FEEDBACK FROM THE 2009 MOBIUS CONFERENCE FORUM FACILITATORS

The email to all 4 facilitators asking for their feedback was sent out about 3:30 p.m. on Monday, 6/8/09. The deadline for sending feedback was 5 p.m. on Monday, June 22, 2009.

June 8: 1 email response received.
June 9: 1 email response received.

Question #1

Did you receive adequate and timely communication (e-mail updates) from the Planning Advisory Committee before the conference? If not, how could we have improved the communication?

Yes, it was perfect!
Yes, thank you!

Question #2

Was there any information you did not receive in advance that would have been helpful to you? If so, please explain.

No, everything was very clear.

I was unclear about the appropriateness of using technology for the forum (PowerPoint with questions displayed on the overhead projector, being able to look at Web sites, etc.) - I chose not to include any technology at all since it was just supposed to be a discussion, but I wonder now if having something to look at would have been helpful. Clearer guidelines on this (even if just relaying what others have done and found helpful in the past) in advance would have been helpful.

Question #3

Was the room setup satisfactory for the purposes of your forum? If not, how could the setup have been improved?

Perfect set-up!

Not really. It would be MUCH more appropriate to have rooms for forums set up with chairs and tables in a rectangle or circle to facilitate discussion. Having it set up like a theater for a presentation just makes it feel like a presentation and is not conducive to discussion. Perhaps next year (if the schedule, etc. allows) there could be one meeting room designated as the forum room that is set up to be more conducive to discussion.

Question #4

Did you experience adequate and timely technical assistance? If not, please elaborate on how the assistance could have been improved.

The MOREnet technician was there at the beginning of the forum and it was very helpful (though I didn't use technology for the forum).

As described above, I chose not to use any technology, but a conference site tech person was there just before the session started to help set things up if needed. He nicely offered to turn the projector off since I didn't need it.

Question #5

Was the introduction to your forum satisfactory? If not, please make suggestions as to how it could have been improved.

Yes, this was also fine (no changes suggested).

The intro was fine, but I wonder if in the future it might be nice if the room hosts/introducers would say something about how a forum works (i.e. that it's supposed to be a discussion and not a presentation, etc.). I had no problem doing this myself, and I think everyone knew what to expect as a result, but I wonder if other forums had issues with this.

Question #6

What suggestions do you have for improving support to forum facilitators at future events?

No changes but keep the format (I love this format).

I'm not sure where this fell through the cracks, but my forum was not originally clearly labeled as a forum on the conference registration site. This was eventually fixed, but I was still worried that those who had already signed up for it would be expecting a presentation and not a discussion forum.

Question #7

Additional Comments

Mary Batterson and Donna Russell (et al.) did a great job with the necessary communication of forums this year (admittedly, I tended towards overkill last year, so it was good to see it done to perfection this year!).

I think it's wonderful that forums are offered as a medium for discussion/collaboration/sharing of best practices at the conference. I think, though, that it needs to be spelled out more clearly to everyone from the outset (from when the call for topics/facilitators is issued, to making it clearer on the registration page what they are, to when the forums are introduced at the conference...) what they are and what their purpose is. Some people still seemed unclear on what a "forum" in this setting entailed.