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Abstract

Purpose – The role of dialogue has recently been identified as being important in generating impact in organisations, but the purposeful use of narrative or story-based approaches to effect organisational change and service improvement is still relatively innovative. The purpose of this paper is to document and examine two projects in health and social care settings which aim to generate organisational development and service improvement.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper evaluates and compares two case studies of story-based organisational development and service improvement projects in the UK. This involved developing an appropriate evaluation framework and assessing the impacts in each case using semi-structured interviews and thematic content analysis.

Findings – This paper reports the diversity of impacts and outcomes that were generated by the projects. Specifically, it is argued that there is a strong indication that story-based projects best achieve their objectives when clearly linked to key organisational strategic drivers or pathways, as evidenced by robust evaluation.

Practical implications – This paper recommends that researchers and practitioners, working with story-based methods, design credible and robust evaluative practices, in order to evidence how their work supports organisations to meet current sector challenges. The paper recommends a flexible evaluation framework for evaluating story-based projects in the workplace.

Originality/value – This paper offers new evidence and insight into the impacts and outcomes of using story-based approaches, and a new evaluation framework for these sorts of projects.
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Introduction

The impact agenda is a highly contested space and has been criticised for limiting creativity and indeed changes in practice beyond academe (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2013; Johnston and Reeves, 2017). As such, rather than “in the box” thinking, there have been calls for “box changing, jumping or transcendence” for more imaginative approaches (Alvesson and Sandberg, 2014, p. 967) which engage stakeholders in collaborative forms of inquiry (Cunliffe and Scaratti, 2017; Ozanne et al., 2017; Pettigrew and Starkey, 2016; Wall, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016a, b, 2017a, b, 2018).

Within this context, MacIntosh et al. (2017) highlighted the importance of dialogue and reflexivity, and the role of the importance of narrative within the impact debate. Alongside
this, story-based and narrative approaches are gradually becoming more respected as an
effective tool for learning and development and for understanding organisational change
(McCormack and Milne, 2003; Gabriel, 2008; Gabriel and Connell, 2010; Reissner, 2011;
Pässilä and Vince, 2016). Evidence of impact has included: service improvement in health
care settings (IDEA, 2009; SCIE, 2010; Ellis et al., 2011); positive impacts on policy
(in terms of client outcomes) (IDEA, 2009; Clark and Purdy, 2007; SROI Network, 2011);
improvements in performance indicators (Schalock, 2001); improvements in staff
engagement (MacLeod and Clarke, 2009); and improvements in well-being outcomes
(Boorman, 2009; Rath and Harter, 2010; NEF, 2011).

However, although there is a diversity of potential methods and strategies to evaluate
story-based interventions, there is no agreed standard or process. Therefore, a practice
problem facing the practitioner researcher using story-based methods in the workplace is
how to analyse, interpret and present the data in a systematic way that results in credible
evidence. As Guest et al. (2012) propose “good data analysis (and research design, for that
matter) combines appropriate elements and techniques from across traditions and
epistemological perspectives”. In this way, evaluation can not only evidence the project
outcomes but also create convincing links to personal learning as well as wider
organisational development objectives, thus adding credibility to story-based methods.

This paper draws from a practitioner research project in the UK, as part of a work
applied learning and organisational development project, to evaluate the impacts of two
case studies. In order to achieve this, however, the practitioner researcher had to develop an
appropriate evaluation framework and methodology which was ecologically appropriate for
the well-being and narrative nature of the project, the practice setting of the practitioner
researcher and generated valid results which could then be utilised in practice to support
organisational development and service improvement.

This paper is structured as follows. The first section reviews some of the key evaluative
methods and tools which are used in practice to measure impact and organisational learning
in the context of health and social care organisations. The second section then outlines the
methodology adopted as part of this study, exploring the suitability of various evaluative
methods in the context of health and social care settings. The following sections then
present and compare two case studies, highlighting the key impacts and broader findings
from the case studies. Finally, the paper moves to a discussion of some of the challenges of
evaluating story-based methods for organisational learning and change, and reflects on the
stages of designing robust evaluative frameworks in the context of story and health.

Assessing impact in health care

Over a decade ago, a cross-government and social care sector working party produced the
document “Putting People First: Transforming Adult Social Care” (IDEA, 2009) setting out the
vision for adult social care and its direction over the next ten years. This paper was a keystone
paper as it set forth a strategic direction which is generically known as “personalisation”, or
highlighting the importance of the individual experience. Similarly, Shepherd et al. (2010), in
their position paper for the Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, identified peoples’ lived
experience as the most potent driver of organisational change within a culture of recovery.
This has positioned and framed the work of external providers ever since, with an emphasis
on co-production, laying the ground for participatory methods of working and of evaluation.

In terms of approaches to evaluating work within this broader professional context, there
are different varieties to how and why evaluation is done. For example, Trochim (2006)
postulates that evaluation strategies fall broadly into four major groups: scientific/
experimental, management-orientated systems, qualitative/anthropological and participant-
orientated (the latter of which seem appropriately aligned to the context). In contrast,
Mertens and Wilson (2012) propose four categories of evaluative purpose: to determine
inputs and need, to improve or change practices, to assess programme effectiveness and to
address issues of social justice. Again, these seem relevant to helping decide the frame of
practitioner oriented evaluation in the above professional context.

Within these broader approaches, there are specific methodologies which are used in
contemporary health care settings. One of the most popular, and which continues to
influence many other models, is Kirkpatrick’s (1998) model and toolkit, which was
developed as an evaluation tool for assessing impact and outcomes of learning and
development programmes. Bespoke methodological approaches utilising Kirkpatrick’s
thinking have been developed by governments. For example, The Impact Evaluation Model
uses principles of outcomes-based accountability, and has been recommended by the UK
Government for localised impact evaluation of activities especially around service and
workforce reform. Reio et al. (2017), however, critique Kirkpatrick’s work as being overly
focussed on the achievement of outcomes of training rather than on the impact on the
stakeholder and whether their needs have been met. Reio et al. propose that stakeholders
should be able to input to design, development and evaluation.

Return on investment (ROI) models have also been adopted to measure impact in a very
specific and narrow sense (Wall et al., 2016, 2017). More recently, social return on investment
(SROI) methodologies have also appeared which have also been participatory by nature, and
emphasise those outcomes which are valued by people, including stakeholders and
beneficiaries of social programmes, and provide a participatory mechanism for their voice or
story to be heard. For example, The SROI Network (2011), which promotes the use of SROI
methods internationally to address social injustice, claims:

SROI tells the story of how change is being created by measuring social, environmental and
economic outcomes […] SROI is a framework to structure thinking and understanding. It’s a story
not a number. The story should show how you understand the value created, manage it and can
prove it (SROI Network 2011, p. 2).

Other forms of participatory evaluation methodologies typically assess progress,
performance and impact of a project, but with a primary objective of creating a culture
of learning for project staff, beneficiaries and partners. Hasenfeld et al. (2004), as an example,
promote the participatory model of evaluation (PME) as a highly collaborative process,
relying upon a feedback loop from partners and staff. In their work, Hasenfeld et al. (2004)
explored how involving clients in the community in ongoing feedback makes them part of
the evaluation process. The validity accorded to case studies by PME lends credence to
personal narratives as a methodology in evaluation.

The practical issues of implementing such complex evaluation approaches can stifle
widespread use (Wall et al., 2017). In contrast to complex methodologies, Davies and Dart
(2005) claim that the most significant change (MSC) technique serves as a legitimate form of
participatory monitoring and evaluation. MSC was first developed as a means of auditing
changes in overseas development aid projects, but can support organisational learning and
service improvement. It is participatory because of the multiple perspectives elicited.
As Davies and Dart (2005) explain:

[…] it contributes to evaluation because it provides data on impact and outcomes that can be used
to help assess the performance of the program as a whole […] MSC makes use of […] “thick,
description”, closely textured accounts of events, placed in their local context, and where the role of
the observer and their subjectivity, is visible. In the world of ordinary people these often take the
form of stories or anecdotes (p. 67).

**Methodology**

This paper adopts a case study approach to document and examine the impact of story in
the context of health care organisations, and was undertaken by a practitioner research
seeking the dual roles of contributing to the development of the organisations and generating new practitioner knowledge for the individual (Wall, 2014; Heikkinen et al., 2016). The two case studies relate to two story-based intervention projects focussed on organisational development and service improvement as dual outcomes. The projects were delivered within two public sector organisations: one is an adult social services organisation (now referred to as “Social Care Co.”) and the other is a health care organisation (now referred to as “Recovery Co.”) in England.

The intention was a form of case study which was discovery led and inclined towards emphasising social processes and relationships within a natural phenomenon, rather than restricting the attention upon outcomes, and is also suitable for comparison case studies (e.g. of individuals or organisations). In this way, the descriptive case studies focus on contemporary events, explored in their real-life contexts rather than in controlled environment (Yin). The use of multiple cases also provides the opportunity to compare and contrast the findings across different real-life contexts, in terms of different real-life organisational cultures and story interventions (Yin, 2013). However, it is acknowledged that the case study approach is also vulnerable to criticism re-credibility of generalisations from findings (Denscombe, 2010).

Several options were considered when designing the project for suitable data collection methods. However, given the nature of the projects, it was argued that evaluation can be a “sense-making process” in organisations (Weick et al., 2005; Weick, 2016), as well as one that collects and interprets data, and sharing of personal stories could be a useful experience for participants in the evaluation. Furthermore, it was also argued that practitioner researchers in the context of providing services to health care organisations need to consider how the provider-client relationship might be affected by their choice of methods, for example, a rigorous “root and branch” investigative survey might jeopardise future relationships.

It was therefore decided that the project data would be collected through semi-structured interviews incorporating the MSC method (Davies and Dart, 2005). This was chosen as it was the most ecologically appropriate for the well-being and narrative nature of the project, the practice setting of the practitioner researcher and generated valid results which could then be utilised in practice to support organisational development and service improvement. The interview guide, which was the initial proposed evaluation framework to be used with story projects, is presented in Box 1. For both case studies, purposive sampling (or purposeful sampling) was used for data collection, with between 6 and 12 staff and service users. The evaluation framework (interview questions) was initially trialled outside of the two evaluations and questions which appeared to prompt repeated answered were adjusted.

**Case study 1: Recovery Co.**

**Background**

The story project was commissioned by a health care organisation which focusses on the recovery of adults who have or are currently experiencing mental health issues (also referred to as “service users”). The project began in October 2012, and explicitly aimed to support culture change, challenge attitudes and practices around “recovery”, improve organisational teamwork, increase the well-being of service users, develop a shared vision for the “recovery” team and improve the team’s profile within the wider organisation. The main intervention involved story-based team-building workshops and “Story Cafes”, which use stories and conversational circles as springboards to new empathetic awareness and learning.

**Evaluating the project**

The evaluation was conducted by semi-structured interviews using the evaluation framework (Box 1). Evaluation focussed on Learnings and Outcomes, and participants were asked to identify the MSC in the following areas: own practice; service delivery; and client benefits.
Six people participated, and included service users, organisational staff, “recovery” leaders and team members (RIPFA, 2011). The interviews were conducted face to face and recorded. The ethicality of this approach was discussed at length with the organisation and the “recovery” team, and agreed before any data were collected.

Organisational outcomes and impact
Outcomes from the project included: set the scene for creative team working; encouraged innovative working; created a sense of community in the team; changes in team experience of itself; changes in behaviour as a team leader and manager; legitimised new ways of reporting incidents; using narrative to support staff in an incident risk review process/handling difficult emotions/staff well-being; encouraged use of anecdotal evidence to inform higher level management; and significant changes in team practices.

Service delivery
In terms of service delivery, the evaluation identified a number of MSCs. The first area of change was that communications within the team have improved and that this is a cultural shift. An indicative statement from a participant said: “Because we’re using it (stories), it’s changing some of the culture already, and the language that we use and the way that we speak to each other”.

The second area of MSC from the story work in the organisation related to developing/finding a community of “recovery”, giving credence to more creative and innovative work, and supporting the promotion of “recovery” principles. One research participant reported a change in knowledge sharing within the “recovery” teams and to higher levels in the organisation (see also reference to the risk procedure above). Exploring the broader impact, the participant further felt that her experience of the Story Café project was helping guide

---

**Box 1. Initial evaluation framework (interview guide) for evaluating story projects**

As a result of participating in the (project):
1. What were your personal expectations of what the story project would deliver in terms of your own learning? (Prompts: In what way were these realised? In what way were they different?)
2. What has been your experience of using what you learnt in your everyday environment? (Prompts: new skills, understanding, or behaviours)
3. What has particularly enabled you to use this learning in your workplace? (Prompts: Opportunities? Particular support?)
4. What has made it difficult to use this learning in your workplace? (Prompts: Obstacles? Lack of opportunities? Culture?)
5. Looking back at the last 6 months, i.e. the duration of the current story project, what has been the most significant change for you in your own work as a result of this project? (Prompts: Behaviours? Practices? Team work?)
6. What were your initial expectations of what the story project would deliver in terms of organisational benefits? (Prompts: In what way were these realised? In what way were they different?)
7. What have been the actual outcomes and benefits to the organisation? (Prompts: Efficiency. Budgetary. Knowledge. Partnership working)
8. Looking back at the last [XX]months, i.e. the duration of the current story project, what do you think has been the most significant change in the organisation’s service delivery, as a result of this project? (Prompts: Better delivery of Recovery services. Better teamwork. Better partnership working)
9. Looking back at the last [XX] months, i.e. the duration of the current story project, what has been the most significant change for your clients (and/or stakeholders and partnership organisations)? (Prompts: Social return on investment. Improvements in well-being or confidence. Better client/organisation relationships. Better take-up of services)
her through leading a piece of work around values across a number of organisational units and processes, for example, revising the annual appraisal and personal development review and supervision templates, to ensure culture change and workforce well-being.

Overall, it was also reported that understanding the importance of using story approaches and seeing the impact of story of the team was reported to have real significance in context of, for example, very high-profile health care incidents, and the importance of taking anecdotal evidence seriously and linking this to best practice. There was considerable importance given to ethics and process of delivery and evaluation, how to collect narrative, use it responsibly and have a process around its collection and use.

**Client benefits**

The evaluation found that engagement with clients was improved as was their relationship with the “recovery” teams, in additional to the level of trust in the team. It seemed that the joint participation in the Story Café by service users and staff prompted a change in attitudes towards service users, their capabilities and the respect shown towards them. Although no baseline evaluation of well-being was carried out, there has been positive feedback from service users in the Story Cafes (informal storytelling and conversation circles). It was reported that The Story Cafes enabled service users to be seen to have more capabilities and this was considered to be helpful in creating a culture shift towards more inclusive approaches to “recovery”.

A summary of the outcomes and impacts generated through use of the evaluation framework (Box 1) are outlined in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal expectations</th>
<th>Personal learning</th>
<th>Organisational outcomes</th>
<th>Change and/or impact on own work</th>
<th>Change and/or impact on service delivery</th>
<th>Change and/or impact on clients and service users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check alignment with recovery principles (2)</td>
<td>Change in staff attitudes towards service users (4)</td>
<td>Creative team practices (2)</td>
<td>Improved therapeutic relationship (2)</td>
<td>Cultural shift (2)</td>
<td>Enhanced offer (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepen understanding of own work Team development (2)</td>
<td>Team development (2)</td>
<td>More supportive management practices (2)</td>
<td>Stories as a powerful tool (2)</td>
<td>Alignment with recovery impact assessment (2)</td>
<td>Change in staff attitudes towards service users (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic/well-being benefit (2)</td>
<td>Impact on therapeutic relationship (2)</td>
<td>Encouraging creativity in the team (2)</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing (2)</td>
<td>RAG team development as a community (2)</td>
<td>Communication (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change management (2)</td>
<td>Setting scene for RAG teams to work more creatively (2)</td>
<td>Improved communications (2)</td>
<td>Working in a holistic and supportive way (2)</td>
<td>Renewed team purpose (2)</td>
<td>Self-expression (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of story practice</td>
<td>Potential of using Narrative and stories in organisation to support other processes/staff development (2)</td>
<td>Confidence to use narrative to support staff in risk review (2)</td>
<td>Improved communications (2)</td>
<td>Using narrative and stories in organisation (2)</td>
<td>Therapeutic benefit (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get to know colleagues New group energy</td>
<td>Experiencing stories is powerful, connects people (2)</td>
<td>Culture change (2)</td>
<td>Model for future narrative projects (2)</td>
<td>Model for future narrative projects (2)</td>
<td>Socialising; being part of a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galvanising</td>
<td>Links to other processes and projects (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Numbered themes refer to order of frequency

**Table I.** Recovery Co.'s summary of project outcomes
Case study 2: Social Care Co.

Background
The second case is based in a public health care organisation, and specifically commissioned by the organisational lead for the “personalisation” agenda. Starting in April 2012, the project aimed to collate evidence of personalisation practices and generate a repository of this evidence. The project aimed to: inform and educate staff, policy makers, other stakeholders and the public about personalisation practices; develop staff skills around gathering, and using customer stories for service improvement in training and teams; and improve internal and external communications and engagement.

Evaluation of the project
The evaluation was carried out by semi-structured interviews in person or by telephone using the evaluation framework designed for the project (Box 1). The evaluation was agreed through the organisational leaders who complied with the organisation’s own research governance framework. The project involved interviewing ten service users.

Organisational outcomes
The evaluation identified that all of the participants stressed the importance of the following MSCs: the achievement of better engagement with clients, and public education and awareness of personalisation practices. However, there was a sense from all participants that the story-gathering group now needed to be supported and developed for its potential outcomes to be realised fully. As one manager said: “We’ve got to do something strategic to create the space for this”.

In addition to the hard outcomes of a media-based repository of stories, the softer outcomes related to partnership working and engagement. Although organisational outcomes could not readily be evaluated nor costed out in terms of ROI, the project was also considered to have built a platform and a legacy for the future.

Service delivery
The evaluation identified that the story project had successfully supported the “transformation agenda”, enabling more creative support planning as well as challenging resistance to culture change. One participant expressed: “The stories are for me the most powerful thing we can offer in this climate in terms of the Change Agenda”. According to the participants, this has impacted upon service delivery where clients’ needs have been met more effectively through a shift in primary focus towards story listening rather than assessment of a “Category of Need” (a bureaucratic assessment of a specific need). Participants reported seeing the beginnings of meaningful change in service delivery of “personalisation”. For one social worker, the time spent in listening to stories was very significant:

What I’m hearing is different – I’m listening to the words that the person uses and how they describe their experiences and what they’re describing because that could be the most important thing they need help with – rather than the Category of Need.

Client impact
For service users, a “SROI” was identified as a common theme: “Where the […] project has been able to influence the practice of staff, then people who use services are going to get a service that is much more tailored to their individual life histories and experiences”.

Similarly, well-being or a “therapeutic perspective” was a significant outcome for the clients, “feeling listened to is very important” and more consideration of what is important to them in their lives; as was raising awareness of use of personal budgets. Additionally, through
involvement of partnership organisations and by providing a framework for knowledge sharing, better services can be offered through better multi-disciplinary working.

A summary of the outcomes and impacts generated through use of the evaluation framework (Box 1) are outlined in Table II.

### Discussion

A cross-case analysis of the findings of both projects indicated similarities around dimensions: how story work underpins radical organisational cultural change, its training application for staff to be better educated around new policies and approaches in health and social care, and its impact on professional relationships particularly partnership working and with service users. A strong indication from this study is that story work enhances team building and benefits new projects in the early stages, as strong organisational outcomes were demonstrated for both projects.

The benefits to Recovery Co. were significant enough for both strategic level and other staff to extrapolate ways of integrating story work into management practice, such as staff support, knowledge sharing and leadership development. In as much as story work evidences good practice and aligns with transformation of services, both projects stated that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal expectations</th>
<th>Personal learning</th>
<th>Change and/or impact on own work</th>
<th>Change and/or impact on service delivery</th>
<th>Change and/or impact on clients and service users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop story writing skills (7)</td>
<td>Developed listening skills (5)</td>
<td>Educating public (7)</td>
<td>Partnership involvement (7)</td>
<td>Engagement with service users (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client engagement (7)</td>
<td>Better listening; listening differently (5)</td>
<td>Educating social workers (7)</td>
<td>Listening skills (6)</td>
<td>Better personalisation (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence collecting for Personalisation (7)</td>
<td>Confidence to talk to people about their life experience and needs (6)</td>
<td>Partnership working (7)</td>
<td>Transformation of service delivery (5)</td>
<td>Creative thinking (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More sympathetic approach (3)</td>
<td>Confidence to write up stories (5)</td>
<td>Staff skills and knowledge development (5)</td>
<td>Different ways of working (5)</td>
<td>Partnership working (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool to promote organisation</td>
<td>Changing ways of thinking about situation (4)</td>
<td>Story awareness (4)</td>
<td>Meeting client’s needs (4)</td>
<td>Sharing good practice (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tool for collecting and analysing information</td>
<td>Letting clients have more time to tell their story in their words (3)</td>
<td>Cultural shift (4)</td>
<td>More effective use of time (3)</td>
<td>More person-centred approach (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap into practical experience</td>
<td>Sharing experiences with other story gatherers (3)</td>
<td>Assist positive risk taking (2)</td>
<td>Significant contribution to transformation agenda (2)</td>
<td>Impact on resistance to culture change (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit organisational learning shared in public arena</td>
<td>Impact of different media on presenting stories</td>
<td>New ways of working (2)</td>
<td>Better recording (profile, care plan, journal)</td>
<td>Engendering trust in the profession and co-operation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on personal life (listening to children)</td>
<td>Material (stories) for Training</td>
<td>Recognition of social workers as champions</td>
<td>Transferable knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A new way of learning about people (behaviours)</td>
<td>First step in the right direction</td>
<td>Knowledge-sharing skill</td>
<td>Supporting creative thinking and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Numbered themes refer to order of frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Social Care Co.'s summary of project outcomes
the outcomes of the story projects potentially enhanced the reputation of the organisation as an “honest broker” (Social Care Co.) or as “innovative” organisation (Recovery Co.).

Yet both projects were different in their focus and ongoing issues. The Social Care Co. project had a skills development focus to support the evidencing of personalisation, whereas the Recovery Co. project focussed on team building, culture change (towards a “recovery culture”). In the Social Care Co. project, participants further reflected in broad terms on sustainability and developing systems to support their “story gatherers”, whereas in the Recovery Co. project, the reflection was towards further exploration of narrative approaches and how these could improve best practice at all levels.

Key themes and outcomes from the interviews were therefore mapped visually for each project using wordle software. Wordles are easily created from key words emerging from the data as visual images; words are “weighted” by occurrence, represented as the larger words in the wordle. These were shared with the clients as a thematic illustration of project outcomes to assist with personal and organisational learning. The Social Care Co. wordle highlights that improvement in skills was dominant (story writing skills, creative thinking, better listening) as well as improvement in service-related relationships (partnership working, engagement, personalisation) (see Figure 1), whereas the Recovery Co. project wordle reflects the current recovery team’s focus on change and on therapeutic relationships (change management, relationships, culture change, well-being) (see Figure 2).

There are also wider implications of such variability in project impacts and outcomes. Specifically, it was recognised that some of the evaluation framework prompts were not necessarily relevant in both contexts, and reflected the nature of the original scoping of the project (as discussed above). The initial evaluation framework that was developed for the purposes of evaluating story work in workplaces therefore needed to be adjusted to reflect the diversity of projects that would be developed. Reflections and decisions about this are reflected in Table III.

This reflects the responsive design of evaluation in workplace learning projects. For example, on consideration, questions 2 to 4 in the evaluation framework are most
relevant where the project involves skills training or/and mentoring, and less so where the project delivers service user interventions or team-building workshops. Questions 6 and 7 are difficult to answer if the participants are not responsible for or knowledgeable of strategic and organisational goals, or where projects involve participation by stakeholder and partnership organisations. Similarly question 9 presupposes that the project is delivered to those who have direct relationship with service users. As such the evaluation framework design needs addressing early into the project design, and purposively linked to organisational outcomes – and reflects Reio et al. (2017) critique of evaluation being overly focussed on the achievement of outcomes of training rather than on the impact on the stakeholder and whether their needs have been met.

Conclusion and implications
This paper concludes that narrative or story-based work is efficacious and credible in generating workplace impacts, especially in the context of service transformation and improvement, and that practitioners can examine such dimensions in participatory ways. The willingness of staff to be involved in the project that this paper has examined further demonstrated that evaluation is regarded as valuable and a way, in itself, of engaging staff. Significantly, the involvement of service users in the evaluation was also said to have “recovery potential”, which further emphasises the suitability of participatory methods of project design and evaluation as well as research more broadly (IDEA, 2009; MacIntosh et al., 2017).

The richness of the evaluation reflect two areas: the reported processes that story activates and shapes, including sense making, team working, re-framing and collective empathy towards workplace impacts (Gabriel and Connell, 2010; Reissner, 2011; Wall and Rossetti, 2013; Pässilä and Vince, 2016), but also the reported impacts of practical and participatory forms of MSC-informed evaluation processes which also facilitate similar processes of sense making, framing, re-framing and collective empathy, but also motivation to act, change and improve (Wall et al., 2017). In addition, the elicited experiential content generated through the evaluation was found to be persuasive when presenting to higher level managers, as it provided strong links between the story work and organisational strategic priorities and pathways. As a result, there are a number of specific implications for different stakeholder groups, and these are represented in Table IV.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation framework (EF) – interview question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Social Care Co.</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What were your personal expectations of what the story project would deliver in terms of your own learning? (Prompts: In what way were these realised? In what way were they different?)</td>
<td>Leads and those involved with the design of the project responded easily; OTTs did not</td>
<td>Cohort participants including partnership organisations responded easily. Not asked of strategic lead</td>
<td>Keep in the generic evaluation framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What has been your experience of using what you learnt in your everyday environment? (Prompts: new skills, understanding, or behaviours)</td>
<td>Leads and those involved with the design of the project responded easily; OTTs did not</td>
<td>Cohort participants including partnership organisations responded easily. Not asked of strategic lead</td>
<td>Keep in the generic evaluation framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What has particularly enabled you to use this learning in your workplace? (Prompts: Opportunities? Particular support?)</td>
<td>Leads and those involved with the design of the project responded easily; OTTs did not</td>
<td>Cohort participants including partnership organisations responded easily. Not asked of strategic lead</td>
<td>Contextual: use in evaluation framework for projects with skills training element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What has made it difficult to use this learning in your workplace? (Prompts: Obstacles? Lack of opportunities? Culture?)</td>
<td>Leads and those involved with the design of the project responded easily; OTTs did not</td>
<td>Cohort participants responded easily. Not asked of strategic lead</td>
<td>Contextual: use in evaluation framework for projects with skills training element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Looking back at the last 6 months, i.e. the duration of the current story project, what has been the most significant change for you in your own work as a result of this project? (Prompts: Behaviours? Practices? Team work?)</td>
<td>Leads and those involved with the design of the project responded easily; OTTs made partial response</td>
<td>Cohort participants responded easily. Not asked of strategic lead</td>
<td>Keep in the generic evaluation framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What were your initial expectations of what the story project would deliver in terms of organisational benefits? (Prompts: In what way were these realised? In what way were they different?)</td>
<td>Leads and those involved with the design of the project responded easily; OTTs did not</td>
<td>Strategic lead responded easily; partnership organisation member did not</td>
<td>Contextual: use in evaluation framework for projects delivered at management or leadership level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What have been the actual outcomes and benefits to the organisation? (Prompts: Efficiency. Budgetary. Knowledge. Partnership working)</td>
<td>Leads and those involved with the design of the project responded easily; OTTs did not</td>
<td>Strategic lead responded easily; partnership organisation member did not. Project manager had difficulty responding.</td>
<td>Contextual: use in evaluation framework for projects delivered at management or leadership level; review sample selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Looking back at the last [XX] months, i.e. the duration of the current story project, what do you think has been the most significant change in the organisation's service delivery, as a result of this project? (Prompts: Better delivery of Recovery services. Better teamwork. Better partnership working)</td>
<td>Leads and those involved with the design of the project responded easily; OTTs did not</td>
<td>Strategic lead responded easily; partnership organisation member did not. Some difficulty in responding from original project manager (see above)</td>
<td>Contextual: use in evaluation framework for projects delivered at management or leadership level; review sample selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Looking back at the last [XX] months, i.e. the duration of the current story project, what has been</td>
<td>Leads and those involved with the design of the project responded easily; partnership</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keep in generic evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III. Reflections on implementing the evaluative framework (EF)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the most significant change for your clients (and/or stakeholders and partnership organisations)? (Prompts: Social return on investment. Improvements in well-being or confidence. Better client/organisation relationships. Better take-up of services)</td>
<td>responded easily; OTTs made partial response</td>
<td>organisation member did not. Some difficulty in responding from original project manager (see above)</td>
<td>framework; review sample selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Looking ahead, what are your recommendations to your organisation regarding future story-based projects? (Prompts: More workshops? More training? Sustainability &amp; Improvements? Less/None?)</td>
<td>All interviewees responded easily</td>
<td>All interviewees responded easily</td>
<td>Keep in the generic evaluation framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications about story work in organisational change</th>
<th>Implications about evaluation frameworks, strategies or techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story-practitioners</td>
<td>Access and utilise evidence to demonstrate the variety of impacts that can be generated through story work. Utilise cases examples to demonstrate the value, richness and possible application areas of story work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly define own evaluation “toolkit” as a flexible menu of options, which might include formal methodologies (as required by clients) as well as adapted techniques (such as MSC). Negotiate the evaluation framework and techniques with the project owners – to fit their particular outcomes as well as their requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project evaluators</td>
<td>Position story work as a way to inform the strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation of strategic change programmes – notice the who, what, why, when elements of the story construction to identify issues or ideas. Collect and analyse a variety of stories (e.g. from different stakeholders) at the various stages of the project process (e.g. design, delivery, decision-gates, evaluation) – story listening and recording processes will be important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involve different parts of the organisation at the evaluation stage to be able to make sense of alternative stories as data/evidence for (1) progression or change and (2) deliverables, impacts and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involve partner organisations where possible in the original project to improve the reach and impact of workplace projects at the outset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt MSC-informed questions to enable deeper levels of evidence to emerge. Utilise real client stories to enrich and “humanise” planning and strategy formulation processes – the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish story curation (collection and display) mechanisms across the organisation to make evaluation a part of a culture. Incorporate partnership working and knowledge sharing around aspects of cultural change in an organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisations (e.g. health or social care)</td>
<td>Position story work as a way to inform and evaluate strategic commitments to service improvement – notice the who, what, why, when elements of the story construction to identify issues or ideas. Engage stakeholders across the organisation by capturing their stories, and telling them in planning and feedback contexts rather than being confined to managers or PR. Establish story generation mechanisms across the organisation and establish links to teams and managers – and develop skills in noticing story elements (e.g. storyline, characters, actors, transition stages and morals) (see Wall and Rossetti, 2013).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV. Summary of implications for story-practitioners, project evaluators and organisations.
In this way, this paper argues that evaluative frameworks benefit from being designed in conjunction with the client organisation to align with their outcomes and be conducted through participatory forms. The decision to adapt the “MSC” method and integrate this into the evaluation framework enabled the strong links to the use of stories as data and evidence. Moreover, the MSC domains of change can be identified by a top-down or bottom-up process, through participatory consultation – in other words – the framework can be adapted to the specific aims and cultural context of the project, for example, more or less skills content, more or less service user involvement.

Findings showed that the MSC-informed questions can generate important stories as data in work-based projects, and can accommodate scaling up. In addition, participatory or co-production of evaluative design has exciting potential, and one which aligns readily with guiding ethos within health and social care organisational governance and culture. In this way, this paper documents contemporary evidence of the variety of organisational development and service improvement that story work can generate as part of workplace learning projects.
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