

Most of the points below are taken directly from (Olive et. Al) while others express my own thoughts about what is important about BSC.

1. Employees needs a tool to understand the big picture
2. Discussion about the model should be the main purpose with BSC
3. We need a tool to better handle the connection between the formal model and the intuitive discussion
4. A tool beside the formal model is needed to fuel the BSC process
5. Employees need a better understanding of what the most important “interventions” the formal BSC process should provide
6. Management needs a better tool than BSC to communicate about intangibles
7. The virtuous circle sought by the formal BSC trough KPIs needs to be complemented by aggregated qualitative information through the employees
8. Convert hypothetical cause and effects to fact based cause and effects

The following solution is designed to fulfill the above points and where any point is fulfilled it is marked with (X) where X is the point made. Not all potential (X) are marked but mainly the most obvious ones.

Solution

I propose creating a corporate strategy game where all employees are involved (1). The game would implement some type of system dynamics where cause and effect linkages would be visible and testable (1). To create the game effect employees would need to rate other employee's cause and effect linkages which would lead to points gained by the employee who created the linkage. If a linkage gets good ratings the linkage would survive the next game tick (8). A tick could be a month a week or a day depending on the purpose for the particular game level. A game level could be created and used by management to test their assumptions or get feedback for some set of assumptions for cause and effect in the formal BSC model(2). By developing game levels in deliberate ways and with a combination of long and short ticks and by nesting levels with each other complex strategy map could be developed. The game results could be used to change and improve the formal BSC model (3). The effect of the game would be some type massively collaborative system depending on the size of the company and how many where involved (4). Furthermore the employees themselves could create their own game levels and use it in an even more playful way. This would encourage employees to think out of the box and come up with imaginable strategies since it wouldn't be any prestige involved (4). Successful game levels would inform management about important issues as seen by the employees (5). This could be seen as aggregate information about what is going on in the organization (7). Much more informative than any KPI could ever be. The game would implement many of the practices proposed in the article about strategy maps by Eppler and Platts.

My question to Nils-Göran Olive och Anette Hallin:

Are gamification mechanisms used as a complement to BSC or strategizing anywhere in the world?