

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

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

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

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


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

Who turned in evaluations? (26 respondents)

Minneapolis Resident	20	76.9%
Member Nghd Assoc	10	40.0%
Staff Nghd Assoc	2	7.7%
Board Nghd Assoc	3	12.0%
Staff Nonprofit	7	26.9%
Educator	3	12.0%
Consultant	6	24.0%
Other	6	24.0%

"Other" include:

- micro-eco entrepreneur
- student
- student, future city planner
- landlord
- Minneapolis City staff
- city committee



Crossroads Resource Center

P.O. Box 7423 / Minneapolis, Minnesota 55407 / USA / 612.869.8664
<kmeter@crcworks.org> <<http://www.crcworks.org/>>

Tools for Community Self-determination

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!