[Journal of Executive Education](https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/jee)

Volume 2 | Issue 2 Article 2

November 2013

Integrated Team Development Methodologies for Managers in an E.M.B.A. Program: A Case Study

Anthony J. Mento
Loyola College in Maryland, amento@loyola.edu

Raymond M. Jones
Loyola College in Maryland, rjones@loyola.edu

Harsha B. Desai
Loyola College in Maryland, hdesai@loyola.edu

Integrated Team Development Methodologies for Managers in an EMBA Program: A Case Study

Anthony J. Mento, Raymond M. Jones, and Harsha B. Desai

Abstract

Established in 1973, Loyola College's Executive MBA (EMBA) program is one of the first ten such programs in the United States. A primary focus of our program is the development of effectively functioning executive teams. The main contribution of our paper is the integration of several creative team development methodologies that are applied over the course of the EMBA program. Specific practices are described which are transferable to a broad range of organizational contexts. The paper concludes with a set of lessons learned regarding team functioning based on our collective forty-four years experience in executive development and education.

Introduction

A hallmark of many EMBA programs is the use of study teams for the duration of the program. The implicit premise is that skills and competencies developed and refined by working together effectively on class teams will transfer directly to the work environment. In most organizations, groups and teams are found everywhere. Teams come in all shapes and forms such as new product teams, cross-functional teams, business process reengineering teams, continuous improvement teams, and autonomous work groups. A primary focus of Loyola College's EMBA program is on the development of teams. We are fully aware of the distinction between groups and teams elaborated on by Katzenbach and Smith (1993), and the role these different units play in the process of leading change (Katzenbach and Beckett, Dichter, Feigen, Gagnon, Hope, and Ling, 1995). For our purposes, however, we will treat the two terms synonymously.

Anthony J. Mento, Ph.D. is a Professor of Management at Loyola College in Maryland.

Raymond M. Jones, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor of Management and International Business at Loyola College in Maryland.

Harsha B. Desai, Ph.D. is a Professor of Management and International Business and the Director of the Center of Closely Held Firm at Loyola College in Maryland.

According to Locke, Tirnauer, Roberson, Goldman, Latham, and Weldon (1997), there are at least three important reasons for using groups or teams at work: the first reason is <u>knowledge</u>; other things being equal (e.g., intelligence, experience, and effort), teams possess more knowledge than individuals. More precisely, five knowledgeable individuals can know more than one, especially when each has expertise in a different field or specialty. The second reason is the <u>capability for action</u>. An effective group of people can accomplish tasks that no individual could accomplish alone, such as building a cathedral, producing a new computer, or running a lean manufacturing operation. The third reason is <u>coordination</u>; a team serves as an effective means to coordinate the actions of individuals so that tasks are accomplished more efficiently or effectively.

Experienced managers are aware that a good measure of their success depends on their effectiveness in building well-functioning teams (Hill, 1994). In his research on key differences between effective and ineffective managers, Gabarro (1987) quoted a consumer goods division manager who had successfully turned around a number of organizations:

"From the first few days it was obvious that there was no inter-working between people (his direct reports). And compared with the need for a standard cost system, this was even more important. I can live without a standard cost system at least for a while. But I can't turn around the division if I can't get people to pull together. But this is a lot more of a subtle thing than getting a new system in place. You can't mandate that people work together as a team. You can't mandate that as a priority - that is unless you're a fool. These things come subtly. People have to want to work together; they have to see how to do it. There has to be an environment for it and that takes time. It's my highest priority right now, but I don't write it down because it's not like other priorities. If I told corporate that building a team was my prime goal they'd tell me, so what? They'd expect that as part of making things better."

In a paper that analyzed competitive dynamics in the leadership and executive development field, Fulmer and Vicera (1996) identified trends shaping the transformation of the field. Their interpretation of survey data led them to conclude that one of the most significant trends was team development and facilitation throughout the duration of an educational program.

Lerner (1995) noted that the use of teams or work groups in MBA programs simulates real-world experiences of project teams and task forces. In our EMBA program, teams are involved in activities such as designing marketing studies, consulting with small businesses, researching and writing case studies, running simulated international businesses, and designing information systems for local businesses. Lerner points out that working in a group in an MBA program can be problematic for students for a number of reasons, including the difficulty of dealing with a troublesome team member, the belief that more and better work can be accomplished alone, and the struggle with interpersonal and group dynamics. Often professors don't want to take the time dealing with behavioral issues arising from intra-group conflict, especially since there are usually no clear-cut or easily implemented solutions.

Despite best intentions and use of materials designed to familiarize students with the dynamics of the team process, teams inevitably encounter problems over the course of their two years together (which encompasses the EMBA experience in our institution). The type and severity of team problems have been fairly consistent across the years with severe team problems (i. e., those threatening the existence of the team) in the distinct minority. It is almost inevitable that problems arise on teams due to the challenging projects that must be completed within the context of time pressures, work and family pressures, and perceived pressure for a high grade. Some literature on student teams illustrates the problems and subsequent solutions.

A study by Heimovics, Taylor, and Stillwell (1996) highlights key components of their EMBA program at the Henry W. Bloch School of Business and Policy Administration at the University of Missouri -Kansas City. Some of the new components of their program that have been operational in ours since 1992 include an initial residency at the start of the program, affiliation with the Washington Campus to familiarize students with external legislative and regulatory issues that can impact on their business, and an international residency. For our purposes, we will focus on how the use of teams is explicitly dealt with in their program. One of the purposes of the initial residency at the Bloch School's EMBA program is to create relationships among program participants. Participants are placed into study groups and work together on projects such as the strategic assessment of an organization. A 20-month small group course dealing with group problem solving and team member skills is used to provide feedback regarding individual behavior.

A study by Schlesinger (1996) reported on Babson College's (in Massachusetts) one-year integrated full-time MBA program. It appears that not much attention was explicitly focused on team issues. An initial two- week residency was required for entering students and included team building exercises and two group projects. The remainder of the summer session for new students involved among other things, integrated sessions on themes like Total Quality Management (TQM), Managing Change, Information Technology, and Managing Innovation. Upon completion of the summer session, the new student cohort joined the second year MBA students. Students were arbitrarily assigned to groups for group exams. Peer evaluations of group exam performance were solicited from the assigned groups. Schlesinger concludes that this one-time peer evaluation was ineffective probably due to the fact that the groups had no training in setting expectations or in giving and receiving feedback.

A study by Young and Kram (1996) focused on team-taught cross-functional courses in Boston University's (BU) MBA program. A concern was to highlight what faculty had learned so far as well as propose specific strategies for addressing challenges posed by team teaching in BUs MBA program. Again our focus is on how team issues were dealt with. In BU's program, team skills are believed to be critical. The following discussion about teams pertains to their new and required integrative course, The Global Manager. Six to eight members are assigned to each team and they work on several projects during the semester as a team. Young and Kram (1996) state that it is expected that students will learn leadership skills, communication, how to handle conflict and how to value diversity through their team experiences. With respect to specific team activities, students take the Myers Briggs Type Inventory (MBTI) and spend one-half-day with the Career Center discussing their results with respect to career implications and work in groups. Students are encouraged to share MBTI information with their assigned team members. The authors note that teams at BU spend considerable time reflecting on and learning from group experience. Early in the program students develop a psychological contract as well as performance appraisal criteria. Students also are encouraged to record journal entries after each team meeting. At mid semester, instructors facilitate a structured exchange of student feedback (it is not clear whether the feedback is between professor and student or between team members). Peer appraisals are used, and a final paper at the end of the semester is required which captures the student's individual strengths and developmental needs for working with groups.

Michaelson (Michaelson, Fink, and Watson, 1994) and colleagues (Watson, Michaelson, and Sharp, 1991) have used an abundance of team activities in both their graduate and undergraduate courses. For a number of years, they have used a six-step sequence to develop student teams' abilities to use concepts. A highlight of team learning is the use of pre-instructional mini-tests. Before each major block of materials in the course is introduced, students take the same tests individually, and then with their work groups. Both test scores are counted towards their grade; this seems to be the compelling performance context that Katzenbach et al. (1995) suggest are necessary for teams to develop. Benefits to students resulting from this experience are the development of influence skills, the understanding of the consequences of individual behavior, and improvement in interpersonal and group decision-making skills. Later in our paper, we will compare our approach to that of Michaelson's and his colleagues.

Our program is significantly different than all of those discussed in that we explicitly orchestrate and integrate a team focus in our program. Typical team problems which we have encountered over the years include concerns regarding free riding and social loafing, poor listening skills of members, lack of leadership, and difficulty in working with students of various cultures and ages. As suggested by Fisher, Shaw, and Ryder (1994), it is unrealistic to expect that the group process and content skills needed to successfully complete challenging group projects will spontaneously develop. In response to these issues and concerns, we have developed the following program. The main contribution of our paper is the integration of several creative team-based teaching methodologies to be applied over the course of the entire EMBA program. We will highlight exactly what we do in our program and what we have learned from our collective 44 years of teaching in EMBA programs.

EMBA Program Overview

Established in 1973, our EMBA program, was one of the first ten such programs in the U. S. Our program is designed to allow senior and upper-level executives to keep pace with an ever-changing business environment without interruption to their careers. Accordingly, the schedule is designed so that an MBA may be earned in two years. Each year begins with a residential period and continues with three 10-week sessions, alternating on Fridays and Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to 4:50 p.m. (refer to Appendix 1).

Admissions criteria are established to guarantee a wide range of student backgrounds and experiences as each student brings an established record of achievement and experience to class. The average age of our students is between 35 and 40 years old. Students are selected on the basis of three criteria: (1) management experience, potential, and achievement with emphasis placed on the individual's present position; (2) prior academic achievement as reflected by undergraduate and graduate performance; and (3) performance on the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) which can be waived at the discretion of the Admissions Committee. Our institution's graduate catalogue states: "Emphasis is placed on team effort with the result that effective group dynamics, which are established in the beginning of the program, are maintained throughout subsequent terms."

The EMBA Residency Course

For the past 8 years, all incoming executive MBA students are required to participate in a 4-day residency program. This extensive orientation program consists of attention focused on quantitative methods, team building, and getting acquainted exercises; assessment and training with the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator; discussion of the strategic aspects of the program with special emphasis on the international component; a decision-making simulation designed to expose students to the impact of legislation on business; and material on ethical and social responsibility. At the end of each conceptual block of material and at the end of class each day we assist students in developing a collective set of lessons learned from the experiences of the day. For our purposes, we will focus on team development activities (refer to Appendix 2).

Team Development Activities

During the first day of residency, students are assigned to teams for the duration of the program; we attempt to balance these teams with respect to quantitative skills and demographics. These newly formed teams are assigned reading materials such as Setting One's Pace: Sprints or Marathons? (Hertenstein, 1990) and Note: An Introduction to Team Building (Beer and Holland, 1989) which they discuss as their first exercise together as a team, then as an entire class to explore the meaning and implications of the materials. Next, based on Dyer's (1987) conceptual work on team building, students complete a goals- and-expectations sheet individually, then with their teams. They are told to consider group process issues such as listening, team leadership, and observation and rating of group effectiveness. The teams are again brought together as a class to discuss their perceptions, goals, and expectations. Students are then administered the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) by a faculty member experienced in Myers-Briggs, and instructed on how to score and determine their type. On completion, the class participates in a 2-hour session designed to highlight the potential strengths and weaknesses of individuals within a particular type, and to examine ways of effectively dealing with individuals on their team as a function of their type.

On day 2 of the residency, 4 hours are spent on the issue of conflict and conflict management, specifically the five styles of dealing with conflict: Forcing, Avoidance, Compromise, Accommodation, and Confrontation (Thomas, 1977). Time is also spent brainstorming the positive aspects of conflict and examining potential problems that might arise from the absence of conflict, such as groupthink (Janis, 1983). To make this discussion more meaningful, we watch the Groupthink video dealing with the space shuttle Challenger disaster. We also schedule a panel discussion with three carefully selected members of our second-year EMBA class. This panel discusses team issues and some lessons they have learned as a result of progressing to the second-year class. The panel of second-year students is drawn from different teams and includes those who have experienced significant team problems and were able to satisfactorily resolve them. The purpose of the panel is to provide a reality check and sounding board with respect to concerns our new students have concerning teams.

A second team reality check is available later on in the residency when we invite a previous EMBA team to have dinner with the new class. This previous team is typically one that has experienced bumps and bruises along the way, but emerged intact and fairly healthy.

Besides the experiences mentioned, students are asked to read and reflect on specific conceptual material from their first day of the residency. This assignment involves reading Chapters 4 ("Getting Underway") and 6 ("Learning to Work Together") in The Team Handbook (Scholtes, 1988). Chapter 4 examines the content and process issues surrounding the team experience. Chapter 6 describes stages a team goes through, and provides suggestions for building a team and maintaining support within a team. Scholtes also provides an excellent presentation of problems and ways to deal with them. As part of the assignment for day 2, students are asked to complete an assignment from Chapter 7 of The Team Handbook that covers "How to Deal with Disruptive Behavior." During the second day, teams practice brainstorming while working on the exercise and are asked as a team to generate a specific action plan to remedy disruptive behavior.

To provide a context for team behavior and develop case analysis skills, student teams are assigned the Martha McCaskey case (Van

Dissel, 1988) that deals with ethical issues confronting a young, inexperienced manager in her first full-time job. Each team is assigned a specific question to respond to using flipchart analysis. On the third day, when we discuss the McCaskey case, one hour is allowed for teams to prepare overhead transparencies and flipcharts, an hour is allotted for team presentations, and a third hour is set aside for the team to critique the group process it experienced during its case analysis presentation preparation. To facilitate this activity, we ask each team to assign one person to be the process analyst for the team's functioning during the case preparation phase. A group process observation sheet is provided to this individual, and he or she is asked to focus on team dynamics, rather than participate in the case analysis. The third hour is led by the team's process observer. The focus is on team improvement feedback. We reconvene as a class at the end of the third hour to discuss collectively a set of lessons learned from the group process exercise that was embedded in the team case analysis.

An improvement we will add to our residency next year is to incorporate team process analysis and critiques into all residency sessions, rotating the process observer from session to session. This can be readily accomplished for the quantitative skills sessions and the political decision-making simulation. Shortly after the last day of residency, the three-course semester begins: this semester includes a course in Organizational Behavior (OB). To ensure a degree of program integrity, the OB professor for the first 10-week session is the same person who designed the residency program and presented the team development component.

The EMBA Partners Model

An integral part of the EMBA program at Loyola is its management and staffing by faculty members who teach in the program. We are known as the EMBA Partners, and operate under the general guidance of a yearly elected Managing Partner (based on the University of Santa Clara, California model developed and advocated by Andre DelBecq). Among other activities, partners are responsible for curriculum control and continual improvement. Halfway through the 10-week module, the three faculty members teaching at any one time meet with elected team representatives, usually one per team. Any academic issues may be discussed at these feedback sessions.

Administrative issues and concerns are brought to the attention of the Associate Dean, who is also the EMBA Program director. This is an example of single-loop learning in which we provide influence mechanisms for faculty to hear the concerns of our stakeholders (Argyris, 1994). A subgroup of the EMBA partners who teach OB, International Business, Managing Organizational Change, and Business Policy specifically focus on team skill development and integration in program material; we are the authors of this paper.

After the EMBA Residency: The OB Course- Skills Building

During the sequence of the OB course that involved extensive case analysis, team issues discussed include active listening, giving and receiving feedback, and the bases for differences in perception. Approximately 40% of the course grade involves writing two team case analyses. Team members are asked to complete a peer evaluation form after each written team analysis and at the end of the course. Students are told that this information is collected for diagnostic purposes and will not affect anyone's final grade. An interesting anecdote is that in years past, we have attempted to use a peer evaluation form during one of the last courses in the 2-year program. On both occasions students strenuously objected to the use of the form and refused to complete it. The common argument was, "We are not about to evaluate our team members at this late point in the program. This is your job." We were also told (and believed) that if this peer evaluation form was made part of the course standard operating procedures from the beginning, we would have received no resistance from students.

A significant component of the student's grade during the first module OB course is an individual written team process analysis that is due on the ninth class session. The specifications for this paper require students to identify the weaknesses and opportunities for improvement with their team using team development concepts from The Team Handbook. After receiving graded feedback from their instructor, students are requested to share this information with their team prior to the beginning of the second module (our first module typically ends before Thanksgiving so students have some time to attend to team development issues should they so desire before the rigors of the second module begin). Last year team representatives reported that those teams that took up the challenge to share their team process analysis and attempted to work through and confront these issues were more successful with their team's functioning than those teams who chose to gloss over the group process feedback. From last year's experience, three of the 10 teams which experienced fairly serious team problems at the end of their first year were easily identifiable based on the team process analysis that they completed after the first 2 months of class.

In order to more efficiently deal with and facilitate team problems we assigned an ombudsman (a neutral third party) this year to work with self-identified troubled teams. The individual chosen is an experienced HR consultant with broad experience in the banking industry in the areas of self-assessment, team development, and career planning. The services of this consultant will be made available to team members toward the end of the first module. We chose not to have our ombudsman work with teams until the end of the first module; we expect initial team problems to be fairly minor and want teams to work through these problems themselves using resources from The Team Handbook.

The Applications Course

EMBA teams are introduced to pertinent team literature and concepts through the first year residency and first session organizational behavior course. Through the use of development exercises in the instructional blocks, teams have had the opportunity to hone their team-building skills both individually and collectively. Thereafter, all courses utilize student teams. Team usage is only natural, given the students' varied and high-level background. A significant portion of the learning occurs among students rather than solely between the instructor and students. However, certain courses use teams as a learning vehicle more intensely than others. Three such courses are International Business, Managing Organizational Change, and the capstone course, Corporate Policy and Strategy. In the following example, the Corporate Policy and Strategy course highlights the actual application of the concepts to both collective team learning and collective production of a team project.

The Corporate Policy and Strategy course lasts for 15 weeks, and focuses on the functions and responsibility of top management and decisions that affect the character of the total enterprise. These decisions include choice of purpose, objectives, and strategies; shaping of organizational character; and mobilization of resources to attain goals in the face of competition or an adverse environment. To facilitate learning goals, three active learning methodologies are utilized. Two out of the three methods are team focused.

The first method is in-class discussion of various strategic management frameworks; e.g., the five forces of industry analysis (Porter, 1980; 1993), strategic architecture of competencies and capabilities (Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Collis & Montgomery, 1995), and the service-profit link (Schlesinger & Heskett , 1991; Jones & Sasser, 1995). Cases and notes are used to introduce these concepts and frameworks in homework assignments for executive students. Almost without exception, most teams meet weekly before class after they have read the assignment individually. Meeting collectively, they share insights and facilitate one another's learning over and above individual study preparation, especially through the use of pertinent application examples from their own respective career experiences. During the in-class discussions, this same experience is repeated, on an inter-team basis. Many teams complete the cycle by either meeting telephonically or electronically after class to discuss the lessons learned from the class itself.

The second active-learning method is the required individual Lessons Learned assignment. The Lessons Learned methodology was introduced to our college by one of the authors based directly on his military experience in the U. S. army (refer to Sullivan and Harper, 1996 re: After Action Reviews and the Center for Army Lessons Learned; also see <u>Learning After Doing</u>, Garvin, 1995). This method is widely used throughout our business school. Typical Lessons Learned instructions for a course would read as follows:

> At the end of the semester, each student will turn in a "lessons learned" assignment. This assignment will consist of an exhibit for each class with the lessons learned noted. You can write in a narrative or "bullet" form. Each exhibit should be one to two pages. In front of the exhibits should be eight to ten pages, typewritten, in bullet and/or narrative format that reflect an analytical "integration" of the lessons learned listed in the exhibits. The purpose is to allow for each class, an integration of the learning that occurs <u>prior</u> to class though preparation, <u>in class</u> through active discussion, and <u>after class</u> through reflection. The eight-to-ten page paper allows for a similar integration for the course as a whole.

Based on what the student has learned both individually and with his/her team from class materials, from his/her team project (described in the following paragraphs), and from his/her own career experiences, the executive student follows the guidelines outlined in the previous paragraph to develop a set of Lessons Learned for the course, (and, in a few cases, for the entire program). Often, executives utilize their own firm to create a running application for their abstracted Lessons Learned. This is an individual effort; it is not unusual, though, for executives to share their applied versions of Lessons Learned with their teams in their real work environment. Thus, an immediate benefit for an employing organization is the application of team-building skills and work application skills to the employer's work team.

The third active learning methodology is a team project that, except for an in-class presentation, is worked on outside of class. Normally, this project consists of an audit of an organization to determine its strategic health. Appropriate prescriptive action is offered. Rules of engagement generally follow the guidelines suggested in the <u>MBA Field Studies</u> (Corey, 1990) Harvard Business School project guidelines book for consultancy projects. Client organizations are normally not-for-profit firms in the surrounding community; past clients have included the Baltimore Zoo, Baltimore Museum of Art, School Board for the Baltimore Catholic

School Dioceses, Health Care for the Homeless Association, and American Red Cross. As a Jesuit institution, we attempt to facilitate the concept of service to others in our EMBA program; hence, the utilization of non-profit organizations for our projects.

This project involves the team in activities where students on a team are more interdependent upon each another and have to produce a joint project. Given the scope of organizations chosen, the team has to undertake a division of labor in order to get its hands around a project. As opposed to the pure mutual enrichment of learning found in the first activity described, the field study project requires individual team members to be responsible for significant individual task accomplishments. Team members must transfer a clear, cogent understanding of their area of responsibility to other team members. The team collectively then defines a strategy for the client, evaluates it, and offers prescriptive action as necessary. All of this is accomplished outside of the classroom by people with full-time positions of responsibility. The EMBA program as a whole provides them with common language, concepts, and tools to utilize.

Previous application courses, the residency, and the OB course provide them with the skills to function as a team in this ultimate environment. Teams' rarely do not perform in either an outstanding or excellent manner. This is true from the viewpoint of the EMBA partners and clients. On those occasions when a team is not working it is too late to rectify the situation. In these rare circumstances, the problem is usually the inability of the team to integrate the individual work of its members due to a lack of mutual respect that has failed to evolve over the 2 years. Although the partners might speak of "irreconcilable differences," the situation still is felt to be a failure on the part of the partnership.

The Team Development Process

It is not our intent to eliminate all group problems. Our purpose is to enable students to learn how to identify, confront, and work through team problems using all resources available, including our expert ombudsman.

In summary, we present a representative sample of the techniques, processes, and materials we employ to facilitate self-managing work teams:

1. During the EMBA Residency Course:
-Team expectations, and goals discussion and clarification
-Team building materials
-Myers-Briggs Type Indicator information regarding each person's type as well as how to work with different types
-Readings and exercises in The Team Handbook
-Discussion of conflict and effective conflict management techniques
-Team analysis and action planning based on The Team Handbook exercise on how to deal with a problem team member
- Panel discussions with past EMBA members dealing with group process issues and lessons learned.
-Explicit and specific group process feedback from team observers concerning group process issues during team preparation for the Martha McCaskey case

2. During the OB course:
-Discussion of active listening, perceptual differences, giving and receiving feedback, and building effective work teams
-Two team written case analyses
-Peer evaluation for developmental purposes
-Group process analysis paper and feedback

-Group process analysis feedback shared with team members
-Ombudsman available to teams for expert group process analysis assistance

3. During the Application Courses:
-Group projects (presently no forms are used for group process feedback or for peer evaluations for development purposes)
-Ombudsman available to teams for expert group process analysis assistance
-Complaints about team functioning usually raised to the managing partner and/or the Associate Dean.

Appendix 3 compares some potential benefits from our programmatic approach to that of Michaelson and his colleagues (Michaelson et al, 1994). In summary, a specific set of team based teaching methodologies that as a whole are unique to our program include:

1. The initial residency program prior to the beginning of the team-based projects.

2. The deliberate pacing of team-based activities across all segments of an EMBA program.

3. The inclusion of a panel of second-year EMBA team participants used as a sounding board for first-year students.

4. The managing partner model, especially meeting with elected team representatives; and the assigned ombudsman made available to assist teams with interpersonal and intra-group problem identification and resolution.

5. Lessons Learned assignments based on each student's learning from class assignments, team projects, and prior career experiences.

Continual Improvement of our Team Development Activities

In the spirit of kaizen (Imai, 1986), we plan to incorporate the following changes during the next EMBA residency course. To expose our incoming students immediately to the functioning of a total business enterprise, we will have teams work on the Business Strategy Game (BSG) (Thompson & Stappenbeck, 1995; Stone, 1995; Parks and Lindstrom, 1995) as part of their activities during the EMBA Residency course. The BSG creates a specific and challenging context of problem-solving, decision-making, data analysis that allows ample opportunity for team process issues to develop and emerge during the time teams take for deliberation over decisions (Katzenbach et al, 1995).

Two additional exercises that will also be incorporated into the team development part of our program are the Scavenger Hunt Exercise (Manning & Schmidt, 1995) and the anticipatory Study Group Problem Case (Fisher, Shaw, and Ryder, 1994). At the end of the residency course, we will require each team to draft and display a Team Code of Conduct for team meetings, and to draft and sign a short contract delineating their commitment to their team and to the program. During the applications courses, feedback will be solicited regarding team process development.

Some Lessons Learned

Following are some of the key Lessons Learned (conclusions and recommendations) we have experienced (along the lines of Learning after Doing (Garvin, 1995, and Baird, Henderson, and Watts, 1997):

1. Team members need time to get to know each other. It is important to

provide them with structured activities focusing on group process issues when they first meet. Katzenbach et al. (1995) suggest that a compelling performance context is critical for development of teams.

2. The use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (along with the pamphlet, Introduction to Type, Myers, 1993) seems to be a valuable instrument for getting students to focus on and grapple with the issues of individual differences. Young and Kram (1996) also found the Myers-Briggs useful in BU's team taught cross-functional MBA courses.

3. The group process paper (also advocated by Young and Kram, 1996 and Lerner, 1995) required during the OB course is useful for reinforcing team development topics introduced in the residency, and as a formal way of providing group process and content feedback to team members.

4. It appears useful to allow students to switch teams; this enables students to develop more fully the skill of working with different people effectively on important projects under a strict time deadline. This approach was also endorsed by Baldwin, Bedell, and Johnson (1997) as a potential way for dramatically increasing team-based student learning.

5. We need to establish specific "booster shot" class sessions periodically during the 2-year program to further address and reinforce team development issues, and to allow students to "vent' and share best practices with other teams (O'Dell and Grayson, 1998).

6. At the end of the 2-year program we will schedule a half-day session to get closure on team issues. We will request that students generate a list of lessons learned based on their team experiences. We need to capture this information so that best practices are institutionalized for future EMBA classes. This notion is also endorsed by Baird, Henderson, and Watts (1997) and O'Dell and Grayson (1998).

7. The use of a neutral third-party external ombudsman seems extremely useful for dealing with group problems when the needs arise, allowing for student growth with respect to group dynamics skills.

8. A general consensus has developed among the EMBA partners that the following are characteristics associated with the better performing teams:

a. They are fully engaged, as individuals and as a team, in team building skills and activities provided in the residency and OB course.

b. In these teams, group process considerations were periodically raised throughout the 2 years.

c. They learned to plan as a team; e.g., create a team calendar for each module's classes, class projects, and any in-work major projects. They met weekly prior to class, but after individual preparation.

d. They learned to listen to one another. They recognized each other's strengths and weaknesses and leveraged them.

e. They learned to teach one another effectively, taking into consideration individual learning styles and prior career experiences. They effectively learned how to learn as a group (Senge, 1990; Leonard-Barton, 1995).

f. They learned to evaluate their own individual and team results and incorporated that feedback into their future work.

Although our experiences and recommendations were generated from our work with EMBA students, we have successfully incorporated many of the ideas and recommendations provided in working with student teams at the undergraduate and MBA levels. Our future team research will involve highlighting the differences in these two programs. Cognizant of variations in age and experience we will then attempt to measure differences in abilities to deal with team work, and satisfaction from team work due to the different approaches utilized by the varied programs. Additionally we are collecting longitudinal survey data, both upon graduation and five years thereafter, to assess the effectiveness of our team development methodologies. Such data collection will allow us to complement the rich texture approach of the case study methodology used here with a quantitative analytical approach.

References

Argyris, C. (1994), "Good communication that blocks learning", *Harvard Business Review,* 74(2), 77 -86.

Baird, L., Henderson, J. C., & Watts, S. (1997), "Learning from action: An analysis of the center for army lessons learned", *Human Resource Management,* 36(4), 385-395.

Baldwin, T. T., Bedell, M. D., & Johnson, V. L. (1997), "The social fabric of a team based MBA program: Network effects on student satisfaction and performance". *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(6),1369-1397.

Beer, M., & Holland, P. (1989). *Note: An Introduction to Team Building*. No. 9-489-095, Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston, MA.

Collis, D. J., & Montgomery, C. A. (1995), "Competing on resources: Strategy in the 90's", *Harvard Business Review*, 73(4), 118-128.

Corey, E. R. (Ed.) .(1990), *MBA Field Studies: A Guide for Students and Faculty,* Harvard Business School Publishing Division, Boston, MA.

Dyer, W. G. (1987). *Team Building: Issues and Alternatives*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Fisher, C. D., Shaw, J. B., & Ryder, P. (1994), "Problem in project groups: An anticipatory case study", *Journal of Management Education*, 18(3), 351-355.

Fulmer, R. M., & Vicera, A. A. (1996), "Executive development: An analysis of competitive forces", *Planning Review*, Jan/Feb, 31-36.

Gabarro, J. J. (1987). *The Dynamics of Taking Charge*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Garvin, D. A. (1995), *Putting the Learning Organization to Work: Learning After Doing*. Harvard Business School Video No.7099.

Groupthink [Videorecording] (1991). Timmons, K. (Writer and director), & Mihal, M (Producer). CRM Films. Carlsbad, CA. (25 minutes).

Heimovics, D., Taylor, M., Stillwell, R. (1996), "Assessing and developing a new strategic direction for the executive MBA", *Journal of Management Education*, 20(4), 462-478.

Hertenstein, J. H. (1990), *Setting One's Pace: Sprints or Marathons*, No. 9-190-134, Harvard Business School Publishing., Boston, MA.

Hill, L. (1994). *Managing Your Team*. Note No.494-081, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Imai, M. (1986), *Kaizen: The Key to Japan's Competitive Success*. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Janis, I. (1983). *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. : Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, MA.

Jones, T. O., & Sasser, Jr., W. E. (1995), "Why satisfied customers defect", *Harvard Business Review*, 73(6), 88-99.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993), "The discipline of teams", *Harvard Business Review*, 71(2),111-120.

Katzenbach, J. R., Beckett, F., Dichter, S., Feigen, M., Gagnon, C., Hope, Q., & Ling, T. (1995), *Real Change Leaders: How You Can Create Growth and High Performance at Your Company*. : Times Business, New York, NY.

Leonard-Barton, D. (1995), *Wellsprings of Knowledge: Building and Sustaining the Sources of Innovation*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Lerner, L. D. (1995), "Making student groups work", *Journal of Management Education*, 19(1),123-125.

Locke, E. A., Tirnauer, D., Roberson, Q., Goldman, B., Latham, M. E., & Weldon, E. (1997), "The importance of the individual in an age of groupism, In M. Turner (Ed.) *Groups at Work: Advances in Theory and Research: Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.*

Manning, M. R., & Schmidt, P. J. (1995), "Building effective work teams: A quick exercise based on a scavenger hunt", *Journal of Management Education*, 19(3), 392-398.

Michaelson, L. K., Fink, L. D., & Watson, W. E. (1994), "Pre-instructional minitests: An efficient solution to the problem of covering content", *Journal of Management Education*, 18(1), 32-42.

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator . Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, California.

Myers, I. B. (1993), *Introduction to Type: A Guide to Understanding Your Results on the Myers- Briggs Type Indicator.* Consulting Psychologists Press, PaloAlto, CA

Nash, L. (1981), "Ethics without the sermon, *Harvard Business Review*, 59(5), 79-90.

O'Dell, C., & Grayson, C. J. (1998), "If only we knew what we know: Identification and Transfer of internal best practices", *California Management Review*, 40(3), 154-174.

Parks, D. M., & Lindstrom, G. L. (1995), "Achieving higher levels of learning in the business policy and strategy course through integration of a business simulation", *Journal of Management Education*, 19(2), 219-227.

Porter, M. E. (1980), *Competitive Strategies*, Free Press, New York, NY.

Porter, M. E. (1993), "Towards a dynamic theory of strategy", *Strategic Management Journal,* 12(5), 95-117.

Prahaled, C. K., & Hamel, G. (1990), "The core competence of the organization", *Harvard Business Review*, 68(3), 79-91.

Schlesinger, P. F. (1996), "Teaching and evaluation in an integrated curriculum", *Journal of Management Education*, 24(3), 479-499.

Schlesinger, L. A., & Heskett, J. L. (1991), "The service-driven service company", *Harvard Business Review*, 69(5), 71-81.

Scholtes, P. R. (1988), *The Team Handbook: How to Use Teams to Improve Quality,* Joiner Associates, Madison, WI.

Senge, P. M. (1990), "The leader's new work: Building learning organizations", *Sloan Management Review,* 32(1), 7-23.

Stone, R. A. (1995), "The business strategy game: Faculty experiences and student Perceptions", *Journal of Management Education*, 19(2), 281-290.

Sullivan, G. R., & Harper, M. (1996), *Hope is Not a Method: What Business Leaders Can Learn from the American Army,* Random House, New York, NY.

Thompson, A. A., & Stappenbeck, G. J. (1995), The Business Strategy Game (3rd ed.) : Irwin, Chicago, IL.

Thomas, K. W. (1977), "Toward multi-dimensional values in teaching: the example of conflict behaviors", *Academy of Management Review*, 2, pp. 484-490.

Van Dissel, B. J. (1988), *Martha McCaskey.* No. 9-488-021. Harvard Business School Publishing, Boston, MA.

Watson, W. E., Michaelson, L. K., & Sharp, W. A. (1991), "Member competence, group interaction, and group decision-making: A longitudinal study", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), 803-809.

Young, M. B., & Kram, K. E. (1996), "Repairing the disconnects in faculty teaching teams", *Journal of Management Education*, 20(4), 500-5155.

Appendix 1

EMBA Program Overview

- ***EMBA First Year Curriculum: The Skills Year***

Residency – Executive Development

Session 1	Session 2	Session 3
Organizational Behavior	Managerial Economics	Macroeconomics
Financial Reporting and Analysis	Managerial Accounting	International Business
Statistical Methods for Executives	Executive Decision-Making/Marketing Strategy	Research for Marketing Decision-making

- ***EMBA Second Year Curriculum: The Applications Year***

International Residency – Executive Development

Session 1	Session 2	Session 3
Financial Management	Financial Applications	Issues in Law and Corporate Social Responsibility
Marketing Management	Operations Management	Managing Organizational Change
Management of Information Technology	Conflict Resolution and Negotiation/Corporate Policy and Strategy	Corporate Policy and Strategy

Appendix 2

EMBA Residency First Year - Team Development Activity

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3
Team Expectations and Goal Clarification	Dealing with Conflict and Conflict Management Techniques	Team Case Analysis -Martha McCaskey Case, Group Process Feedback from Team Observer
Myers-Briggs Administered and Scored; and Feedback Given on Different Types Presented	Dealing with Disruptive Team Behavior	
	Panel Discussion with Current EMBA Team Members	

Appendix 3

A Comparison of Team Development Activities

Michaelson et al (1994)	Our Team-Focused EMBA Program
1. Influence skills practiced on each question	1. Influence skills practiced at weekly team meetings on every issue discussed throughout the program.
2. Scores count; groups are permanent, can't ignore interpersonal problems	2. Same, except we have 18 in the program, two residencies, and the Washington campus where these issues can be confronted. We provide training for dealing with these issues in the residency, during the OB course, and through the use of a team consultant.
3. Immediate feedback on group performance; member contributions noted by team members	3. Teams receive timely feedback; same is true, only continued throughout 2- year program.
4. Must face up to consequences of own behavior; if your are a poor listener and you are wrong, you can see your mistake	4. Same is true, but learning should be compounded since group projects are weighted heavily and encompass 18 courses.
5. Importance of working in groups to make important organizational decisions	5. True in all 18 courses, especially in field studies where important organization decisions are actually made
6. Increased awareness of positive potential awareness of group	6. Increased awareness of positive and negative potential of group
7. Exposure to positive role models	7. Exposure to positive and negative role models during the program
8. Improved group and personal decision-making skills	8. Lessons Learned are used throughout program; group process paper with feedback and ongoing availability of team consultant allows opportunity for team skills to be developed and internalized
9. Over time, individuals on team appreciate members who can sort out information and build group consensus	9. As a result of program, team members should become aware of strengths and weaknesses of each team member as well as their distinctive competence
10. Groups will become increasingly effective over time, growing less dependent on best member	10. Especially true in our program; as course content varies, "best member" shifts usually based on course content expertise; all skills brought together in final capstone and integrative course.