








Evaluation Instrument: Success factors and effects of LSI




Success factors and effects of LSI and how they can be observed in practice





 = Open interview  = Documents




Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
1. Context/Task: LSI is the right approach		
1.1. The task is important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A leader with an itch to scratch, a compelling business purpose - An urgent problem or issue, business as usual is not a viable option - A super-ordinate goal or shared concern - Multilevel issues - The expected benefits must outweigh the costs 	 <u>Client, participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why this? What was the intention of the LSI? - Why now? - Was it worth the effort?
1.2. Stakeholders need each other to succeed with this task	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No one of the stakeholders can do alone what they can do together - Need for joint problem definition and strategy in diversity and conflict - A basic willingness to work together, awareness that collaboration is necessary 	
1.3. Situation is complex and/or uncertain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A high level of fragmentation - Uncertain, fast changing situations - Multiple complexities and ambiguities to deal with, nobody could possibly know all the details or all the answers - The change is transformational - Unprecedented or breakthrough changes call for unprecedented or breakthrough action 	
1.4. Contra-indications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue is not important to anyone - Task is abstract and likely to lead to talk without action - One-way information transfer is required (confidentiality, loss of face, knowledge transfer) - Individual professionals can solve the problem - No opportunity for change, due to lack of resources, energy, time or lack of actual influence 	




Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
2. Client: Leaders support the LSI approach		
2.1. Leaders are willing to collaborate, to share power	<p>Leaders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have good intentions - Are credible, no hidden agendas - Show willingness to work from a shared power-base to achieve shared ownership - Believe that collaboration is more likely to stimulate follow-up - Tolerate uncertainty, are able to stay with “not knowing” - Minimise the influence of power differences and adopt a neutral position - Allow local control and establish clear boundaries - Are willing to live with the outcome 	<p> <u>.Client</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Were you prepared to support follow-up? Did you? <p> <u>Participants</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How did you feel when you were invited? - What were your expectations?
2.2. Leaders are willing to spend time and money to do it “by the book”	<p>Leaders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are prepared to support follow-up, carefully balancing between too much and too little support - Act as champions who sponsor the process, or want to involve a champion - Show commitment and persistence 	
2.3. Political climate: enough trust to start	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leaders realize and acknowledge that trust is unlikely to be present from the start - Conditions for trust building are created by providing a minimal structure - Careful consideration of cross cultural communication - Degree of negative stereotyping between groups does not prevent participation of specific stakeholders - Willingness to opt for a different way, despite political vulnerability 	
2.4. Contra-indications:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highly-charged political situations with no space for open discussion or follow-up action; fight-flight behaviour, apparent indifference - Leaders delegate the process to subordinates and show up only at the beginning and/or the end - Focus on personal gain, win-lose dynamic - Sponsor wants to squeeze work into too short a time - Fast cycle of leadership succession - Withdrawal behaviour: declining attendance at planning meetings 	





Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unspoken agenda: ongoing negotiation and discussion outside the planning group about the central issue - Communication with responsible staff is done by an intermediary such as a project leader 	
3. Consultant: Facilitators are skilled to conduct an LSI		
3.1. Facilitators make and keep a clear contract with the client	<p>Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insist on adequate time with the client to clarify the contract, and discuss implications for the process and for follow-up - Work on alignment with (top)leaders, share information openly before the LGI: in a workshop/meeting with the management team to demonstrate the principles and implications for personal roles and follow-up - Help to set clear goals, by starting with solid understanding of what is to be accomplished with the process; the task is well-defined - Bring and keep the principles of LSI front and centre - Focus on the bigger process, not on an event or method - Help to create clear boundaries that create a meaningful playing field: enough room for people to play, but people do not get lost; balancing top-down and bottom-up decisions - Help leaders manage their anxiety about uncertainty of the process and loss of control - Avoid the “they won’t come dialogue”, people nearly always come once they know the importance of the task and who else is coming - Build follow-up into their fee structure, at least an evaluation meeting, and offer advice and consultation on ways to increase diffusion and support sustainability 	<p> <u>Contract with the client (proposals)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What goals are mentioned? - Are the principles of the approach explained? - What boundaries are set? (clear/abstract) - Is follow-up built in or mentioned? <p> <u>Client, consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was there a sponsor meeting? - Were principles demonstrated and/or discussed before the LGI? - Did the playing field suite the task? (Model When LGI?) - Were the boundaries of participation and responsibility clear to you? <p> <u>Client, consultant, participants</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Choose interaction levels on chart “When LSI”
3.2. Facilitators gain credibility, managing expectations	<p>Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make a conscious choice for application of LSI, making the aims of the LSI explicit - Check and explore each other’s assumptions about LSI - Don’t raise expectations they can’t fulfil, they aim for good enough rather than for 	<p> <u>Client, Consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What made you say “yes” to this process?






Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - unrealistic outcomes - Are able to explain why they are doing what they are doing (methodical reasoning) in everyday language - Show energy and decisiveness - Show positive personality, appearance of trust, maturity, calmness, integrity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What did you say “no” to? - What were your expectations? - Looking back, do you consider your expectations realistic?
3.3. Facilitators are aware of their own role	Facilitators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are conscious of their impact on the system, from the start - Are aware of own assumptions about change and the role of knowledge - Know their own strength and weaknesses, facilitation is preferably done with two facilitators who complete each other 	 <u>Client and consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What was your role in the process? - What do you consider as your relevant strength and weaknesses for this process?
3.4. Facilitators have skills to work with large groups	Facilitators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are tolerant for ambiguity - Have the objective to accept people as they are, not as facilitators might wish them to be - Work on staying calm, to contain “messiness” long enough to prevent premature structuring - Can contain frustration projected onto them - Are prepared to let go of their need to control the change process, but hold on to a vision during ups and downs of the project - Are able to deal with differences and competitive attitudes in a constructive way, in function of the jointly defined goals - Are experienced enough to deal with the circumstances - Have experience in working with large groups - Are improving their competence in working with large groups, for example through intervision, supervision, or training 	 <u>Participants, client</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did you feel free to participate and contribute? - What moments did stand out for you? Why? - What did the facilitator do or not do that was important for you? - How was time managed?  <u>Consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Were there difficult moments for you? What did you do? - How did you manage time? Were you satisfied with it? - Were you trained to work with large groups? How?
3.5. Facilitators believe in the principles of LSI	Facilitators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adopt an open system perspective, paying attention to fragmentation and limitations - Recognise and respect diversity - Believe that ordinary people can engage in productive dialogue - Take contributions of participants seriously, so they do not prompt, correct, or interpret 	





Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> people; all participants are seen as experts - See themselves as co-investigators - Focus on possibilities for the future, not on problems now and in the past - Seek to alter conditions rather than behaviour - Promote and teach self-management 	
3.6. Contra-indications consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitators want to sell LSI - Facilitators use abstract jargon, do not search for connection to the needs of the client - Facilitators take an expert role, believing they have the right answers 	
4. Intervention: LSI is performed right		
4.1. LGI is planned as part of a larger effort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A post-event strategy, or a sequence of LGIs, is planned or built in - The timing of the LGI: not too early and not too late in the process - Road map of the bigger process is available 	<p> <u>Contract, design LGI</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was the LGI part of a larger effort? <p> <u>Participants, client</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was it the right time for you to have the LGI?
4.2. Working with a planning group for all essential decisions regarding design, management, and logistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Planning team/steering committee with key stakeholders, people who have the credibility and connections to get all the other participants to come - Planning team with diversity of perspectives, interests, identities, potential contributions; a cross-section of the system - Knowledge and ability to select stakeholder groups, especially the under-bound groups - Facilitator helps the planning group find common ground of interest across all the stakeholder groups - Awareness that whole system issues surface as a prelude to the larger meeting; points of conflicts are elicited - Alternative designs with enough diversity are offered and discussed - An invitation strategy for getting people to commit to the meeting time - Invitation with strategic questions and a challenging title - Conscious attention is given to the inclusiveness of participants who represent alternative or opposing perspectives on the issue at hand 	<p> <u>Reports of planning group meetings, invitation(s)</u></p> <p> <u>Consultant, client, planning group members</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How was the stakeholder analyses done? (ARE-IN model) - How did you feel about the invitation



Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Division of responsibilities is clearly enunciated at a very early stage; participants are responsible for the outcomes of the large group conference - Planning group has enough confidence in the process 	
4.3. Design is coherent with context, task, relations and directions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Principles of LSI are respected in design, using them in combination - Adequate LGI method selected, limitations of the method are discussed - Awareness of pattern-setting activities that may amplify or dampen the effects of change after the large group meeting - Awareness that the mere categorisation of people into different groups is a sufficient condition for negative stereotyping to develop - Enough time for preparation and invitation - Good timing of events considering the circumstances - Minimal and flexible design for real time adaptation, no more rules than strictly necessary - A broad spectrum of learning styles is met, work forms addressing head, heart and hands - Division of work done by planning team and in large group meeting is balanced with available time and budget - LGI is interactive as much as possible - Enough time and space to get the work done - A 2-3 day LGI - Adequate project management 	<div style="margin-bottom: 10px;">  <u>Design, participant list, report LGI, reports planning team</u> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was the planning team a micro cosmos of the system? - Compare design with prescriptions LGI method: How many people were involved, what was the nature of the task, how much time did participants spend together? - How interactive was the design? - What makes the way of working and the outcomes transferable? - Are “all” learning styles met? - Compare design and report: What differences can be seen? <div style="margin-top: 10px;">  <u>Consultant, client</u> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How was the planning team made up? - How was diversity invited?
4.4. Participants: getting the right people in the room	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inclusion of stakeholders: Whole system is in the room (representation, micro cosmos), working across boundaries of the organisation; minimum 3 X 3 rule: 3 levels, 3 functions - Invite those who can influence or are influenced (ARE-IN: with Authority, Resources, Expertise, Information, Need) - Build critical mass, with capacity to facilitate and lead change - Highly diverse group: interests, opinions, age, sex, culture - Unusual meeting: Provide a forum for dialogue among people who rarely have an 	<div style="margin-bottom: 10px;">  <u>Invitation, participant list, contract, design, reports of meetings</u> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Who were invited? - Who participated? - How was paid attention to key stakeholders who were not there?



Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
<p>4.5. Representation: consideration for those who are not present; contact needs to be supported by the larger social system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - opportunity to hear one another - Stakeholders can and will come - Prevent 'ghosts' or 'prebents'; champions who are only psychologically present, can have a strong impact, with real or imagined power - Identify key stakeholders who were unable to attend and arrange to brief them immediately - All relevant parties are represented in an acceptable way, the number of participants is considered consciously - Re-use the event briefing materials and working notes to sweep in people who were unable to attend 	<p> <u>Participants, client, consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where the right people in the room? - Who should have been there too? - How do you feel about the group size? - Was there a critical mass involved in the overall LSI process? - How was paid attention to key stakeholders
<p>4.6. LGI enables everyone's contribution (inclusiveness, building trust)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-coercive process: people are free to come, no threats or sanctions - Meeting managed so the entire group can be in dialogue at each stage - No one is in the "expert" role: no long monologues, presentations etcetera, each person having a chance to speak and listen - Search for common ground: not an activism against the authority structure, but for the world we want - Powerful questions that stimulate mind, heart and soul to attract collaborative engagement - Facilitators invite openness, but participants decide what to reveal - Leaders express openness, not control; they do not intervene or try to control the process, and they contain anxiety - A structure that lets weaker people contribute as well, with room also for individual work: a balanced mixture of work in small groups, large group and individual work - Structure of the event/day facilitates containment, dealing with unpleasant feelings - No press invited; if unavoidable, pay special attention to their attitude and reports - The composition of the small groups must build the trust that this is not another form of manipulation - Participants need no special knowledge or prior training to succeed - Balance in energetic level of activities - Meeting face-to-face is stimulated in order to build trust, share information and enhance new relationships; use of technology must serve, not hinder, this process - Duration and work forms meet the needs of people who are not used to or unable to sit 	<p> <u>Design, report</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How much work is done in small groups, how much individual, how much plenary? - How high was the potential "contribution time" for each participant? - What were the ground rules for working together? <p> <u>Participants</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did you feel free to participate or not? - Did you feel free in what and how to contribute? - What were the ground rules?





Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> still for a longer time (for instance children, disabled, outdoor workers) - All recording is done publicly, on flip-charts or large paper sheets - Reception before the meeting permits release of tension gathered during the journey to the venue 	
4.7. Divergence: Exploring the whole before fixing any parts, engaging new connections, building a common database of the system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reality is perceived in the complexity of its constant becoming; focus is on dynamics in relations, not on positions - Models of connections in the system are created and visualised, so each person is experiencing the whole of their organisation or community, in time and space - Making sense together by honouring the past - Engage in dialogue about perspectives on the present - Elicit people’s dreams, making a shared picture of the preferred future - Cross pollination connects diverse perspectives, by travelling small groups or sitting in mixed stakeholder groups - The right information is publicly available at the right time to stakeholders - Group memory is created by visualisation; everything is worked out on i.e. flip charts - Sufficient “soak” time to digest all the data, interpretations and emotions 	<p> Design, report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How was the whole explored? - How was the whole visualized? - Who did the data gathering? - How was the past honoured? - How was the preferred future explored? - How were perspectives exchanged? <p> Participants, client</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How was the whole explored? - What did you learn?
4.8. Leadership is distributed by shared responsibility and self-management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Structure facilitates self-management, puts the participants in leadership roles - Focus on contribution: focus on the relations, we instead of the I - No speakers or consultants telling participants what to think or what to do - People do all their own data-gathering, assembly, analyses, dialogue and wrapping up - A level playing field, no remote control: people have the work authority needed to accept responsibility for their performance and to give what they have to offer, whatever position they come from - “The majority rules”, or power plays in design and performance are not accepted - People have a right to hold back and accept the consequences (no outcome) 	<p> Design, report LGI, reports planning team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the design facilitate collaborative leadership and shared responsibility? <p> Participants, client</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What was your responsibility as a participant?


Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
4.9. Convergence: Tapping into collective intelligence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Listen and look together for patterns, insights and deeper questions - Observing the thought process in yourself and others: notice fragmentation or incoherence - Suspending judgment, assumptions and certainties: experience unwritten and unconscious rules and patterns - Accessing the generative order in dialogue, sensing a mutually shared field, experience of a sense of community or collective wisdom - Playful moments, signs of humour 	 <u>Participants, client, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did you experience a sense of community? - How did you look for deeper insights or questions? - Did it work for you? What insights, questions? - Was there laughter, fun, spontaneous applause (or other signs of humour)?
4.10. Conference setting for the LGI facilitates the process, the room setting symbolizes the principles of LSI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Informal and hospitable atmosphere, a well-lighted room with windows - A neutral and accessible place for all participants, psychological safe - Location is physically safe to work with large groups - Location and room setting encourage feelings of equality - Personal comfort is as high as possible: beverages available at any time, good food, atmosphere, logistics, serving cultural needs - Meeting physically is necessary to make eye contact: helps building trust, enhances new relationships and invites strategic conversations - Residential conference gives participants time to interact outside the formal group time, away from other commitments - Room setting facilitates sharing of information, knowledge, learning - Facilitators are satisfied with the meeting room 	 <u>Photos, design, reports</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the conference setting facilitate the goals of the meeting? - Are there signs of playful moments, fun, humour?  <u>Participants, client, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the conference setting facilitate the goals of the meeting?
4.11. Action planning for next steps is done in the LGI, or soon after	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Energy and ideas are channelled into action planning, identifying next steps - Common ground and future action first; problems and conflicts are background information - Agreements are reviewed plenary - Meeting and progress are celebrated - Immediate reporting at the end of the LGI, or soon after 	 <u>Design, report</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How was action planning done?  <u>Participants, client, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How was action planning done?


Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
4.12. Reflection on conditions and principles with participants LGI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuation thinking begins at start-up, reflection on the action learning questions: what's happening, what are we learning, what do we need to do next, how to continue - Participants understand they have a role in diffusion of the conference outcomes throughout the greater system - Attention is given to the conditions and principles that produce the effectiveness 	 <u>Design, photos, report</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How was attention for the core principles build in? Look for signs - Planned actions for capacity building (training)
4.13. Building of capacity to work participatively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitators help people explore and develop new patterns of working on engagement, in their own organisation and in the bigger system - Training of support teams in designing their own LGI meetings; grasping is easy, applying is difficult - Training is planned for people to carry out new roles and to relate with each other in new ways; combination of training and large group conferences 	 <u>Participants, client</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What was different in this meeting? What do you consider as conditions for success in this process?  <u>Consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did you give explicit attention the conditions and principles? How?
4.14. LGI is managed well by facilitators	<p>Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prepare themselves for "holding space"; room set-up and materials are ready well before starting time - Make people feel welcome, by setting the right tone - Set the context by clarifying purpose and process - Communicate clearly the rules of the game, displayed on the wall and/or in a participant workbook - Deal with frustration, anger and anxiety; do not ignore them - Facilitate exploration, work with diversity rather than reducing it via power, stereotyping, conflict avoidance, conformity - Help people avoiding discussion or debate to engage in constructive dialogue, in function of the jointly defined goals - Understand thoroughly the level of polarisation and manage time to permit the fullest discussion of difference among participants: facilitate the deepest level of common 	 <u>Participants</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did you feel invited by the consultant? - Was the purpose and process of the LGI clear to you? - How was dealt with differences, conflicts?

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
<p>4.15. Building of a post-event support structure: during the LSI a delivery system for change is made or initiated</p>	<p>ground instead of a superficial or narrow area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep a clear focus on issues and task <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Follow-up planning sessions - Agreement on a protocol for decision-making - Learning Fairs or workshops for people throughout the organisation to share what action groups are doing - Procedure for monitoring of the action plan, for measuring results, progress and communication - Building of a systematic and stakeholder-oriented evaluation - Initiation of ongoing communication processes, an information system is designed in cooperation with primary users (review meetings, newsletters, website, interactive tools) - Action groups, implementation planning teams, task forces and other temporary structures are put in place - Agreement with a champion who promises to continue sponsoring the process, affirming and supporting the normative change - Circulate ideas from the LGI and invite comments from both attendees and other on specific issues - Adding representatives to an existing group for new interactions - Infiltrate agendas of already scheduled meetings both inside and outside the organisation with relevant follow-up from the LGI - Connection to the existing cycle of policy making 	<p> <u>Contract, reports, evaluations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What post-event support structures were built? - What follow-up actions were planned? <p> <u>Client, participants, non-participants, consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What follow-up actions were planned?
<p>4.16. Contra-indications to holding the LGI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meeting goal is fuzzy or irrelevant to most participants - People can't or won't come 100% of the time - An important stakeholder group is absent - Design reinforces the existent power relations (an existing group, LGI has to be tailored to an already planned meeting) - No time or resources to realize the design in a proper way 	
<p>5. Effectiveness: Short-term effects; LSI contributes to getting more and better work done</p>	<p>Non-sustainable effects are transactional, they do not shift the norms, but may generate potentials, conditions, for sustainable effects of future change processes</p>	

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
5.1. Short-term objectives are met	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LSI is considered worth the effort - New structures, strategies, procedures are formulated and/or implemented - New proposals, wishes, needs and interests introduced/ expressed - More informed decisions - Coherent and effective collaboration on an issue / problem - Consensus development among organisations and entities outside the formal structures of any of them - Increased individual skills - Controlling inspectors are satisfied 	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did you get what you wanted? Why? - Did the practitioners accomplish what they set out to do? Why? - What did you change as a result of the process? What do you do different or not anymore?
5.2. Increased awareness and understanding of the system and context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased awareness of larger systemic developments - Discovery of generative themes, emerging patterns of working - A picture or model for operating in a more coherent, integrated way - Increased knowledge of work processes - Common ground for information gathering, education, raising awareness - Deepened mutual understanding of each other's situation and more respect for other views - People appreciate the whole and their part in it; more appreciation of the shop floor - Individuals understand the organisation's objective, they know its strategy, how it is doing and who their customers and competitors are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do action groups or follow-up structures still exist? What did they produce? - Did new relations or new networks emerge?  Ask for evidence, observables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - action plans: how shallow/penetrating/profound
5.3. Commitment and energy for change, better implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less barriers, more enthusiasm and support for the change process - People are committed to do something together, getting diverse interest groups together discussing real issues; action groups are viable - Players take responsibility for the issue - Engagement with outcome, better acceptance of conclusions, designs or redesigns - Increased building of trust enables personal action - Decreased polarisation 	
5.4. New relationships, more potential for innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Learning bridges between those in power and other voices, so something new can emerge - Emotional bond between participants - New relationships are created, networks are extended 	

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
5.5. Some elements of LSI are transferred	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participative follow-up meetings - People start incorporating some elements of LGI in their own meetings (sitting in circles, using talking stick, inviting “strangers”, working in small groups, more collective visualisations) 	 <u>Meeting rooms, meeting agendas, reports</u>
5.6. Efficiency is increased	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Condensation of work, better alignment, less disturbance - Better use of resources and knowledge, substantial savings in time and money - Decreased implementation time 	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is efficiency increased? How?
6. Effectiveness: Sustainable effects; LSI contributes to transformed capability for change and learning	Sustainable effects are transformational; they shift the norms in relationships and communication, showing in transformed capability for change and ongoing learning	
6.1. Collective learning and changing continue, increased capability for change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use of LSI or other participative approaches is continued, used for other issues or by other people - Participants learn how to fragment complex problems, how to do their own data-gathering and make system models - Development of capacity to deal with uncertainty and chaotic circumstances - Deepened dialogue between leaders and the entire organisation/system - Increased self-organising capacity; empowerment shows in self-management, more distributed leadership - Improved capacity to work with the principles; increased capacity to cross boundaries of levels and functions; design ideas can come from anyone 	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Were there more LGIs, or 'microcosm practices' ? Why? - Is leadership more distributed? How?
6.2. Increased reflective self awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Self-evaluation among leaders is conducted to reflect on progress and required example behaviour - Discussions with stakeholders on what is working or not are included in meeting agendas - Reflective questions are asked in meetings, distinctions between lived and spoken beliefs are explored - Teams learn to review and evaluate their performance - “Noise” in the change process is explored and amplified: does it help or hinder the process 	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How are processes evaluated? - How is interaction evaluated? - Did new words, new language, arise as a result of the process?

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The way of interaction is reflected: time for stopping and reflection is taken - Profound mind-set shifts for some people 	
6.3. More permeable boundaries: opening up the organisation, inviting diversity; focus on how good the system is; more systemic thinking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of a shared perspective on their own system with stakeholders is continued for other issues - Cross-functional teams have decision-making power, shared decision-making in action teams - Stakeholder or customer review for input in progress - Increase of participation of often excluded groups - Increased ability to work with diversity: relevant diversity is identified and valued, different views are not minimised or discounted - Microcosm practices continue: large group meetings, deep divers, checkpoints, reunions, action teams 	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you meet differently as a result of the process? Do you communicate differently? - How are stakeholders involved? - Are there any new structures or management systems made as a result of the process?
6.4. New structures sustain ongoing participation in change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creation of a delivery system to avoid dead zone after short-term success; action groups remain viable - Shift of policy decisions; leaders are more aware of the need of the ground level to make policies actually work; better balance between top-down and bottom-up decision-making - Employees are able to influence important organisational decisions concerning their own work, such as work methods, strategy, coordination - Communities of practice are established, new networks - Tools learned during the LSI are used to ensure continued learning - Ongoing participation in new partnerships and collaborations - Management systems changed, especially human resource systems, that build and support the new culture - Progress is monitored, feedback provided, midcourse corrections and directions changed - Role of work councils shifts from participation to helping to organise participation - Leaders are coached in their roles in the change process 	
6.5. Communication is more direct and constructive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meetings with an “engagement edge”: more efficient, effective and participative - Shift from one-way to two-way communication between levels and functions - Unusual or unexpected message approaches to keep awareness high - Different modalities (play, pictures, interaction technology) are used - New language that expresses mutual understanding - Negative feelings expressed in conversations about an issue change from fear or anger to 	

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	sadness or frustration	
7. Risks: Possible undesired effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cynicism and greater resistance to change - Loss of trust in participative processes, frustration about unfulfilled expectations - Apathy among some people, awaiting further action of leaders, to get relief of responsibility - Withdrawal of champions after the conference event - Not enough time for follow-up; dissipating energy and frustration when people return to their demanding workplaces even when the follow-up seemed ok - People agree only at a high level of abstraction doing relatively minor, non-controversial projects - Discouragement among people who were not invited - Increased power game, increased distrust, decline of open communication - Collusive climate, overemphasis of group interests at the expense of the personal affiliate 	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Were there any undesired effects? Which?

