



NATIONAL CENTER for LEADERSHIP in VISUAL IMPAIRMENT

MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

Meeting of the NCLVI University Consortium
Washington DC, December 11-13, 2004

Evaluation Response Rate: 100%

I. Meeting Outcomes:

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 4 = Agree
- 3 = Not Sure
- 2 = Disagree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

Using the scale above please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

As a result of the NCLVI University Consortium meeting, the Consortium

1. Developed a decision-making protocol: **4.85** Mean
2. Determined how tuition and stipends will be awarded to NCLVI Fellows: **4.38** Mean
3. Developed a variety of recruitment strategies to attract doctoral candidates to the Consortium Member universities: **4.31** Mean
4. Developed the protocol for NCLVI Fellowships to be awarded to Fellows, including criteria for awards: **4.31** Mean
5. Developed a plan for the NCLVI Enrichment Program, including goals and objectives, topics, working committees, time devoted to enrichment during each year, individuals who will be responsible for the enrichment topics, and a timeline for work to be completed: **3.54** Mean
6. Suggested additional questions that should be included in the core data collection each year from Consortium Members: **2.85** Mean
7. Agreed on a variety of strategies for communicating: **4.38** Mean

II. Meeting Strengths and Needs:

1. Please identify what you see as the strengths of the meeting:

- Consensus building.
- Problem solving mentality.
- Openness of all.
- The primary strength was that we focused on the common goal of identifying the best candidates who can be prepared with a fair distribution of resources. There was a sense of productivity that resulted from knowing we could reach this goal (thanks to all of you at PCO).
- The group was collegial and shared a variety of perspectives with integrity and respect.
- I felt that everyone's opinions and concerns were allowed to be aired without much danger of retribution.
- The face-to-face meeting was ideal. So much more in-depth conversation goes on when the group physically meets. I hope that we will be able to continue meeting this way.
- People working together. I think the consensus approach was very helpful.
- The meeting was well organized and people worked as a true consortium.
- Preparation by PCO people.
- Consensus method of making decisions.
- Having notes taken during meeting that were accessible for referral during subsequent discussions.
- Enthusiasm and commitment by all who were present.
- For me, meeting face-to-face was important to establish a sense of "group."
- Deciding to reach consensus vs. majority rule took extra time but I believe will ultimately resulted in a stronger program.
- The preparedness, organization, determination, and focused efforts of the PCO faculty and staff made the meeting a success.
- Providing detailed minutes and prompt dissemination of information strengthened my connection and commitment to the group and NCLVI process and outcomes.
- Providing financial support for meeting attendance was important.
- Requesting materials and/or assignments prior to the meeting was great (for example, to bring our program descriptions).
- Development of an environment that fostered collaboration; expression of diverse points of view.

- The goals for the meeting were met to some degree.
- Facilitators changed group process techniques when the existing process was not working.
- The degree of communication among the group.
- The organizational verve of the leadership team.
- The support evident from OSEP.
- The willingness of members to invest themselves in the process.
- In my opinion, the primary strength was the collaboration of many competing universities for the betterment of the profession. Open dialogue, candor and honesty were the rule. It was an excellent meeting made better by shared commitment.
- Consensus approach to decision making.
- Openness of project leaders.
- Heartfelt participation by all university consortium representatives.
- The meeting goals and objectives were adhered to.
- Well-prepared agenda and materials.
- Well-prepared interaction decision-making methods.
- Everyone's needs and opinions were valued.

2. Please identify areas for improvement in future meetings:

- I'm not sure anything could have been done better. Perhaps we needed more time for work groups?
- I honestly can't remember any. Perhaps a little too much discussion at certain points...we still need to be careful of getting sidetracked on minor issues...but it was generally a constructive meeting.
- I think this was a great first meeting; it would be helpful to set the longer term vision for NCLVI and focus the agenda in advance of subsequent meetings.
- Seating so we could see each other easily would be helpful. This was not something that could have been changed for this meeting but something to think about when planning for the next meeting.
- Providing information about future meetings as soon as possible will increase the probability of my attendance.
- Not taking pictures would make me happier. I hate having my picture taken. (However, I will survive.)

- Being more realistic about the goals and how much time it will actually take to complete tasks to meet the goals.
- Shirts to match the hats.
- I am well satisfied with the conduct of the meeting.
- I think we might have been more effective at some points if we broke into smaller working groups and reported back. I know some groups met in the evening, but it seemed some parts were dragged out during the days and working groups during the days might have moved us along more quickly.
- Room with windows. It might help as a meeting progresses to relieve the intensity of the situation.
- Room where everyone could easily see each other's faces rather than the horseshoe configuration.

III. Meeting and Evaluation Checkout:

In the spirit of our meeting “checking in and out” process please share any thoughts as a final “Check Out” for the meeting and its evaluation:

- Oh, you guys. This meeting went very well.
- I was sometimes annoyed with my colleagues' lack of vision, but overall I think it ended well.
- I surprised that there was so little doctoral program experience in our group - but maybe that explains why this project is needed.
- It's difficult to provide this because I missed the last morning of the meeting. However, my general sense was that it was a constructive meeting and we need to be sure not to become distracted by minor details, which will work themselves out as the process evolves.
- The commitment to succeed with the challenge of the 1 + 4 funding arrangement was encouraging.
- The energy and optimism we have leaving the meeting was palpable. I look forward to the next one and to continue the positive flow.
- It was a great meeting, one which exceeded my expectations with regard to group decision-making, and progress toward getting everything ready for recruiting a cohort for this coming academic year.
- It's so exciting to have this wonderful opportunity and to be part of developing it. Keep up the great work!
- This is an important opportunity for our field and I am honored to be part of it.
- I look forward to the next one with great enthusiasm and hope.

- At times it seemed as though the process was getting too weighed down with emotional "feel good" sentiments instead of work. But it seems that these factors are also important in solidifying the members' investment in the process, making sure everybody is heard and validated, and maintaining a healthy group dynamic. It is a new way of doing things but I believe that in the long run it is more useful.
- I only have nice things to say about the meeting.
- The NCLVI staff is doing a dynamite job!
- Really good meeting!