




# Evaluation Instrument for complex interventions with the whole system



## Success factors and effects of Large Scale Interventions and how they can be observed in practice





This document is part of the book Building an evidence based practical guide to Large Scale Interventions. Towards sustainable change with the whole system  
 © 2011 Tonnie van der Zouwen. Publied by Eburon, Delft, Netherlands.


 = Open interview     = Documents






Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
<b>1. Context/Task: LSI is the right approach</b>		
<b>1.1. The task is important</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A leader with an itch to scratch, a compelling business purpose</li> <li>- An urgent problem or issue, business as usual is not a viable option</li> <li>- A super-ordinate goal or shared concern</li> <li>- Multilevel issues</li> <li>- The expected benefits must outweigh the costs</li> </ul>	 <u>Client, participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Why this? What was the intention of the LSI?</li> <li>- Why now?</li> <li>- Was it worth the effort?</li> </ul>
<b>1.2. Stakeholders need each other to succeed with this task</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No one of the stakeholders can do alone what they can to together</li> <li>- Need for joint problem definition and strategy in diversity and conflict</li> <li>- A basic willingness to work together, awareness that collaboration is necessary</li> </ul>	
<b>1.3. Situation is complex and/or uncertain</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A high level of fragmentation</li> <li>- Uncertain, fast changing situations</li> <li>- Multiple complexities and ambiguities to deal with, nobody could possibly know all the details or all the answers</li> <li>- The change is transformational</li> <li>- Unprecedented or breakthrough changes call for unprecedented or breakthrough action</li> </ul>	



Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
1.4. <b>Contra-indications</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Issue is not important to anyone</li> <li>- Task is abstract and likely to lead to talk without action</li> <li>- One-way information transfer is required (confidentiality, loss of face, knowledge transfer)</li> <li>- Individual professionals can solve the problem</li> <li>- No opportunity for change, due to lack of resources, energy, time or lack of actual influence</li> </ul>	
2. <b>Client: Leaders support the LSI approach</b>		
2.1. <b>Leaders are willing to collaborate, to share power</b>	<p>Leaders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Have good intentions</li> <li>- Are credible, no hidden agendas</li> <li>- Show willingness to work from a shared power-base to achieve shared ownership</li> <li>- Believe that collaboration is more likely to stimulate follow-up</li> <li>- Tolerate uncertainty, are able to stay with “not knowing”</li> <li>- Minimise the influence of power differences and adopt a neutral position</li> <li>- Allow local control and establish clear boundaries</li> <li>- Are willing to live with the outcome</li> </ul>	<p> <u>.Client</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Were you prepared to support follow-up? Did you?</li> </ul> <p> <u>Participants</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How did you feel when you were invited?</li> <li>- What were your expectations?</li> </ul>
2.2. <b>Leaders are willing to spend time and money to do it “by the book”</b>	<p>Leaders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are prepared to support follow-up, carefully balancing between too much and too little support</li> <li>- Act as champions who sponsor the process, or want to involve a champion</li> <li>- Show commitment and persistence</li> </ul>	
2.3. <b>Political climate: enough trust to start</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leaders realize and acknowledge that trust is unlikely to be present from the start</li> <li>- Conditions for trust building are created by providing a minimal structure</li> <li>- Careful consideration of cross cultural communication</li> <li>- Degree of negative stereotyping between groups does not prevent participation of</li> </ul>	




Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	specific stakeholders - Willingness to opt for a different way, despite political vulnerability	
<b>2.4. Contra-indications:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Highly-charged political situations with no space for open discussion or follow-up action; fight-flight behaviour, apparent indifference</li> <li>- Leaders delegate the process to subordinates and show up only at the beginning and/or the end</li> <li>- Focus on personal gain, win-lose dynamic</li> <li>- Sponsor wants to squeeze work into too short a time</li> <li>- Fast cycle of leadership succession</li> <li>- Withdrawal behaviour: declining attendance at planning meetings</li> <li>- Unspoken agenda: ongoing negotiation and discussion outside the planning group about the central issue</li> <li>- Communication with responsible staff is done by an intermediary such as a project leader</li> </ul>	
<b>3. Consultant: Facilitators are skilled to conduct an LSI</b>		
<b>3.1. Facilitators make and keep a clear contract with the client</b>	Facilitators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Insist on adequate time with the client to clarify the contract, and discuss implications for the process and for follow-up</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Help to set clear goals, by starting with solid understanding of what is to be accomplished with the process; the task is well-defined</li> <li>- Bring and keep the principles of LSI front and centre</li> <li>- Focus on the bigger process, not on an event or method</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Help leaders manage their anxiety about uncertainty of the process and loss of control</li> </ul>	 <u>Contract with the client (proposals)</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What goals are mentioned?</li> <li>- Are the principles of the approach explained?</li> <li>- What boundaries are set? (clear/abstract)</li> <li>- Is follow-up built in or mentioned?</li> </ul>  <u>Client, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Was there a sponsor meeting?</li> <li>- Were principles demonstrated and/or</li> </ul>

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Avoid the “they won’t come dialogue”, people nearly always come once they know the importance of the task and who else is coming</li> <li>- 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</li> </ul>	<p>discussed before the LGI?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did the playing field suite the task? (Model When LGI?)</li> <li>- Were the boundaries of participation and responsibility clear to you?</li> </ul> <p> <u>Client, consultant, participants</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Choose interaction levels on chart “When LSI”</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.2. Facilitators gain credibility, managing expectations</b></p>	<p>Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Make a conscious choice for application of LSI, making the aims of the LSI explicit</li> <li>- Check and explore each other’s assumptions about LSI</li> <li>- Don’t raise expectations they can’t fulfil, they aim for good enough rather than for unrealistic outcomes</li> <li>- Are able to explain why they are doing what they are doing (methodical reasoning) in everyday language</li> <li>- Show energy and decisiveness</li> <li>- Show positive personality, appearance of trust, maturity, calmness, integrity</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Client, Consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What made you say “yes” to this process?</li> <li>- What did you say “no” to?</li> <li>- What were your expectations?</li> <li>- Looking back, do you consider your expectations realistic?</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.3. Facilitators are aware of their own role</b></p>	<p>Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are conscious of their impact on the system, from the start</li> <li>- Are aware of own assumptions about change and the role of knowledge</li> <li>- Know their own strength and weaknesses, facilitation is preferably done with two facilitators who complete each other</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Client and consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What was your role in the process?</li> <li>- What do you consider as your relevant strength and weaknesses for this process?</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4. Facilitators have skills to work with large groups</b></p>	<p>Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are tolerant for ambiguity</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Participants, client</u></p>




Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Have the objective to accept people as they are, not as facilitators might wish them to be</li> <li>- Work on staying calm, to contain “messiness” long enough to prevent premature structuring</li> <li>- Can contain frustration projected onto them</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Are able to deal with differences and competitive attitudes in a constructive way, in function of the jointly defined goals</li> <li>- Are experienced enough to deal with the circumstances</li> <li>- Have experience in working with large groups</li> <li>- Are improving their competence in working with large groups, for example through intervision, supervision, or training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did you feel free to participate and contribute?</li> <li>- What moments did stand out for you? Why?</li> <li>- What did the facilitator do or not do that was important for you?</li> <li>- How was time managed?</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="1653 539 1832 595"> <u>Consultant</u></p>
<b>3.5. Facilitators believe in the principles of LSI</b>	<p data-bbox="656 730 790 754">Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adopt an open system perspective, paying attention to fragmentation and limitations</li> <li>- Recognise and respect diversity</li> <li>- Believe that ordinary people can engage in productive dialogue</li> <li>- Take contributions of participants seriously, so they do not prompt, correct, or interpret people; all participants are seen as experts</li> <li>- See themselves as co-investigators</li> <li>- Focus on possibilities for the future, not on problems now and in the past</li> <li>- Seek to alter conditions rather than behaviour</li> <li>- Promote and teach self-management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Were there difficult moments for you? What did you do?</li> <li>- How did you manage time? Were you satisfied with it?</li> <li>- Were you trained to work with large groups? How?</li> </ul>
<b>3.6. Contra-indications consultant</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilitators want to sell LSI</li> <li>- Facilitators use abstract jargon, do not search for connection to the needs of the client</li> <li>- Facilitators take an expert role, believing they have the right answers</li> </ul>	
<b>4. Intervention: LSI is performed right</b>		





Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
<b>4.1. LGI is planned as part of a larger effort</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A post-event strategy, or a sequence of LGIs, is planned or built in</li> <li>- The timing of the LGI: not too early and not too late in the process</li> <li>- Road map of the bigger process is available</li> </ul>	 <u>Contract, design LGI</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Was the LGI part of a larger effort?</li> </ul>  <u>Participants, client</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Was it the right time for you to have the LGI?</li> </ul>
<b>4.2. Working with a planning group for all essential decisions regarding design, management, and logistics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning team/steering committee with key stakeholders, people who have the credibility and connections to get all the other participants to come</li> <li>- Planning team with diversity of perspectives, interests, identities, potential contributions; a cross-section of the system</li> <li>- Knowledge and ability to select stakeholder groups, especially the under-bound groups</li> <li>- Facilitator helps the planning group find common ground of interest across all the stakeholder groups</li> <li>- Awareness that whole system issues surface as a prelude to the larger meeting; points of conflicts are elicited</li> <li>- Alternative designs with enough diversity are offered and discussed</li> <li>- An invitation strategy for getting people to commit to the meeting time</li> <li>- Invitation with strategic questions and a challenging title</li> <li>- Conscious attention is given to the inclusiveness of participants who represent alternative or opposing perspectives on the issue at hand</li> <li>- Division of responsibilities is clearly enunciated at a very early stage; participants are responsible for the outcomes of the large group conference</li> <li>- Planning group has enough confidence in the process</li> </ul>	 <u>Reports of planning group meetings, invitation(s)</u>   <u>Consultant, client, planning group members</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How was the stakeholder analyses done? (ARE-IN model)</li> <li>- How did you feel about the invitation</li> </ul>
<b>4.3. Design is coherent with context, task, relations and directions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Principles of LSI are respected in design, using them in combination</li> <li>- Adequate LGI method selected, limitations of the method are discussed</li> <li>- Awareness of pattern-setting activities that may amplify or dampen the effects of change</li> </ul>	 <u>Design, participant list, report LGI, reports planning team</u>






Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>after the large group meeting</li> <li>- Awareness that the mere categorisation of people into different groups is a sufficient condition for negative stereotyping to develop</li> <li>- Enough time for preparation and invitation</li> <li>- Good timing of events considering the circumstances</li> <li>- Minimal and flexible design for real time adaptation, no more rules than strictly necessary</li> <li>- A broad spectrum of learning styles is met, work forms addressing head, heart and hands</li> <li>- Division of work done by planning team and in large group meeting is balanced with available time and budget</li> <li>- LGI is interactive as much as possible</li> <li>- Enough time and space to get the work done</li> <li>- A 2-3 day LGI</li> <li>- Adequate project management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Was the planning team a micro cosmos of the system?</li> <li>- 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?</li> <li>- How interactive was the design?</li> <li>- What makes the way of working and the outcomes transferable?</li> <li>- Are “all” learning styles met?</li> <li>- Compare design and report: What differences can be seen?</li> </ul> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <u>Consultant, client</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How was the planning team made up?</li> <li>- How was diversity invited?</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.4. Participants: getting the right people in the room</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Invite those who can influence or are influenced (ARE-IN: with Authority, Resources, Expertise, Information, Need)</li> <li>- Build critical mass, with capacity to facilitate and lead change</li> <li>- Highly diverse group: interests, opinions, age, sex, culture</li> <li>- Unusual meeting: Provide a forum for dialogue among people who rarely have an opportunity to hear one another</li> <li>- Stakeholders can and will come</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Invitation, participant list, contract, design, reports of meetings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Who were invited?</li> <li>- Who participated?</li> <li>- How was paid attention to key stakeholders who were not there?</li> </ul>




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







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




Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<p>responsibility for their performance and to give what they have to offer, whatever position they come from</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “The majority rules”, or power plays in design and performance are not accepted</li> <li>- People have a right to hold back and accept the consequences (no outcome)</li> </ul>	<p> Participants, client</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What was your responsibility as a participant?</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.9. Convergence: Tapping into collective intelligence</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Listen and look together for patterns, insights and deeper questions</li> <li>- Observing the thought process in yourself and others: notice fragmentation or incoherence</li> <li>- Suspending judgment, assumptions and certainties: experience unwritten and unconscious rules and patterns</li> <li>- Accessing the generative order in dialogue, sensing a mutually shared field, experience of a sense of community or collective wisdom</li> <li>- Playful moments, signs of humour</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Participants, client, consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did you experience a sense of community?</li> <li>- How did you look for deeper insights or questions?</li> <li>- Did it work for you? What insights, questions?</li> <li>- Was there laughter, fun, spontaneous applause (or other signs of humour)?</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.10. Conference setting for the LGI facilitates the process, the room setting symbolizes the principles of LSI</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Informal and hospitable atmosphere, a well-lighted room with windows</li> <li>- A neutral and accessible place for all participants, psychological safe</li> <li>- Location is physically safe to work with large groups</li> <li>- Location and room setting encourage feelings of equality</li> <li>- Personal comfort is as high as possible: beverages available at any time, good food, atmosphere, logistics, serving cultural needs</li> <li>- Meeting physically is necessary to make eye contact: helps building trust, enhances new relationships and invites strategic conversations</li> <li>- Residential conference gives participants time to interact outside the formal group time, away from other commitments</li> <li>- Room setting facilitates sharing of information, knowledge, learning</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Photos, design, reports</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did the conference setting facilitate the goals of the meeting?</li> <li>- Are there signs of playful moments, fun, humour?</li> </ul> <p> <u>Participants, client, consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did the conference setting facilitate the goals of the meeting?</li> </ul>


Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilitators are satisfied with the meeting room</li> </ul>	
<b>4.11. Action planning for next steps is done in the LGI, or soon after</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Energy and ideas are channelled into action planning, identifying next steps</li> <li>- Common ground and future action first; problems and conflicts are background information</li> <li>- Agreements are reviewed plenary</li> <li>- Meeting and progress are celebrated</li> <li>- Immediate reporting at the end of the LGI, or soon after</li> </ul>	 <u>Design, report</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How was action planning done?</li> </ul>  <u>Participants, client, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How was action planning done?</li> </ul>
<b>4.12. Reflection on conditions and principles with participants LGI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Participants understand they have a role in diffusion of the conference outcomes throughout the greater system</li> <li>- Attention is given to the conditions and principles that produce the effectiveness</li> </ul>	 <u>Design, photos, report</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How was attention for the core principles build in? Look for signs</li> <li>- Planned actions for capacity building (training)</li> </ul>
<b>4.13. Building of capacity to work participatively</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilitators help people explore and develop new patterns of working on engagement, in their own organisation and in the bigger system</li> <li>- Training of support teams in designing their own LGI meetings; grasping is easy, applying is difficult</li> <li>- 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</li> </ul>	 <u>Participants, client</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What was different in this meeting? What do you consider as conditions for success in this process?</li> </ul>  <u>Consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did you give explicit attention the conditions and principles? How?</li> </ul>

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
<p><b>4.14. LGI is managed well by facilitators</b></p>	<p>Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prepare themselves for "holding space"; room set-up and materials are ready well before starting time</li> <li>- Make people feel welcome, by setting the right tone</li> <li>- Set the context by clarifying purpose and process</li> <li>- Communicate clearly the rules of the game, displayed on the wall and/or in a participant workbook</li> <li>- Deal with frustration, anger and anxiety; do not ignore them</li> <li>- Facilitate exploration, work with diversity rather than reducing it via power, stereotyping, conflict avoidance, conformity</li> <li>- Help people avoiding discussion or debate to engage in constructive dialogue, in function of the jointly defined goals</li> <li>- Understand thoroughly the level of polarisation and manage time to permit the fullest discussion of difference among participants: facilitate the deepest level of common ground instead of a superficial or narrow area</li> <li>- Keep a clear focus on issues and task</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Participants</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did you feel invited by the consultant?</li> <li>- Was the purpose and process of the LGI clear to you?</li> <li>- How was dealt with differences, conflicts?</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.15. Building of a post-event support structure: during the LSI a delivery system for change is made or initiated</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Follow-up planning sessions</li> <li>- Agreement on a protocol for decision-making</li> <li>- Learning Fairs or workshops for people throughout the organisation to share what action groups are doing</li> <li>- Procedure for monitoring of the action plan, for measuring results, progress and communication</li> <li>- Building of a systematic and stakeholder-oriented evaluation</li> <li>- Initiation of ongoing communication processes, an information system is designed in cooperation with primary users (review meetings, newsletters, website, interactive tools)</li> <li>- Action groups, implementation planning teams, task forces and other temporary structures are put in place</li> <li>- Agreement with a champion who promises to continue sponsoring the process, affirming and supporting the normative change</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Contract, reports, evaluations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What post-event support structures were built?</li> <li>- What follow-up actions were planned?</li> </ul> <p> <u>Client, participants, non-participants, consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What follow-up actions were planned?</li> </ul>

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Circulate ideas from the LGI and invite comments from both attendees and other on specific issues</li> <li>- Adding representatives to an existing group for new interactions</li> <li>- Infiltrate agendas of already scheduled meetings both inside and outside the organisation with relevant follow-up from the LGI</li> <li>- Connection to the existing cycle of policy making</li> </ul>	
<b>4.16. Contra-indications to holding the LGI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meeting goal is fuzzy or irrelevant to most participants</li> <li>- People can't or won't come 100% of the time</li> <li>- An important stakeholder group is absent</li> <li>- Design reinforces the existent power relations (an existing group, LGI has to be tailored to an already planned meeting)</li> <li>- No time or resources to realize the design in a proper way</li> </ul>	
<b>5. Effectiveness: Short-term effects; LSI contributes to getting more and better work done</b>	<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>	
<b>5.1. Short-term objectives are met</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LSI is considered worth the effort</li> <li>- New structures, strategies, procedures are formulated and/or implemented</li> <li>- New proposals, wishes, needs and interests introduced/ expressed</li> <li>- More informed decisions</li> <li>- Coherent and effective collaboration on an issue / problem</li> <li>- Consensus development among organisations and entities outside the formal structures of any of them</li> <li>- Increased individual skills</li> <li>- Controlling inspectors are satisfied</li> </ul>	 <p><u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did you get what you wanted? Why?</li> <li>- Did the practitioners accomplish what they set out to do? Why?</li> <li>- What did you change as a result of the process? What do you do different or not anymore?</li> </ul>
<b>5.2. Increased awareness and understanding of the system and</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased awareness of larger systemic developments</li> <li>- Discovery of generative themes, emerging patterns of working</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Do action groups or follow-up structures still exist? What did they</li> </ul>

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
<b>context</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A picture or model for operating in a more coherent, integrated way</li> <li>- Increased knowledge of work processes</li> <li>- Common ground for information gathering, education, raising awareness</li> <li>- Deepened mutual understanding of each other's situation and more respect for other views</li> <li>- People appreciate the whole and their part in it; more appreciation of the shop floor</li> <li>- Individuals understand the organisation's objective, they know its strategy, how it is doing and who their customers and competitors are</li> </ul>	<p>produce?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did new relations or new networks emerge?</li> </ul> <p> Ask for evidence, observables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- action plans: how shallow/penetrating/profound</li> </ul>
<b>5.3. Commitment and energy for change, better implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Less barriers, more enthusiasm and support for the change process</li> <li>- People are committed to do something together, getting diverse interest groups together discussing real issues; action groups are viable</li> <li>- Players take responsibility for the issue</li> <li>- Engagement with outcome, better acceptance of conclusions, designs or redesigns</li> <li>- Increased building of trust enables personal action</li> <li>- Decreased polarisation</li> </ul>	
<b>5.4. New relationships, more potential for innovation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Learning bridges between those in power and other voices, so something new can emerge</li> <li>- Emotional bond between participants</li> <li>- New relationships are created, networks are extended</li> </ul>	
<b>5.5. Some elements of LSI are transferred</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participative follow-up meetings</li> <li>- 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)</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Meeting rooms, meeting agendas, reports</u></p>
<b>5.6. Efficiency is increased</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Condensation of work, better alignment, less disturbance</li> <li>- Better use of resources and knowledge, substantial savings in time and money</li> <li>- Decreased implementation time</li> </ul>	<p> <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is efficiency increased? How?</li> </ul>

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
<b>6. Effectiveness: Sustainable effects; LSI contributes to transformed capability for change and learning</b>	Sustainable effects are transformational; they shift the norms in relationships and communication, showing in transformed capability for change and ongoing learning	
<b>6.1. Collective learning and changing continue, increased capability for change</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use of LSI or other participative approaches is continued, used for other issues or by other people</li> <li>- Participants learn how to fragment complex problems, how to do their own data-gathering and make system models</li> <li>- Development of capacity to deal with uncertainty and chaotic circumstances</li> <li>- Deepened dialogue between leaders and the entire organisation/system</li> <li>- Increased self-organising capacity; empowerment shows in self-management, more distributed leadership</li> <li>- Improved capacity to work with the principles; increased capacity to cross boundaries of levels and functions; design ideas can come from anyone</li> </ul>	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Were there more LGIs, or 'microcosm practices' ? Why?</li> <li>- Is leadership more distributed? How?</li> </ul>
<b>6.2. Increased reflective self awareness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Self-evaluation among leaders is conducted to reflect on progress and required example behaviour</li> <li>- Discussions with stakeholders on what is working or not are included in meeting agendas</li> <li>- Reflective questions are asked in meetings, distinctions between lived and spoken beliefs are explored</li> <li>- Teams learn to review and evaluate their performance</li> <li>- "Noise" in the change process is explored and amplified: does it help or hinder the process</li> <li>- The way of interaction is reflected: time for stopping and reflection is taken</li> <li>- Profound mind-set shifts for some people</li> </ul>	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How are processes evaluated?</li> <li>- How is interaction evaluated?</li> <li>- Did new words, new language, arise as a result of the process?</li> </ul>
<b>6.3. More permeable boundaries: opening up the organisation, inviting diversity; focus on how good the system is; more</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of a shared perspective on their own system with stakeholders is continued for other issues</li> <li>- Cross-functional teams have decision-making power, shared decision-making in action teams</li> </ul>	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-participants, consultant</u>

Factors	Indicators	Evaluation method
<b>systemic thinking</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stakeholder or customer review for input in progress</li> <li>- Increase of participation of often excluded groups</li> <li>- Increased ability to work with diversity: relevant diversity is identified and valued, different views are not minimised or discounted</li> <li>- Microcosm practices continue: large group meetings, deep divers, checkpoints, reunions, action teams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Do you meet differently as a result of the process? Do you communicate differently?</li> <li>- How are stakeholders involved?</li> <li>- Are there any new structures or management systems made as a result of the process?</li> </ul>
<b>6.4. New structures sustain ongoing participation in change</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creation of a delivery system to avoid dead zone after short-term success; action groups remain viable</li> <li>- 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</li> <li>- Employees are able to influence important organisational decisions concerning their own work, such as work methods, strategy, coordination</li> <li>- Communities of practice are established, new networks</li> <li>- Tools learned during the LSI are used to ensure continued learning</li> <li>- Ongoing participation in new partnerships and collaborations</li> <li>- Management systems changed, especially human resource systems, that build and support the new culture</li> <li>- Progress is monitored, feedback provided, midcourse corrections and directions changed</li> <li>- Role of work councils shifts from participation to helping to organise participation</li> <li>- Leaders are coached in their roles in the change process</li> </ul>	
<b>6.5. Communication is more direct and constructive</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Meetings with an “engagement edge”: more efficient, effective and participative</li> <li>- Shift from one-way to two-way communication between levels and functions</li> <li>- Unusual or unexpected message approaches to keep awareness high</li> <li>- Different modalities (play, pictures, interaction technology) are used</li> <li>- New language that expresses mutual understanding</li> <li>- Negative feelings expressed in conversations about an issue change from fear or anger to sadness or frustration</li> </ul>	
<b>7. Risks: Possible undesired effects</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cynicism and greater resistance to change</li> </ul>	 <u>Client, sponsor, participants, non-</u>



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

Additional tools available for free download on [www.tonnievanderzouwen.nl/en/evaluation-instrument](http://www.tonnievanderzouwen.nl/en/evaluation-instrument)

- Audit matrix
- Score table
- Score chart

**Contact information:**

Dr. Tonnie van der Zouwen MCM, [info@tonnievanderzouwen.nl](mailto:info@tonnievanderzouwen.nl)