



## Open Discussion

# Enterprise Assessment Diagnostics: Lessons Learned from LAI Members

Facilitators: Tom Shields & Ricardo Valerdi

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

April 2, 2009

- **Topic area is broadly - assessment**
  - Interest in a common diagnostic methodology
  - Motivated to achieve clarity, standardization, normalization, or benchmarking on this topic
- **Approach**
  - No presentations of what has been done
  - Interested in discussing aspects of assessment that vex participants in achieving assessment objectives
  - Sharing what you learned in doing assessments
  - Sharing what you would do differently
  - Record the discussion
- **Outcome**
  - Compile the accumulated knowledge and perhaps consensus “most successful” approaches
  - Publish to the participants via email
  - Guide the development of LAI’s LESAT version 1.5/2.0



# Ideas of how to How to Frame the Discussion

- **Agree to topics to be discussed**
- **Split time between each agreed topic saving time for a wrap-up**
- **Record the key points of the discussion**
- **Review these key points and mark those items that are most important**

## Topic Suggestions

- **Possible topics of discussion**
  - **Principles and Practices...the basic vision and tenants that this process must align with to be relevant in the enterprise culture**
  - **Methodology...how we would use this to make a difference in our business**
  - **Model...The design and content of the actual diagnostic that are consistent with the above**
  - **Assessing the results, engaging enterprise leadership**
  - **Balancing assessment brevity with thoroughness**
  - **Others ...**

## Agreed Approach

- 1. What is the interest in actually using a common diagnostic? Proprietary models are seen as a competitive advantage...**
- 2. If yes, what is the process for updating LESAT?**
- 3. What's the value/purpose of an assessment, how will it be used, at what level, and who with/for?**
- 4. A scalable model and how the tool is interpreted?**
- 5. One-off vs. recurring event model? RR used annual (recurring) model**
- 6. How to minimize gaming scores and process impact on organization?**
- 7. Where/how has the current model not worked?**



## What's the value/purpose of a lean assessment, how will it be used, at what level, and who with/for?

- Serves as learning event, knowledge transfer \*
- Outcome must inspire/indicate action e.g., begin dialogue, drives progress, deployment strategy\*
- Measures effectiveness of strategy
- Link to the past, longitudinal comparison tool
- Is it a pull or push process?
- Let's develop a set of LAI recommendations to drive use of common tool/taxonomy (LESAT)
- Need to understand the phenomenon of better educated self assessors, score variabilities
- Value of metric/score dependent on company culture (gaming issue)

## What is the interest in actually using a common diagnostic? Proprietary models are sometimes seen as a competitive advantage...

- **Common framework\***
- **Common, understandable approach for suppliers\***
- **Enterprise tool supplemented by unit-specific modules (PD, etc.)\***
- **Assessment of current state of leadership and enterprise level**
- **Comparability w/o getting bogged down in comparing actual scores**
- **Any metric can be made into a weapon; metrics can also provide context for comparability**
- **Cost savings in common model**
- **How to achieve commonality in the tool?**
- **Model not proprietary but the results are**
- **Issue of outside assessors...**



## Scalable model and how the tool is interpreted

- Common tool would also lead to common lean principles, language, and taxonomy\*
- Validation, accountability, interpretation\*
- What about a cross-industry tool? LESAT has some manufacturing-specific bits but could be applicable in other contexts, has a services flavor\*
- Enterprise, function, level?
- Maturity?
- Can a single tool work for level and maturity? Does it require multiple tools or perhaps a suite of tools?
- Maturity levels easily scalable
- Boeing is open to sharing/using a common tool
- Develop a common baseline/core module (lower than LESAT) as first step
- Version 1.5 will capture this
- LESAT synthesizes LAI's other research...unique benefit



## How to minimize gaming scores and process impact on organization?

- **Self assessments followed by additional assessments are problematic...**
- **Creating safety/keeping scores within the team (team sense of ownership) enables more honest conversation (Raytheon experience)\***
- **What is acceptable evidence of improvement other than a score?**
- **Avoid gaming by not averaging scores**
- **Length of assessment? Preparation for assessment risks creating false situation**
- **Assessment results risk being overwhelming...outside assessors can help winnow the list**
- **Scores as a window to more meaningful discussion**
- **Use of scores more important than their existence**

## What have we learned?

- We would like to use a common tool; will discuss within individual organizations
- Willingness to share at sub-module level
- We've established a new community of practice
- Items with \* indicate agreed-upon starting points
- Can we look at making language more common?
- Stamp out/beware of circularity
- Group wants input into Version 1.5
- LESAT out in 2001, 1.5 will capture subsequent learning and experience within LAI team. Then open discussion to LAI and collectively develop 2.0. A few practices will be introduced, some will be changed...1.5 will be an updated draft circulated to LAI