## MODEL FOR EVALUATION OF GROUP MEETINGS

1) **Focus.** How did we manage to keep our focus on what we were supposed to do? How much time was wasted on irrelevant matters? How did we act if some group member was straying?

2) **Consideration.** How did we manage to let everyone speak? Was there too little consideration (someone's dominance)? Or too much consideration ("courtier behaviour")? Note that in one and the same group there can be too much and too little consideration, and that excess of both kinds impairs the quality of the work.

3) **Observance.** How was our application of given rules and principles? Did we forget or neglect some rule? Was there any trace of a sub-culture in contravention of given rules?

4) **Organization**. How was the adoption of assumed names and the appointment of chairman and secretary? How was the time available used; did we manage to get our tasks done in time? Were there tendencies to shirk appointments?

5) **Leadership**. How did the chairman perform his task? Too active–dominant or too passive–lax?

6) **Documentation**. How did the secretary perform her task? Was everything essential being said entered into the minutes? Were the minutes read to the whole group and approved by it?

7) **Expedience**, or **Finality**. Was the group meeting expedient on the whole of it? Can the members say that the work performed at the meeting was useful for the members in terms of increasing their knowledge and strengthening their being? Was the general spirit good? Was it balanced: characterized by compassion without laxity, discipline without hardness? (Physiological analogy: expedient muscle tone.) If not, where were the deficiencies?

## Summing it Up:

- 8) What did we do that was good?
- 9) What did we do that we should not have done?
- 10) What did we not do that we should have done?
- 11) What did we do that we should have done better?
- 12) What do we want to do next?

Note that this model concerns only evaluation of the form of group meetings convened for exercise purposes. The evaluation of the work of a more permanent group should be done according to a partially different model, which includes some further questions, for example such as concern the definite tasks the group has assumed in its work, the contributions of the members between meetings, etc.

L.A. 2005, April 8th.