

# Workshop Evaluation

Workshop Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Workshop Leader: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please give us some feedback on this workshop. Mark your response by filling in the oval space.**

Factors contributing to choosing to attend

	Extremely Unimportant					Extremely Important	Comments	
Relevance of topic to my work	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	_____
The speaker	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	_____
The title	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	_____

**On a scale of 1 to 5 for Very Poor to Very Good, please rate each of the following.**

	Very Poor					Very Good	Comments
The format of the workshop for this topic was	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		_____
The style of group facilitation was	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		_____
The presentation was	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		_____

**What did you like least?**

---



---

**What did you like most?**

---



---

**Was the Case Study useful for this session?**

Yes	No	Comments
(Y)	(N)	_____

**Were your expected objectives for this session achieved?**

Yes	No	Comments
(Y)	(N)	_____

*Compared to other workshops that I have attended this one rates*

Very poor	Acceptable	Outstanding
 0++++1++++2++++3++++4++++5++++6++++7++++8++++9++++10		

*Compared to my expectations for this workshop I rate this as*

Very poor	Acceptable	Outstanding
 0++++1++++2++++3++++4++++5++++6++++7++++8++++9++++10		

**What would you suggest to improve this kind of a workshop session?**

---



---



---



---



---



---



---

Thank you for making the time to complete this evaluation. Your input will contribute to effective conference planning.

Please place your completed survey in the box on your way out.

## Workshop Evaluation

<b>Policy</b>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Format</i>	<i>Facilitation</i>	<i>PresentationCase</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>WShop</i>	<i>XptnRate</i>	
Mean	5.70	5.50	5.83	3.90	4.10	4.11	0.56	0.67	6.83	6.63
Median	6	6	6	4	4	4	1	1	8	6
Standard Deviation	0.949	1.378	0.753	0.738	0.994	0.601	0.527	0.500	1.734	1.202
Minimum	4	3	5	3	2	3	0	0	5	5
Maximum	7	7	7	5	5	5	1	1	8.8	8.4
Sum	57	33	35	39	41	37	5	6	47.8	53.0
Count	10	6	6	10	10	9	9	9	7	8
Scale	Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat	Fair	Good	Good			<b>68.3</b>	<b>66.3</b>
Per Cent Agree							<b>55.6</b>	<b>66.7</b>		

  

<b>Implementation</b>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Format</i>	<i>Facilitation</i>	<i>PresentationCase</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>WShop</i>	<i>XptnRate</i>	
Mean	5.45	4.64	4.91	3.95	4.09	3.77	0.33	0.80	7.11	6.84
Median	6	5	5	4	4	4	0	1	7	7
Standard Deviation	1.405	0.953	1.535	0.722	0.684	0.685	0.485	0.410	0.809	0.898
Minimum	1	3	1	3	3	3	0	0	6	5
Maximum	7	6	7	5	5	5	1	1	8	8
Sum	120	102	113	87	90	83	6	16	135	130
Count	22	22	23	22	22	22	18	20	19	19
Scale	Somewhat	A Little	A Little	Fair	Good	Fair			<b>71.1</b>	<b>68.4</b>
Per Cent Agree							<b>33.3</b>	<b>80.0</b>		

  

<b>Monitoring</b>	<i>Relevance</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Format</i>	<i>Facilitation</i>	<i>PresentationCase</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>WShop</i>	<i>XptnRate</i>	
Mean	5.4	5.3	4.8	3.4	4.3	3.7	0.2	0.6	6.8	6.3
Median	5	5	5	3	4	4	0	1	7	6.5
Standard Deviation	1.302	1.380	1.389	0.527	0.500	0.500	0.441	0.527	1.193	2.121
Minimum	3	3	2	3	4	3	0	0	5	2
Maximum	7	7	7	4	5	4	1	1	9	9
Sum	43	37	38	31	39	33	2	5	54.5	50
Count	8	7	8	9	9	9	9	9	8	8
Scale	Somewhat	Somewhat	A Little	Fair	Good	Fair			<b>68.1</b>	<b>62.5</b>
Per Cent Agree							<b>22.2</b>	<b>55.6</b>		

People’s reasons for attending a specific workshop are only somewhat dependent on the topic rather than on recognition of a speaker or the catchiness of a title. The Case Study served as a springboard for the discussions and was not seen as useful. Overall, the workshops scored a “C+” while the workshop format rated “Fair.” Not everyone’s objectives for the workshops were achieved and ranged from an average of 56% to 80%.

### What did you like least?

### What did you like most?

### Comments

28	Too large of a group	Discussion that arose -- other viewpoints and issues they are dealing with	
17		eventual outcome of group considerations after wandering through the topic	All should know the "formal" outcome objective. The Case Study materials were more of a distraction than an aid.
18		Discussion on implementation in general as opposed to planned case study specifically	We used the Case Study as reference.
19	lack of format	the discussions	Have a more detailed introduction with a time for feedback/discussion at the end
20		discussion during afternoon workshop. It was relevant and thought provoking.	- The Case Study was used as a springboard for discussions. - I also liked the fact that people were from a variety of backgrounds.
21		open forum of discussion sparked many kernels for digestion	We moved away from the Case.
23	lack of structure; little new information presented	Excellent open discussion	- Provide a better, more structured presentation and case study. The case study was essentially not used at all. Session ended up being 1 1/2 hours of open discussion.
27	not very focussed; did not come to any conclusions or consensus	hearing the various opinions an viewpoints	
29		Open discussion of topics relevant to individuals in the groups	
30		I chose this workshop because this speaker was the best prepared of the morning speakers and was bound to spark discussion, which he did. Hearing input on range of issues from most of those in the room	.
31	Didn't get into the _meat_ of implementation vis a vis the case study.	Very good group dialogue on a number of issues, such as Big Picture, growth, OMB, compensation, landowner education, municipal challenges	- If a Case Study is presented, should try to use it as a springboard to address all aspects of implementation -- perhaps direct discussion more. We tended to move around on a number of topics, all interesting, without reaching a consensus. - Networking opportunities very good,
32	wanted to hear from Gary on his experiences on implementation	Hearing about some of the approaches others use to overcome challenges	- provide handouts on implementation tools - need overview presentation(s) on effective implementation methods and then open it up to broader discussion
34		open relevant purposeful discussion	Smaller breakout groups
35	Too many people to get into issues in depth	It resulted in a very good discussion of problems related to natural heritage protection	
36			People want more "how to", more "nuts and bolts" from these sessions than general discussion only. This comes from our round the room introductions. It would need more structure and more time and more preparation time.
25	- not too structured; did not seem to follow a prescribed format - at times the discussion tended to leap around	general discussion of issues in other areas	- Perhaps a better Case Study, since we really did not refer to our Case Study very often.
33	need a specific discussion on how to implement the PPS as well as the discussion that happened; didn't get answers; facilitator did not keep us on topic	good to know other issues that others face	Discussion was valuable but also needed to discuss concrete implementation methods. Both discussions need to happen.

***What did you like least?***

***What did you like most?***

***Comments***

41	The evaluation matrix was too confusing.	Interaction and dialogue. Defining what is monitoring.	- Better link of case study with evaluation process. - Simple terminology - one can always have a larger objective that time would permit but try not to overwhelm with detailed matrices
42		The cross section of people represented. Developers and politicians would have been a bonus.	Session could have been longer.
40	was hoping to discuss and to design specific tools in monitoring for case study. Thought that the Case Study was good but wasn't followed through.	good discussion, good facilitation	focus on tangible aspects of case study
39	Evaluation Process sheet did not have a clear direction	Discussion arising from group	Discuss experiences and questions of participants. How do the various municipalities handle unevaluated wetlands? What policy have they implemented? How have they implemented monitoring?
38	Matrix setup	discussions	Simplify workshop tasks. Tackle only one set of issues. Many of these subjects are too multi-faceted to tackle in a short session.
37		group discussion	
44	I found the level of jargon a bit above me. Also, the questions in the sheet accompanying the afternoon workshop were very difficult to get one's head around.	The opportunity to interact and compare and share ideas and experiences.	
43	- a little hard to follow set up of workshop -- we didn't really follow the handout or case study	Good discussion	
7	not enough time to air all opinions and ideas or to work through the process	Excellent mix of planners, environmentalists and biologists	Allow more time for discussion
15		Presentation style adapted to the wants/needs of the group	
14		participation by the participants	- provide the group with actual policies to work from - identify problems...propose solutions - pre-scope the issues
13	The mechanism for the brainstorming was not very effective	Good discussion	Need a more structured format. This was _not_ because we did not subdivide the group.
12	not enough time	group discussion	- More time - Assignment or selection of workshop long before attending so timing and group issues settled
11		working as one group	
10		good blend of experience/the round robin/good contacts/discussions in pm worthwhile	Thank you!
9	was tough to decide which session to go to and then we were split into 3 groups which some were reluctant to do	discussion which was generated--we wanted hear everyone's thoughts and follow the entire process	If the purpose was to review differences between groups, set up several (or certainly more than 1) and allow each group to work their way through; then review (would require 2 more facilitators if you split it in half).
8			Provide more info on the breakout sessions so we can decide which one to go to. Also, I did not find the workshop did anything to improve my knowledge or understanding of provincial policies--which is what I was hoping to achieve.



# Conference Evaluation

## Conference Evaluation, 1 May 2001, Natural Heritage Planning

	PDDay	Support	Agenda	Knowledge	LowCost	LearnOthers	ValuetoWork
<b>Mean</b>	4.49	2.93	5.29	6.16	3.76	6.09	5.89
<b>Median</b>	5	2	6	6	4	6	6
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	2.197	2.086	1.218	0.999	1.819	0.996	1.301
<b>Minimum</b>	1	1	3	2	1	2	1
<b>Maximum</b>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Importance</b> L < 4; M 4-5.5; H > 5.5	Medium	Low	Medium	High	Low	High	High

	KingsSite	AM Room	Wkshps	Dining	PM Room	FoodPrep	AM Break	PM Break	Luncheon	TimeManagement
<b>Mean</b>	4.38	4.39	4.18	4.38	4.29	4.33	4.23	4.45	4.47	4.30
<b>Median</b>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	0.576	0.538	0.576	0.576	0.506	0.707	0.774	0.548	0.548	0.632
<b>Minimum</b>	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3
<b>Maximum</b>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>P &lt; 3; F = 3; G = 4; VG = 5</b>	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good

	OneDay	UsefulOverall	PanelInformative	PlenaryClarify	Objectives
<b>Mean</b>	0.84	0.98	0.86	0.68	0.77
<b>Median</b>	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	0.374	0.151	0.351	0.471	0.424
<b>Minimum</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Maximum</b>	1	1	1	1	1
<b>Sum</b>	36	43	37	30	34
<b>Count</b>	43	44	43	44	44
<b>Percent Agree</b>	83.7	97.7	86.0	68.2	77.3

To network and the opportunity to gain knowledge and to learn from others are regarded as important reasons for attending. Overall, factors such as the venue, organization and food rated “Good.” About three-quarters of conference delegates responded that their objectives for the day were met. This corresponds with the ranges reported for each of the three workshops. The format for the afternoon plenary could be changed to allow more time for discussion and to try to reach a common understanding and perhaps also “tangibles” to complete the day. Almost everyone of those who responded through the evaluation report that the one day conference is informative and is useful overall.

# 1 May 2001 Natural Heritage Planning Conference Evaluation

## Comments

1 content and contacts valuable

2  
3 2 day conference  
expected to learn more about Provincial Policy

4

5

6

7

8 excellent venue

9

10

11

12 could be two day conference

13 keep it up, you did a great job

14

15

16

17

18 Low cost would be less than \$50  
Good Day, productive; could be longer but may not get participation

19 good topic and timely  
quite useful to hear from others  
King's seems to work well; last year as well

20

21

22 glad to go outside for break  
glad to see fish on the menu  
panel discussion wasn't really a discussion, more a presentation format  
did not expect plenary session to clarify issues

23

24 Afternoon plenary introduced/brought up many issues

25

## Recommendation

I learned of the conference relatively recently on the web, but I'm wondering if the municipal planning boards were specifically targeted for participation.  
Overall, it was a great event--very informative for a novice like myself and I was impressed with the participant's willingness to share information.  
Thank you.

Would the speakers who used PowerPoint for their presentations be willing to forward copies by eMail?

Have a more proactive theme, not reactive like a lot of the discussions were

Include references in Proceedings

retain round table discussion  
retain panel discussions

shorten the morning panel discussion  
signage on the way in was quite poor

1) Invite agricultural interests; government and non-government  
2) get participating organizations to put notice of events/workshop calendars on individual web sites

3) write a brief summary -- one page news article that participants could take and feed into their system: identify range of participants, interests, issues covered, any next steps, next conference, 2 lines "who is Carolinian Canada"

panel of practitioners as for this conference  
representing all stakeholders (government, industry, community)

No recommendations for improvement, good format for conference

Insure that the panel experts are retained with ample time for them to properly prepare for the conference

## Comments

- 26 One day is sufficient depending on the objectives  
Afternoon plenary introduced new issues
- 27
- 28 Integrate natural heritage system planning with Smart Growth to Healthy Communities
- 29 Great food!
- 30
- 31 I had no expectations
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35 - conference was a little bit useful  
- plenary clarified to a small extent  
- objectives not really met
- 36 - 2nd day might help  
- plenary helped somewhat; no easy answers  
- objectives met somewhat
- 37 - two tables for morning refreshments  
- plenary had more questions than necessary
- 38
- 39 - Good networking and information  
- 2 day conf would be good  
- objectives not met; but, it was still valuable
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43 Plenary session stayed broad level and resulted in general recommendations; could have been more specific
- 44
- 45

## Recommendation

- The afternoon discussion amongst individual guests was very informative and much more useful than the panel discussion in the morning. Perhaps consider having two workshop times which could be attended -- one in the morning and another in the afternoon with 2 or 3 choices of workshops to attend at each time.
- get more specific, for example, protecting upland woodlots -- policy, implementation, monitoring
  - could have a guideline policy development workshop for natural heritage planning
  - need to know the speakers list early, not one week before the conference
  - Also, need speakers who've had time to prepare.
  - Good that there were both government and consultant employees at the front of room -- the more consultants the better, because they've dealt with a wider range than most government employees
- better structure for breakout sessions
- Try to get development community representation, OPPI, UDI, etc. Their input is important in adding balance and perspective; perhaps some practicality, as well as financial implications. Otherwise, good spectrum of attendees present.
  - A key benefit was networking which is a key part of any conference.
- More formal plan to present range of things happening in Carolinian Canada--this could include a summary/analysis before the conference with presentation during conference. Also, select invited speakers from participants and give 5-10 minute presentation of their "success story."
- Developing significance criteria: should we?
- If the conference is organized for 2002 you might consider having an open forum session to accommodate the specific needs, questions and issues of municipal and regional planners. The afternoon session on "implementation" for the case study became this type of session. Even though the session was interesting I really did want more detailed information on Natural Heritage Implementation. I was a little disappointed.