Trigger Question	Implications	Notes & Thoughts
1. What are the relevant contexts?	your context(s) as researcher/employee/ manager; innovation; governance; regulatory; policy, workplace; users/communities; market(s)	- Extremely dynamic trending to volatile organisational climate - Acute VC-identified organisational needs around org culture, org learning and change capability - Extremely rapid pace of change - Lower-level employee with limited positional power but leadership backing and conceptual influence in some spheres
2. Who stands to lose or gain with respect to the innovation and/or the research you conduct concerning that innovation?	relevant stakeholders; power brokers; investors; clients/customers	**Gain** - Staff - experiencing improved workplace experience - University leadership - improved culture and change capability - Learning design/SoTL community - expanded capability - Community broadly - a more agile and sustainable institution **Lose** - Staff who benefit from current environment and perceive loss of power in change - Central directorates who perceive rigid role boundaries (eg HR potential perception of loss of control if others outside are doing development work) - I may well burn myself out
3. What are your resource constraints?	feasibility considerations; personal capabilities & development/skill needs; time; finance; power relationships/political; organisational/institutional support; access to potential users/beneficiaries/stakeh olders; practical considerations	- I have limited positional power - I have limited time available - I have no budget available - Strategic landscape is shifting at a very rapid rate - No institutional capacity for high-level, large scale or longitudinal interventions
4. What approaches to use to gather the evidence?	guiding assumptions; evaluation modes and designs; methods & procedural choices	**Guiding assumptions** - There is no empirical truth, only subjective experience - It is impossible to know what a 'right thing' is to do **Modes and methods** - Participatory narrative inquiry bookending each intervention as a way to gather and make sense of experiential evidence

		● Evidence informs developmental evaluation
5. What goals or research questions is the evidence intended to inform?	focused thinking on the intentions of the research/evaluation	● What can we learn from the intentional design and implementation of an organisational learning and culture development program? ● How can these learnings be used to meet organisational needs/identified organisational issues? Essentially, we need to try *something* in order to gather learnings around what might work, does work and doesn't work to inform wider solutions to strategic goals and issues that are too big to be addressed within the bounds of this PhD.
6. What is the relationship between the development of your innovation and research about that innovation?	identifying systemic linkages between innovation development and evaluation/evidence gathering processes	The reconnaissance phase of the action research frame that has occupied much of the past year has existed in two streams that have led the development of my innovation to its current form: **Literature** ● Establishing a transdisciplinary frame and ecosystem for my work ● Honing an appropriate niche to situate the innovation in ● Finding research and praxis methods that resonate **Contextual and capability analysis** ● Understanding the complexity of the institutional context ● Tracking the strategic landscape ● Iterating a concrete "innovation product" that synthesises the same conceptual landscape into different potential products ● Personal capability development
7. What is already known about similar innovations, contexts and evaluations?	contextualisation of your research vis-a-vis the literature (e.g., past evaluations of similar innovations; relevant theoretical considerations)	● Intentional interventions and development programs towards organisational learning and culture can and do result in positive change ● Traditional corporate training programs may have limited impact ● External consultancy interventions may have limited impact ● Development programs that are tailored and pedagogically designed (eg academic development programs) can and do result in positive change ● Large scale institution wide radical change programs (eg VU's move to the block model) can and do result in cultural change and increased organisational learning capacity, but UNE does not currently have the resources or capability for this scale of initiative

8. Where/when to gather the evidence?	site/occasion choices	• Determined at each identified point of need when an intervention is developed, inquiry will bookend each designed intervention • Pre-intervention session collects data to inform intervention design • Post-intervention session collects data to inform developmental evaluation
9. What evidence should be gathered and how?	types of data needed (quantitative, qualitative); measurements/instruments, if appropriate; procedures for gathering and recording/editing/transcribing/storing data	• Qualitative data - group storytelling sessions • Data gathered is captured and analysed in situ by participants
10. Who to involve and at what stages?	participant & sampling access and choices; involvement in innovation process;	• Participants will be determined on a case by case basis as each point of need for intervention is determined • Leadership will need to facilitate participant access and engagement
11. Is evidence worthwhile?	cost-benefit considerations; quality of evidence considerations	• If a guiding assumption is that there is no empirical truth, only subjective experience, evidence is essential to understand and act based on that subjective experience, and determine the impact on subjective experience • Evidence is made worthy through a process of collective sensemaking, not through a disconnected process of coding
12. Is evidence gathering ethical?	social/environmental responsibility considerations; meeting institutional ethical approval requirements	• Meets ethical requirements from a research ethics point of view • What are the ethical implications of using data for developmental evaluation? How to balance privacy and transparency for learning? How to navigate political tensions?
13. What is the timeline for the research/evaluation process?	mapping out milestones for components of the research process	Project plan TBA and will appear in the innovation project proposal.
14. Who do you have to convince and how?	target audience(s); power brokers; leaders; garnering support; disseminating findings	• Leadership who will facilitate interventions - relevant when seeking/"selling the product" moreso than responding to need requests • Staff who are reluctant to engage • Convincing people that there is value in work that takes time and does not visibly contribute to measurable outcomes • Convincing people that there is value in work that makes them uncomfortable and challenges their mental models and power dynamics
15. How should you make sense of and display the evidence?	data analysis approaches & display of results; write up of outcomes and recommendations	• Participatory narrative inquiry has collective sensemaking processes built in - groups sit with the stories of their experiences and work together to make sense of them • The HFS website is a central curation and

		communication point for experiences, outcomes and recommendations but further comms strategies can probably be fleshed out as the project progresses
16. How will you understand what happened/changed?	maximising value for learning and decision making; drawing conclusions from your evidence	This is a key function of the PNI/sensemaking process - each post-intervention PNI session allows contextualised understanding of what has happened and changed, and what considerations may need to be taken into the next intervention or iteration. I will also be engaging in my own ongoing sensemaking process, as the common 'node' across all interventions.
17. How will you know what action(s) are needed?	maximising value for implementation; improvement; adoption and/or change; recommendations; drawing conclusions from your evidence	As above, but this will also be guided by the points of need identified by leadership.
18. How will what you learn fuel your own further learning and that of others with respect to the innovation?	using the evidence to inform reflections (retrospective analyses = looking back) and anticipations (prospective analyses = looking forward)	The individual sensemaking process will continue to unfold much in the same way this reconnaissance year has - I already have established sensemaking practices, and these will continue to expand with more outward facing communication as implementation begins.