



## TOWN OF FOUNTAIN HILLS STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

### **Our Town. Our Choices. A Road Map to the Future**

## **Town Hall I – April 15-16, 2005 Summary of Participant Evaluations**

### **Background: Town Hall I**

The Town of Fountain Hills and the Fountain Hills Civic Association sponsored a Town Hall on Friday evening, April 15, and all day Saturday, April 16, 2005, to gather citizen input for a strategic plan. Over 250 citizens attended Friday evening, which featured presentations including:

- Six teams of high school students who participated in the Youth Visioning Institute,
- “Then and Now,” by residents Dan Foster (“Then”) and Curt Dunham (“Now”),
- “Trends affecting Arizona Cities and Towns,” keynote remarks by Catherine Connolly, Executive Director, League of Arizona Cities and Towns.

The Saturday session drew over 175 participants. After orientation, participants broke into 13 heterogeneous groups facilitated by a non-resident volunteer. In the small groups, participants identified what they like and what they would change about Fountain Hills, core values that are so important they would not compromise them, components of their vision for the Town and strategies to achieve their vision. Later, each participant identified the top three values (of 27) and vision components (of 15) developed in the small groups.

A second Town Hall event is scheduled for August 13, 2005.

### **Evaluation and Analysis Process**

At the end of the Saturday session, participants were asked to rate five aspects of the Town Hall meeting, and to comment on each aspect. The form (see last page) had optional blanks for the respondent’s name, phone and email address. A total of 129 evaluation forms were received, or about 74% response rate. In most analyses, a response rate of 70% or better is considered acceptable. This report summarizes the ratings and comments from the 129 forms received.

The table on the next page summarizes the quantitative results. Key terms include:

- *Number of responses received* is the number of answers received for each item. While 129 evaluations were received, some forms did not respond to every item.
- *Response rate* is the percentage of all respondents (129) who responded to each item.
- *Satisfaction rate* is the percentage of respondents who rated the item either a “4” or a “5,” meaning either they “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the statement (for questions 1, 2 and 3), or they rated the group leaders and meeting “highly effective” or the next, unlabeled response, (for questions 4 and 5). In most analyses, a satisfaction rate of 65% percent or higher is acceptable.

- *Dissatisfaction rate* is the percentage of respondents who rated the item either a “1” or a “2,” meaning either they “strongly disagreed” or “disagreed” with the statement (for questions 1, 2 and 3), or they rated the group leaders and meeting “not effective” or the next, unlabeled response, (for questions 4 and 5). In most analyses, a dissatisfaction rate of 10% or higher is cause for concern.
- *Excellence rate* is the percentage of respondents who rated the item either a “5,” meaning either they “strongly agreed” with the statement (for questions 1, 2 and 3), or they rated the group leaders or meeting “highly effective” (for questions 4 and 5). In most analyses, an excellence rate of 25% or higher is outstanding.
- *Number of comments received* counts the respondents who wrote a comment on each item.
- *Comment rate* is the percentage of all respondents (129) who wrote a comment on each item.

### **Evaluation Comments**

The pages following the table contain the verbatim comments received for each rated aspect of the event. On those pages:

- *Response number* is a sequence number assigned to each evaluation form received. Sequence numbers are consistent across items.
- *Score* is the evaluation score given that item by the respondent. The highest score is “5,” corresponding to “strongly agree” or “highly effective,” depending on the question.
- *Comment* is the participant’s verbatim comment for that item, corrected only for spelling.

### **Evaluation Results**

The participants rated the event very favorably. The satisfaction rate is consistently near 90%; the dissatisfaction rate never exceeds 3% and the excellence rate ranges from 36% to 54%, a truly outstanding rate!

The Town Hall appears to have met its primary purpose, according to 91% of respondents. Even more (95%) reported that they were able to express their vision for Fountain Hills. Only 1% was not able to express their vision. It also met its secondary objective, to educate the citizenry about the strategic planning process, as reported by 90% of respondents.

Participants were particularly pleased with the small group facilitators. This item received the highest excellence rate: over half of respondents (54%) rated their small group facilitator “highly effective.” Moreover, except for the overall rating item, the facilitator item had the highest comment rate: over one-third of the respondents commented on their facilitators. A review of all comments shows that several others commented on their facilitator under other questions. The facilitators item also had the lowest satisfaction rate (89%) and the highest dissatisfaction rate (3%), but neither measure is at a level that would indicate a systemic problem. While nearly all comments are positive, a few indicate that isolated issues may have arisen in two small groups.

The overall ratings are also very positive: 89% of respondents rated the event satisfactory or better and more than two in five (42%) rated it excellent. Even more (43%) provided comments, virtually all of which are positive.

Satisfaction is further measured by the high number (84%) of respondents who identified themselves on their evaluations. In general, negative evaluations are typically not signed.

**Quantitative Summary of Evaluations: 127 Evaluation Forms Received**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Number of responses received</b>	<b>Response rate</b>	<b>Satisfaction rate – Score = 4 or 5</b>	<b>Dissatisfaction rate – Score = 1 or 2</b>	<b>Excellence rate – Score = 5</b>	<b>Number of comments received</b>	<b>Comment rate</b>
1. Town Hall meeting purposes were achieved.	129	100%	91%	2%	36%	31	24%
2. Town Hall meeting methods (discussions, exercises, etc.) helped me to express my vision for Fountain Hills.	129	100%	95%	1%	43%	21	16%
3. This Town Hall meeting helped me to become more aware of the Town's strategic planning process.	128	99%	90%	2%	41%	15	12%
4. My rating and feedback on the small group leaders of the Town Hall meeting.	128	99%	89%	3%	54%	43	34%
5. My rating and comments on the Town Hall overall.	127	98%	89%	2%	42%	56	43%
Respondent provided a name	108	84%					
Respondent provided a phone number	102	79%					
Respondent provided an email address	84	65%					

**Item 1. Town Hall meeting purposes were achieved.**

<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1	3	I've been to a 100 govt. offsites in my federal govt. job just like this. I am well aware that the results can be manipulated to please the hierarchy. I hope that doesn't prove true for this one. I vote!!
2	4	I think more emphasis should have been placed on practical matters rather than things that were wishful thinking.
5	4	I don't think our group fully understood the definitions of the categories & went on a tangent
9	4	Concern for the lack of (appropriate) representation of median age group (45-47)
17	5	I think this was a great process
19	4	Very stimulating, thoughtful, well-organized meeting; I enjoyed it immensely.
20	3	How money is spent today was not explained; why is the need for new money source?
21	5	Good process; time constraints made it impossible to carry out all stages completely
23	3	Good start, but success dependent on follow-up & community "buy-in"
30	4	My only concern is the final group session didn't give us enough time to have high quality plans & solutions
32	4	Under 45 population significant under-represented. Recruit more of this segment of the population for next town hall
36	5	A wonderful experience. Our facilitator, Carlos Duarte Herrera, is a gifted leader. He quickly secured a main stream of opinion to get our job done.
41	4	Hopefully!
52	5	Everyone involved in preparing the "Road Map to the Future" did a wonderful job; i.e., All the reading material.
55	5	Input was received and discussed for all. Age demographics will skew results.
59	4	"In process"
66	5	Town goals were defined and strategic planning for those goals established
67	5	Very well organized; lively discussions; good summaries captured in short time.
71	4	A timely session; growth is on its way!
78	2	Too simple.
84	4	It got the public interested and involved
87	5	This should be done often to get the town's input
99	5	Well run. My expectations were met very well. Participation was balanced.
102	4	Good basis to start from for future planning

<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comment</b>
105	4	Good goals & vision
108	4	Good planning, execution
110	4	OK, but I think many of the views expressed are not representative of the community as a whole.
112	5	Great participation in my breakout group
113	4	Brought residents together to be heard
122	5	It appeared to be right on line
129	3	I believe the small group discussions were very effective. I'm not sure the closing papers on the walls reflected many of the main points discussed in some groups.

**Item 2. Town Hall meeting methods (discussions, exercises, etc.) helped me to express my vision for Fountain Hills.**

<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comment</b>
7	5	The facilitator for my group, Linda Winslow, was excellent!
9	4	Some discussions focused more on solutions rather than vision (small group discussions)
17	5	Good way to get a lot of opinions
19	5	Yes, indeed
20	3	Excellent small group meeting; large meetings are somewhat questionable as to their usefulness
25	5	Great focus group leaders
32	4	Very well structured
33	5	Impressed with the planning that went into all of this
36	5	Good use of multi-media.
41	5	Very good.
66	5	There was 100% participant involvement in our group
71	5	Let's hope this takes off!
80	5	Cathy Connolly's remarks seemed somewhat vague and without grounding; for example, water not her specialty but sure there would be enough; very concerning
84	1	This was never a charge of our group; we were to comment on "values."
85	3	Since small groups were group consensus, individual ideas may have gotten lost
87	5	Learned a lot by having these discussion groups
102	4	Pickleball
105	4	Good group; very good discuss
113	4	Facilitator was very helpful in honing the discussion into consensus
119	5	"Friendliest Town in AZ"; "Town of Fountains" - fountains at every new development
122	5	Kept on track

**Item 3. This Town Hall meeting helped me to become more aware of the Town's strategic planning process.**

<b>Response</b>		<b>Comment</b>
<b>Number</b>	<b>Score</b>	
3	4	Helped me understand the planning process better
7	5	Kudos to the Strategic Position Report, "Where We Are Now"
9	4	Process not really described, but documented in flow chart
15	3	I still get the feeling that a few people make all the decisions for our town - great plans & ideas keep getting changed or disappear (linear park downtown; median & walkway changes)
17	5	Great effort!
25	4	Need in-depth explanation in Aug. Town Hall on revenue streams & what diff possibilities of percentage, i.e., mun. city prop. tax v. sales tax, bond capacity
36	5	Yes, as a new member to the community I got "up to speed" quickly!
41	4	I was already aware.
66	5	the handouts were excellent, especially the "Where We Are Now" report
71	5	A wonderful way to have the opportunity for expressing ideas.
84	5	Process was excellent, but more time is required
94	5	Wish I were going to be here on August for the "how to" & "how can" we - do this
102	4	Many different ideas and goals to melt into a plan
113	4	Shared opinion helps my learning process
122	5	Educate me!

**Item 4. My rating and feedback on the small group leaders of the Town Hall meeting.**

<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comment</b>
2	5	The leader was very effective and diplomatic.
3	5	Group leader did a great job
4	2	Directed ideas; inhibited clarification of ideas
10	4	Not sure we tracked to overall requirements - but we had good discussions
11	5	Room 105 leader was excellent
17	5	Lynne did a great job
18	5	A.M. outstanding; P.M. too much "drifting;" not on task
20	5	Opinions were freely expressed & discussed; group of citizens had excellent input; group leader was very good.
23	4	Good session in a.m., but leader should have kept group better focused in p.m.
32	5	Marsha Miller was outstanding and a very effective facilitator
33	5	Excellent facilitator
34	5	Lynne Brown was excellent facilitator! Allowed every voice to be heard
35	1	Room 205 - Allowed three persons to monopolize discussions
36	5	Yes, yes, yes. Very productive. The people are concerned, knowledgeable & willing to share honest view points. Consensus came only after thoughtful discussion.
39	3	He had a contentious group to deal with. Did the best he could.
40	5	Wayne was an excellent facilitator! He was able to "capture our thoughts" and "rein us in" when needed.
41	4	Not enough interaction between participants.
42	5	Aaron Aylsworth, rm. 103
43	5	Room 105 Wayne
44	5	Room 105
45	5	Lynne was wonderful in keeping the group focused and interested
54	5	Excellent facilitator. Kept us on task & summarized ideas effectively
55	0	Aaron did a great job!
59	4	Held things well in place
62	1	Our leader (Linda) gave her own opinions, did not keep us on track, & let people go on & on; intro's were over an hour!
63	5	Jim (Rm. 102) was excellent!
66	5	The small group leaders are great; they kept the discussions going with enthusiasm.
67	5	Jennifer Livingston was excellent
68	4	Good group with good energetic ideas; however, should have had a few more women (only 3) of us.
75	5	Excellent job managing the discussion so everyone's view was expressed (Rm. 108)
76	5	Becky Thacker did a great job!

<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comment</b>
80	5	Jennifer was fabulous; excellent people skills; exceptional at managing discussion & keeping group on objective
84	2	Lost control of afternoon session; needed to have a scribe
85	5	Jennifer Livingston did good job.
87	5	Jennifer in room 200 was a fantastic facilitator
93	5	Jerry Williamson was excellent!
98	5	Becky Thacker 4 stars!
101	5	Jennifer of Flagstaff very good
108	5	Well done; strong leader
109	5	Jennifer Livingston
113	4	Wonderful
118	5	Jennifer Livingston was excellent
122	5	Tactfully disciplined
128	5	Our facilitator, Jackie Fifield of SRP was an excellent leader of room 110.

## 5. My rating and comments on the Town Hall overall.

<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1	4	I met many new friends with the same ideas & they vote too!
2	5	If recommendations are implemented it will have been well worth the effort
4	3	I hope this leads to direction. I'm afraid everyone will say "that's not what I wanted/meant."
6	5	Well organized meeting
7	5	Well organized
8	4	Very good process. Hopefully results will lead to implementation
9	4	Effectiveness depends (in part) on the correct interpretation & summary of inputs (a later exercise)
16	4	I think grouping the aquatic center into recreational facilities was a mistake—it needs to be in a category of its own. I'm not sure it was worth devoting 2 days to.
17	5	Outstanding!
19	5	Congrats on a very well-planned exercise
22	3	Need housing for our working families; i.e., "affordable" housing!
28	4	Very good overall; we need to keep in mind that those attending did not represent the town population. We need to continue to encourage younger residents to participate; look forward to further participation in the future
29	5	Excellent meeting! I hope the elected people pay attention and that the 25,000 others in FH are informed.
30	4	My other concern is small % of 30/40 year old adults who have kids in town present as a % of their community %
32	4	Severely under-represented younger (below 45) population, which could skew results. For next meeting, be aware of small group creation relative to demographics
33	5	Only sorry that I've not been called up to volunteer; completed, signed up on several sheets at the FH Birthday Celebration
36	5	Excellent!
40	5	Very well organized event; well timed scheduling; good flow; relaxed atmosphere
41	5	Results will prove its value.
42	4	Very effective
43	4	Need map in the future for parking and meeting room
45	5	We enjoyed being here at the meeting. It's nice to know that we all have similar thoughts about the way this town proceeds.
52	3	My personal experience with employee of town hall "Not customer service"
53	3	Facilities for Senior Activities & Youth places war left our
54	5	Will happily participate again; would welcome becoming active in other planning projects.
55	4	Unfortunately the vast majority of participants are retired and this detrimentally skews results of meetings

<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comment</b>
59	4	Good; will see in future
60	2	A Senior Center was not listed, yet discussed
63	5	Very professional
66	5	The entire event was on time, well explained with great support and background
67	5	I would be happy to get more involved in the future
69	4	A Senior Center was not on the final board where we were to put our dots to "vote"
71	4	We were fortunate to have a very good director!
72	4	It was very far to walk.
76	5	Great Town Hall!
79	4	This was a great idea & it was well executed.
81	4	Please see other side for registration for August session for me and my wife
83	5	Very efficient, effective session
84	3	On the right track
87	5	Have the H.S. raise temperature in rooms; go too cold!
91	4	I highly commend the mayor and council for holding this public forum!
92	5	Maintained interest & continuity and provided focus on the purpose of the town hall meeting
93	5	Well-organized, informative, interesting. I enjoyed all of the sessions very much
104	4	Appreciate all the effort to make this process possible
105	4	Would like to see more from the age group of 18-40
108	4	Good start to the plan process
109	2	None of the visions reflect our group's concern with a growing percentage of active seniors; those over 45; where to put all their activities
112	5	Terrific for information & vision sharing; over-represented by seniors, e.g., 46% are retired
113	4	This is a great big inning
117	5	Well organized & run; learned a lot and was given the chance to express my views
119	5	Wonderful to see the enthusiastic participation
121	4	Very informative; first town I've ever lived in where citizens were so involved.
122	5	Absolutely wonderful, informative; so happy I attended
123	5	Great discussion; great people
128	5	Now if the powers of our town act upon this research our town can go forward. I'm very interested in this planning.
129	3	I probably would have added allowing some comments in the meeting as a whole, limited to 90 sec. each. It would have been interesting to hear a variety of comments from those people you <u>don't</u> read about regularly in the local paper.



**TOWN OF FOUNTAIN HILLS  
STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS  
Town Hall Meeting, April 15-16, 2005  
Our Town. Our Choices.  
A Road Map to the Future**

**Please check one box for each question**

1. Town Hall meeting purposes were achieved.

Strongly Agree     Agree     Uncertain     Disagree     Strongly Disagree

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Town Hall meeting methods (discussions, exercises, etc.) helped me to express my vision for Fountain Hills.

Strongly Agree     Agree     Uncertain     Disagree     Strongly Disagree

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

3. This Town Hall meeting helped me become more aware of the Town's strategic planning process.

Strongly Agree     Agree     Uncertain     Disagree     Strongly Disagree

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

4. My rating and feedback on the small group leaders of the Town Hall meeting:

Highly Effective                 Not Effective

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

5. My rating and comments on the Town Hall overall:

Highly Effective                 Not Effective

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Name (Optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_