Evaluation responses (26) for Minneapolis Sustainability Roundtable (January 17, 2004): (5 is strongly agree; 1 is strongly disagree—65 people attended)
Prepared by Crossroads Resource Center (612) 869-8664

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am glad I participated in the meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed hearing new ideas from other participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got to share my ideas with other people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meeting was well-facilitated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is reason to believe the negative evaluations were meant to be positive. These occurred only on one rating form. On this form, the scale receiving the lowest numeric rating ("new ideas") received the highest written praise. This suggests rater used "1" to mean "5." If so, all ratings were positive except for one "neutral" concerning facilitation.

Positive/ Negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 to 3</th>
<th>4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am glad I participated in the meeting</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed hearing new idea from other participants</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got to share my ideas with other people</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meeting was well-facilitated</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two other respondents used the green form, giving Roundtable highest possible rating as "very useful."

Who turned in evaluations? (26 respondents)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Resident</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Nghd Assoc</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Nghd Assoc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Nghd Assoc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Nonprofit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Other" include:
- micro-eco entrepreneur
- student
- student, future city planner
- landlord
- Minneapolis City staff
- city committee
2004 Minneapolis Sustainability Roundtable—Evaluation Comments
(26 respondents on white forms out of 65 participants)

Likes

Quality of participation (7)
- hearing the thoughtful ideas and passion of participants
- interaction & honesty of participants
- great participation
- enjoyed hearing new ideas
- enjoyed learning perspectives I have never considered
- meeting of concerned, knowledgeable people
- hearing new ideas

Who was here (7)
- meeting different leaders of Mpls area
- informed discussion participants
- meeting other people & learning ideas
- good attendance
- meeting new people
- being able to enter into a conversation with other people from other backgrounds
- opportunity to share with variety of people

Organization (4)
- well-organized
- well-organized
- well organized
- structure of event

How we discussed the topics (4)
- sharing ideas based on concrete situations
- plenty to talk about
- It was super. I loved that we were creative, fun, playful and not drudging with word-smithing
- Ron Cottone was informative and respectful (he was a volunteer facilitator)

Small group format (3)
- small groups
- small groups
- opportunity to participate in different small groups
Likes—continued

Issues addressed (3)
- substantive issues
- interactive mode
- opportunity for giving input and developing input in groups

Hope for future (2)
- sense of hope
- enjoyed feeling like I have a voice in future of our community

That we met (1)
- a start -- liked just that it was happening

What we discussed (1)
- brainstorming future of city

Content re: indicators (1)
- indicators - great intro!

Dislikes

More time needed (12)
- more time needed (6)
- more time -- give this two days
- more time for first part (2)
- too much time on visioning, not enough on indicators
- time
- traveled very fast

Diversity (1)
- somehow to have a more diverse group of participants (age, race, etc.)

Small groups (6)
- our group skipped pairs since it worked to discuss with whole group
- we skipped around in 2nd session, rather than taking issues in order. This worked.
- create less structure for small groups
- became confusing -- we became hung up on measurement instead of what we were measuring
- set up group seating in advance
- don't switch small groups, since we are working with people we don't know

Where does this lead? (4)
- critical thing is follow-up
- clarify follow-up roles
- should have been filmed for politicians, businesses, schools to see
- tell participants how input will be integrated
Dislikes— continued

Conference format (3)
- confusion w/ neighborhood conference
- need different format for review of indicators
- parking

Change discussion format (2)
- add creative visualization to lead us to ideal vision in first session
- perhaps a general discussion would have been more suitable

Greater clarity (1)
- better definition of the word sustainability

Advance preparation (1)
- preview of packet over internet would have allowed time to reflect

Suggestions:
- great job
- do this every year or two
- hold at locations more comfortable to people of color
- another meeting to review results of this session
- more time
- less talk or interruption in first half better
- large group wrap up for visioning
- have sessions on local currency, barter, etc
- please— have some food
- great facilitators! Ken did a marvelous job of explaining and keeping us on track.

Key Conclusions of Facilitators' Evaluations of Roundtable:

From JoAnne Berkenkamp, Ron Cottone, Cindy Lukas, David Scheie, Guy Trombley, and Ken Meter
This includes a group discussion January 27, and other written and oral comments

More time was needed for the exercises given, especially for the first (visioning) session
Facilitators needed more lead time and better preparation for the duties they were asked to perform at the Roundtable. Next time, there should be a meeting in advance of the Roundtable so we can all get on the same page.
Ideally, we would have had one facilitator and one recorder for each small group.
We needed a clearer definition of sustainability.
Other observations by the facilitator:

As I walked around the room during both the visioning and the indicators sessions, I was struck by how energetically people were discussing the issues in front of them, and how detailed were the written comments they were making.

At the end of the first half of the Roundtable (the visioning exercise) the facilitator called a 10-minute break. Few of the participants stopped talking, or got up to stretch. I take this as a sign that time was too short for the exercise we had suggested, and also as a sign that people largely enjoyed their small groups, and wanted to know more about each other.

We are aware of one person who left the Roundtable after the first session because the process was making this person angry.

Another person left because he/she apparently found him/herself in the wrong room, having hoped to attend a session on recycling.

Many of the participants did not realize until they came to the conference that a Roundtable was occurring that day. We are glad these folks joined us!