

Results from the CBM 2006 Conference Evaluations

Summary: Overall the conference was looked upon very favorably based on the evaluation comments listed below. Most people liked the overall format of the conference and the information presented. As expected the location proved to be a catch 22 with most people commenting on the wonderful location, but wishing that it could have been a shorter drive! Talks that communicated successful case studies, new monitoring techniques, and data that generated conservation action or changes in policy were popular. Overall the theme of connecting monitoring to management was mentioned numerous times throughout the evaluation. It's possible that as a follow-up to this property-based theme that we could develop another workshop or materials/resources that would further this discussion and provide more examples to all partners within the network.

1. What other subject areas would you like to see covered in future presentations?

- More Case Studies
- More techniques 2
- Fishery management/monitoring
- Coastal wetland indicators
- Lake chemistry monitoring or algae/milfoil
- Aquatic Invasive species monitoring – aquatic ER plant monitoring
- Student presentations.
- More information on training to ensure data quality by volunteers.
- What neighboring states are doing in citizen-based monitoring.
- “hands on” volunteer training. Involve volunteer coordinators and volunteers to learn what works. 2
- A larger discussion on volunteer needs and how to attract and retain. 2
- Results workshop. 2
- Mammals.
- Better mix of terrestrial and aquatic talks.
- More teacher/student projects.
- More about worms.
- More terrestrial (other than bird) monitoring? Plants?
- Prairie restoration monitoring efforts.
- More training on what to do with data.
- Results from LoonWatch.
- Concrete examples of how citizen data influenced management or policy
- Wisconsin mushrooms.
- More on invasive species control.
- Monitoring vegetative changes in natural areas and impacts on wildlife.

2. Did you have any comments concerning the location?

- Great Facility 6
- Not very centrally located 16

- Lots of outdoor activities
- Great Location 18
- Didn't like resort
- Keep moving location around the state 3
- I liked arranging a vacation around the conference.
- Wished the Wagon Trail offered in-room internet access.
- Wished I had arranged a vacation around the conference!
- Bad for waistline.
- Great food! Good vegetarian selection.
- Fun to have conferences at less popular locations.
- Hotel and food were so-so.
- Would have been nice to have high-speed internet for some of the presentations.
- Facility had a lot of background noise that made using a hearing aid difficult.

3. Do you think the presentation format was effective?

- Very good 22
- Good variety of projects 2
- Not enough breaks
- Handouts with powerpoint presentations
- I liked the balance
- Longer breakout sessions.
- Liked transition times between talks.
- A little fast.
- Longer presentations.
- Two concurrent sessions worked well, but not any more!

4. What topics or themes would you like to see covered in next year's conference?

- Ideas for projects sharing information
- "All working together" connecting DNR, Lake Management, Monitoring groups, academia, etc.
- More involvement of the volunteers in presentations – perhaps round table discussion or more time to interact? 2
- Loved hearing group results. Possibly make a future theme "data to action". 3
- Training sessions for citizens and connect them with the "rest of us".
- More invasive plant species topics.
- More success stories and more involvement from actual citizen groups.
- Updates on monitoring sites/EcoAtlas
- More amphibian monitoring, stream stuff, advanced atrazine/PCB, etc.
- Resources for helping to analyze the data.
- More directly for monitors, reasons to volunteer.
- Joint with MN in 2008?
- How do we get started monitoring!
- More about recruiting and training volunteers. 2
- Better advertising and better location where more people outside DNR could attend.

- I'm interested in the eco-region concept perhaps citizen-based monitoring can be pulled together or an eco-regional basis to further the objectives of the protection of specific eco-regions such as Door County.

5. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions regarding this year's conference?

- Liked the format for the overall conference 2
- Enjoyed hearing about the success of other groups.
- Found out several projects in my area.
- Would have liked more time to discuss projects with folks in more detail.
- Informative and thought provoking. Will share and educate with our lake district's property owners. 3
- Develop the connection between monitoring and management. 2
- I learned a lot about emerging resources that will be useful to us in setting up our monitoring program.
- Incorporate training into the conference – focus on 1-2 projects a year.
- Larger nametags. 2
- Recycling!!
- Stratify the breakouts so that similar projects didn't compete with one another. 2
- Food was great!
- Need a participant list.
- Attract more students!
- More handouts!
- Some speakers difficult to hear, better PA. 2
- Very good content!
- Need to get more citizens by offering free registrations or a discount. Maybe to key citizen monitors nominated by regional cs leaders perhaps?
- Introduce some of the Total Quality Management ideas like Plan, Do, Check, Act. Most of the projects lacked a focus on the Check, Act side of things.
- The presenters were very good!
- Worth my trip even though it was a long drive!
- Need field trips associated with these beautiful areas.
- I have enjoyed all of the presentations and I have found it to be very helpful. I especially appreciate knowing about resources available.
- Good mix of actual projects and general "how to" and why topics. Especially like Noel Cutright's talk.
- A lot of discussion of data, data collection, electronic, etc. but very little, if any action taken on the data.