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Abstract

In public, as well as private sectors it is inevitable to react to the versatile environment and evaluate the influence of qualitative and quantitative factors on the organization while planning complex projects, processes or/and forecasting growth. Expert evaluation, discussed in the current research paper, is one of the strategic planning tools employed as an external source of knowledge and advice. The purposes of the current research were formulated seeking to identify a full expert evaluation process, to single out obligatory stages that could impact company development, and to highlight issues that might influence the level of success of organisational change, brought by the expert evaluators as a result of the external evaluation process. Based on the analysis of theoretical sources with regards to stages, main actors and distribution of responsibilities in the evaluation process and the case study the Model of Expert-Based Evaluation Process has been developed.
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Introduction

In public, as well as private sectors it is inevitable to react to the versatile environment and evaluate the influence of qualitative and quantitative factors on the organization while planning complex projects, processes or/and forecasting growth. Development of the strategic development greatly helps to clarify the organization's objectives and commitments and ensure that key leaders are all in agreement with it.

Nowadays, strategic planning system is conceived as a system where the decision makers consult with respect to drawing, implementing and controlling important prospective decisions across all the functions and levels in the organization. Not less important than the strategic document, is the strategic planning process itself (McNamara, 2007). The way that a strategic plan is developed depends on the organization's leadership, culture and complexity of the organization, size of the organization and etc. Expert evaluation, discussed in the current research paper, is one of the strategic planning tools employed as an external source of knowledge and advice in order to assist with and improve present situation with the outstanding current issues of organisations. It is widely common to use external consultants to seek new frontiers for organisational improvements.

For around twenty years management consulting have faced constantly growing market domain (Rassam, 1998) covering wide range of organisational activities that stimulate internal organisational changes. It is due to the fact that very organisation has its own culture and means of conducting business (Bresciani, 2003) and in order to implement changes it therefore might need external guidance from an independent third party. Require that evaluators display honesty and integrity not only in their own behaviour but also in ensuring the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process (Yang & Shen, 2006). Different experts apply different methodologies and follow different procedures. However, it is important to identify the common trends and tendencies in expert evaluation projects and to point out those bringing real value to the company – client interaction.

The purpose of this research is to create an Expert-base Evaluation Model which could stimulate the real organisational changes and to contribute the most valuable effect and would be in alignment with organisational goals.

Research is based on single case study of international high-technology company. The results of the case study are limited to the context of a US-based medium-sized company with regional offices in 20 European countries. The empirical data have been collected via interviewing staff of one of the European branches, located in the UK. In order to maintain anonymity and privacy of the respondents, their names, as well as the name of the company are not disclosed in this research. Instead, the company is hereby referred to as “the Company” and the actors are referred to as “respondents” and “interviewees”.

Evaluation process theory: literature overview

As defined by the American Evaluation Association, evaluation in broader sense is the collection and analysis of data, concerning strengths and weaknesses of programs, products, and organizations overall to
improve effectiveness (American Evaluation Association, 2004). There are some approaches on consulting in scientific literature. In cases of consultancy being directive action, “acting as an advocate and information expert”, it is referred to as a “purchaser-provider” model. The opposite model is described by assigning a personal involvement to a nondirective consultancy (Pellegrinelli, 2001). However, both approaches could be combined and analyzed in the light of day-to-day experts’ and managers’ participation in a coherent evaluation action seeking to encourage core organisational changes. Consulting as an intervention to the inner life cycle of an organisation could be accepted as an external evaluation, hereinafter referred to as an expert based evaluation.

Mark and Henry developed a system that outlines potential effects of the evaluation (Mark & Henry, 2004). Their model is based on the theory that there are three levels of influence, i.e., individual level, interpersonal interactions’ level and collective actions in the organisation. This theory is further supported by Stufflebeam’s CIPP model (Alkin & Christie, 2004) based on decisions to be made or actions to be brought to life at different stages of the evaluation process. CIPP hereby stands for context, input, process, and product. Context evaluation involves identifying needs to decide upon program objectives. Input evaluation leads to decisions on strategies and designs. Process evaluation consists of identifying shortcomings in a current program to refine implementation. Product evaluation measures outcomes for decisions regarding the continuation or refocus of the program. Stufflebeam was one of the first to recognise that client needs in the evaluation process are not only with respect to the objectives achieved, but also information obtained from the evaluation process itself. This was a decision-based approach rather than objective-based approach. Mark, Henry and Julnes identified that primarily expert-based evaluation serves to help organisation in judging merit and worth, facilitate decisions about program continuation or improvement, and monitor or improve program or organizational performance (Mark et al., 2000). The expert based evaluation process is not just technology of managing the groups (Schein, 1999). It could be carefully planned and broken down to stages with respect to different managerial tasks. Foremost, the evaluation process strategies imply three main stages: pre-evaluation, evaluation and post-evaluation.

The pre-evaluation stage mainly concerns singling out the aims and objectives of the evaluation process in general, as well as final decisions in regards to the identification and appointment of certain experts. Organic strategic planning should start by articulating the organization’s vision and values and then action plans to achieve the vision while adhering to those values. Some planners prefer a particular approach to the pre-evaluation planning (McNamara, 2007). At this stage the client would be expected clarify the results they are seeking to achieve, deadlines and possibly methods of evaluation. Usually, the feasibility and the scope of the project for evaluation are determined at this stage as well.

The evaluation stage encompasses the evaluation process. This stage involves expert interaction with various departments of the company in order to obtain subject-specific information, quantitative or qualitative researches and formation of conclusions on the basis of their findings. Data is gathered and organized in a systematic way to reduce sources of bias and increase validity and patterns are discerned from qualitative and quantitative data. Furthermore, experts involve key decision makers of the Company to help interpret the date collected.

The post-evaluation stage is the period from the moment of change implementation to further monitoring of the level of overall project success. Its purpose is to execute the final recommendations and summarize the evaluation experience and serve to check the final results by analyzing change brought as a result of evaluation. Based on post-evaluation feedback, relevant policies and programs can be adjusted.

Analytical framework: Model of Expert-Based Evaluation Process

On the bases of analysed scientific literature, there seems to be a set of minimum prerequisite sub-stages present in expert based evaluation process. Very sub-stages could be represented by appropriate set of others attributes that are of great importance to the positive impact on the added value of expert based recommendations to further organisational changes. Such attributes could be named as set of actors and properly and timely directed set of information flow. Hereinafter there are discussed the suggested sub-stages, their aims and the impact of the whole evaluation process outcomes.

Conceptualisation of the need of external evaluation. We suggest the first step on the pre-evaluation stage of the process dedicate to conceptualization of the need of external expertise. There might be a various reasons behind the decision to employ external consultants. One of the reasons of a great importance is the need for a third party opinion, i.e. for objectivity, which is often associated external expertise (Ray, 2006). Such executive bodies of an organization as the Board of Directors, Regional Heads
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or Department heads participate in the process of conceptualization of need for external evaluation is essential. Also, the stakeholders might be involved into this initial stage of the process where applicable.

**Identification of aims and objectives of the evaluation.** Once the need for expert evaluation has been established, the exact purposes and aims should be set before one can proceed to the search for experts and the evaluation itself. It should be noted that the aims of evaluation exercise should be established in collaboration with experts. The aims and objectives of the evaluation set out the range of deliverables and possible project delivery timescales, taking into account and accommodating changes that might follow the evaluation processes. Clearly defined aims make clear the means and the reason for individual outputs that should be contributed to the outcomes of the evaluation. The key stakeholder groups should be involved in the evaluation design and implementation for further support. The other actors such as top (executive) management of an organisation and other middle rank of leadership depending on the scope of the project needs to be involved in this decision-making process with the purpose to create positive environment for commitments and for successful change (Smith, 2003).

**Appointment of experts.** Once the purposes of evaluation have been clearly defined, the panel of experts is assigned to carry out the evaluation. The power of expert evaluation depends to a greater extent on the general state of knowledge in the field relevant to the exercise (Vedung, 2000). Experts ought to be knowledgeable about the area in question and should have demonstrated that knowledge in actual accomplishments. Moreover, experts should be familiar with the findings of evaluations of similar topic. Experience is a necessary condition for judgment accuracy; however, it is not sufficient. According to Cassidy and Buede (Cassidy & Buede, 2009) principal requirement for expert accuracy seems to be the availability of a detailed and validated knowledge base, i.e. competency and independent viewpoint. The decision with respect to the final choice of experts lies upon the top management (Executive Board) of an organization.

**Clarification of aims and impact to make.** Whilst remaining independent and professional, experts would be expected to cooperate with the clients in order to fully understand and discuss the situation in the country/enterprise, needs and purposes of the evaluation project and to devise the plan for the evaluation, as well as to set the targets. Clarification of aims and impacts to make is a joint process carried out by experts, company representatives and stakeholders together in order to achieve the maximum results and the most relevant recommendations at the end of the process.

**Evaluation process.** Evaluation process involves a combination of quantitative and qualitative monitoring and evaluation to analyse, defend and communicate the impacts and contributions of an organisation. In order to evaluate a project or program it is necessary to know the relevant measures or indicators. The following typical evaluation indicators such as inputs/investment in expenditures, financial outputs (cost savings, return on investment), commercial (sales and profit ratio, customer satisfaction, quality and reliability), peer review (consultations with key decision makers in the organizations, internal evaluations/audit), organisational, strategic (evaluation of organizational capabilities) are the targeted for evaluation. Whilst experts are responsible for carrying out the evaluation process itself, company representatives as well as stakeholders, should provide all the needed assistance to experts. This might involve providing missing information to experts, clarifying outstanding issues and providing feedback with regards to the preliminary results to experts.

**Results and conclusions.** Upon having conducted the evaluation, an expert or panel of experts draft initial conclusions and recommendations and review them. While drafting the results evaluators should consider not only immediate operations and outcomes of the evaluation, but also the broad assumptions, implications and potential side effects. It is also important for the evaluators to maintain a balance between the client needs and interests and independence of the evaluation (American Evaluation Association, 2004).

**Double-checking results.** Experts present their findings to the client who may want to hold a subsequent discussion with both experts, to clarify issues and to identify areas of agreement and disagreement, and the key participants from the organization. This should be done in order to check feasibility of the results and to avoid misguidance for the organizations. Christie identified that the extent to which evaluators involved clients into the discussion of results, as well as chose the further recommendations were strong factors in underlying evaluation approaches (Christie, 2003). Effective Company’s key decision makers’ engagement is paramount in ensuring that the processes and outputs of the evaluation fit the aim. The mutual commitment to sharing views on the results of the evaluation process would mean both Experts and the Client are confident and orientated towards achieving the same goal. Experts are responsible for providing their intermediate results to the Board of Directors, Regional Heads, Heads of Departments or any
other company representatives involved in the evaluation process and discuss it widely just to test how perfectly it matches the targets and company expectations.

**Final expert recommendations.** Expert recommendations should be feasible, transparent and made available to the Client as rapidly as possible. Bresciani in her research on expert driven assessments concludes that in order to trigger success in the Company, the final expert recommendations must match certain criteria. Firstly, it must be meaningful and useful to the company in articulating the results and gathering information. Secondly, it must be easily manageable and consider various resources in the Company. Thirdly, it must be flexible, that it must account for internal culture of the Company. Moreover, the evaluation should be trustworthy and influential so that it could inform decisions for continuous improvement and help company culture of accountability (Bresciani, 2003).

**Figure 1. Proposed Expert-Based Evaluation Process Model**

**Implementation of changes.** Early conceptions of evaluation, according to Fitzgerald (Fitzpatrick, 2009), focus on instrumental use of results, i.e. the results of evaluation would be used directly to make decisions. However, it is up to the general management of the enterprise to decide whether full implementation of recommendations, as well as setting the future targets in accordance with them, would be feasible. It is important to stress that private sector companies might be reluctant to implement changes. Raukko’s longitudinal research in a hi-technology company findings suggest that key in the beginning employees might be enthusiastic about the changes (Raukko, 2009). However, at a later stage of change
implementation they might feel that changes are not well communicated or implemented. It is a responsibility of Heads of Departments and other representatives of organisation’s top-management concerned to initiate and supervise change implementation with strong support of other staff members.

**Monitoring change.** The results/changes are evaluated over time, beginning with the data on situation before evaluation, such as, for example, standards, attendance rates, company work environment, etc. These then are monitored during the change process. Feedback of various evaluation process participants at each main stage of the change process can be incorporated into the changes to help ensure the objectives are met. An appropriate monitoring and evaluation process should be an integral part of all strategic management projects and programs.

**Model of Expert-Based Evaluation Process**

Based on the analysis of theoretical sources with regards to stages, main actors and distribution of responsibilities in the evaluation process and the discussions above a following model of the evaluation process has been developed (Figure 1). The process of evaluation in proposed model is divided into 3 main blocks, representing pre-evaluation, evaluation and post-evaluation stages. Each of the blocks is divided into the process sub-stages, necessary to be followed in order to fully benefit from the evaluation process as such and reach maximum impacts. The special consideration is paid to set of actors need to be involved in the certain evaluation stage or sub-stage. The actors included in the model are the Company, represented by the Executive Team, stakeholders and other employers concerned and Experts, representing the party carried out the evaluation. The arrows represent the information flow in the process, highlighting the sequence of stages in the process and involvement of actors in each and single stage. Different directions of arrows represent outward and inward information input by/to the actors during the process stages, respectively.

This model will be further applied in the context of the analysis of empirical data collected during the research of the case study chosen for the current research. In addition, it will be used in drawing conclusions on the overall success of the evaluation process in the Company.

**Research**

Empirical evidence has been gathered on the basis of the already conducted and documented excises of expert evaluation. The case chosen for this research was an expert based evaluation process carried on in a high-technology company.

**Target Company.** The studied company (the Company) with the headquarters in the United States and offices across the Americas, Europe, Australia and Asia, was incorporated in 1990s. There are 20 offices across Europe, divided into Southern and Eastern, Western and Central Europe, as well as Scandinavia. The company specialises in high technology products and services such as network infrastructure solutions as optical platforms, software and services. With the industry evolving at a fast pace and the Company becoming more global in 2006, it faced issues with organizing the work of its functions and regions more effectively.

The Executive Board, as well as the Regional Heads had come to a conclusion that there emerged a need to design a new look for the organization globally across all the functions, departments and regions. Overall continuous issues and differences of opinions choosing the optimal business model led the company at beginning of 2006 to set out for an expert based evaluation exercise. The Company has already passed the pre-evaluation, the evaluation and the post-evaluation stages of the expert based evaluation, which provides a perfect opportunity to research and to analyze the issues that arose during the evaluation and allows drawing conclusions on the success of the whole evaluation project.

**Research design.** The current research was launched in the first fiscal quarter of 2009 and finished with the end of fiscal year, November 2009, i.e. it was conducted at the post-evaluation stage of the process. It was undertaken in biggest European office. The top-management of European regional is based in London as well, which determined the choice of this particular. A number of Company strategic documents and annual business reports were analysed the draw the framework for need of expert based evaluation.

The case study comprised 20 in-depths interviews for which a set of open-ended questions was designed in order to scan the expert-based evaluation process and recognise each and single stage. The respondents were asked the same set of 11 open-ended questions. The questions were divided into the following broad categories: questions with respect to the evaluation process; questions with respect to expert choice; questions with respect to mutual Company-expert communication; questions with respect to levels of employee involvement in the evaluation process; questions with respect to attitudes of the respondents.
Approximately an hour long discussions based on the questions above were conducted with the interviewees as a result of which empirical data were collected. The respondents were drawn from a mix of organisational departments and levels in order to recognise the obstacles of the evaluation impact. The top management of European entities (e.g. Directors, Heads of Departments) as well as Junior Management (Program Managers, Receptionists) and Supporting Staff (Coordinator, Supervisor) of the Company were involved into this research. The respondents were either directly or indirectly involved in collaboration with expert evaluators throughout the process of evaluation. Afterwards, answers of the respondents were analysed in order to determine common tendencies in their opinion with respect to different issues that arose during the evaluation process. The main complaints were analysed by grouping seeking to find main constrains of the evaluation process.

Findings

The expert evaluation was undertaken at the end of 2006 - beginning of 2007 with a goal of ensuring that the organizational support structure is in place throughout the Company to drive business results and to develop a framework for the future due to the recent growth of business in the regions outside of the US. The initial Company aim of external evaluation was to improve communication, company structure and increase overall business velocity in the Company overall and cope with the cultural diversity management. In addition, another aim was a re-evaluation of some approvals and accountabilities in the Company, i.e. "guiding decision making". The main objective was to focus each level of the organization on the key results they are accountable for revenue, profit and customer satisfaction and to minimise management layers and levels of bureaucracy.

Choice of experts. The Company’s decision to hire external experts was a serious attempt to stimulate changes. The experts for the evaluation were chosen through the personal channels of the Company CEO. European top management did not participate in choosing, testing or evaluating experts and their suitability for that particular research. The basic selection requirements set forth for expert evaluators by the Executive Board included their long-term experience working with strategic planning of global high-tech companies, as well as previous successful experience of project delivery to the Company. Trust between the consulting group of expert evaluators and the Company was established during previous contacts, when the experts demonstrated credibility, competence, and assistance in development of shared vision and values.

Evaluation process. The expert evaluation process consisted of a pre-evaluation stage, evaluation itself and post-evaluation. It was discovered in the process of interviewing for the current research that the experts did not demonstrate flexibility in accommodating the Company’s requests that arose at different stages of the evaluation.

Pre-Evaluation. The pre-evaluation stage firstly comprised the conceptualisation of aims and the appointment of experts for executing the evaluation project. In addition to these items, the timelines and the budget for the evaluation process were decided upon. The preparatory (pre-evaluation) stage was the stage when European based employees were practically consulted in regards to the process. It should be noted, however, that only the representatives of the European top-management were given opportunity of expressing their point of view. The Junior Management was not informed about the third party evaluation being conducted in the Company.

Evaluation. The lead expert was based in Europe throughout the evaluation process in 2007-2008, whereas other members of the expert team were mostly based in the USA. They played administrative support, analytical and advisory roles in the evaluation process. They were given an open access to the information on various Europe-based offices/departments and their functions within the global organisation. Moreover, experts were guided and advised by the Company’s Legal representative in Europe, who ensured the evaluation process is fully compliant with EU rules and regulations. Therefore, it is possible to presuppose that experts partly supported the democratic external evaluation methodology by giving opportunities for the company decision makers to contribute to the evaluation process.

The newly appointed experts conducted short telephone interviews with the top management of European region. These interviews consisted of thirty multiple choice questions and lasted for up to half an hour in total. The questionnaire was mainly aimed at gathering specific data, i.e., the lead expert called upon key decision makers’ opinions with respect to the possible solutions to the existing problems and available methods of mutual expert-client collaboration throughout the process. Furthermore, it was aimed at measuring and assessing the level of understanding of the external evaluation processes among the
employees of the Company; also it was dedicated to collecting factors that may have impact on the evaluation process transparency.

The experts prepared their final recommendations in 2008 and then forwarded them to the Headquarters of the Company in the USA. Their presentation consisted of set out objectives and proposed changes, grouped by the region for Operations and by function for all other Departments (Support and Services). The process of drafting the final evaluation report did not contain any substantial changes from the side of the Company (steering group). The results were reviewed by the Board who decided they should be implemented. It should be noted that the final recommendations of the experts partly matched suggestions of the President, expressed by him during the initial consultation with the experts (at the pre-evaluation stage).

Post-evaluation. The post-evaluation phase of the process lasted from the beginning of 2008 until early autumn 2009, when the final conclusions on the success of the implementation of changes were drawn. It started with the implementation of changes, proposed by the experts in their final recommendations to the Company. One of the final expert recommendations was that the Company should change directions and accountability of some departments was transferred to the European Management, as opposed to the previous accountability to the US Headquarters.

The proposed changes were implemented by the end of the second quarter of 2008, when the “Change Monitoring” stage started in order to evaluate change results with respect to goals and lessons learned. The implemented organisational structure was replaced in the end of the third quarter of 2009. Change success was measured by the Company against several traditional benchmarks, such as the commitment to the goals and objectives set in the pre-evaluation stage of the process, as well as the recommendations outlined in the final recommendations of the expert group. Another criterion of success tracking was the overall performance in connection with the originally forecasted reduction of bureaucracy. The analysis of results of the change monitoring carried out in autumn 2009 by the Company with cooperation with experts allowed to presuppose that changes were not as effective as it has been hoped for.

Discussions: the analysis of the evaluation process

The analysis of results of the change monitoring allows to presuppose that changes were not as effective as it has been hoped for, partly due to the worldwide financial crisis. The return of investments in the high technology sectors could be measured on a more frequent and regular basis than in other sectors and, therefore, the fall in revenue growth was impacted not only by the financial crisis of 2008, but also by the changes brought to the Company. It was revealed during the current research and interviewing process that the evaluation process carried out in the Company consisted of the pre-evaluation, evaluation and post-evaluation stages. In addition to it, the stages could be divided into sub-stages in accordance with the Expert-Based Evaluation Process Model, developed in the previous section of the current research (Figure 1). With some deviations it corresponds to the theoretically proposed Evaluation Process Model when sub-stages of the evaluation process are introduced.

Table 1. Evaluation Process Stages, observed in the Company during the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Process Model: Stages</th>
<th>✓ - Fully observed</th>
<th>✓ - Partly observed</th>
<th>-- - Not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualisation of the need of external evaluation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of aims and objectives of the evaluation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of experts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of aims and impact to make</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Process</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and conclusions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-checking of results</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final expert recommendations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of changes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring change</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, only several sub-stages were fully completed (Table 1.). The first sub-stage of the pre-evaluation, i.e. “Conceptualisation of the need of external evaluation” and also “Identification of aims and objectives”, were executed thoroughly, as well as the sub-stage of the “Evaluation Process” itself was carried
out in practice. Besides that, the results and conclusions were developed and formulated by the experts as a consequence to the evaluation process and presented to the Client. Finally, the post-evaluation “Monitoring change” sub-stage was implemented by the Company.

However, the sub-stages of “Appointment of experts” and “Clarification of aims and impact to make” were met only partially due to the fact that not all of the key decision makers of the company were given opportunity to discuss this with the Board of Directors and experts. Similarly, the “Final expert recommendation” sub-stage was fulfilled only to a certain extent as experts practically presented the recommendations, but only to the Board of Directors. In addition to it, only part of the proposed changes was implemented in the Company.

Furthermore, the sub-stage of “Double-checking results” is believed to have been omitted from the process at all due to the fact that the results of the evaluation were not shared with the Key decision makers of the Company prior to the final presentation, delivered by the lead expert to the Board of Directors in the USA. The main actors of the evaluation process were the Board of Directors of the Company, Regional Heads of Departments and Experts.

Conclusions and recommendations

The Expert-Based Evaluation Process Model has been developed, as well as the key sub-stages, actors and sequence of the process were identified. The Expert-Based Evaluation Process Model consists of ten obligatory stages that should be followed in order to ensure the satisfactory level of mutual collaboration is reached and obligations are distributed evenly throughout the evaluation process; also to secure aims and purposes of the evaluation fully achieved.

Based on the interviews carried out during this research, it is possible to draw conclusions with respect to issues, arising in the evaluation process. The main reasons for the evaluation process in the Company not being as effective as forecasted concern non-observation several stages of the Expert Evaluation Process Model. Several stages were omitted from the evaluation process, proper set of actors did not participate in the respective stages and mutual collaboration and information sharing between experts and the Company was poor throughout the process.

The first type of expert evaluation issues could be grouped under the category of the company-caused constrains. This type of issue would usually occur in the first several stages of the overall evaluation process, i.e. – “Conceptualisation of the need for external evaluation”, “Choosing experts” and “Identifying purposes”). This category of issues includes issues when the Company have no clear vision of their own goals and priorities for the evaluation process. The Company’s vaguely expressed ideas could possibly make it more difficult for the Expert to fully profit from the offered expertise.

The second type of expert evaluation issue categories is the expert-caused constraints, occurring on the stage of setting goals for the evaluation between the Company and the evaluators. In the track of the current research in appeared that some of the key actors of the evaluation process (from the Company side) were not given a chance to express their opinions on the subject matter. Moreover, lack of detailed design of the evaluation process and exclusion of some actors from the process conditioned the environment inside company during the first pre-evaluation step – collecting information. The lack of trust appeared due to the fact that experts used “surface” questionnaires with a set of pre-defined questions and overly technical jargon, not relating the insights of the Company situation. According to the Company’s Management point of view, there was a lack of interest demonstrated by the expert in related relevant issues.
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