised the possibility that team conflict can occur when there is a violation of role expectations. When a team asks for help in defining or clarifying job roles and responsibilities, Phillips and Elledge's (1989) module on role clarification will be useful. The module provides questions that can be used for individual role negotiation, asking an individual what he or she expects to do in his or her job, what he or she actually does, what is needed from the individual, and what the individual needs from other team members. Dyer developed a similar activity (Activity 5) to help teams eliminate discrepancies in role perceptions.

For teams needing help in identifying responsibility for leadership roles, Francis and Young (1979) offered a "Leadership Functions Check Sheet" (see Figure 14.1) that allows participants to identify who on their team performs each of 11 different leadership tasks. This activity can be adapted for both preservice and inservice instruction by asking each participant to identify the leadership tasks on the check sheet that they can perform with comfort and skill and those in which they want more practice to increase their level of skill.

If team members are ready to move beyond basic role definition to learning how to use the transdisciplinary process of role transition, instructors can use one of several activities available in the CDR Trans/Team Outreach materials (1996). The "Role Transition Examples" table is designed to increase understanding of the steps in the role transition process. This table (see Table 14.2) gives behavioral examples related to teamwork, and participants identify the step in role transition that is exemplified by each behavior. For example, given the behavior "an occupational therapist who is a specialist

Who on the team . . .

- brings together individual contributions?
- ensures decision making?
- begins meetings?
- checks whether objectives are set?
- ensures effective teamwork methods?
- gets the team started or unstuck?
- watches over operations?
- brings in external information?
- represents the team with other groups?
- summarizes or clarifies discussions?
- encourages contributions and/or supports members in difficult situations?

Figure 14.1. An example of a leadership functions check sheet. (Adapted from *Improving Work Groups: A Practical Manual for Team Building* [pp. 152–153, 161–162] by D. Francis & D. Young. Copyright © 1979 by Pfeiffer & Company, San Diego, CA. Used with permission.)

TABLE 14.2. Steps in role transition

Role	Description
Role extension	Self-directed study within one's own discipline
Role enrichment	Understanding basic terminology and rationale outside one's own discipline
Role expansion	Making programming judgments across disciplinary boundaries
Role exchange	Demonstrating techniques to a colleague in another discipline
Role release	Implementing, with authorization, techniques learned from a colleague in another discipline
Role support	Consultation and support or back-up therapy provided to team members across disciplines

From Child Development Resources. (1996). *Trans/Team Outreach training materials.* Norge, VA: Author; reprinted by permission.

in feeding attends a workshop on new feeding techniques,'' participants should correctly identify that this is an example of role extension, through which a team member increases knowledge within his or her own discipline or area of expertise. Another activity, ''Daily Activities that Support Team Teaching and Learning'' (CDR, 1996), helps team members identify activities during which teaching and learning can naturally take place among all members, emphasizing opportunities for family participation in the role transition process.

Communication and Conflict Resolution

Group problem solving rests on a climate that supports the free and open exchange of ideas and opinions without fear of criticism, divisiveness, or reprisal for dissent. Such a climate fosters the development of innovative, state-of-the-art treatment and program approaches (Antoniadis & Videlock, 1991; Garner & Orelove, 1994). A climate of open communication and trust is also critical to the parent–professional partnerships that are the hallmarks of family-centered teams.

There are many instruments available to help teams assess their functioning. These usually include at least one item that measures the extent to which communication on the team is characterized by openness and honesty or by guardedness and reluctance to share ideas and opinions. Dyer's Team Development Scale (1987) includes questions such as ''How safe is it in this team to be at ease, relaxed, and myself?'' and ''To what extent do I feel 'under wraps,' that is, have private thoughts, unspoken reservations, or unexpressed feelings and opinions that I have not felt comfortable bringing out into the open?'' Answers to the second, on a scale of 1–5, range from ''almost completely under wraps'' to ''almost completely free and expressive.'' Francis and Young (1979) offered a Team Climate Questionnaire, which includes an item on ''openness'' that asks, ''Are individuals open in their transactions with others? Are there hidden agendas? Are some topics taboo for discussion within the group? Can team members express their feelings about others openly?'' Responses can be made on a 7-point scale from ''individuals are very open'' to ''individuals are very guarded.''

Videotapes such as *Delivering Family-Centered, Home-Based Services* (Project Copernicus, 1991) can help learners identify communication successes and problems by viewing examples of home visits or IFSP meetings. A simple but sometimes threatening way of addressing communication problems among team members is to use written messages that help members to state and address their problems. Activity 6 helps teams recognize the importance of clear communication.

Conflict is an inevitable part of working in a team and, when well managed, a positive force. Preparation for teamwork must emphasize that diverse views and perspectives are inherent in teamwork and must provide team members and leaders with ways to incorporate diverse perspectives and conflicting views in decision making and ways to use a range of ideas in creative problem solving. Finally, team members must learn a variety of productive styles and strategies for airing and managing conflict.

There are many resources available to help instructors with this topic. Clinard (1987) offered a step-by-step guide to conflict resolution that gives participants the opportunity to practice conflict resolution in role-play or real-life situations. The idea of sending a written message is a frequently used strategy, and Francis and Young provided a sample in their "From me to you, from you to me" message sheet (1979, p. 189). The message sheet provides a written framework for telling another team member, "It would be more comfortable and beneficial for me if you would . . . do the following things more or better; do (other) things less or stop doing them; continue (others); and start doing these additional things." This sheet can be given to the group as a resource for giving feedback and for handling conflict as the need occurs. Some instructors may use the form during classes or workshops as a way of having participants practice giving feedback in a supportive environment. Preservice instructors may invite feedback on their own work as a teacher, giving students another chance to practice using the form.

Francis and Young (1979) based the following activity on an idea by Roger Harrison of Development Research Associates. Message sheets are distributed to participants, who are asked to fill out one for every other team member. When the messages are completed and delivered face down, all team members read their messages and are asked to seek clarity through open discussion, asking for behavioral examples when needed. Team members are encouraged to negotiate agreements resulting in commitments such as "In the future I will . . ." (p. 188) that can be posted or recorded and distributed to the entire team as a reminder of their commitments. An extremely high level of interpersonal comfort among learners must be present to support this activity. In the absence of such trust and comfort, the instructor may instead encourage participants to use the format on a one-to-one basis, using the instructor as a resource. Conflict vignettes may also be used as the basis for less threatening role play, having the "From me to you" messages filled out by participants who play the roles of individuals in the vignettes. Case studies, such as "The Team Meeting" (McWilliam & Bailey, 1993), which illustrates a team with unresolved conflicts, are also useful catalysts for role-play activities. The video and accompanying guide *Interdisciplinary Teamwork: A Team in Name Only and Becoming an Effective Team* (Virginia Institute for Developmental Disabilities, 1992) illustrate the impact of ineffective teamwork on the family.

Phillips and Elledge (1989) offered sample flipcharts and many activities, including a conflict resolution role play. Their "Personal Definitions of Conflict" activity provides an opportunity for participants to consider their own "reactions to conflict and . . . ways of dealing with it" (p. 135). After responding to 12 open-ended statements such as "When someone disagrees with me about something important or challenges me in front of others, I usually . . ." (p. 136), participants are encouraged to work in pairs to discuss their responses. This activity helps participants understand their own and others' responses to conflict. It provides each learner with an opportunity to assess areas for personal skill development. The activity can also be used to create an awareness of how individuals respond differently to conflict and, thus, the importance of having a variety of conflict resolution strategies from which to choose. Activity 7 is also from *The Team Building Source Book* (Phillips & Elledge, 1989).

Decision Making and Problem Solving

Early intervention professionals come together because they acknowledge the advantages of group problem solving and because "a group has a greater capacity to recognize and reject poorly conceived solutions" (Rainforth & York-Barr, 1997, p. 22). However, teams frequently lack procedures for using the skills of their members in group problem-solving processes. Inservice and preservice instruction should provide team members with several strategies for group problem solving and should offer opportunities for participants to practice using new skills.

Instructors may provide information about a basic five-step problem-solving process similar to the following: 1) define the problem, 2) generate alternative solutions, 3) select alternative strategies, 4) decide and implement, and 5) evaluate and monitor solutions. Based on the needs and skills of the group, each step may need to be taught separately or can be taught in a single activity if participants have experience in group decision making.

Dyer (1987) suggested using the force field analysis problem-solving design to help team members clarify a problem or an issue. The force field method involves asking three simple questions: 1) What is our desired level of effectiveness? 2) What forces drive us toward the desired level? and 3) What forces restrain us? Once obstacles and facilitative factors in the environment are clear, the team can develop realistic and strategic plans for problem solving.

The Nominal Group Technique (Delbecq, VandeVen, & Gustafson, 1975) can help teams to practice generating solutions and setting priorities. The major steps in this procedure are working alone to write down ideas, offering and recording of ideas, clarifying ideas, ranking of strategies, and discussing the outcomes. Instructors pose problems related to early intervention service delivery or teamwork, for example, long waiting lists for physical therapy services. Participants are given the opportunity to generate creative strategies for problem solving without judgment by other team members. In practicing brainstorming techniques, instructors may want to appoint a process monitor who provides feedback, reminding people not to evaluate or discuss solutions prematurely or to provide nonverbal feedback such as rolling their eyes or nodding emphatically.

Instructors should ensure that they offer an understanding of both group and individual decision-making strategies and the advantages and disadvantages of each, particularly consensus. It is important for participants to have a good understanding of how their teams typically make decisions and to understand the parameters for acceptable change. Teams wanting to move from authoritative decisions to group decisions will need to understand that salaries, for example, are unlikely to be determined by consensus. Francis and Young (1979) provided an activity, "Who Decides," that has been adapted by Trans/Team Outreach (CDR, 1996) to help early intervention providers identify their team's typical decision-making styles. Participants circle statements that reflect how the team usually makes decisions. Three of 15 statements reflect each of five styles: 1) authoritative, 2) consultative, 3) group voting, 4) group consensus, and 5) delegated. Scores are tallied to get a group profile. As participants clarify their understanding of how their team makes decisions, they can identify areas in which collaborative group process might be more effective.

For many of the activities of early intervention teams, most especially assessment and IFSP development, the best collective judgment of the team can be reached only by open communication and by sharing perspectives and opinions. Instructors can choose from many activities designed to practice group decision making. Activity 8, adapted from *A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training* (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1973), can help teams practice reaching consensus using an activity of low threat to the early intervention team.

Action Planning and the Change Process

Preservice and inservice education should result in commitment by individuals and teams to make behavior change. Whether the goal of change is to increase the extent of team collaboration or family centeredness or to change the ways in which teams make decisions, it is necessary for those who serve on early intervention teams to understand the importance and nature of the change process.

In Edelman (1990), there are several activities dealing with change. In one, participants are asked to remember a time of difficult change and to draw a picture of themselves in the midst of such change. Participants are asked to look at their own pictures and to tell what they were feeling in that picture. The instructor can record the feelings on an overhead or flipchart and point out common responses to change such as fear, anxiety, anger, and isolation as well as the less frequently cited but more positive responses of hopefulness, eagerness, and excitement. Participants can be invited to tape their pictures on the walls.

Team members who already have a problem-solving framework should be able to move easily into planning for change in teamwork and in their service delivery strategies. Instructors can help teams use a consensus decision-making process to identify the results they want from their change projects. Teams can use new brainstorming skills to generate and select strategies to be used, as in Francis and Young's exercise "Creative Change" (1979, p. 249). Formats that teams can use in planning for change are found in Phillips and Elledge (1989) who suggested using action planning to bring closure to team-building training and to reinforce the progress made during. Dyer (1987) suggested that action planning should answer the following questions: 1) What specific actions should be taken to deal with (teamwork) problem areas? 2) Who should be responsible for the actions? 3) When should the actions start and end? and 4) What should be the date of the first report of results?

For teams taking on change projects, whether related to teamwork or service delivery, or in the preservice context to create an appreciation of the possibilities of positive change, the videotape *The Winds of Change* (Barr Films, 1991) is a wonderfully allegorical cartoon that brings an optimistic closure to a team-building session.

CONCLUSION

All personnel preparation, whether at the preservice or inservice level, is intended to result in changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, or behaviors. Change is difficult for most people. Changing the ways in which people work together to provide early intervention services, similar to most change projects, is fraught with anxieties, frustrations, and fear. However, resistance to change is greatly minimized when people are confident that they will be given a chance to develop the skills needed to do new tasks or old tasks in new ways and that they will not be allowed to fail. Building skills in teamwork at both the preservice and the inservice levels is the prerequisite for the changes in early intervention service delivery that will result in coordinated, collaborative, family-centered teams.

RESOURCES

Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council & Colorado Department of Education. (1990). *Creating a vision: The Individualized Family Service Plan.* Denver, CO: Denver Early Childhood Connection. Cost: $2.40 (covers postage and handling). (303) 832-6168.

A 30-minute videotape with vignettes illustrating different applications of the IFSP process, suitable for use in inservice or preservice instruction.

Eastern Kentucky University. (1992). *The story of the goose.* Richmond: Eastern Kentucky University, Training Resource Center, Cost: $65. (606) 622-1497.

This 4-minute videotape tells the story of how geese have developed a model of teamwork and cooperation that can be an inspiration even to the most cynical.

Francis, D., & Young, D. (1992). *Improving work groups.* San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company. Cost: $34.95. (619) 578-5900.

Materials focused on the underlying concepts of working teams include 25 activities for helping teams learn to work through "blockages" and other elements that inhibit success.

Garland, C., Frank, A., Buck, D., & Seklemian, P. (1992). *Skills Inventory for Teams (SIFT).* Norge, VA: Child Development Resources. $24.95 plus postage and handling. (804) 566-3300.

An inventory of skills needed to function as a part of an early intervention team. This instrument was designed to help teams and individual team members identify key areas of need and strength regarding teamwork and can be used to complement preservice or inservice instruction. Directions and forms are provided.

Garland, C.W., McGonigel, M.J., Frank, A., & Buck, D. (1989). *Transdisciplinary arena assessment process: A resource for teams.* Norge, VA: Child Development Resources. Cost: $149.95 (videotape and print viewing guide). (804) 566-3300.

A 43-minute videotape demonstrating a six-step family-centered transdisciplinary approach to arena assessment and IFSP development. Viewing guide includes forms, activities, and materials suitable for teaching/instructing about the process as a whole or the component parts (e.g., preassessment planning).

McWilliam, P.J., & Bailey, D.B., Jr. (Eds.). (1993). *Working together with children and families: Case studies in early intervention.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co. Cost: $29 plus postage and handling. (800) 638-3775.

An edited collection of cases exemplifying the application of recommended practices in early intervention for use in preservice and inservice instruction. The text presents unsolved case dilemmas for teaching/instructing, decision making, and problem solving.

Pfeiffer, J.W., & Jones, J.E. (Eds.). (1973). *A handbook of structured experiences for human relations training* (Vol. IV). San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company. Cost: $19.95. (619) 578-5900.

A compact, portable collection of activities on teams and teamwork that are easy to use, adaptable, and reproducible.

Phillips, S.L., & Elledge, R.L. (1989). *The team building source book.* San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company. Cost: $89.95. (619) 578-5900.

Fully reproducible activities and materials for a single team-building exercise or a sequence of team-building instruction. Eleven modules of varying length (15 minutes to 3 hours) are included on aspects of teamwork, each complete with objectives, instructions, sample assessment materials, and handouts.

Project Copernicus. (1991). *Delivering family-centered, home-based services* [Videotape]. Bethesda, MD: Association for the Care of Children's Health. Cost: $98 plus shipping and handling. (301) 654-1205.

This videotape includes five vignettes, each of which illustrates what happens when service providers fail to practice family-centered priciples. Each vignette illustrates a different interaction (e.g., home-based assessment, an IFSP meeting) and provides instructors with material that can be used for awareness (i.e., identification of practices that are not family centered), knowledge (i.e., of alternative, desirable practices), and application (i.e., through role playing).

Virginia Institute for Developmental Disabilities. (1990). *Interdisciplinary teamwork: A guide for trainers and viewers.* Van Nuys, CA: Child Health and Development Educational Media. Cost: $65. (818) 994-0933.

A two-part videotape designed to illustrate and promote discussion and analysis of both positive and negative team processes (e.g., disagreement among team members, not honoring family priorities, using jargon). Viewer's guide provides background information, instructional objectives, a content outline, suggested learning activities, and discussion questions for use in preservice or inservice instruction.

REFERENCES

Anoniadis, A., & Videlock, J.L. (1991). In search of teamwork: A transactional approach to team functioning. *Infant and Toddler Intervention, 1*(2), 157–167.

Bailey, D.B., Jr. (1989). Issues and directions in preparing professionals to work with young handicapped children and their families. In J.J. Gallagher, P.L. Trohanis, & R.M. Clifford (Eds.), *Policy implementation and PL 99-457: Planning for young children with special needs* (pp. 97–132). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Bailey, D.B., McWilliam, P.J., & Winton, P.J. (1992). Building family-centered practices in early intervention: A team-based model for change. *Infants and Young Children, 5*(1), 73–82.

Bailey, D.B., Simeonsson, R.J., Yoder, D.E., & Huntington, G.S. (1990). Preparing professionals to serve infants and toddlers with handicaps and their families: An integrative analysis across eight disciplines. *Exceptional Children, 57*(1), 26–35.

Barr Films. (1991). *The winds of change* [Videotape]. Irwindale, CA: Barr Training and Development Films/Videos.

Blackman, J.A., Healy, A., & Ruppert, E. (1992). Participation by pediatricians in early intervention: Impetus from P.L. 99-457. *Pediatrics, 89,* 98–102.

Briggs, M.H. (1993). Team talk: Communication skills for early intervention teams. *Journal of Childhood Communication Disorders, 15*(1), 33–40.

Bruder, M.B., & McLean, M. (1988). Personnel preparation for early interventionists: A review of federally funded projects. *Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, 12*(4), 299–305.

Bruder, M.B., & Nikitas, T. (1992). Changing the professional practice of early interventionists: An inservice model to meet the service needs of P.L. 99-457. *Journal of Early Intervention, 16*(2), 173–180.

Child Development Resources (CDR). (1995). *Trans/Team Outreach needs assessment instrument*. Unpublished. (Available from Child Development Resources, Post Office Box 280, Norge, VA 23127-0280)

Child Development Resources (CDR). (1996). *Trans/Team Outreach training materials*. Unpublished. (Available from Child Development Resources, Post Office Box 280, Norge, VA 23127-0280)

Clinard, H. (1987). *Winning ways to succeed with people*. Pfafftown, NC.

Cohen, H., Kanthor, H., Meyer, M.R., & O'Hara, D. (1990). *American Academy of Pediatrics Survey: District II*. Valhalla: New York Medical College, The Mental Retardation Institute.

Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council & Colorado Department of Education. (1990). *Creating a vision: Individualized family service plan* [Videotape]. Littleton, CO: Mile High Down Syndrome Association.

Delbecq, A.L., VandeVen, A.H., & Gustafson, D.H. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning: A guide to Nominal Group and Delphi processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Dyer, W. (1987). *Team building: Issues and alternatives*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986, PL 99-457, 20 U.S.C. §1400 *et seq.*

Edelman, L. (1990, July). *Developing change agent skills: Keeping a "people focus" during organizational change*. Paper presented at Child Development Resources' Summer Institute, Williamsburg, VA.

Francis, D., & Young, D. (1979). *Improving work groups: A practical manual for team building*. San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company.

Garland, C.W. (1994). World of practice: Early intervention programs. In H.G. Garner & F.P. Orelove (Eds.), *Teamwork in human services: Models and applications across the life span* (pp. 89–113). Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Garland, C.W., Frank, A., Buck, D., & Seklemian, P. (1992). *Skills Inventory for Teams (SIFT)*. Norge, VA: Child Development Resources.

Garland, C.W., McGonigel, M.J., Frank, A., & Buck, D. (1989). *Transdisciplinary arena assessment process: A resource for teams.* Norge, VA: Child Development Resources.

Garner, H.G. (1994). Critical issues in teamwork. In H.G. Garner & F.P. Orelove (Eds.), *Teamwork in human services: Models and applications across the life span* (pp. 1–15). Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Garner, H.G., & Orelove, F.P. (Eds.). (1994). *Teamwork in human services: Models and applications across the life span*. Newton, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hebbeler, K. (1994). *Shortages in professionals working with young children with disabilities and their families*. Chapel Hill, NC: NEC*TAS.

Krahn, G.L., Thom, V.A., Hale, B.J., & Williams, K. (1995). Running on empty: A look at burnout in early intervention professionals. *Infants and Young Children*, *7*(4), 1–11.

Ludlow, B.L. (1994). Using distance education to prepare early intervention personnel. *Infants and Young Children*, *7*(1), 51–59.

McCollum, J.A., & Bailey, D.B. (1991). Developing comprehensive personnel systems: Issues and alternatives. *Journal of Early Intervention*, *15*(1), 57–65.

McGonigel, M.J., Woodruff, G., & Roszmann-Millican, M. (1994). The transdisciplinary team: A model for family-centered early intervention. In L.J. Johnson, R.J. Gallagher, M.J. LaMontagne, J.B. Jordan, J.J. Gallagher, P.L. Hutinger, & M.B. Karnes (Eds.), *Meeting early intervention challenges: Issues from birth to three* (2nd ed., pp. 95–131). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

McMahon, B. (1989). Teamwork: A complete service with specialist skills. *Professional Nurse*, *4,* 433–435.

McWilliam, P.J., & Bailey, D.B., Jr. (Eds.). (1993). *Working together with children and families: Case studies in early intervention*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Neugebauer, R. (1983, November). Team effectiveness rating scale. *Child Care Information Exchange, 4*.

Parker, G.M., & Kropp, R.P. (1992). *50 Activities for team building*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.

Pfeiffer, J.W., & Jones, J.E. (Eds.). (1973). *A handbook of structured experiences for human relations training* (Vol. IV). San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company.

Pfeiffer, J.W., & Jones, J.E. (Eds.). (1975). *A handbook of structured experiences for human relations training* (Vol. V). San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company.

Phillips, S.L., & Elledge, R.L. (1989). *The team building source book.* San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company.

Project BRIDGE. (1986). *Decision-making for early services: A team approach*. Chicago, IL: Center for Educational Development & Project BRIDGE, American Academy of Pediatrics.

Project Copernicus. (1991). *Delivering family-centered, home-based services* [Videotape]. Baltimore: Kennedy Krieger Institute, Project Copernicus.

Project Copernicus. (1993). *Family and the IFSP process: Training in family-centered approaches* [Videotape]. Baltimore: Kennedy Krieger Institute, Project Copernicus, Department for Individual and Family Resources.

Rainforth, B., & York-Barr, J. (1997). *Collaborative teams for students with severe disabilities: Integrating therapy and educational services* (2nd ed.) Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Rosin, P., Whitehead, A., Tuchman, L., Jesien, G., & Begun, A. (1993). *Partnerships in early intervention: A training guide on family-centered care, team building, and service coordination*. Madison: University of Wisconsin–Madison, Waisman Center.

Spruell, G. (Ed.). (1989, January). *Team building at its best*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD Infoline Series.

Stuart, R.R. (1986). Promoting adult learning. *Programmed Learning and Educational Technology, 23,* 253–258.

United Cerebral Palsy (UCP) National Collaborative Infant Project. (1976). *Staff development handbook: A resource for the transdisciplinary process.* New York: Author.

VanLeit, B. (1995). Using the case method to develop clinical reasoning skills in problem-based learning. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy, 49*(4), 349–353.

Virginia Institute for Developmental Disabilities. (1992). *Interdisciplinary teamwork: A team in name only and becoming an effective team member* [Videotape]. Van Nuys, CA: Child Health and Development Educational Media.

Winton, P.J., McWilliam, P.J., Harrison, T., Owens, A.M., & Bailey, D.B. (1992). Lessons learned from implementing a team-based model for change. *Infants and Young Children, 5*(1), 49–57.

Woodruff, G., & McGonigel, M.J. (1988). Early intervention team approaches: The transdisciplinary model. In J.B. Jordan, J.J. Gallagher, P. Hutinger, & M.B. Karnes (Eds.), *Early childhood special education birth–3* (pp. 163–182). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

ACTIVITY 1

TEAMS YOU HATE

Objective:

- To help clarify the characteristics of effective teams

Time:

45–60 minutes depending on team size

Materials:

- Blank flipchart
- Markers
- List of characteristics of effective teams

Content review:

Not applicable. This is a good introductory activity that draws on the participants' experiences and helps them clarify the qualities they need for teamwork to succeed.

Instructions:

1. Tell participants that almost everyone has had some teamwork experience, whether on the job or in personal life—as a member of a committee; a PTA or church or synagogue board, youth group, sorority, fraternity or social organization; an interagency team; or even as part of a family decision-making process. The activity leader who knows something about the work experience of the participants will be able to choose the most meaningful examples.
2. Ask participants to think about the team they belonged to that they most disliked, the one whose meetings they dreaded attending. Ask them to reflect on those times and to remember what about the team they so disliked. Record their feelings on the chart or overhead.
3. The list can then be used to introduce, by comparison, the qualities of effective teams, pointing to the specific examples the participants gave and contrasting the behaviors of smooth-functioning and poorly functioning teams. For example, "Remember the team that you hated because all they did was talk and no one ever made a decision? Well the effective team is one in which the team has clear-cut procedures for making decisions and for assigning responsibility to ensure that decisions made are implemented."

Activity 1 is from Child Development Resources. (1996). *Trans/Team Outreach training materials.* Unpublished. (Available from CDR, Post Office Box 280, Norge, VA 23127-0280)

ACTIVITY 2

THE PUZZLE OF EFFECTIVE TEAMWORK

Objective:

- To increase knowledge of types of teams and characteristics of effective teams

Time:

45–60 minutes

Materials:

- Pictures of teams from magazines, for example, baseball team, Boy Scout group, cheerleaders, orchestra or band, SWAT team, firefighters, or surgical team, all glued onto cardboard and cut into 3-, 4-, or 5-piece puzzles.
- Flipchart, overhead, or worksheet given to each participant with the following questions:

  What type of team is represented by the picture in the puzzle: task team, decision-making team, or support team?

  Why does this team work together?

  Is there a designated leader? What kind of leadership is needed for this team to function?

  How dependent are team members on one another?

  What are two or three other characteristics that make a team effective?

Content:

Before this activity, the activity leader should introduce the definition of a team and descriptions of types of teams. A simple team definition is a group with a reason for working together, interdependent and committed to a cause. Types of teams include task, decision-making, and/or support team.

Instructions:

1. Count participants. Shuffle and distribute puzzle pieces, one to each participant, telling them they have pieces of puzzles that represent working teams.
2. Ask participants to assemble the puzzles by finding the participants who hold other pieces and putting the puzzle together. Have them work in small groups to answer the questions.
3. The small groups can share their responses in the large setting if time allows.

Activity 2 is from Child Development Resources. (1996). *Trans/Team Outreach Training Materials.* Unpublished. (Available from CDR, Post Office Box 280, Norge, VA 23127-0280)

ACTIVITY 3

TEAM DEVELOPMENT WHEEL

Objective:

- To help the participants determine the characteristics of their teamwork and to place their team on a continuum of team development

Time:

30 minutes

Instructions:

Before this activity, the activity leader should introduce the definition of a team and stages of team development (Briggs, 1993).

1. Place the team development wheel shown below on an overhead and distribute as individual handouts.
2. Ask individual team members to make a mark that places their team on the continuum of team development.
3. Have the members work in small groups to discuss where they placed their team and why, giving specific examples of team behaviors.

TEAM DEVELOPMENT WHEEL

Activity 3 is adapted from Francis and Young (1979) who suggested placing a slightly different version of the team development wheel on a large flipchart and having each team member mark his or her rating directly on the chart. Each team member is asked, in the large group context, to explain his or her appraisal, giving specific examples. The facilitator helps the team to come to consensus about the developmental status of the team and to plan activities to help the team move forward in development.

ACTIVITY 4

DEVELOPING A MISSION STATEMENT

Objective:

To help a team develop a draft mission statement or to clarify its understanding of its existing mission statement

Time:

Minimum of 60 minutes to several hours, depending on clarity of purpose and whether the desired outcome is a written mission statement

Materials:

- Paper and pencils for each participant
- Flipchart, paper, markers, and masking tape

Content review:

Before this activity, the activity leader should introduce the concept of mission as an enduring and broad purpose of a team that is distinct from goals that apply to a fixed period of time and that is revised as it is accomplished.

Instructions:

1. As a full team or in small groups of fewer than eight members, ask participants to write a draft mission statement that describes what the team does and for whom. The mission statement should reveal the team's values and identify how the team relates to children, families, team, agency, and/or community. For example, CDR's mission is to provide services to young children with special needs and their families and to provide training and technical assistance for the professionals who serve them.
2. Ask each group to write a one-sentence statement of the mission of the team on flipchart paper and to post it on the wall.
3. Review each of the statements with the full group to identify common elements of all statements and underline these in the same color marker. The team may need assistance from the instructor in seeing commonalities.
4. Ask the team to identify those statements that appear to be conflicting or inconsistent among the statements (e.g., to serve children or to serve children with disabilities) and underline those in another color.
5. Lead the team in discussion to help it resolve discrepancies in the statements of mission until there is consensus around key points in the mission statement. If the team had a mission statement before it started, compare its work product with its existing statement, trying to resolve discrepancies.
6. Depending on the complexity of the task, the activity leader can bring closure by drafting a mission statement for consideration by the group, appointing a work group made up of one member from each of the previous subgroups to develop the draft, or asking the team to work on the mission statement before the next teamwork session.
7. Ask the team whose approval it will need to have for its mission statement, and develop a plan for securing that approval.

Activity 4 is from Child Development Resources. (1996). *Trans/Team Outreach Training Materials.* Unpublished. (Available from CDR, Post Office Box 280, Norge, VA 23127-0280)

ACTIVITY 5

ROLE EXPECTATIONS / CLARIFICATION DESIGN

Objective:

- To clarify job roles and responsibilities

Time:

Average time of 15–20 minutes for each role discussed. The first few may take longer than subsequent role discussions.

Instructions:

1. Ask one person on the team to volunteer to be the focus of the activity to start.
2. Ask the focal person to describe his or her role.
3. Ask the team members to tell the focal person how they perceive his or her role.
4. The activity leader helps the team come to agreement on the focal person's role.
5. Ask the focal person to tell the team what he or she needs from the team to perform the job.
6. Help the team reach consensus about the redefined role of the focal person.

The sources of Activity 5 are Dyer (1987) and Phillips and Elledge (1989).

ACTIVITY 6

TEAM-BUILDING ACTIVITY

Objective:

- To recognize the importance of clear and open communication in work groups

Time:

45–60 minutes

Materials:

- Several sets of Legos, Tinkertoys, or other colored building blocks

Instructions:

1. Divide participants into groups of 10–12 people, and divide each of those groups in two: architects and builders. The builders are asked to wait in another room. A time limit is set for each of the tasks.
2. Architects are given the necessary pieces, all the same color, and are told that they have 20 minutes in which to develop written instructions for assembling structure out of the building materials for the builders. The architects may not touch the building pieces.
3. The builders' job is to assemble the structure according to the architects' plans within a specified time.
4. Architects are told that they may not talk to the builders. Architects observe how their plans are carried out by the builders.
5. After completion, large-group discussion emphasizes the importance of communication. The activity leader may ask, "How did builders feel when they were asked to leave the room?" Architects may be asked, "How did you feel when the builders came in and said 'Aren't you ready for us yet?'" Discussion may also be used to create an awareness of the ways in which arbitrary regulations unnecessarily hamper teamwork and of the need of teams to question and challenge, when possible, those regulations. The activity informs participants about problems that may arise when policy makers or administration develops a plan or program without input from the service providers who will implement it.

Activity 6 is adapted from *A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training*, vol. V, by J.W. Pfeiffer & J.E. Jones. (eds.). Copyright © 1975 by Pfeiffer & Company, San Diego, CA. Used with permission.

ACTIVITY 7a

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES

Objective:

- To recognize preferred styles of conflict management

Time:

45–60 minutes with discussion

Materials:

- Worksheet on the following page
- Pencils
- Additional worksheets can be found in Phillips and Elledge (1989)

Instructions:

1. Distribute worksheet(s) to small groups of fewer than eight participants.
2. Ask participants to rank the alternative courses of action on the worksheet, from the most to the least desirable way of dealing with the conflict situation. Rank the most desirable course of action "1," the next most desirable "2," and so forth, ranking the least desirable or least appropriate action "5."
3. When the large group reconvenes, discuss the experiences of participants. For example, ask, "What influenced your decision about the best course of action?" or "When would you choose a different strategy?"

Variations:

Have participants choose partners with whom to discuss their results and their responses to situations; or ask participants to share, with partners, behavioral examples of how they use their dominant conflict management style within the teamwork context. Another adaptation is found in Parker and Kropp's (1992) *50 Activities for Team Building*. Participants rate the team's dominant mode of conflict management and place their ratings on a large graph on a flipchart. The activity leader can help the team consider individual perceptions and reach consensus about the team's style of conflict management.

Activity 7a was originally adapted from *The Team-Building Source Book* by S.L. Phillips & R.L. Elledge. Copyright © 1989 by Pfeiffer & Company, San Diego, CA. Used with permission.

Activity 7a is from Child Development Resources. (1996). *Trans/Team Outreach Training Materials*. Unpublished. (Available from CDR, Post Office Box 280, Norge, VA 23127-0280)

Additional worksheets can be found in Phillips and Elledge (1989).

ACTIVITY 7b

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES ACTIVITY WORKSHEET

Instructions:

Your task is to rank the five alternative courses of action with the case below from the most desirable or appropriate way of dealing with the conflict situation to the least desirable. Rank the *most* desirable course of action "1," the next most desirable "2," and so forth, ranking the *least* desirable or least appropriate action "5." Enter your rank for each item in the space next to each choice.

Jacqueline is the coordinator of an early intervention program. Recently she noticed that one of the staff from another program in the same agency has been coming over and talking to one of her staff (*not* on break time). The efficiency of Jacqueline's staff member seems to be falling off, and there have been some deadlines missed due to her inattention. Jacqueline thinks she detects some resentment among the rest of the staff. If you were Jacqueline, you would

__________ A. Talk to your staff member and tell her to limit her conversations during on-the-job time.

__________ B. Ask the agency director to tell the coordinator of the other project to keep her staff in line.

__________ C. Confront both staffers the next time you see them together (as well as the other coordinator, if necessary), find out what they are up to, and tell them what you expect of your staff members.

__________ D. Say nothing now; it would be silly to make something big out of something so insignificant.

__________ E. Try to put the rest of the staff at ease; it is important that they all work well together.

__________ F. OTHER: ____

____

Activity 7b is from Child Development Resources. (1996). *Trans/Team Outreach Training Materials.* Unpublished. (Available from CDR, Post Office Box 280, Norge, VA 23127-0280)

ACTIVITY 8

CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES

Objective:

- To practice and examine the process of reaching consensus

Time:

45–60 minutes

Materials:

- Trustworthiness of Occupations Worksheets
- Pencils

Content review:

Review the definition of consensus and the rules for reaching consensus. Consensus means that the "right" answer is the best collective judgment of the team. The purpose is not to argue or to win but to use conflict productively. Each member must accept responsibility for hearing and being heard. In consensus, there is no voting and no horse trading. Voting only measures the surface opinion of the majority. Horse trading or bartering is concession rather than true sharing.

Instructions:

1. Participants should work alone for 5–10 minutes to rank 15 occupations: clergy, used-car salesperson, auto mechanic, physician, college professor, army general, TV repairperson, labor union organizer, corporate executive, auto mechanic, judge, politician, news reporter, lawyer, and police officer. The rank order should be the same order of trustworthiness that they think 400 people in a university study used, from "1," most trusted, to "15," least trusted.
2. After the rankings are complete, participants work in small groups of 3–5 people. Each group must choose a timekeeper, spokesperson, and recorder and work to achieve consensus on a rank-ordered list.
3. Small groups discuss the following questions: What helped the process? What impeded the process? Who was influential and in what ways? How did the group discover and use its resources?
4. Spokespersons from each of the groups report on their experiences to the large group.

Note:

In Volume IV of Pfeiffer and Jones (1973), there is a variety of similar activities on pages 58–67, including "Life Crisis" and "Dating Preference" worksheets.

Variations:

Trans/Team Outreach (CDR, 1996) has created two adaptations. The "Waiting List Worksheet" is a scenario in which an early intervention program with a waiting list considers options for dealing with a referral of a child who has a diagnosed condition that will make her eligible. Working as above, the teams must reach consensus on the ranking of the range of options. A values clarification activity gives the team another chance to practice reaching consensus around the values that drive early intervention services.

Activity 8 is adapted from Pfeiffer and Jones (1973).

Early Intervention Therapy Team Member Roles. Additional Team Members. Early Intervention Therapy Team Approach. Services Offered to Children and Families.Â The Early Intervention Therapy Program Guidelines were developed with the generous support of practitioners and families. We would like to thank the following Advisory Group members for their valuable input: Lorraine Aitken, Supported Child Development Program.Â Research evidence indicates that teamwork results in more effective and efficient services than those provided individually (Cook, 1996 and Enderby, 2002, as cited in Soever, 2006). The Early Intervention Therapy Program uses a collaborative model in order to coordinate services and improve child and family outcomes. Work done by several associates with each doing a part but all subordinating personal prominence to the efficiency of the whole. Now for some more difficult questions: How do you come up with ideas to promote teamwork in the workplace? How do you inspire people to table their personal goals and glory for the benefit of the team? How can you bring more collaboration to your company culture?Â Vulnerability in a team enables members to help each other out, which in turn builds trust and bonding, solidifying value-based teamwork. Unfortunately, most people donâ€™t like to be vulnerable. Thatâ€™s why you need to develop a concrete plan for encouraging vulnerability and building trust. Effective teamwork results from: a team whose membership, size and resources match the task. good leadership and attention to team-building. commitment by team members to understand and identify with one another's goals. the development of team goals â€“ a shared vision.Â AMEC Design is committed to interdisciplinary teamwork from the very early stages of design projects. AMEC regularly runs two-day â€˜Designing Togetherâ€™ workshops as part of its staff development programme. Held at a training centre and led by an experienced facilitator, the aims of the workshops are to promote understanding of the various skills owned by the different professions, to develop presentation and teamworking skills and to provide an environment where innovation can be explored without risk.