Shaping the Parish

Developmental Initiative Report

Initiative Title: Improving Group Functioning

Level: B

# YOUR NAME

E-MAIL

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Improve the functioning of the vestry and other significant groups in the parish in an action – research process. Facilitate a process in which members of the group learn from their experience as a group.

Use a learning-from-experience process with the vestry and other selected groups. The process may be the use of meeting assessment forms or another EIAG process (see attachments below). The same process is to be used for at least two meetings in a row and scheduled for use at several other meetings over the following 14 months.

Participant’s additions & changes to the description

If you are revising the above in some manner, note that here. Offer a rationale for the change. Changes may not be so extreme as to change the basic thrust of the project description above --

Have you carefully reviewed the above description?

 Yes No [ Note: You must have done this review for the DI to be accepted]

ACTION PLANNING

1. What are you planning to do? What is the action plan? First steps. How you will monitor and adjust along the way

2. Theoretical base and strategic assumptions for the project

a. Theoretical Base (connect related theory to the project and the particulars of your parish) -

b. Strategic Assumptions (In your parish as it is now – what were you assuming would happen allowing the project to move forward? A strategic assumption has enough significance that if it turns out to not be true, the project will fail) -

A. Results: What are the initial results are you seeking? Note: we are assuming you are working from the basic DI description. This section is more a brief statement of overall objectives expressed in a way that integrates the description with the particularities of your parish.

Do the same regarding longer-term development goals? Relationship to the parish’s overall health? Relationship to the primary task of a parish church? -

B. Reflection

1. Strategic (pp 12 – 13 *Intervention Considerations*)

*The Developmental Initiatives are by their nature strategic or at least they are in that arena. These elements may help you consider related factors*

1. Long term, developmental, likely to have a ripple effect -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not likely |  |  |  | Very Likely |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment:

1. Related to the primary task of a parish church (form people in faith, renewal in baptismal identity and purpose, facilitating the movement between renewal and apostolate) -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not related |  |  |  | Very related |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment:

1. Can anticipate adequate resources of time, money, and energy devoted to the initiative? -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Anticipate inadequate resources |  |  |  | Anticipate very adequate resources |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment:

2. Demand System (pp13 – 14 *Intervention Considerations*)

*What is really developmental is usually also not urgent. It may be important but it is not urgent. How do you establish a new demand system that serves what’s important?*

1. How will you cope with all the other demands, expectations and pressures of the parish an your life as you try to focus on the DI? -
* How will you work to create a new “demand system” that will make this initiative part of the parish’s routine business? -

3. Critical Mass (pp. 23 – 29 *Intervention Considerations*)

*In general critical mass theories are about building the overall level of commitment, competence and emotional maturity at the center of the parish so that it grounds the system in a mission orientation and an organizational culture that supports the mission. In relationship to a specific Developmental Initiative there may be two considerations.*

* What will you do to create enough “weight” to support this particular DI? Will there be enough physical and emotional energy to get the work accomplished? This has to do with the social and political process by which you help the parish move forward. (For example, if working on Group Functioning – can you anticipate enough initial support from members of the groups you want to involved?) - Describe it. -

* In most DIs there is a second consideration. Will enough of a critical mass develop in relationship to the *desired results* of the initiative? (For example, if working on Group Functioning – How will you develop a critical mass of competence and commitment in the groups going through the process? What will you do so people become more skilled?) -

* Is there an “emotional inversion” in the parish, either broadly in the parish in general or in regard to this particular DI? (See bottom p. 26 *Intervention Considerations*) -

4. Internal Commitment (pp. 29 – 31 *Intervention Considerations*)

*This is often interrelated with critical mass considerations. You want as many people as possible, at least a critical mass, to have a high level of commitment to the direction or action that was chosen. This makes it more likely that the intervention will continue to have its benefits for the parish over time and under stress. The assumption is that commitment is built upon a base of valid and useful information and free choice. One element builds on the other. The more the information is valid and useful, the more likely the free choice, the more there is truly free choice, the more likely there will be internal commitment.*

How will you help people engage an adequate amount of valid and useful information? --

How will you design the process so that people have an adequate degree of free choice vs. acting from habit or emotional pressure)? --

5. Your influence (pp. 31 - 34 *Intervention Considerations*; take note of “OD Roles” and “Circles of Influence”)

Assess your influence in relationship to this specific DI? -

6. Readiness (pp. 34 - 38 *Intervention Considerations)*

* Adequate dissatisfaction – Is there dissatisfaction with the way things are in relationship to the DIs field of interest? -
* Favorable stance of people – Is there a person, or more than one person, who wants this to happen and is willing to spend energy making it happen? A person with enough influence with people who would need to cooperate in order for it to happen? -
* Competence for change – Did you have the skills and knowledge needed for this particular intervention? -
* How does it fit with the parish’s current culture? -
* Resources available – Are there adequate resources of people, money, facilities and such to implement the project/change? Any concerns? -
* Energy and attention – What are the likely problems around having the needed amount of energy? -
* Formal authorization – Most of the efforts that can shape a parish only require the

investment of the parish priest. That role assumes the authority to initiate efforts to improve the faithfulness and health of the parish. But there are situations requiring vestry action. Is formal authorization needed from some group within the parish or diocese? -

7. Intervention Choices (pp. 39 - 41 *Intervention Considerations)*

*We are constantly making choices about interventions. Who to involve - just the leadership, a working group, everyone in the organization? What to focus on - the issue it would be easiest to make headway on or the most strategic opportunity? The style of work - do we take a problem solving approach or use some appreciative process? How deep shall we go - are we working on deep underlying assumptions about how we work and relate with one another or are we simply trying to get this problem behind us?*

* What is the unit focus of the intervention? Is there a need to engage at several levels? Rationale for this -
* What is the opportunity, problem, or issue to address? Not simply the title of the DI but in relation to those listed on p 39 -
* What is the intervention method? (for example those listed on p. 39)-

8. Your stance (pp. 42 – 43 *Intervention Considerations)*

* What leadership style do you see yourself taking in doing the intervention (p 42)? How does that match with your preferred leadership style? Do you find yourself needing a broader range of styles? -
* What is your usual stance in relationship to the parish and its leaders (loving critic, unloving critic, uncritical lover)? How might that impact the intervention? -

RESULTS & LEARNINGS

A. Results: What happened? What are the initial results you’re seeing? Also look at it in terms of the project goal/objectives. Is there anything to report in regard to longer-term development goals? Any initial sense about sustainability over the long-term and under pressure? Relationship to the parish’s overall health? Relationship to the primary task of a parish church? Experience regarding your strategic assumptions -

B. Theoretical base and strategic assumptions for the project

a. Theoretical Base (connect related theory to the project and the particulars of your parish) -

*Mark one*

-As expected (in action planning) -

-Differed from what we expected -

 If different, please comment -

b. Strategic Assumptions -rate and comment in relationship to strategic assumptions as noted in action planning -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not on target  |  |  |  | Very much on target |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

Comment -

C. Reflection

*Make comments connecting what happened with the area of reflection.*

1. Strategic (pp 12 – 13 *Intervention Considerations*)

*The Developmental Initiatives are by their nature strategic or at least they are in that arena. These elements may help you consider related factors*

* Long term, developmental, likely to have a ripple effect; rate and describe -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| None |  |  |  | Strong effect |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

* Related to the primary task of a parish church (form people in faith, renewal in baptismal identity and purpose, facilitating the movement between renewal and apostolate); rate and describe -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No noticeable relationship |  |  |  | Strong relationship |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

* Were adequate resources of time, money, and energy devoted to the initiative?; rate and describe -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not adequate  |  |  |  | Very adequate  |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

2. Demand System (pp13 – 14 *Intervention Considerations*)

*What is really developmental is usually also not urgent. It may be important but it is not urgent. How do you establish a new demand system that serves what’s important?*

* How did you cope with all the other demands, expectations and pressures of the parish an your life as you tried to focus on the DI? -
* How have you worked to create a new “demand system” that will make this initiative part of the parish’s routine business? -

3. Critical Mass (pp. 23 – 29 *Intervention Considerations*)

*In general critical mass theories are about building the overall level of commitment, competence and emotional maturity at the center of the parish so that it grounds the system in a mission orientation and an organizational culture that supports the mission. In relationship to a specific Developmental Initiative there may be two considerations.*

* Was there enough “weight” to support this particular DI? Enough energy to get the work

accomplished? This has to do with the social and political process by which you help the parish move forward. (For example, if working on Group Functioning – was there enough initial support from members of the groups you wanted involved?) - Rate and Describe -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not enough |  |  |  | Enough weight  |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

* In most DIs there is another consideration. Is enough of a critical mass developing in relationship to the desired results of the initiative? Rate and Describe (For example, if working on Group Functioning – Is a critical mass of competence and commitment beginning to develop in the groups going through the process? Are people becoming more skilled?) -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not enough |  |  |  | Enough  |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

* Was there an “emotional inversion” in the parish, either broadly in the parish in general or in regard to this particular DI? (See bottom p. 26 *Intervention Considerations*) -

 Yes No unsure

 Comment -

4. Internal Commitment (pp. 29 – 31 *Intervention Considerations*)

*This is often interrelated with critical mass considerations. You want as many people as possible, at least a critical mass, to have a high level of commitment to the direction or action that was chosen. This makes it more likely that the intervention will continue to have its benefits for the parish over time and under stress. The assumption is that commitment is built upon a base of valid and useful information and free choice. One element builds on the other. The more the information is valid and useful, the more likely the free choice, the more there is truly free choice, the more likely there will be internal commitment.*

a. What did you do to build internal commitment as seen is this approach? -

b. Assess

Enough internal commitment for what was needed in this case -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not enough |  |  |  | Enough  |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

Base of free choice and valid and useful information to build the internal commitment -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not enough |  |  |  | Enough  |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment -

5. Your influence (pp. 31 - 34 *Intervention Considerations*; take note of “OD Roles” and “Circles of Influence”)

Was your influence adequate to manage the intervention?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all |  |  |  | Adequate |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment -

6. Readiness (pp. 34 - 38 *Intervention Considerations)*

* Adequate dissatisfaction – Was there dissatisfaction with the way things were in relationship to the change projects field of interests? -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all |  |  |  | Adequate |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment -

* Favorable stance of people – Was there a person, or more, who wants this to happen and is willing to spend energy making it happen? A person with enough influence with people who would need to cooperate in order for it to happen? -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all |  |  |  | Adequate |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment -

* Competence for change – Did we have the skills and knowledge we need for this particular intervention? -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all |  |  |  | Adequate |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment -

* It fit with the parish’s current culture -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all |  |  |  | Adequate |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment -

* Resources available – the people, money, facilities and such needed to implement the project/change. -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all |  |  |  | Adequate |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment -

* Energy and attention – The needed amount of energy was available -

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all |  |  |  | Adequate |
|  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |

 Comment -

* Formal authorization – Most of the efforts that can shape a parish only require the

investment of the parish priest. That role assumes the authority to initiate efforts to improve the faithfulness and health of the parish. But there are situations requiring vestry action. Was there the needed authorization? -

 Yes No Uncertain

 Comment -

7. Intervention Choices (pp. 39 - 41 *Intervention Considerations)*

*We are constantly making choices about interventions. Who to involve - just the leadership, a working group, everyone in the organization? What to focus on - the issue it would be easiest to make headway on or the most strategic opportunity? The style of work - do we take a problem solving approach or use some appreciative process? How deep shall we go - are we working on deep underlying assumptions about how we work and relate with one another or are we simply trying to get this problem behind us?*

* What was the unit focus of the intervention? Did that end up being appropriate? Was there (or is there) a need to engage at several levels of units? -
* What was the opportunity, problem, or issue to address? Not simply the title of the DI but in relation to those listed on p 39 -
* What was the intervention method? (for example those listed on p. 39)-

8. Your stance (pp. 42 – 43 *Intervention Considerations)*

* What leadership style did you take in doing the intervention (p 42)? Was that effective? Did you find yourself needing a broader range of styles? -
* What is your usual stance in relationship to the parish and its leaders (loving critic, unloving critic, uncritical lover)? How did that effect the intervention? -

C. Learnings

1. About change theory and methods -

2. About spiritual practices in shaping the parish -

3. About emotional & social intelligence in shaping the parish -

4. About yourself as a person and leader

D. Next Steps

1. Thoughts on long-term goals -

2. Next steps in the short term -

3. Comments -

Copyright Robert A. Gallagher & Michelle Heyne, 2010, 2011

# Rating Team Effectiveness

1. Direction &Goals

**Poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Good**

Confused; conflicting; unrealistic; uninteresting to or no “ownership by” members

Clear and shared by all; important to all; “owned”

2. Participation in Team Meetings

## Poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Good

All participate, all are listened to

A few dominate; some listen; several talk atonce or interrupt

3. Expression of Feelings

**Poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Good**

Feelings are unexpressed, ignored or criticized

Freely expressed; empathetic responses

4. Planning to Accomplish the Team’s Work

## Poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Good

Shared by all members

Done by one or two

5.Decisions

## Poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Good

Agreement sought and tested; differences used to improve decisions; decisions made are fully supported

Needed decisions don’t get made; decisions made by one person or clique; others uncommitted

6. Shared Leadership for Team Work

## Poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Good

Team needs are met by various members; strong sense of shared responsibility

Team depends on one person or a clique; little shared sense of responsibility for team success

Team Meeting Assessment

Steps: 1. All members of the group complete the assessment; 2. Put the results on newsprint in front of the group; 3. Discuss and explore; 4. Identify an area to work at improving or something the team does well that can be expanded and built upon.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Low |  |  |  |  | High |
| 1. We had clear meeting objectives - knew what we were trying to accomplish in this meeting |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. We met our meeting objectives |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Participation – all were able to fully participate in a way that fit the needs of the meeting and individual working styles |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. We made use of a team decision-making tool/method, e.g., Brainstorming & Prioritizing, Force Field Analysis (FFA), SWOT, Testing Process, etc. |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. We effectively used newsprint or easels & pads – kept ideas visible  |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The meeting was well designed -- for participation, time use, outcomes |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
| 7. The space was used in a manner that allowed us to see each other and the work space |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. I felt free to express my feelings and ideas |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Communication in the meeting was open, authentic and productive |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. There was a respect for differences of working style and opinions in the meeting |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Other (something the team wants to assess in its meetings): |  |  1 |  2 |  3 |  4 |  5 |  6 |

Comments:
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Working Relationship: Exploration

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Our sense of direction as a team is confused, unclear |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | Is clear, shared,  | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  2. Feelings are discounted or ignored |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | Feelings are respected and heard | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. We jump to solutions too quickly |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | We give time for adequate data gathering & diagnosis | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4. One of us dominates the relationship |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | We all speak up, get our voice in | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  5. We take too much time making decisions, feels stuck too often |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | We are adequately efficient in our decision making together | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6. We are tentative with each other, too polite and cautious |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | We trust each other; are rather direct | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7. Our communications with each other are frequently unclear, confusing |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | Communications are clear  | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8. We don’t use each others resources |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | We make good use of one another | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9. I feel very uninvolved & uncommitted to the relationship |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | I feel very involved & committed | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10. We don’t give each other feedback about how we work together |  |  1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | We handle feedback well | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Copyright Robert A. Gallagher 2002

CHANGING NORMS: A WORKSHEET

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **AREA** |  **CURRENT NORMS** |  **WISHED FOR NORMS** |
| Acceptance of each other |  |  |
| Seating/Room arrangement |  |  |
| Formal Leadership |  |  |
| Shared Leadership (using the resources of everybody’s participation |  |  |
| Dealing with Differences |  |  |
| Decision Making |  |  |
| Advance Designing of Meetings |  |  |

© Robert A. Gallagher, 1993

Learning from Experience

It is a core assumption of lab training that we do not learn from experience itself; we learn from disciplined reflection on experience. The learning process is really one of learning about our experience from a structured reflection on our experience. The method offered here is called --- **E - I - A - G.**

E – Experience

I – Identify

A – Analyze

G – Generalize

This has been a core learning method in lab training. With adaptation in has been used in team development and Organization Development efforts.

**Experience** – This is anything that happens in the group. The behavior of the group or people within the group becomes the starting place for learning.

**Identify** – A specific behavior or pattern of behaviors is selected as a starting point. The group needs to identify what happen, when it happened, etc. The objective is for all the group members to adequately recall the experience so they can all contribute to the learning process. The assumption is that everyone may be able to learn from the experience.

**Analyze** – The group explores and examines the experience that has been identified. The group may look at the impact or effect of the behavior(s); sharing how they felt, what they thought, how they acted, etc. Judgments each person made may be shared – was the behavior helpful or hindering to the group’s life and work? Analysis may include relating the experience to some theory, model or research?

**Generalize** – This is an opportunity for group members to state what they have learned; to generalize what has been learned into other situations. Based on the analysis, the members state what they might do in a similar situation, what they might have done differently in this situation, what conclusions they have drawn, etc. Members will not necessarily share the same learnings. In lab training two norms are useful in the “Generalization” discussion. First – Each person has his or her own learning. That learning has its own validity. It doesn’t need to be shared by others to by legitimate. Second – It is acceptable for members to ask each other for information about the basis for stated learnings or generalizations.

# The Reflection Process

# First, be clear about roles

Name those in the group who share, first hand, the experience being explored. These are the people who will need to do most of the work in the process and draw the learnings. Others serve in a support role -- offering suggestions to consider based on similar experiences and the common skills and knowledge they share. In a training group it is usually best for the learning process if the experience being reflected on is shared by all group members.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **E – Experience** |  | This is the experience you have already had. It is the base for the process. The disciplined learning process really starts with **I – Identify** |
| **I – Identify** |  | An event in the life of the group that you want to use to learn from.1. Select an event.2. Describe the event so everyone understands what is being discussed.3. Each person that was present during the event share what they saw, heard, felt. What behavior did you observe in yourself and others? |
| **A – Analyze** |  | Think about what happened1. Share about the event -- *Concerns Likes*2. What helped or hindered the group * in terms of its task?
* in terms of its trust?
* in terms of \_\_\_\_\_?

3. What was the effect on you? What did you say and do? What were your feelings and thoughts?4. Use appropriate theory, models or research to explore the event. |
| **G - Generalize** |  | State what you have learned1. What would you do in a similar situation in the future? What would you repeat? What would you do differently?2. State anything you have learned. |

© Robert A. Gallagher, 1996, 2001

#

# Learning from Experience: An Alternative Use of EIAG

The group goes through these steps in a disciplined process. It may help to have a designated facilitator and to use newsprint to record the group’s thinking.

## A. Identify the experience

1. Select an event in the group’s experience to reflect upon and learn from.

2. Describe the event (do not try to resolve issues of “true and false”, if people have different descriptions, receive them all)

a. who was involved?

b. what happen, what was the sequence of events, what did we see, hear?

c. what did people feel, think?

## B. Analyze the experience

**1. What assessment do people have of what happened?** The concern here is with the results, outcome or consequences of the event and what effected the outcome. You might put the following on newsprint.

Outcome/Results of the Experience

 NOT VERY

 SATISFIED 1 2 3 4 5 SATISFIED

What helped/hindered the group during the event.

**2. We are also interested in the consequences of people’s behavior during the event**.

Compare the effects, impact, consequences of people’s behavior during the event and --

* Its relationship to the group’s goals, norms, results, etc.

For example -- “I think that my standing up and beginning to record on the newsprint when Harry began to ‘tear up’, violated our norm of respecting each others feelings and contributions.”

* People’s intentions; the effect the person hoped the behavior would have

For example -- “By remaining silent I hoped to avoid further upsetting Peter. What happen was that Peter’s frustration grew and the group was unable to continue its work.”

C. Generalize

This involves both drawing any conclusions based on the analysis and identifying what the group or individuals might do in a similar situation.

1. Each person share what they might do differently in a similar situation. And/or

2. The group brainstorm a list of what it would “wish” for in a similar situation. Each person then identifies which of the “wishes” they could and are willing to do something about. And/or

3. Each person share “What I have learned ...+about myself” +about how groups function”
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# Learning From Experience: Worksheet

Sometime sit is useful to have group members use a worksheet in doing the EIAG.

A. The group -- Identify a significant event that it wants to explore

B. Each person uses this worksheet in an individual exploration

1. During the event what did you

* Observe?
* Feel?
* Think ?

2. What did you do during the event; what was your behavior?

3. What did you see as your choices at the time; what choices were you aware of? Was there something you thought of doing and now wish you had?

4. How did you block yourself from acting? What messages did you give yourself that interfered with your ability to act?

5. Is there anything you wish you had done differently?

C. Share what you want to share with the group.
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