

Evaluation Results from MRS workshop 3

We asked all stakeholders who attended the workshop in Aldershot to fill in an evaluation form so that we could gauge their views and opinions and see how we could make the future stakeholder events more valuable. They were asked to rate their views on a scale of 1 – 5.

The following is a summary of these results:

1. Range of stakeholders at the workshop?

Poor	→	1	0%
	→	2	7%
Good	→	3	39%
	→	4	30%
Excellent	→	5	24%

It was felt that perhaps there could have been more industry or government agencies present to balance out those from Local Authorities. It would also have been good to have more commercial businesses there.

Overall it was felt that the presence of the experts was extremely useful to aid the discussion process.

2. Quality of the workshop briefing material?

Poor	→	1	0%
	→	2	12%
Good	→	3	25%
	→	4	56%
Excellent	→	5	7%

The briefing papers were well presented and put together, but there was a noticeable absence of data on various commodities. Circulation of the papers could have been better prior to the event.

3. Value of presentations?

Poor	→	1	0%
	→	2	7%
Good	→	3	55%
	→	4	28%
Excellent	→	5	10%

David Smith's presentation on Foster Yeoman was well focused and the message was put across well. The acoustics were the only downside.

Doreen Fedrigo from Waste Watch had a very powerful message which put our current lifestyles into the wider context.

4. Value of open floor session?

Poor	→	1	3%
	→	2	23%
Good	→	3	44%
	→	4	24%
Excellent	→	5	6%

Mixed views were expressed about this session. On the one hand people found it a useful means for networking and getting the views of the experts, especially for topics which weren't going to be discussed in the afternoon session. On the other hand it was felt that topics weren't strictly adhered to, and as a result there was too much diversion of subject. The acoustics for this session were an issue and separate rooms should have been provided.

5. Value of group discussions on changing minds and practices (morning session)

Poor	→	1	7%
	→	2	22%
Good	→	3	33%
	→	4	36%
Excellent	→	5	2%

It was generally felt that the size of the groups was a problem and that as a result it was very difficult to hear what was being said. The facilitators though were highly commended for keep discussions on course, and that a lot of value was gained from the session.

6. Value of group discussions on individual resource streams (afternoon session)

Poor	→	1	2%
	→	2	5%
Good	→	3	36%
	→	4	47%
Excellent	→	5	10%

The experts were seen as a huge boost to this process, especially the range of people for specific resource groups. The session was highly productive and of great value for the large majority of people, but many felt that this could have gone on for longer as just as you begin to develop the discussion you were moved to the next group. Again acoustics was an issue, and ideally there should have been separate rooms.

7. The value of involving experts at the workshops?

Poor	→	1	0%
	→	2	2%
Good	→	3	14%
	→	4	46%
Excellent	→	5	38%

The experts were seen as an invaluable addition to the days' discussions adding enormous value and information. Some felt that they dominated the discussion too much and that they got stuck on some issues without looking at the broad overview.

8. Extent to which you felt able to have your views heard and recorded?

Poor	→	1	2%
	→	2	9%
Good	→	3	24%
	→	4	50%
Excellent	→	5	15%

Facilitators were excellent in leading and directing the discussion, but it was also felt by some that the experts dominated too much.

9. Do you feel you have a good grasp of what the Material Resources Strategy will be?

YES	81%
NO	14%
Sort of	5%