1-1-2013

Measuring Team Cohesiveness in the Marshall University Summer Enrichment Program

Sara Fragale
fragale@marshall.edu

MEASURING TEAM COHESIVENESS IN THE MARSHALL UNIVERSITY SUMMER ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

A thesis submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Education Specialist

in
School Psychology

by
Sara Fragale

Approved by
Sandra S. Stroebel, Ph.D. Chairperson
Fred Jay Krieg, Ph.D.
Edna Meisel, Ed.D

Marshall University
May 2013

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates team cohesion among graduate students participating in the Marshall University Graduate College (MUGC) summer enrichment program. The purpose of the study was to use a team cohesiveness evaluation and expert ratings to determine if this evaluation is an accurate measure of team cohesiveness. A Spearman's rho correlation showed low correlation and non-significance between the team cohesiveness evaluation survey ratings by students in a consultation class and practicum class for each week that was examined. Results also showed low correlation and no significance between the ratings of students in a consultation class and practicum class and the expert panel rankings. There was also no significant difference between using raw and weighted scores. Results indicated that the MUGC summer enrichment program should re-evaluate the use of the Team Cohesiveness Evaluation survey.

CHAPTER 1

Review of Literature

Definitions: Teams and Collaboration

Teamwork and collaboration are essential parts of today's schools. However, we have a limited understanding of what they mean. Krieg (2010) defines a team as a small number of people with complementary skills who are equally committed to a common goal and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable. Collaboration can be defined as at least two coequal individuals working toward a common goal by voluntarily interacting in shared decision-making through direct interaction (Kennedy & Stewart, 2011). There are several benefits to teamwork and collaboration such as, provision of a sense of shared responsibility, increased communication within and across professional disciplines, and enlarged teaching repertoire of participants. Teamwork also allows teachers to establish more rewarding and long lasting social and professional relationships than those who labor in isolation (Gable & Manning, 1999). It also allows opportunities for educators and parents to work together to communicate and develop effective strategies as well as problem solve, monitor student progress and evaluate outcomes (Lee, n.d.).

Collaboration and teaming in schools

One type of team in schools is pre-referral Intervention Teams. Nationwide, 73% of state education departments currently require or recommend that schools use pre-referral interventions developed by teams, compared with 67% in 1989 (Yetter and Doll, 2007). According to WV Policy 2510, pre-referral intervention teams are required in every school. Student Assistance Teams, or SAT teams, receive training in referral procedures for multidisciplinary evaluation,

alternative education placements, disciplinary procedures, and other school processes. They conduct the problem-solving process that includes designing and monitoring implementation of interventions, receiving and processing written referrals from outside sources, and initiating early evaluation for special education and related services for students. SAT teams are created to prevent the escalation of students' learning and behavior problems. These teams are also referred to as pre-referral intervention teams, student assistance teams, teacher assistance teams, and child study teams (West Virginia Board of Education, 2012).

Pre-referral intervention teams are not the only means which requires collaboration in schools. A study done by Leonard and Leonard (2003) found that the most frequent forms of collaborative practices cited by 56 corresponding teachers included faculty meetings, department meetings, grade-level or subject area meetings, and special education meetings. A majority of schools have instructional intervention teams. Instructional Intervention teams conduct meetings that involve teachers to collaborate to address student needs and standards and are often found in elementary and middle schools (West Virginia Board of Education, 2012). They use classroom data and assessments to evaluate student needs, provide evidence based interventions, set goals, and monitor progress.

The Bush Administration's No Child Left Behind Act (2002) has greatly increased expectations for educators to do more to ensure that all students meet standards of learning performance, particularly measured by standardized testing procedures. Newly revised professional standards have been adopted that endorse the collaborative initiative. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards includes the proposition that effective teachers are members of learning communities and accomplished teachers contribute to the effectiveness of the school by working collaboratively with other professionals on instructional policies,

curriculum development and staff development. Two laws that also address collaboration in schools are the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). IDEA requires multidisciplinary teams in the development of Individualized Education Plans, and the ADA requires professionals within a school system to collaborate with each other and people from outside agencies in order to prevent discrimination against people with disabilities (U.S. Department of Education, 2006).

A study was conducted by Hunt, Soto, Maier, and Doering (2003) to investigate the effectiveness of a general education/special education collaborative teaming process in increasing the social and academic participation of elementary students with significant disabilities and students at risk in general education classrooms. They found that consistent implementation of unified plans of support developed through a collaborative teaming process increased the students' engagement in classroom activities. There was also an increase in interactions initiated by some students. Interactions with general and special education classmates rose to levels substantially above those of their peers. Results suggest that the unified plans of support from the teaming process made it possible to focus efforts on those students who required intensive and comprehensive interventions for success and to provide the general education teachers with additional resources to implement the support plans.

What are effective teams and what do they consist of?

Collaboration is an essential part of effective teams. As most of the current educational reforms call for extensive collaboration, the demands on schools and teachers are greater. Research has shown that successful schools create structures that allow teachers to collaborate on the challenges they face (Center for Collaborative Education, 2001). Instead of working in

isolated classrooms without interaction with their colleagues, teachers in successful schools come together to discuss ideas, share practices and plan curriculum (Center for Collaborative Education, 2001).

A study done by Yetter and Doll (2007) investigated the impact of logistical resources on the acceptability of student assistance team consultation. Elementary and middle school staff completed a measure of the acceptability of pre-referral intervention team procedures, while also rating the importance of five logistical supports for effective team functioning. A multiple regression analysis showed that the team process was more acceptable to staff who perceived these teams as effective in helping students and to staff who identified three supports for effective teaming. An effective collaborative teaming process involves regular, positive face-to-face interactions, a structure for addressing the issues, monitoring, as well as a clear individual accountability for agreed-upon responsibilities (Hunt et al., 2003).

According to Gostick and Elton (2010), there are five important traits of an effective team: goal setting, communications, trust, accountability, and recognition. When leaders combined these basic 4 leadership characteristics with frequent purpose-based recognition, team morale was twice as high. Research also showed that when these traits are shared by members, as well as leaders, members are more engaged in their work and deliver superior results. Data shows that employees become more engaged if they believe their teams, leaders, and organizations set clear goals, communicate openly, build trust, hold them accountable, and recognize great work. Only four percent of employees felt part of an engaging team environment when none of their basic 4 plus recognition needs is met. A team that incorporates the five essential traits will find that almost nine out of ten employees are fully engaged (Gostick & Elton, 2010).

Goal setting is important, because it allows the team to develop a shared vision, mission, and set of values. It allows a team to decide what they want to accomplish. According to Thomas (n.d.), a goal is a situation or condition that will exist in the future and that is considered desirable by members of an organization. Goals shape the direction in which a team wants to go, and they provide a foundation for accountability and performance. When goals are not clear, the team declines (Gostick & Elton, 2010). The best goals are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely. Goals can be planned through team meetings or other various kinds of strategic planning.

The next characteristic is communication. It is the primary vehicle through which groups accomplish their goals. Research suggests that effective team performance is related to the quantity and quality of communication. Effective teams communicate more and better than less effective teams (Driskell, Salas, Goodwin, & O'Shea, 2006). Communication allows team members to clearly define and delegate responsibilities, as well as, exchange ideas and information in a clear and timely matter. According to research, other effective communication behaviors include: exchanging information in a timely manner, acknowledging information, double checking that the intent of a message was received, clarifying ambiguity, and appropriately using verbal and nonverbal cues (Driskell, et al., 2006). While these communication skills are vital, it is important to add that listening is also an important part of communication. Team members must listen to one another to develop mutual knowledge and understanding (Mickan & Roger, 2000). If people do not comprehend the messages they get from co-workers or managers, communication fails, goals are missed, and trust is shattered. When communication is open, honest, and clear to all parties, it helps team members to

understand one another's motivations and intentions. It can establish where they are, where they want to go, and how they get there (Gostick & Elton, 2010).

A third characteristic is trust. Trust originates from self-knowledge and competence and must be built slowly among members (Mickan & Roger, 2000). Dirks (1999) proposed that high trust leads to greater commitment, greater effort, and greater cooperation. It is believed that high trust team members are more likely to seek and receive feedback from others, engage in activities, resolve conflicts, ensure smoother interpersonal relations among team members, and communicate more openly (Driskell, et al., 2006). Trust is the most difficult trait to obtain and maintain; however, it is as critical to success. A problem with trust is that most employers believe co-workers already trust them, when in fact, trust is rare in most work environments and takes time and work to develop. Trust involves occasionally accepting blame, letting go of control, and placing greater faith in your colleagues (Gostick & Elton, 2010).

A fourth trait is accountability. Mutual accountability refers to holding each team member equally responsible. It means that a person, or a group of people, is responsible for the outcome, whether good or bad. Effective teams must adopt the motto, "we win as a team; we lose as a team". If team members do not develop this trait, it can lead to blaming other members for a loss and in return destroy chemistry (Gostick & Elton, 2010).

The last trait is recognition. Recognition refers to being able to appreciate other team members' roles and responsibilities. This trait requires trust. Team members have to trust one another to do their job and accomplish what is needed. Five thousand employees and managers who attended a recognition training session were surveyed. More than one half reported that it had been at least six months since they were last publicly appreciated by their bosses. More than

one third said it had been a year or longer. Another study found that an increase in recognition and praise leads to lower employee turnover, higher customer loyalty and satisfaction scores, an increase in overall team productivity and profitability. The U.S. Department of Labor statistics show that the number one reason people leave organizations is that they do not feel appreciated (Gostick & Elton, 2010).

Barriers to Collaboration

Although there are many benefits to teamwork and collaboration, there are also barriers to overcome. Teachers might be hesitant because of the change that comes along with collaboration. Previously, the teacher environment included classroom isolation and individual planning. However, now they are entering an environment where teamwork, collaboration, and communication with other teachers are required. This change can be hard to adapt to, especially if an educator has been in the field a long time. Teachers must learn to work collaboratively, establish equitable responsibilities among team members, and set attainable goals for the team (Flowers, Mertens, & Mulhall, 2000).

The research on professional collaboration has identified a number of prevailing barriers. Leonard and Leonard (2003) stated that teachers felt as though lack of time was a major problem in their schools. One high school teacher stated, “So many programs activities, etc. that we are involved in planning and conducting until no time is left for professional collaboration” (Leonard & Leonard, 2003). Teachers also stated that any extra time they do have is spent on developing lesson plans, helping children with make-up work, copying papers, gathering materials for lessons and completing school committee work. Leonard and Leonard (2003) found that lack of commitment by teachers was also an issue in their school. Respondents mentioned teachers who

were lazy or wished to avoid additional work. Teachers are reluctant to accept new ideas. Furthermore, many respondents revealed that they do not receive appropriate compensation for the additional work of collaboration. (Leonard & Leonard, 2003).

Instrument Development

The most common method of data collection in educational and evaluation research is the use of questionnaires. Questionnaires help gather information about knowledge, attitudes, opinions, behaviors, facts, and so forth (Radhakrishna, 2007). A review of 748 research studies conducted in agricultural and extension education, found that 64% used questionnaires (Radhakrishna, Leite, and Baggett, 2003).

Boynton & Green (2004) suggest it is best to begin developing your instrument with clarifying the goals of your research and determine what information needs to be collected. After goals are clarified, one needs to determine whether the questionnaire is appropriate for what needs to be measured. Using an existing instrument should also be taken into account. The use of an already existing instrument can save time and resources. Next, determine if the instrument is valid and reliable. Does it measure what it claims to measure? Are results consistent across repeated samples or researchers? Research also found that a third of the studies reviewed did not report procedures for establishing validity (31%) or reliability (33%), which are important to reduce measurement error (Boynton & Green, 2004). After validity and reliability are determined, decide how to present your questions. There are several formats for questions, (e.g., yes/no, true/false, likert ratings scales, visual analogue scales, symbols, open ended questions, etc.). It is essential to decide which questions are best for your instrument. Next, determine if there is anything else that needs to be included in your questionnaire and decide on page format:

font, layout, etc. After question format is decided, determine how to select your sample and establish if any approval is needed, such as IRB.

Barkman (2002) lists six steps to designing quantitative instruments: (1) Clearly identify the outcome(s). An outcome is defined as the "change" one would expect to see as a result of participation in a program (Barkman, 2002); (2) Determine how to measure the achievement of that outcome(s); (3) Determine the specific detail to be measured under each outcome indicator; (4) Determine when to administer the instrument or make the observations; (5) Design the instrument. All instruments have three common elements (questions, response choices, demographics) that describe the characteristics of your participants; (6) Pilot test and revise the instrument.

Radhakrishna (2007) lists five steps to develop a valid and reliable questionnaire. (1) Gather background information. In this step, determine the purpose, objectives, research questions, and hypothesis, as well as the audience, their background, educational/readability levels, and access and process of selecting respondents. (2) Questionnaire conceptualization. In this step, create the statements and questions for the questionnaire. (3) Format and Data Analysis. In this step, write out the statements/questions, select appropriate scales of measurement, choose questionnaire layout, format, question ordering font size, front and back cover, and proposed data analysis. (4) Establishing Validity. Make a draft questionnaire and test validity. In this step, it is important to determine if the questionnaire is valid, if it represents the content and is appropriate for the sample/population, and if it is comprehensive to collect all information needed. (5) Establish Reliability. To determine the reliability a pilot test is usually performed.

National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (2013) suggests characteristics of good measurement instruments. They explain that practical issues are ones to consider, such as: cost, availability, training, ease of administration, scoring and analysis, time and effort required for respondents, completeness of data gathered, potential sources of bias, and relevance to research question. Reliability and validity are also important when considering which instrument to use. The instrument needs to be consistent to give accurate scores more than once. It also needs to measure what it is supposed to be measuring. When choosing or developing a questionnaire it is important to keep these steps in mind to reduce measurement errors. It is also important to pay attention to important details. Failing to follow proper procedures could lead to poor quality data, misleading conclusions, and/or unclear recommendations (Boynton & Greenhalgh, 2004).

Marshall University Summer Enrichment Program

The Marshall University Summer Enrichment Program is a six-week program offered to students from kindergarten through eighth grade and held during the summer for four days a week for six weeks. It is held at an area middle school. The program is designed to offer Marshall University graduate students a clinical experience leading to certification, licensure or completion of masters' degrees while also providing children an opportunity to participate in an activity-based learning experience. Counseling and individual assessment services are also provided (Krieg, Meikamp, O'Keefe, & Stroebel, 2006).

Students are recruited from local schools in a variety of ways, including parent contact and school referrals. Students also come from a variety of backgrounds, including children who are failing, children attempting to minimize summer loss of skills, socially maladaptive students,

developmentally young children, students with medical conditions, behaviorally difficult children, and children from different races (Krieg, et al., 2006).

Need for Study

In past years, graduate students of the MU Summer Enrichment Program completed a weekly survey called a, Thermometer. This instrument consisted of two questions designed to measure team cohesiveness. In 2011, Conaway conducted a study to determine the reliability and validity of the Thermometer. He, along with an expert on teaming, developed a new instrument, the Expert Rating Scale, which was designed to help determine if the Thermometer was a valid instrument. He found that the Thermometer did not correlate with questions from the Expert Rating Scale.

Pyles (2012) attempted to determine whether the Thermometer or the Expert Rating Scale was the better measure of team collaboration and which should be used in the future. She selected five questions from the Expert Rating Scale that were highly correlated with each other and entitled it the, Collaboration Survey. These five questions were designed to reflect the critical team components of structure, communication, trust, function, and recognition respectively (Pyles, 2012). She compared the instruments to independent ratings by expert raters and found that the Thermometer correlated best with the expert raters.

Kreig & Stroebel (2013) concluded that collaborative teams equate to cohesive groups. In light of additional information, another attempt was made to develop an effective instrument for assessing team collaboration in the MUGC summer enrichment program. The Team Cohesiveness Evaluation was developed based on the work of Gostick and Elton (2010). This instrument includes an assessment of five traits which have been found to be important in

teaming: goal setting, communication, trust, accountability, and recognition. The Team Cohesiveness Evaluation was administered weekly during the 2012 MUGC summer enrichment program. The current study will evaluate Team Cohesiveness Evaluation by comparing it to expert ratings and using multiple raters.

CHAPTER II

Method

Subjects

Participants included all 59 graduate students participating in the Marshall University Summer Enrichment Program, divided into 7 teams. Each team worked with a different age group ranging from Kindergarten through eighth grade. The teams consisted of graduate students from four different programs: school psychology, special education, literacy, and school counseling. These teams collaborated to develop lesson plans, to identify students who needed extra help, to provide academic and behavioral interventions, and to evaluate student performance and progress.

Instruments

The Team Cohesiveness Evaluation was used to assess team cohesiveness in the MUGC summer enrichment program (See Appendix A). This survey consisted of five questions and assessed how well their team performed regarding five team characteristics: goal setting, communication, trust, mutual accountability, and recognition. For each characteristic they were to rate their team on a scale of 1 to 7, with one being poor and 7 being excellent. A total score was then calculated by adding up the scale responses. Finally, a team average was calculated. To discourage participants from reporting indifferent feelings, a score of 4, which would normally indicate neutral, was not provided as an option.

Procedure

Each week participants completed a Team Cohesiveness Evaluation Survey to assess the cohesiveness of their own team. All surveys were anonymous, with participants only recording the number of their team for identification purposes. The date was also recorded to show which survey corresponded with which week. Students trained in the team process, as a part of consultation class, observed one of the seven teams and completed the Team Cohesiveness Evaluation survey on a weekly basis. In addition to Team Cohesiveness Evaluation surveys, a panel of experts also rated the teams on team cohesiveness and collaboration. Experts observed the teams during the program and then rated them at the end of the program by ranking teams ordinally. Expert raters used a scale of 1-7 to rank the teams for cohesiveness. This panel consisted of four supervising faculty members. Some of the faculty had more knowledge of teams than others.

CHAPTER III

Results

Relationships between the data sets were examined using Spearman's Rho correlation. This statistic was used due to the non-parametric, ranked data that was collected. It should be noted that team members' individual scores from the Team Cohesiveness Evaluation survey were averaged to give a single team score. This was needed because there were different numbers of practicum members per team compared to the number of observers per team and also because the Expert Panel gave one score per team. Scores were calculated using raw scores and then calculated by weighting the different questions due to estimated significance. Since there was also no difference in correlation when using raw scores, as opposed to weighted scores, raw scores were used for all correlations reported in this study.

Spearman's Rho correlation showed a low correlation and no significant relationship between the Team Cohesiveness survey scores from the participating practicum students and the Team Cohesiveness survey scores from the observers from the consultation class for weeks 2-5. No data from the SPSY 740 teams were collected during week one due to orientation activities. Appendix B gives the Spearman's Rho results tables that show the correlation results for weeks 2 through 5.

Spearman's Rho correlation showed low correlation and no significant relationship between the Team Cohesiveness survey scores from the participating practicum students and the Expert Panel rankings from week 5. Week 5 was the only week that the Expert Panel ranked the teams. Spearman's Rho correlation showed low correlation and no significant relationship between the Team Cohesiveness survey scores from the observing students from the consultation

class and the Expert Panel rankings from Week 5. Appendix C gives the Spearman's Rho results in tables that show the correlation results for week 5.

Chapter IV

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the Team Cohesiveness Evaluation survey was an effective measure of team collaboration. Based on the non-significant results from the Spearman's Rho correlation, it is suggested that the Marshall University summer enrichment program should re-evaluate the use of the Team Cohesiveness Evaluation survey to assess team cohesiveness. The Team Cohesiveness Evaluation did not correlate with the expert raters' rankings nor did it show a correlation between the participants and the observers.

As discussed in the literature review, team cohesion is a critical component of an effective team. In past years, students participating in the summer enrichment program were asked to fill out the Thermometer scales. Conaway (2011) found low correlations between the Thermometer and the Expert Rating Scale, yet a statement could not be made concerning which was the better measure because he did not have an independent measure of collaboration in the study.

In response to this, Pyles (2012) compared five highly correlated questions from the Expert Rating Scale with the Thermometer. She entitled the new instrument the Collaboration Survey. Pyles found that the Collaboration Survey did not add anything once the thermometer was placed into the equation; therefore, the Thermometer was actually the better measure of how well one's team functions. In an effort to find a better instrument to measure team cohesiveness, the Team Cohesiveness Evaluation survey was developed. This survey was based on the research of Gostick and Elton (2010). This study is the first step in determining if the Team Cohesiveness Evaluation is a reliable and valid instrument for measuring team cohesiveness.

Limitations

A limiting factor in this study is the clarity of the questions on the Team Cohesiveness Evaluation Scale. Graduate students were from different programs and were not all familiar with the concepts on the scale. There was training on teaming but some students may not have made the connection between the scale and the concepts covered in the presentation. Although the evaluation included descriptions of what each factor was, confusion could still have contributed to low correlations.

Another limiting factor is the amount of effort required to complete the evaluation. The evaluation consists of five questions to be rated 1-7. Each category also included descriptors to read explaining the category. This required participants to analyze each component which takes time, which is limited during the summer program.

A third limiting factor is the lack of interest in this survey. It appeared that some students actually read and filled out the evaluation based on real answers, while others just simply picked ratings without attentiveness. Due to the different level of expectation regarding the importance of teaming, students who were not in the school psychology program may not have seen the importance of this survey. This limitation could have contributed to the low correlation between scores. Students may also have felt that the scores would affect their grade in some way, therefore, resulting in a tendency to select higher scores.

A final concern is that there was also no criteria which the expert raters used to rate the team. Each expert rater simply ranked the teams based on their understanding of what an effective or good team is.

Future Research

In order to address some of the above stated concerns, the survey could be further simplified so participants can better understand what they are rating and so that it is less time consuming. Or perhaps review the survey with students during orientation so that students have a chance to ask questions. This review could also allow time to stress the importance of measuring collaboration and the need to answer the surveys correctly.

Another suggestion would be to have the expert raters evaluate the teams using the same instrument as the students, instead of rank ordering them so that the experts are not forced into selecting a "poor team". The expert raters should at a minimum be given criteria to use when evaluating the teams.

The development of an instrument is a complex process. An important first step is the examination of the validity and reliability of the instrument. This study helped the MUGC summer enrichment program gain more understanding of the dynamics of evaluating team collaboration.

References

Barkman, Susan J. (2002). A field guide to designing quantitative instruments to measure program impact. Retrieved from http://sharepoint.agriculture.purdue.edu/ces/development/evaluation/Shared%20Documents/QuantitativeFieldGuide.pdf

Boynton, Petra M., & Greenhalgh, Trisha. (2004). Selecting, designing, and developing your questionnaire. BMJ, 328.

Center for Collaborative Education. (2001). Turning points: Transforming middle schools. Retrieved from http://www.turningpts.org/pdf/Teams.pdf

Conaway, J. B. (2011). *Team collaboration between groups in the Marshall University summer enrichment program.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marshall University Graduate College, South Charleston, West Virginia, United States.

Dirks, K. (1999). The effects of interpersonal trust on work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 445-455

Driskell, J., Salas, E., Goodwin, G., & O'Shea, P. (2006). What makes a good team player? Personality and team effectiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*,

10(4), 249-271

Flowers, N., Mertens, S. B., & Mulhall, P. F. (2000). What makes interdisciplinary teams effective? *Middle School Journal.* Retrieved from http://www.cprd.illinois.edu/files/MSJ%20article%20March%202000.pdf

Gable, R., & Manning, L. (1999) Interdisciplinary teaming: Solution to instructing heterogeneous groups of students. *Clearing House*, *72*(3), 182-185

Gostick, A. & Elton, C. (2010). The orange revolution. New York, NY: Free Press.

Hunt, P., Soto, G., Maier, J., & Doering, K. (2003). Collaborative teaming to support students at risk and students with severe disabilities in general education classrooms. *Exceptional Children*, *69*(3), 315-332

Kennedy, S & Stewart, H. (2011). Collaboration between occupational therapists and teachers: Definitions, implementation, and efficacy. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 58, 209-214.

Krieg, F.J. (2010). Team building [PowerPoint Slides]. Department of School Psychology, Marshall University Graduate College, South Charleston, West Virginia.

Krieg, F.J., Meikamp, J., O'Keefe, S. & Stroebel, S. S. (2006). Field-based experience in light of changing demographics. Trainer's Forum, 25, 15-17

Kreig, F.J., & Stroebel, S.S. (2013). Creating collaborative school teams. Paper presented at National Association of School Psychologists, Seattle, WA.

Lee, Hwa. (n.d.). Collaboration: A must for teachers in inclusive educational settings. College of Education and Human Services, Seton Hall University.

Leonard, L. & Leonard, P. (2003). The continuing trouble with collaboration: Teachers talk. *Current Issues in Education*, *6*(15). Retrieved from http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume6/number 15/

Mickan, S. & Rodger, S. (2000) Characteristics of effective teams: A literature review. *Australian Health Review, 23,* 201–208.

National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. (2013). Characteristics of good measurement instruments. Retrieved from http://www.servicelearning.org/service-learning-research-primer/characteristics-good-measurement-instruments

Pyles, M. (2012). *Measuring team collaboration in the Marshall University Summer Enrichment Program.* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Marshall University Graduate

College, South Charleston, West Virginia, United States.

Radhakrishna, Rama B. (2007). Tips for developing and testing questionnaires/instruments. Journal of Extension. *45*(1).

Thomas, C. (n.d). Team building and goal setting. [PowerPoint Slides]. Ed Thomas Leadership. Retrieved from http://www.masc.sc/SiteCollectionDocuments/MEO_TeamBuildingHandouts.pdf

United States Department of Education (2006). Individualized education programs (IEP) team meetings and changes to the IEP. Retrieved from http://www.ideapartnership.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=845&oseppage=1

West Virginia Board of Education. (2012). Support for Personalized Learning: Guidance for West Virginia schools and districts.

West Virginia Department of Education: State Board Policy 2419. (2012). Education of Exceptional Students. Retrieved from http://apps.sos.wv.gov/adlaw/csr/readfile.aspx?DocId=23475&Format=PDF

Yetter, G., & Doll, B. (2007). The impact of logistical resources on prereferral team.

Psychology Quarterly, *22*(3), 340-357.

APPENDIX A

Team Cohesiveness Evaluation

Team Number _____ Date _____

1. Goal Setting
   A. Understand mission vision, objectives, goal setting
   B. Demonstrate planning toward goals and objectives
   C. Effective use of time
   D. Effective Use of Resources

   1 2 3 5 6 7

2. Communication
   A. Direct, open, honest
   B. Changes in plans are communicated prior to implementation
   C. Members are open to input
   D. Members interact primarily to share information
   E. Good listening skills

   1 2 3 5 6 7

3. Trust
   A. Each member believes what other members are saying
   B. Appear to collaborate versus cooperate
   C. Delegate responsibility versus “I’ll take care of it”
   D. View conflict as positive
      1 2 3 5 6 7

4. Mutual Accountability
   A. Share decision-making
   B. Accept feedback from each other
   C. Separate person’s ideas from feelings about that person
      1 2 3 5 6 7

5. Recognition
   A. Genuine appreciation of each other’s accomplishments
   B. Recognize and appreciate complimentary role functions
   C. Accepts feedback from supervisors
      1 2 3 5 6 7

APPENDIX B

Correlation between SPSY 740 ratings compared to SPSY 617 ratings

Significance tested at $p < 0.05$

Correlations

			SPSY 740 WEEK 5	SPSY 617 WEEK 5
Spearman's rho	SvnFrtyWk5m	Correlation Coefficient		.029
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.957
		N	6	6
	SxSvntWk5	Correlation Coefficient	.029	
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.957	.
		N	6	6

Correlations

			SPSY 740 WEEK 4	SPSY 617 WEEK 4
Spearman's rho	SvnFrtyWk4	Correlation Coefficient		-.657
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.156
		N	6	6
	SxSvntWk4	Correlation Coefficient	-.657	
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.156	.
		N	6	6

Correlations

			SPSY 740 WEEK 3	SPSY 617 WEEK 3
Spearman's rho	SvnFrtyWk3	Correlation Coefficient		-.771
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.072
		N	6	6
	SxSvntWk3	Correlation Coefficient	-.771	
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.072	.
		N	6	6

Correlations

			SPSY 740 WEEK 2	SPSY 617 WEEK 2
Spearman's rho	SvnFrtyWk2	Correlation Coefficient		-.700
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.188
		N	5	5
	SxSvntWk2	Correlation Coefficient	-.700	
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.188	.
		N	5	5

Appendix C

Correlation between SPSY 740 ratings and SPSY 617 compared to Expert Panel rankings for Week 5

Significance tested at $p < 0.05$

Correlations

			EXPERT WEEK 5	SPSY 617 WEEK 5
Spearman's rho	ExprtWk5m	Correlation Coefficient		.143
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.787
		N	6	6
	SxSvntWk5	Correlation Coefficient	.143	
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.787	.
		N	6	6

Correlations

			SPSY 740 WEEK 5	EXPERT WEEK 5
Spearman's rho	SvnFrtyWk5	Correlation Coefficient		.357
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.432
		N	7	7
	ExpertWk5	Correlation Coefficient	.357	
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.432	.
		N	7	7

APPENDIX D

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY
www.marshall.edu

Office of Research Integrity

April 11, 2013

Sandra S. Stroebel Ph.D. NCSP
Associate Professor/Program Director
School Psychology Program
Marshall University
100 Angus E. Peyton Drive
South Charleston, WV 25303-1600

Dear Dr. Stroebel:

This letter is in response to the submitted abstract for the evaluation of the Marshall University Summer Enrichment Program (MUSEP). After assessing the abstract it has been deemed not to be human subject research and therefore exempt from oversight of the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The Code of Federal Regulations (45CFR46) has set forth the criteria utilized in making this determination. Since the information in this study consists solely of a program evaluation involving deidentified data it is not human subject research and therefore not subject to Common Rule oversight. If there are any changes to the abstract you provided then you will need to resubmit that information for review and determination.

I appreciate your willingness to submit the abstract for determination. Please feel free to contact the Office of Research Integrity if you have any questions regarding future protocols that may require IRB review.

Sincerely,

Bruce F. Day, Th.D., CIP
Director
Office of Research Integrity