

NAWMP Stakeholder Input
Workshop
Evaluation


AHM Working Group

Portland OR

Dec 2009


The meeting objective “To gather input on the overarching objective of waterfowl management, and opinions how such objectives might best be pursued from a large-scale strategic perspective” was met.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree




The meeting objective “To obtain information from stakeholders that will help inform the Plan Committee as they develop the scope and nature of the pending Plan Revision” was met.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree




The meeting objective “To discuss with waterfowl managers the practical aspects of fulfilling ‘A Vision for Integrated Waterfowl Management’ ” was met.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree




How do you feel about the Revision process as described at this meeting?

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Okay
4. Not so good
5. Bad




The meeting's facilitation by Dave Case was:

1. Very Good
2. Good
3. Average
4. Poor
5. Very Poor



The meeting's instruction/facilitation by Fred Johnson and Scott Boomer was:

1. Very Good
2. Good
3. Average
4. Poor
5. Very Poor



Overall, I thought this workshop was a success

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

