

## APPENDICES

---

### Appendix A Narrative Summary of Semi-structured Interview

From interview responses:

#### **Most Important thing to learn**

Out of 58 comments 27 of them focused on understand outcomes. Among those there was an equal amount of feedback directed at solidly measurable outcomes – agreements, durability, and satisfaction, as there was to using outcomes to create a feedback loop into process improvements. A small minority of these 27 indicated that both are equally important and inter-related. Several caveats were offered that specified that the most important thing an evaluation can capture is directed by the intent of the evaluation’s implementation. Other responses included comments directly related to process improvement and lessons learned, understanding participant perceptions, gathering real time feedback, understanding participant BATNA to ADR, and practice of the facilitator or mediator.

#### **Measures**

Responses on what measures an evaluation should seek to capture was easily the most diverse and complex set of responses. Answers interview respondents gave regarding measured was gathered in two different questions (for a total of 54 responses). Please note that respondents were not limited to a single response per question, though segmented responses rarely exceeded 4. The first asked their opinion on what sort of indicators would indicate success or danger for an project of the nature The Center engages in, and what specific questions they would want to see in an evaluation with the specific purpose of creating process improvements and capturing lessons learned.

#### Hard Measures

There were 40 comments which focused directly on hard measures. These include agreements, durability of agreements including longitudinal effects, participant satisfaction, and cost and time. Of the these 40, nine were about the agreement itself being reached, six regarded the durability of the agreement (which implicitly means agreement was reached), ten touched on how satisfied with outcomes participants felt, eleven were cost and time, there were four uncoded answers. These were: rate of agreement, whether or not something of value which is enduring was created, whether a high level of benefit was gained, and lessons learned for process improvements.

#### Soft Measures

There were 48 answers coded as soft measures. Eleven of these targeted participation and stakeholder communication, seven asked if all of the right parties were part of the process, and six asked if participants were well prepared and had access to the right information. These were the highest categorical responses. Others included satisfaction with the mediator / facilitator, commitment or ownership, a review by the ‘losing side’, process transparency, stakeholder needs,

length and density of the process, procedural satisfaction, and capturing participant alternatives to ADR.

#### Transformative Measures

There were 16 comments that touched on ‘transformative measures’. These were how much trust was gained between parties, how much trust was gained between mediator and parties, how relationships changed during the process, how parties relationship to the area of conflict changed as a result of the process, the participant’s ability to work collaboratively in the future, development of negotiation skills, and participant’s emotional satisfaction.

#### Participant Perceptions

Participant Perceptions are measures which were frequently covered in Hard, Soft, and Transformative measures, but the interviewee specifically referred to the perception of the stakeholder or participant. These also included perceptions of fairness, efficacy, and appropriateness of the process. There were 24 responses which referred to a participant’s perception.

#### Quantitative and Qualitative Measures

Interviewees were asked their feelings on quantitative vs. qualitative measures.

Five were in favor of qualitative measure and said that quantitative measures should not be used. Two reported the exact opposite. Two reported positively in favor of quantitative measures while not commenting on qualitative measures. Eleven reported in favor of both types of measures, and seven did not comment on the question or reported ‘I don’t know’.

#### **Other Instruments**

Interviewees were asked if they knew about or used other ADR process/project evaluation instruments. Ten said they knew about the work done by USIECR, of which four currently use variations of, one referred to the EPA evaluation instrument (which is essentially the USEICR instrument), one referred me Frank Dukes’ work, two did not answer the question and 13 reported no. Of those, the work by Juliana Birkoff and Peter Adler was mentioned. There was a general lack of satisfaction with the instruments currently available or the lack thereof and some amount of response which was pointedly negative about the prospect of evaluation itself (more on this later).

#### **Other Types of Feedback**

Interviewees were asked what other methods of process feedback The Center could utilize. The three most common responses, five each, were Focus Groups, post project Stakeholder Interviews, and using neutral observers. Other responses included engaging in long term follow up of project outcomes, internal staff meetings or ‘mediator’ meetings, writing case studies and using performance scorecards.

**Appendix B**  
**Tradeoffs and Benefits Chart**

	<b>Transactional Cost</b>	<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Cons</b>
<b>Instrument Type: Survey / Questionnaire</b>			
Post - Single Shot	Relatively easy to create and implement	Can provide useful information	Validity concerns, may not capture participant changes accurately
Pre/Post	Higher than post only, requires more analysis	More complete than single-shot post only evaluation	Potential Hawthorne effect
Mid	High - Interrupts project process	Low	Interrupts process, potential unintended consequences
<b>Implementation Timeframe of Post or Focus Group</b>			
Upon conclusion	--	Potential high completion rate	Feedback possibility skewed by post process emotions
Within 3 months of conclusion	--	--	--
Within 6 months of conclusion	--	Allows Center more preparation time	Feedback may be less reliable due to participant memory
<b>Survey format</b>			
In person interviews			
By Practitioner	High - requires high number of hours	Allows for in-depth feedback - familiar with project history and participants	Potential conflict of interest - participants may be disaffected
By Neutral	High - requires high number of hours	Allows for in-depth feedback	Unfamiliar with project history and participants
By Project Manager	High - requires high number of hours	Allows for in-depth feedback	--
Survey Monkey	Low	Easy to use and analysis	Limits feedback and potential participation
Mixture of Both	Medium	Gives participants options	Complexity resulting from mixed models
<b>Survey Size</b>			
10 - 20 minutes	--	Higher completion rates	Lower degree of information
20 - 30 minutes	--	--	--
30+ minutes	--	Lower completion rates	Higher degree of information
<b>Who Participates</b>			
Participants	Low	--	--
Dropouts	Potentially High in terms of difficulty gathering feedback	Provides important process information for The Center	--
Practitioner	Low	--	--
Community Members	Medium	Creates full feedback which could be useful for The Center	Highly subjective

Instrument Type: Post Focus Groups	High cost for both The Center and participants in terms of hours and intensity	High degree of information, potential for dynamic feedback	Selection issues
Instrument Type: Neutral Observer	Very high cost to Center	Potential for detailed information	Possible instrumentation issues, single point of view feedback
Instrument Type: Case Studies	Very high cost to Center	Potential for detailed information	Delayed usefulness, no systematic evaluation
<b>Questions</b>			
Hard	Low	Potentially easy for participants, easy to analyze	Lack of detailed information presents reliability and sensitivity issues
Soft	Low - Medium		Validity concerns
Transformative	Low - Medium		Validity concerns
Participant Perceptions	Medium - requires detailed participant reflections		Validity concerns
Quantitative questions	Low		Lack of detailed information
Qualitative / Essay response questions	Medium - requires more of participants	Provides detailed information	Validity concerns, difficult to analyze