Participant Satisfaction Scorecard

Name of Collaborative Forum

1.	What primary interest do you represent on behalf a stakeholder group? (Please check only one)				
	Ranching/farming Timber Mining (incl. oil & gas) Motorized recreation Outfitting/guiding Utility company Other. Please describe:	 Wildlife/fish Wilderness Conservation Non-motorized recreation Hunting Tourism industry 	Local gov't State gov't Federal gov't Tribal gov't Water-right holders University/college		
2.	How long have you participated in this particular forum? (Please check only one)				
	3 months or less 4 – 12 :	months1 - 2 years	3 years or more		
3.	Have you participated directly in other collaborative processes? (Please check only one)				
	No Yes, 1 – 3 processe	es. Yes, 4 – 6 processes.	Yes, 7 or more processes.		
4.	What process would you have used to address this situation if a collaborative forum weren't available?				
	No action Direct pressure on decision maker(s) Litigation Lobbying Proposed legislation Citizen initiative Citizen petition Other Please describe:				
5.	Compare this collaborative process to your next best option (from #4 above). In your opinion, which o the two would most likely:				
	Cost less? Take less time? Improve communication among partic Produce a more effective, lasting outcome.	*	<pre>other option other option other option other option</pre>		
8.	Would you recommend a collaborative process to address similar issues?				
	Yes No. Please explain:				
		-			
9.	How could this process be improve	ed?			

Page 2 - Participant Satisfaction Scorecard

For each statement, please check whether you think that aspect of the process is important or unimportant. Also circle the number that best matches your level of agreement with each statement. 1=completely disagree, 2=strongly disagree, 3=disagree, 4=indifferent, 5=agree, 6=strongly agree, 7=completely agree.

Working Relationships —————	<u>Important</u>	<u>Unimportant</u>	<u>Circle One</u>
The process helped build trust among participants. The process improved communication among participants.	0		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I gained insights about others' views and values. I would negotiate other issues with the same participants.	0	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
The process improved my ability to participate in collaborative forums.			1234567
QUALITY OF THE PROCESS			
Everyone who wanted to participate had a fair chance to do so. Participants' concerns were respected.	0	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
The process fostered information gathering as a group. Participants had access to the information needed to make good decisions.	0	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
The process fostered learning as a group. The group considered different options for resolving the issue.	0	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Participants kept their constituents informed. Participants effectively represented their constituents at the table.	0	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
There was a way to address participants' concerns about the process. Gains and losses were fairly distributed among all participants.	0		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
The process was efficient. It was time well spent. The process was cost effective. It was money well spent.	0		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
The public was able to review and comment on the process.			1234567
THE OUTCOME			
An agreement (Recommendations, MOUs etc) was reached to resolve key is The agreement was ratified by everyone needed to implement it.	ssues. 🗖	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
I trust that the agreement will be implemented in good faith. The agreement will be responsive to new information, interests and ideas.	0	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
The outcome satisfies my basic interest. The outcome is better than what I could get from another process.	0	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
The situation surrounding this issue is better than before. The underlying issue was resolved; it will not likely recur.	0	0	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2 3 4 5 6 7