

COLLABORATIVE DECISION PROCESS – VERSION 3.0

CONSENSUAL PERSPECTIVE

Participatory Process

Time constraints made it difficult for all opinions to get an equal hearing. (R)
Group members were encouraged to raise questions and express personal concerns even when divergent.
All affected parties were well represented in the meeting.
We tried to understand the interests and concerns of every member of our group.
Some people felt they had not been given full opportunity to participate. (R)

Supportability of Decision

We did not reach a full consensus. (R)
By the end of the process, our group displayed high morale and a strong “team spirit.”
The outcome of the meeting was nothing more than a foregone conclusion that few of us really supported. (R)
There was a great deal of commitment in our group to the way we resolved key issues.
We all agreed on the next steps that ought to be taken.

POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE

Adaptable Process

There was no opportunity to alter the procedures we used. (R)
We could have changed our evaluation of various courses of action at any time during the process.
The meeting was too structured. (R)
The method we used was very flexible in dealing with the problem.
The approach was adaptable enough to deal with changes in the situation.

Legitimacy of Decision

We were especially careful to respect the interests and concerns of external groups.
Outside interests might be alienated by our actions. (R)
The political feasibility of proposed actions was made quite important in our deliberations.
Because the process seemed so fair, any result would have the appearance of greater legitimacy.
An effort was made to find a solution that would not in any way damage how others perceived our group.

RATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Goal-centered Process

The method we used to deal with the problem helped to further clarify our real priorities.
We developed a logical and coherent framework for evaluating various courses of action.
The process made us specifically relate our discussions to statements of our group's values.
The focus of our discussion was often misdirected. (R)
The process encouraged us to consider our group's goals and objectives.

Efficiency of Decision

Important organizational resources were wasted in the process of making a decision. (R)
Our group worked with considerable efficiency.
Results were achieved in much less time than it ordinarily would have taken.
It is difficult to point to any tangible result. (R)
The costs of the process were too high. (R)

EMPIRICAL PERSPECTIVE

Data-based Process

The work of our group was guided by available information when appropriate.
We did not have enough data to reliably evaluate our options. (R)
The process was based too much on subjective judgments rather than factual considerations. (R)
Any data we used were presented in a useful form.
Our access to pertinent information helped to answer important questions.

Accountability of Decision

A record was made to document the resolution of all key issues.
Most steps in the process could be retraced and recounted, if necessary.
As a result of the process, our group was well prepared to be fully accountable for its deliberations.
It would be difficult to explain our actions to anyone who was not present. (R)
The approach recognized the need for our group to be answerable for its actions.

(R) Reverse coded.