

## INSTRUMENTS

---

1. Post Process Participant Evaluation  
This questionnaire style survey combines elements of the USIECR Facilitation and Mediation Participant Surveys, surveys used by Frank Dukes, and is otherwise informed by the literature review and interview process.
2. Post Process Evaluation Questionnaire for Semi-structured Interviews  
This questionnaire uses the same questions as the above but is altered for semi-structured interviewing.
3. Pre Process Participant Questionnaire  
This questionnaire is based solely on the feedback from interviews and is designed to have some aspects parallel to the Post Process Participant Evaluation
4. Post Process Practitioner Survey  
The post process practitioner survey is a nearly identical with the USIECR Facilitation Practitioner Questionnaire

**Post Process Evaluation Questionnaire**

The William D. Ruckelshaus Center performs evaluation of its services, projects and processes. Your responses to this questionnaire will help The Center identify lessons learned and create process improvements so that we may better serve our communities and citizens. Responses to this questionnaire are confidential: key themes and findings are shared, but identity of individual respondents is not recorded unless offered by the respondent.

This questionnaire should take about 20 minutes to complete.

Please indicate what organization or interest best describes you (Federal government, Tribal Nation, concerned citizen, etc) *[drop down box in electronic version]*

Please identify the number which best indicates your level of agreement:  
 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

<b>Process</b>	Disagree ---- Agree				
The views and interests of all participants were considered during the process	1	2	3	4	5
All participants in the process were treated respectfully	1	2	3	4	5
All participants were able to participate in the process	1	2	3	4	5
You were able to participate in the process	1	2	3	4	5
The process was not dominated by one or more person(s)	1	2	3	4	5
All the people or interests needed to participate in this process were included If not, who do you feel should have been involved who was not?	1	2	3	4	5
The end goals of the process were widely agreed-upon and clearly articulated at the outset.	1	2	3	4	5
If goals changed along the way, that was accomplished and articulated in an intentional and open manner. N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Interim goals, milestones or benchmarks were clear N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Activities (meetings, breakout groups, etc) the process engaged in were useful in helping the group move forward	1	2	3	4	5
You, at any point, were positively 'coached' on how to participate in a collaborative effort.	1	2	3	4	5
Process activities proceeded in a fair and unbiased manner.	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Please provide any additional feedback on these questions below.</i>					
<b>Information</b>	Disagree ---- Agree				
The <i>right</i> information was used during the process.	1	2	3	4	5
That information was accessible and understandable to all participants.	1	2	3	4	5
That information was accessible and understandable to you.	1	2	3	4	5

The information used in the process helped the group move forward.	1	2	3	4	5	
This process identified <i>all</i> relevant and necessary issues needed to make progress	1	2	3	4	5	
<i>Please provide any additional feedback on these questions below.</i>						
<b>Relationships</b>	Disagree ---- Agree					
The process improved communication among all parties	1	2	3	4	5	
The process improved communication among 'key' parties	1	2	3	4	5	
Trust was built between participants as a result of this process	1	2	3	4	5	
This process helped you to understand other's interests and values	1	2	3	4	5	
Participating in this process will help you in future collaborative efforts	1	2	3	4	5	
<i>Please provide any additional feedback on these questions below.</i>						
<b>Outcomes</b>	Please select					
The project reached agreements on:						
All key issues	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Most key issues	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Some key issues	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No agreement was reached but progress was made toward resolution	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No agreement was reached or progress made	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Disagree ---- Agree						
The project's outcomes reflect all perspectives brought up during the process	1	2	3	4	5	
The project's outcomes will solve the intended problem(s)	1	2	3	4	5	
The goals stated at the project's outset were met	1	2	3	4	5	
Goals which may have arisen during the process (if any) were met.	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
The projects outcomes, if they include agreements, can be implemented.	1	2	3	4	5	
If the project's outcomes have 'next steps' for you, you fully understand them.	1	2	3	4	5	
If so, you are committed to the 'next steps.'	1	2	3	4	5	
In general, you feel this was a good process to solve the problem.	1	2	3	4	5	
<i>Please provide any additional feedback on these questions below.</i>						

What do you feel were the best and worst parts of this process?

What surprised you about this process?

Do you feel that the process resulted in any negative impacts?

If you could have changed one or more parts of the process, what would it/they have been?

Please take a moment to elaborate on any of the questions asked in this questionnaire, or address any other topic of your choice.

Would you like to be contacted for a follow-up conversation, to provide a more in-depth evaluation of this project? [yes/no] If yes, please provide contact name, email and phone number. Note, The Center may contact you proactively to request such a conversation.

**Post Process Evaluation Questionnaire for Semi-structured Interviews**

*Thank you for taking the time to speak with me and your willingness to share your feelings and insight regarding the [name] project. The William D. Ruckelshaus Center is interested in evaluating its projects in order to capture lessons learned and foster process improvements. The questions I have today are similar to the survey sent to you previously, but are more open ended to allow us to have a fuller conversation. This interview should take about 30 to 45 minutes depending upon how much information you would like to share. Information collected from you today is confidential. Are you ready to begin?* (Interviewer: sub-questions are for prompting dialogue, use as needed)

1. What is your affiliation with regard to this project? Who or what did you represent?
2. During this project, do you feel that all the interests of all the participants were heard?
  - a. Was there an incident you can remember where participant interests were not voiced or were voiced, but not included in the discussion?
  - b. Were your interests taken into consideration during the process?
3. Do you feel the process was fair to everyone who participated? If not, please explain.
  - a. Was the processes dominated by one or more voice or personality, in totality or at any particular phase?
4. Do you feel the goals of this process were clearly and articulately stated at the process outset? Did the group play a role in developing and/or confirming those goals?
  - a. How did you feel about those goals?
  - b. Did they change or evolve during the process? If so, was that an intentional or transparent evolution?
5. How did you feel about the activities (meetings, field trips, information sessions, etc) that happened during the project?
  - a. Do you feel that any were redundant or otherwise lacking?
6. When thinking about the information this processed used, do you feel that it was adequate?
  - a. Did the information help the group move forward?
  - b. Was there information you wish had been used which was not?
7. Do you feel that the relationships between participants changed as a result of this process?
  - a. If so, how?
  - b. Do you feel that your own relationships changed?
  - c. Has your opinion of other stakeholders changed?
8. Did the outcomes of this process meet your needs?
  - a. If not, please explain.
  - b. Did the process meet other participant needs?
  - c. Would you call these outcomes successful for all involved?

9. Do you feel that The Center being a university-affiliated practitioner had an effect on the process (positive, negative or both)? In what ways?
10. What do you feel were the best and worst parts of this process?
11. If you could have changed one or more parts of the process, what would it/they have been?
12. Do you feel that the process resulted in any negative impacts?
13. Is there anything else you would like to give us feedback on?
14. Can you think of a question which I should have asked you but did not?

**Pre Process Participant Questionnaire**

The William D. Ruckelshaus Center performs evaluation of its services, projects and processes. Your responses to this questionnaire will help The Center identify lessons learned and create process improvements so that we may better serve our communities and citizens. Responses to this questionnaire are confidential: key themes and findings are shared, but identity of individual respondents is not recorded unless offered by the respondent.

This questionnaire should take about 20 minutes to complete.

Please indicate what organization or interest best describes you (Federal government, Tribal Nation, concerned citizen, etc) *[drop down box in electronic version]*

Please indicate how you feel about the following with 1 being negative, 3 being neutral, and 5 being positive.

<b>At this point:</b>	Very low- Very High					
How well informed do you feel about the issues involved in this policy challenge?	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Your overall knowledge of other parties' interests and concerns?	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Your overall level of trust for the other parties involved?	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
<i>If you'd like to indicate your level of trust for particular parties, please do so here:</i>	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Your overall amount of communication with the other parties?	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
The overall quality of your communication with other parties?	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
<i>(Please provide any comments about amount or quality of communication with specific parties here)</i>						
Rate your level of understanding of [ type of process ] processes	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Rate your level of confidence that this process is the right one to address this/these problem(s)	N/A	1	2	3	4	5

Please identify the number which best indicates your level of agreement:  
 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

<b>I expect this process to:</b>	Strongly Disagree – Strongly Agree					
Include all the necessary parties needed to have a full discussion of the problem	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Identify all the relevant issues involved in this problem	N/A	1	2	3	4	5
Alter relationships between the involved parties	In a positive fashion					
	In a negative fashion					
	In no meaningful way					
	I have no guess					

The project will reach agreements on:						
All key issues	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Most key issues	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Some key issues	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No agreement will be reached but progress was made toward resolution	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No agreement will be reached or progress made	<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please take a moment to write down your knowledge of, or experience with, the William D. Ruckelshaus Center

---



---



---



---

Do you feel clear about the goal(s) of this project? Can you briefly state them?

---



---



---



---

Please take a moment to elaborate on any of the questions above or on any of your expectations for this project

---



---



---



---

*Thank you very much for your time and participation!*

**Post Process Practitioner Survey**

The William D. Ruckelshaus Center performs evaluations of its projects. Recently, you have served as a practitioners in one of these projects/cases, and the Center requests your assistance with this project evaluation. The purpose of the Center’s evaluation is to identify lessons learned, identify best practices, and foster continual process improvements. Your responses will provide information that will be used to improve our programs and services. If you have any questions or concerns please contact *email address*.

**1. What was the application of the collaborative process in this case or project?**  
 OUT OF THE FOLLOWING LIST, PLEASE CHECK THE MOST APPROPRIATE BOX.

Please select those that apply	
Policy development	
Planning	
Siting and construction	
Rulemaking	
License and permit issuance	
Compliance and enforcement action	
Implementation/monitoring agreements	
Other (please specify): _____	

**Please identify the geographic location(s) for this case:**

**City(s), County(s), Watershed(s), etc.** \_\_\_\_\_

**State or States** \_\_\_\_\_

**Regional** \_\_\_\_\_

**Please identify the central issues to this collaborative process:** (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Archeology or Historic Preservation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coastal Zone or Marine Management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Collaboration Training
<input type="checkbox"/>	Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	Economic Development
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ecosystem Management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Endangered Species and/or Critical Habitat

	Energy
	Forest and Timber Management
	Governance
	Land Use and Urban Development
	Mining
	Native American, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian Issues
	Parks and Refuges
	Public Health
	Recreational Use and Access
	Solid or Hazardous Waste
	Transportation
	Watershed/River Basin Management
	Water Quality
	Water Supply
	Wildlife Management
	Other

Approximately how many sessions (including conference calls and meetings) were held in conjunction with this particular process?

_____	Number of sessions
-------	--------------------

Estimate the number of hours you and any other practitioners devoted to this case/project:

_____	Total hours
-------	-------------

What was the total number of months or years in which you were actively working on this case/project:

0 – 6 months	
7 – 12 months	
1 – 2 years	
3 – 5 years	
More than 5 years	

On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being ‘not at all difficult’, 5 being ‘moderately difficult’ and 10 being ‘extremely difficult’, please rate the difficulty of:

Developing an effective collaborative process for this case or project \_\_\_\_\_

Implementing an effective collaborative process for this case or project \_\_\_\_\_

**Did The Center provide you with the resources, time, and information you required to hold an effective process?**

---

**If not, what other resources, time or information do you feel you (or the project) would have benefited from?**

---



---



---

**What was the greatest challenge that YOU faced as the practitioner in conducting an effective collaborative process (including barriers to participants' ability to participate)?**

---



---



---



---

**Please characterize the participants by doing the following:**

Please indicate THE NUMBER of participants that were included in the process within each of the given categories (e.g., if 2 separate participants represented the state, place a '2' in the box for 'State Government').

Number of participants included in the process	
Academic	_____
ADR Practitioners	_____
Agriculture	_____
Aviation/Aerospace	_____
Consulting	_____
Education	_____
Environmental Interest	_____
Federal Government	_____
Finance	_____
Forest Products	_____
General Public	_____
Healthcare	_____

Information Technology	_____
Labor	_____
Legal	_____
Local Government	_____
Marine Industry	_____
Media	_____
NGO	_____
Philanthropy	_____
Real Estate	_____
Retail	_____
State Government	_____
Tribal	_____
Special Advocacy Interests (Please specify): _____	_____
Other (Please specify): _____	_____

**On a rating scale of 1 – 10, with 1 being Strongly Disagree and 10 being Completely Agree, please rate the following questions (Circle N/A if not applicable):**

On reflection, I feel I was the right practitioner to guide this process.  
Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

If needed, resources were available to obtain the relevant expertise/information for this case or project  
Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

Experts were used to educate participants in the collaborative process on the relevant issues  
Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

In general, the relevant information was understood by the participants  
Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

Participants worked to ensure agreement on the meaning of the relevant information  
Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

**On a rating scale of 1 – 10, with 1 being Strongly Disagree and 10 being Completely Agree, please rate the following questions (Circle N/A if not applicable):**

Participants had the skills required for participating effectively in the collaborative process  
Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

Participants had the time required for participating effectively in the collaborative process

Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

Participants had the financial resources required for participating effectively in the collaborative process

Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

Participants had access to the information required for participating effectively in the collaborative process

Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

Organizations or interests that should have been included in the process did in fact participate in the

Rating \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

**Please indicate the extent to which progress was made:**

(Check only one)

Progress made on all key issues	Progress made on most key issues
Progress made on some key issues	No progress was made

*Use the space below if you would like to elaborate on your response:*

---



---



---



---



---

**Are there any relevant lessons learned that should be recorded?** (Were there any specific events or issues that affected process outcomes? What was the 'most useful' aspect of the process? The most damaging? etc)

---



---



---



---



---



---

Would you like to be contacted for a follow-up conversation, to provide a more in-depth evaluation of this project? [yes/no] If yes, please provide contact name, email and phone number. Note, The Center may contact you proactively to request such a conversation.

*Thank you very much for your time and input!*

**Considerations for instrument usage – Post project evaluation questionnaire**

The Ruckelshaus Center should consider the following suggestions for using instrument results over time.

- Identify which questions or groups of questions lead to actionable information.
- Identify which questions, over a number of instrument usages, contain the highest amount of divergence in responses.
- Identify questions, if any, which show no difference in response over a 'large' number of uses. These questions may need to be refined to contain a greater degree of sensitivity, or perhaps removed.
- Identify which *projects* The Center is most *satisfied* with; analyses the instrument feedback for just those projects, then compare with instrument feedback from projects The Center is most *unsatisfied* with.
- Use feedback from project drop-outs and participant interviews to identify 'missing questions'.
- Look for correlation between project statistics (duration of process, number of participants, number of meetings, etc) and survey data.