Team Effectiveness Profiler

Communications Team Report
February 2020

Team Effectiveness Profiler

Guidelines on the use of the tep report

This report consists of two sections.

SECTION ONE: TEAM PROFILE

The first section presents MEAN scores (shown as yellow) for the group on each of the 12 scales. This is supplemented by an indication of the RANGE of responses (shown as blue). For the MEAN scores (yellow), facilitators should note the following interpretive guidelines:

♦ Very Low or High scores suggest that the overall team view is **EXTREMELY** like the scale description.

♦ Scores close to the extremes suggest that the overall team view is **VERY** like the scale description.

♦ Scores moving towards the extremes suggest that the overall team view is **QUITE** like the scale description.

♦ Scores close to but not at the average suggest that the overall team view is **FAIRLY** like the scale description.

♦ Scores at the average are TYPICAL for teams generally.

♦ Decimals have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

The **RANGE** of responses (blue) is important since it provides an indication of the degree of agreement between team members. The narrower the range, the more likely it is that team members share the same view.

SECTION TWO: SCALE DISTRIBUTIONS

The second section provides a detailed breakdown of the actual (anonymous) responses. This breakdown allows facilitators to see graphically how each of the respondents rated the team on each of the 12 scales.

Team Effectiveness Profiler
Section One

LEADERSHIP

Scale labels:	Extremely	Very	Quite	Fairly	Average	Fairly	Quite	Very	Extremely

AVERAGE / RANGE		
AVERAGE Average **RANGE** Fairly low to Fairly high	Uncertain about role. Unsure what responsibilities are. Ambiguity about nature and purpose of job.	**Role clarity** Clear understanding of role. Knows what is expected/required. Lack of ambiguity about purpose of job.
AVERAGE Average **RANGE** Average to Fairly high	May feel overlooked or not listened to. Poor communication with team leader.	**Communication** Sound upward communication. Open, candid dealings.
AVERAGE Average **RANGE** Quite low to Very high	Decision making is top down. Team members uninvolved. Directive rather than consultative style.	**Decision making** Feels involved in decision making processes. Democratic teamworking. Consultative decision making style.
AVERAGE Average **RANGE** Quite low to Quite high	Under resourced. May lack the necessary tools, people, time etc to get the job done.	**Resources** Provided with the right resources (time, materials, people etc) to do the job.

LEADERSHIP

The team's results for Leadership are typical for teams generally - that is to say they fall at the average. However, the overall score is only one part of the story.

This team will want to explore the broad range of scores around the decision-making process. To what extent do all team members feel that they are either consulted or allowed to participate in decisions that have to be made?

Similarly, there appears to be a lower consensus around the adequacy of resources provided.

More encouragingly, the ranges of scores for both role clarity and communication are tighter, but nevertheless some discussion needs to take place about how things might be even better.

Overall, these results suggest that the team will benefit from sharing their thoughts openly about how the team can move forward.

tep

COHESIVENESS

		Extremely	Very	Quite	Fairly	Average	Fairly	Quite	Very	Extremely	
AVERAGE Average / **RANGE** Very low to Fairly high	Competition more evident than collaboration and co-operation. Lack of team identity.				[yellow at Fairly]						**Collaboration** Emphasis on co-operation and working together. Supportive environment. Sense of team belonging.
AVERAGE Fairly low / **RANGE** Extremely low to Average	Interpersonal or work-related difference ignored or allowed to affect work.			[yellow at Fairly]							**Conflict resolution** Differences resolved with mutual regard. Problems not allowed to fester.
AVERAGE Fairly low / **RANGE** Extremely low to Fairly high	Lack of trust and respect. Suspicions over motives.			[yellow at Fairly]							**Trust** Mutual respect. Openness in dealings.
AVERAGE Average / **RANGE** Fairly low to Quite high	Team goals and values may be out of step with personal values. Unease about team operation or goals.					[yellow at Fairly]					**Values** Personal goals and values congruent with those of team/organisation.

COHESIVENESS

This domain is perhaps the area that needs to be addressed as the top priority. It is hard to see how the team can consolidate its position across the piece without coming to terms with what is happening in terms of conflict resolution and an apparent lack of trust and/or respect where over or around a half of the team have concerns.

Although there is some evidence of a convergence of values and some sense of belonging, there is still some way to go to re-boot team cohesiveness.

Overall, these results point to this area as the primary focus for this team's further development.

Team Effectiveness Profiler
Section One

ENERGIES

		Extremely	Very	Quite	Fairly	Average	Fairly	Quite	Very	Extremely	
AVERAGE Average / **RANGE** Average to Quite high	Lack of buzz and energy. Unequal effort and contribution within the team.					🟨 [blue bar: Average to Quite]					**Energy** Team displays high levels of energy. Members all contribute.
AVERAGE Quite low / **RANGE** Very low to Average	Negative; pessimistic approach. Team may be overwhelmed by problems.		[blue bar: Very to Fairly]	🟨							**Positivity** A positive, optimistic team. Sees challenges as opportunities.
AVERAGE Average / **RANGE** Quite low to Quite high	Lack of focus. No clear sense of purpose or direction.				🟨	[blue bar: Quite low to Quite high]					**Focus** Able to maintain focus on goals and targets. Team avoids distractions.
AVERAGE Average / **RANGE** Fairly low to Fairly high	Team feels at the mercy of external forces. Fate and/or luck affect performance.					🟨 [blue bar: Fairly low to Fairly high]					**Locus of control** Team sees itself as master of own destiny. Works to overcome challenges.

ENERGIES

There is some evidence of the team having a reasonable level of energy, focus and a sense that they have some control over their destiny. This is to be fostered and encouraged.

However, the scores around pessimism need to be addressed. Is there a connection here with the feedback around cohesion and maybe issues related to involvement?

Overall, the possible negativity and its relationship with conflict resolution and trust should be seen as a priority.

tep

Role Clarity

Communication

Decision making

Resources

Collaboration

Conflict resolution

Trust

Values

Energy

Positivity

Focus

Locus of control