




MEETING EVALUATION FORM

2010 SIS Strategic Plan Update Leadership Committee – 5th Meeting

FDOT District 7 Office ~ Tampa, Florida

August 20-21, 2009

Proposed Meeting Objectives

				
<u>Agree</u>				<u>Disagree</u>
<i>CIRCLE ONE</i>				
5	4	3	2	1 =Avg

WERE THE MEETING OBJECTIVES MET?

• Review, discuss and consensus test draft policy recommendations as revised since the 4 th Leadership Committee meeting.	4	2	1	0	0 = 4.43
• Provide additional guidance, as needed, for further refinement of the draft policy recommendations.	5	4	3	0	0 = 4.29
• Approve draft recommendations for use in regional workshops and other partner and public involvement activities before the 6 th SIS Leadership Committee meeting	5	4	3	1	0 = 3.83
• Agree on next steps and assignments for the 6 th Leadership Committee meeting.	5	4	3	0	0 = 3.83

MEETING ORGANIZATION

• Background and agenda packet were helpful	5	4	3	2	0 = 4.57
• Presentations were effective and informative	5	4	3	2	0 = 4.71
• Plenary discussion format was effective	5	4	3	2	0 = 3.43
• The simulated prioritization exercise (SimSIS) was effective and informative.	5	4	3	2	0 = 2.83
• Facilitator guided participant efforts effectively	5	4	3	2	0 = 4.14
• Participation was balanced	5	4	3	2	0 = 4.14

What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?

- Was constructive overall
- Having subject matter experts on hand helps to get quick responses that we can rely on (e.g. Kaliski)
- SimSIS and the time allowed for the global concepts discussions
- Good meeting

What Could Be Improved?

- Exhaustive wordsmithing on (micro) statements
- We deviated too much from the agenda – too much “chatter” off-points – tighten up the meeting – we should be moving toward closure and instead we opened up a new can of worms repeatedly
- I am becoming increasingly concerned regarding the proposal that will expand the SIS. It seems that opportunity for SIS funding in rural areas will be more difficult
- Hard to discern if just updating SIS or rewriting. We waste time saying “already in”
- SimSIS was not the best use of limited policy development time
- SimSIS could have been useful if used the planned 4 hours
- Needed significantly more info for the SimSIS

Other Comments (use the back if necessary)

- Recommendations should be more descriptive of what it is trying to accomplish and why rather than so prescriptive
- Time and end of project meant facilitators were tested more – but appropriately so
- Some were very quiet, some more vocal (including me)
- We have not fairly addressed parallel reliever issue (aka off-SIS projects)