



KALEIDOSCOPE
Health and Care

How strategy wasn't eaten for breakfast

Applying deliberative democracy
to strategy development

Kaleidoscope Health and Care
September 2019

Hello.

Thanks for picking up this report. It's about how 'deliberative democracy' can be used to help organisations develop their strategy. We hope you enjoy it.

Let's be honest. 'Strategy development' not only sounds dull, but can also be pretty awful to experience. It's no surprise culture is seen to gobble it up.

How about using the process of developing strategy as a way to improve the culture of a place? We think 'deliberative democracy' principles can help us do this. Deliberative democracy, and particularly 'citizens assemblies' are in vogue, and for good reason. They've been used around the world with some great results.

The Stroke Association wanted to think about developing strategy in a new way. This built on a history of changing radically what it was there to do. Working with Kaleidoscope, the Stroke Association designed and ran the #WhatNext process to develop their new strategy. This was based on deliberative democracy principles.

The process was based around a group drawn from across the organisation, and given real power to determine how the Stroke Association should develop. This approach gave a clear message: we trust our staff. The group was given the support and resources it needed to deliver its task.

This challenged existing ideas as to what leadership meant in the organisation, sparking hundreds of new conversations about the organisation's direction. At the end of the process, the group presented a set of principles as to how the Stroke Association should develop. These went on to underpin the new strategy.

This wasn't about having a group hug. It developed strategy grounded in the experience of staff and stroke survivors, and developed new ways of working. But did it work? Partly because of this, the Stroke Association is now a different organisation. It's better connected, and better able to solve problems.

The impact lives on today through the way the group's principles have shaped how and what the organisation does. The #WhatNext process helped the Stroke Association connect different aspects of its work, including how the care they show to stroke survivors they show to themselves.

Unsurprisingly, we think this is a pretty good way to develop strategy. It's particularly good in dealing with large, broad issues where there isn't a 'right' answer. But we're not naive. It's not a panacea, it's not going to work for everyone, and it's tricky to do. Doing it badly is worse than not doing it at all.

The four factors that are most likely to lead to an effective process are: high level of senior leadership support; a representative, empowered group of people; widespread involvement; a clear product and next steps.

What do you think? Let us know your views. If you think it might be right for you, get in touch with us at Kaleidoscope for a coffee – hello@kscopehealth.org.uk.

Thanks for reading.

Hello. Thanks for picking up this report.
It's about how 'deliberative democracy'
can be used to help organisations
develop their strategy.
We hope you enjoy it.

Introduction

Every organisation needs a strategy. Culture eats strategy for breakfast.¹ How can these two mainstays of perceived wisdom be reconciled?

In 2018 Kaleidoscope worked with the Stroke Association to run a different approach to developing organisational strategy. The starting point was that if the development process didn't explicitly manage to develop the Stroke Association's culture, it would have failed – regardless of the quality of the strategy produced at the end of it.

The key idea was to apply 'deliberative democracy' – a form of democracy in which deliberation is central to decision-making – principles to strategy development. The Stroke Association, supported by Kaleidoscope, used a 'citizen's jury' of staff drawn from across the organisation, not simply to be engaged in the process, but to lead a significant element of it.

This short report sets out:

- the rationale for deliberative democracy
- the process for using deliberative democracy
- the impact of the Stroke Association's #WhatNext process
- the starting points for those interested in using a similar approach to strategy development.

Do let us know what you think – hello@kscopehealth.org.uk

¹ Attributed to Peter Drucker

Let's be honest. 'Strategy development' not only sounds dull, but can also be pretty awful to experience.

It's no surprise culture is seen to gobble it up.

Why do it?

The process of creating a new organisational strategy has become a monster. It's a shape-shifting beast: both ever-present, consuming huge amounts of time and effort, while being strangely isolated and impervious to day-to-day business. When the day comes to publish the shiny stock-image-filled document, everyone celebrates, not because of its brilliance, but because they can finally get back to the real work. Developing a new strategy is a tax on organisations – a costly unavoidable distraction they would rather do without.

We caricature (but we'll give you a pound if you've previously participated in strategy processes without a smidgeon of that resonating). There's a reason why phrases such as 'Strategy', 'Strategy development' and 'New strategic plan' don't quicken the pulse. In many organisations, staff simply don't see what strategy has to do with them. They may change what they do when they're instructed, but when no one is looking, they're likely to do exactly what they did before.

It's this disconnect between strategy (we use Richard Rumelt's definition: 'a coherent mix of policy and action designed to surmount a high-stakes challenge') and culture (never better described than by Herb Kelleher: 'what happens when no-one is looking') that spawned the cliché that 'culture eats strategy for breakfast'. However, in its common usage, culture is the aggressor, gobbling up the poor, well-intentioned, defenceless strategy that has had the temerity to cross culture's path.

This way of thinking isn't helpful. It strips 'strategy' of any agency to work with and positively influence culture. It's not possible to have a strategy be developed *without it* having an effect on culture. This may be simply reinforcing existing ways of working or views of senior leadership. Rather than strategy development being an isolated exercise focused on the creation of a static, stand alone product it presents an opportunity to have organisational strategy explicitly and proactively seek to have a positive benefit on organisational culture – the success of this process to be judged as much by cultural metrics as views of intellectual

How about using the process of developing strategy as a way to improve the culture of a place?

We think 'deliberative democracy' principles can help us do this.

brilliance. Taking this opportunity inevitably changes the focus of a strategy development process from being about creating a cynically viewed document that lives on a shelf, to how an organisation 'does' strategy constantly.

So if you did want to develop strategy in a different way, what can you do?

Inspiration lies in the field of deliberative democracy: a form of democracy in which deliberation is central to decision-making, adopting elements of both consensus decision-making and majority rule. Currently undergoing a renaissance, deliberative democracy is based on a central idea that authentic discussion between free and equal citizens can enable consensual decision-making which has greater legitimacy and is less vulnerable to the distortions that come with party politics.² In short, it is valued for its impact beyond the decision it produces.

Box 1: Principles that underpin deliberative democracy (Source: Royal Society of Arts)

- Debate should be informed and informative, enabling people to explore issues from a range of perspectives based on sound argument rather than personality.
- Participants should be willing to talk and to listen with civility and respect.
- Participants should represent a range of backgrounds and perspectives from across the general population.

² www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/rsa-blogs/2018/07/our-call-for-action-on-deliberative-democracy

Deliberative democracy, and particularly ‘citizens assemblies’ are in vogue, and for good reason.

They’ve been used around the world with some great results.

For example, Ireland created a Citizens’ Assembly³ (one form of deliberative democracy) in 2016 to consider abortion law. A group of 99 randomly picked strangers, broadly representing Ireland’s demographic diversity and views, were brought together for five weekends over five months to hear evidence from medical, legal and ethical experts, as well as hearing testimony of personal experience. At the end of the process, a majority of members recommended (to a specially created parliamentary committee) that the Irish constitution be amended, a change confirmed by a nationwide referendum in 2018. The Assembly has been credited with playing a key role in breaking the deadlock; that even a referendum should be held was not a mainstream proposal prior to the Assembly.

The New Zealand region of Canterbury used a deliberative democracy approach to help design their integrated health and care system.⁴ In 2006, the region was faced with a set of challenges familiar to many: ageing population, tired facilities, fragmented services. Rather than trying to ‘fix’ these problems in a traditional way, the Canterbury District Health Board created ‘Seeing 2020’, in which 80 members of staff, from cleaners to chief executives, were brought together with the explicit instruction to think differently about the future of health and care. Furnished with insights from other industries and creative facilitation to help rethink the nature of the problems they faced, the 80 recommended an approach that put patients at the centre, where patient time should be the metric from the outset – not cost. Subsequently, Canterbury developed and implemented a strategy that, over the first four years, saved over 1.5 million days of patient time. The Canterbury health and care system is now studied around the world as the future of healthcare.

It was opportunities like this that inspired the Stroke Association to develop their organisational strategy in a new way.

The Stroke Association wanted to think about developing strategy in a new way.

This built on a history of changing radically what it was there to do.

The Stroke Association: what happened?

The Stroke Association has a history of radical evolution.

Founded in 1898 as the National Association for the Prevention of Consumption and other forms of Tuberculosis, it had its first campaigning success a year later with the introduction of a by-law against spitting in public in London (posters warning of the dangers of spitting continued until the 1950s). It became the Chest and Heart Association in 1959, helping found the British Heart Foundation in 1961. 'Stroke' was added to its title in 1974, with 'Chest and Heart' dropping out from 1992.⁵

Today the Stroke Association employs around 800 people across the UK, and has a vision for a world where there are fewer strokes and all those touched by stroke get the help they need. The Stroke Association supports 50,000 stroke survivors and their families each year, and works with over 3,000 volunteers.

With their existing strategy due to expire in 2019, and a largely new team of executive directors, including Chief Executive Juliet Bouverie, a deliberate decision was made to develop the new strategic direction in a way which helped to continue and accelerate the development of a new form of organisation. Existing work included the introduction of an extensive leadership development programme in 2017, designed to produce a new set of leaders more able to thrive in an increasingly complex environment where the Stroke Association played multiple roles, often at the same time.

"Our previous strategy gave us a list of things to aim at," commented Chris Macqueen, who is responsible for the development of corporate strategy. "But it didn't really help us decide what to prioritise or how to approach these goals." A new approach was required. "We wanted a far more dynamic, inclusive way of doing strategy," commented Hilary Reynolds,

⁵ www.stroke.org.uk/about-us/our-history

Working with Kaleidoscope, the Stroke Association designed and ran the #WhatNext process to develop their new strategy.

This was based on deliberative democracy principles.

Executive Director for Strategy and Research. “So much of the energy and creativity in our organisation comes from the frontline or from volunteers and beneficiaries. We wanted to find a way of doing strategy that heard those voices.”

The Stroke Association asked Kaleidoscope to facilitate a different kind of strategy process. Kaleidoscope helped them create a massive company-wide conversation about the future which would be based on the Stroke Association’s best self. The conversation, which took place at informal events and on internal social media, was called #WhatNext.

Drawing on deliberative democracy principles, a new team – the #WhatNext group – was created to lead the conversation and become the visible leaders of the process. Impressively, 10% of the staff applied for one of the 12 places on the group. Individuals were selected to join the group to ensure a representative mix across the organisation’s roles (both function and seniority), and geography. In addition, data from the Stroke Association’s internal Yammer messaging system was used to ensure that the group collectively had as broad a set of networks as possible. “This was definitely not traditional strategy,” reflected a member of the organisation’s executive director team. “It had whole organisation, non-hierarchical engagement buy-in from multiple levels and roles. There was a sense of progress and involvement.”

The group was not created to be *engaged* with the strategy process, but to *lead* an element of it: the creation of strategic principles for the organisation’s future. This was a responsibility the group took seriously. “Being part of the core group was very motivating and the whole team were very dedicated,” commented a member of the group. “We took the responsibility very seriously and wanted to do it justice.”

This still required significant trust from the Stroke Association’s senior leaders and their Trustees. While there was space for the executive director team to understand and build on the principles, the group was given explicit permission to create a set of principles which would challenge the organisation.

The process was based around a group drawn from across the organisation, and given real power to determine how the Stroke Association should develop.

This appears a risk: leaving a group of people to make decisions yet without the information needed to do so. However, deliberative democracy approaches seek to proactively mitigate this risk, providing the representative group with all of the evidence they need to make good decisions. The risk became a symbol of the whole process, a clear message from senior leadership to the rest of the organisation: armed with the right resources, we back our staff to make excellent decisions.

As Juliet Bouverie wrote in an internal blog during the process, “The group is playing a fantastic role in helping shape our new strategy, and, as Chief Executive, some might expect me to know how that’s going to end. But I don’t... Yet I am confident that as a charity, we hold the keys to all of them.”

This message was heard by staff. “It engaged a wider part of the charity than a conventional strategy development process and there was a feeling that for the first time that the executive directors team wanted to hear what people thought,” commented a member of the #WhatNext group. “It allowed for much more freedom, and that allowed the process to really challenge assumptions and come up with stronger principles.”

“An inclusive and questioning process...”

“When we started to plan our corporate strategy refresh in late 2017, we’d just agreed a major investment in developing the leadership capability of our organisation. As an executive team we hoped that the refresh of our strategy would reinforce leadership learning. So at first sight, giving away the keys to the kingdom by asking a mixed group of staff to explore what next for the Stroke Association, was a perverse action.

But the inclusive and questioning process we went through, facilitated by Kaleidoscope, proved both liberating – and challenging – to accepted norms of hierarchical leadership. It gave people the opportunity to choose for themselves how they engaged and contributed. At times it was uncomfortable for our leaders and managers, for us as the executive team and also for our Trustees. At a number of points we needed to talk about how we felt.

**This approach gave a clear message:
we trust our staff.**

**The group was given the support and
resources it needed to deliver its task.**

The strategy development approach we took seems to have reinforced leadership development. Reflecting now (from the position of having our strategy fully owned by our Trustees), the process was key to getting to the a-ha moment - that how we operate is as important as what we do in achieving our mission."

Hilary Reynolds CBE

Executive Director for Strategy and Research, The Stroke Association

"In the first month, the #WhatNext group led the harvest of information of all sorts, analytical and anecdotal. Internal social media usage doubled, fuelled by the activity of the #WhatNext group," commented Rich Taunt, part of Kaleidoscope. "In the second and third months, we created a really rich set of experiences for the #WhatNext group." This combination of evidence, insights, and facilitation was carefully designed to support deliberative democracy principles (Box 2).

This challenged existing ideas as to what leadership meant in the organisation, sparking hundreds of new conversations about the organisation's direction.

Box 2: Supporting the #WhatNext group in line with deliberative democracy principles

Deliberative democracy principles (Source: Royal Society of Arts)

Support for the #WhatNext group

Debate should be informed and informative, enabling people to explore issues from a range of perspectives based on sound argument rather than personality.

- Six 'insight days' where the group heard from a wide range of experts (inside and outside of health), service users, and staff.
- This included visits to researchers in Edinburgh, the Dutch equivalent organisation in Rotterdam, and hearing from organisations such as Buurtzorg, Scope, SameYou, Royal Mail and more.
- The group ran a 'harvest' process in collecting input from across the Stroke Association, including running workshops, and extensive use of internal social media.

Participants should be willing to talk and to listen with civility and respect.

- Applications for the group were sought from those who actively wanted to be involved in different conversations.
- The process was facilitated by Kaleidoscope using a range of techniques to hear from all members of the group.
- Given the volume of inputs to the process, special 'insight cards' were created to help the group capture insights so they could be shared and discussed among the group.

Participants should represent a range of backgrounds and perspectives from across the general population.

- The #WhatNext group was representative of the organisation's people and functions, and contained a mix of viewpoints. This included people who had recently joined, as well as those who were considering their future at the organisation.

At the end of the process, the group presented a set of principles as to how the Stroke Association should develop.

These went on to underpin the new strategy.

“It was amazing to see the group developing from a disparate group of relatively junior staff to a confident team who thought and spoke like chief executives,” said David Laszlo, the Kaleidoscope project manager. “The thing I enjoyed about it was that it brought people with very different backgrounds, skills and jobs together,” reflected a member of the #WhatNext group. “It also made us look outside the organisation, to other countries, charities and organisations, which we don’t often do.”

The learning culminated in a “principles summit” where the group articulated what they had heard from staff and stakeholders and presented a set of principles that would govern the strategy.

The Stroke Association went on to develop the principles into a strategy that focused both on outcomes and capability. This ‘practicalities’ phase was led by the executive director team, and principally supported by the Stroke Association internally. This phase explored the implications of the principles for how the Stroke Association worked, what it needed to prioritise, and how it measured its success. “Anchoring the strategy in the harvest period ensured that what we developed was evidence-based and started where we are,” said Chris Macqueen.

Just as important as the content of the strategy was the process. Working through the strategy in this way enabled the Stroke Association to learn how to be the organisation it wanted to be: open, participative, engaged and outward looking.

“It demonstrated what a team of ordinary staff could achieve when trusted and well supported,” reflected a member of the Stroke Association who supported the process. “We started to model a more empowering, less hierarchical way of being as an organisation; we focused more on ‘being’ and less on ‘doing’, which is an important shift for us.”

This wasn't about having a group hug. It developed strategy grounded in the experience of staff and stroke survivors, and developed new ways of working.

"This challenged old mindsets..."

"My past experience of strategy processes was that they rarely sprang any surprises. Using a structured process of horizon scanning, visioning and strategic planning, they mostly seemed to help senior leaders to formalise the priorities they already had in mind. There was a focus on defining fixed targets to be achieved rather than on becoming a different and more effective kind of organisation.

The #WhatNext process was quite different. It opened up the responsibility for strategy development to a diverse group of passionate and not particularly senior staff volunteers. What this group produced at the end was a set of strategic principles refreshingly different to what a closed, leaders-only process might have produced. This challenged old mindsets, causing some initial anxiety, but the principles have stood up to scrutiny and strongly support the new strategic direction we are taking.

Other aspects of our strategy (goals, outcomes) are less surprising, but the #WhatNext principles continue to challenge us to think as much about 'how' as we do about 'what'. This is particularly true as we develop our plans and measures of success for our strategy, focusing on more cross-functional and empowering ways of working."

Chris Macqueen
Deputy Director, Strategy and Planning, The Stroke Association

This combination of delivering both a strategy product and cultural impact was seen to be particularly effective. "It has given us five strong, guiding principles that will shape the future of our charity," reflected another member of the Stroke Association. "It also prompted a cultural shift at all levels of the organisation, in support of the strategic direction that our principles describe."

"Increasingly, our success as a charity depends on our internal agility and our ability to form external partnerships," reflects Juliet Bouverie. "The #WhatNext process allowed us to embed those ways of working even as we conducted our strategic conversation."

But did it work?

Partly because of this, the Stroke Association is now a different organisation. It's better connected, and better able to solve problems.

The Stroke Association: what impact?

You don't run a process of this sort because it's 'nice', or as a means to avoid hard choices. Instead, this type of process enables an organisation to achieve a set of impacts beyond the reach of a normal strategy development process.

Within the Stroke Association, there is clear evidence the #WhatNext 'way of working' has influenced changes in how the organisation works. "We have reflected on the kinds of challenge best tackled using a #whatnext-style approach" reflects Chris Macqueen. "We've identified opportunities where we plan to apply the approach (as well as opportunities where we have deliberately chosen not to). The first opportunity is likely to be the review of how we can work in a more empowering way in communities."

The Stroke Association is much more aware of, and sensitive to, how decisions are made by leaders. There are signs of more distributed leadership decision-making, and more engagement of people affected by a decision in the process itself.

There is a greater awareness of the natural tendency to work in functional silos, and a greater commitment to reduce that tendency by defining problems where possible in terms of achieving organisation-wide outcomes and engaging cross-functional teams.

"Internal social media doubled..."

"The #WhatNext process certainly kept us busy. Internal social media doubled, with new voices joining in. And blogs and news articles were widely read and commented upon. But we were just the conductor for the energy that began whizzing around our charity.

The impact lives on today through the way the group's principles have shaped how and what the organisation does.

The #WhatNext Team and other champions for the process led the way by generating content and conversation by sharing their own perspectives and experiences, or asking questions that sparked ideas and debate.”

Kyla Lacey-Davidson

Head of Internal Communications and Engagement, The Stroke Association

“We have embarked on a major change programme to adopt a more agile operating model based on cross-functional teams at local and national levels,” comments Hilary Reynolds. “This model seeks to empower teams to develop a profile of their locality and to work with stakeholders to identify opportunities to partner in ways that benefit people affected by stroke.”

In addition, the ‘product’ of the #WhatNext group’s process – a set of strategic principles – is generating impact through its application across the organisation’s decisions and actions (Box 3).

Box 3: Applying the #WhatNext principles within the Stroke Association

Principle	Evidence of change resulting from adoption of the principle
“We are stroke to the core”	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Significant initiative launched to progressively increase the involvement of people affected by stroke in decision-making.• Informally, people are challenging any significant development processes that do not seek to include people affected by stroke.• Corporate induction and mandatory training revised to give all incoming staff a much stronger understanding of the lived experience of stroke.

The #WhatNext process helped the Stroke Association connect different aspects of its work, including how the care they show to stroke survivors they show to themselves.

Box 3: Applying the #WhatNext principles within the Stroke Association

Principle	Evidence of change resulting from adoption of the principle
“We are in the conversation”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much bolder organisational stance in working with our research partners to establish the national priorities for stroke research. • Provision of additional training to front line staff to equip them to exercise greater influence. • Equipping leaders in stroke support, fundraising and influencing to work more effectively with partners to open up opportunities that benefit people affected by stroke.
“We know how to make an impact”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of a new set of measures for determining the impact the organisation is having. • Launch of a significant organisation-wide initiative to strengthen capabilities and culture around the use of evidence for decision-making.
“We unleash potential”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start of process to transform how the organisation works locally and nationally, through more distributed leadership and agile working. • New strategic goal to focus on empowering people affected by, or connected to, stroke to take action for themselves, whether that be stroke survivors establishing their own supportive care networks, or voluntary groups taking action to support the cause of stroke in different ways.
“We care for ourselves as for others”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of a number of changes that offer improved support for the wellbeing of staff. • Established a learning community whose role is to support middle managers and their teams in the process of testing, learning and applying new ways of working so that people are better supported through the process of change.

Unsurprisingly, we think this is a pretty good way to develop strategy.

It's particularly good in dealing with large, broad issues where there isn't a 'right' answer.

Making it work

Organisations working in health and care increasingly need to find ways to successfully navigate a complex and challenging environment. In responding to this, many organisations are using deliberative democracy processes (often to improve service user involvement), at the same time as using organisational development approaches to improve internal engagement.

This case study shows a way of combining both of these techniques at the same time as developing a robust organisational strategy. The potential value of this type of approach over traditional methods is threefold:

- **It works as an effective way to develop strategy** by genuinely involving a wide range of people, considering fresh perspectives, increasing the sense of ownership in what is decided, and creating a rigorous end product.
- **It works as a way to develop an organisation** (beyond the specific task) by changing internal ways of working, and by improving understanding of other perspectives.
- **It works as a way to develop individuals** by giving a development opportunity to members of the core team, and by role-modelling a new set of interpersonal behaviours.

However it is not a panacea. It will not be suitable for all contexts, and to realise the full set of behaviours requires a range of resources which will not always be available.

But we're not naive. It's not a panacea, it's not going to work for everyone, and it's tricky to do.

Doing it badly is worse than not doing it at all.

While amenable to considering issues of overall organisational strategy, it also has value for other scenarios for which an inclusive approach is needed to address a particular challenge. Factors needing to be taken into account include:

- **Breadth of the issue:** Does it cut across traditional boundaries? Does it require a number of teams input to make progress on?
- **Scale of the issue:** Is it significant enough to warrant the necessary investment to make it work? Does it require organisation-wide ownership of the processes end-product?
- **Nature of the issue:** Is it a 'wicked' problem for which the way forward is more about collectively understanding different viewpoints than finding the 'right' answer?

This again mirrors where deliberative democracy processes are seen to be of most value in politics, where challenges are more complex, longer term, and where answers lie beyond simple binary choices.

There are many ways to apply deliberative democracy processes to strategy development. What matters most is that care and deliberate design has gone into determining a process that is most likely to work within the specific circumstances. From our experience, we would highlight four factors which are most likely to lead to an effective process.

1. High level of senior leadership support

An inclusive, collaborative and emergent process like this requires 'buy-in' from senior leaders. They must understand the process, be in agreement with the strategic questions being asked, and explicitly supportive of power being ceded to the representative group. This isn't just about getting out of the way, but using their positional power to very visibly support the group and the task they have been asked to do. Equally, when inevitably the process hands power back to the leadership, it must do so in a way that doesn't disenfranchise those who were involved.

The four factors most likely to lead to an effective process are: high level of senior leadership support; a representative, empowered group of people; widespread involvement; a clear product and next steps.

2. A representative, empowered group of people

The 'representative group' is the focal point of the whole process. They become the voice of the organisation or team. By design, the representative group consists of people who represent a cross-section of the organisation. They also need to be empowered to act as the conduit for the thoughts of the wider organisation in a comprehensive and honest way. To do this requires:

- **Careful selection**, in addition to being representative, members of the group should have existing abilities to engage colleagues, develop ideas, and cross boundaries.
- **Time to properly contribute**, which will need to be cleared with line managers, if applicable, and might mean performance targets are adjusted.
- **Coaching**, to identify and achieve their individual development needs. The process will require members of the group to develop new skills, and work in new ways.

3. Widespread involvement

This type of strategy process is an opportunity for the wider organisation to have a 'big conversation' about the strategy; all members of staff being able to contribute ideas and reflect what they are hearing from stakeholders. The representative group can be the visible facilitators of the conversation using a range of different channels, and recording the insights contributed. Whilst the core group are visible leaders of the process, the senior team shouldn't be invisible. They should model the behaviour asked of the organisation, by contributing ideas and thinking, informally in face-to-face conversations and on social media.

4. A clear product and next steps

This isn't a process for process sake. It relies on a clear question or issue at the start, and clarity as to what is and is not in scope. While the cultural impact is important, the need to resolve a problem or develop a product is the reason why such a process is run. Therefore, giving sufficient time and support to developing and capturing the output of the process is fundamental. Such a process can also generate significant energy within an organisation; when the process closes, this energy needs to be redirected with clear next steps and a celebration of what has been achieved.

What do you think?

Let us know your views. If you think it might be right for you, get in touch with us at Kaleidoscope for a coffee.

Thanks for reading.

This is a new type of approach. While we have seen the potential, there is a huge amount more to learn to develop processes that are increasingly able to support organisations to best meet their purpose. If you are interested in discussing such an approach with Kaleidoscope, we would be delighted to hear from you – hello@kscopehealth.org.uk. If you have been inspired to run a similar process yourselves, we would love to hear how you get on.

About Kaleidoscope

Kaleidoscope brings people together to improve health and care. We find new ways to overcome old barriers. We enable constructive conversations on difficult topics, using inspiring events to encourage clarity of purpose and rigorous problem-solving. Our approach to collaboration is systematic, evidence-based and cost-effective.

Our services enable you to collaborate with rigour. We provide everything required to support effective connections, conversations and networks, from design to management to events. We provide consultancy to help you resolve complex issues through practical, sustainable changes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, we seek to work with our clients in a spirit of kindness, trust, and openness. Our multi-disciplinary team includes clinicians, policy makers, managers, specialists in communications and digital technology, and more.

Could we help you to solve your problems? If so, get in touch, we'd love to hear from you.

Kaleidoscope Health and Care
604 Cannon Wharf
Pell Street
London, SE8 5EN

hello@kscopehealth.org.uk



KALEIDOSCOPE
Health and Care