Extension Risk Management Education Workshop
St. Louis Missouri June 6-7, 2000
Evaluations

What was good about the workshop?

Sharing of information on completed projects. Time for networking with RME associates/colleagues. General and Breakout sessions were excellent!! Don Tilmon deserves a commendation for a job well done!

The variety of Topics, and some hints of the future with its risk.

Core meeting of extension and other r.m. educators from around the country. Great sharing of ideas.

1. Networking
2. Being able to see & hear results of the various nationwide RME projects.
3. The Risk Management Partnering Panel discussions. “GREAT”
4. The session on distant education. This is the area of the future. Distant learning will grow rapidly. It allows students to select time that is best.

Lots of networking opportunities, good location and facilities, great registration procedure.

Great networking opportunities, extension sharing ideas on teaching that works, well organized.

Great variety of programs, reasonable amount of time for presentation, many had good presentations with supporting documents.

Very good coverage of commodities and geographic areas, good location, share fair good.

Concurrent sessions, location, the food, quality of information.

Lots of substance presented in a professional manner, best organized agenda I’ve experienced in a long time, facilities, food, etc were excellent.

Good representation of RME folks in the land grant/extension, willingness of participants to share, good use of electronic media to plan and register.

1. One of the best conferences I’ve attended in some time!
2. Wonderful breakouts, lots of variety & excellent speakers
3. Follow Finpack Ldr. Meeting or I wouldn’t have known about it.
Seeing and listening to other’s projects, opportunity to ask questions and discuss selected topics with “gurus” in the Risk field, network.

Excellent opportunity to see programs and tools which are being used successfully in other areas. Hearing and meeting private sector partners was particularly useful.

Organization, network time, showcase of ideas.

Open format for sharing, similar goals and objectives of participants.

Technical sessions of risk analysis & education.

Well organized, good opportunities for networking, good topics.

Mixture of presentations, Dogs to Wash talk.

Very good and interesting topics were discussed. Audience interaction usually led to excellent discussions. Times for breakout sessions were good.

Good start – Dan Smith – liked Monte Hemenover (but could have used some follow-up – what does this mean for farmers/ranchers).

Discussed about the projects – opportunity to network/share ideas.

All of the topics & presenters being willing to present. Association with other co-workers & the idea sharing that occurred.

1. Sharing of materials/programs
2. Timing (time of year)

Time amount and willingness of participants to share ideas, materials, tools and strategies.

Well organized & Finpack session, excellent presentations, similar interests of participants to facilitate networking.

The sharing of experiences from so many individuals.

Excellent location, facilities, travel cost savings.

Interaction with extension and RME from across the nation.

The full session presentation were excellent. Exceeded expectations.

Excellent workshop – the diversity of presenters and grant/project presentations.
Presentations: short, to the point, lots of different perspectives; great food; good facilities; public-private participation

You have provided a “Risk Education Expo”, as equally valuable to purveyors of Risk education as any trade expo.

Networking, being able to hear about the many projects.

Well planned, a huge amount of information available to anyone looking for ways to implement risk management.

Individual presentation “breakouts”, registration and arrangements were obviously well-planned & took a lot of effort.

Good common goal, good networking.

1. Many topics & points of view presented by speakers
2. Most of the presentations were concise.
3. Diverse participants

Hearing about other programs and tools. Inclusion of extension, research, RMA and private sector.

Diversity and quality of presentations, location.

Morning session Tuesday – good thought provoking, many breakouts – useful sharing of program materials.

Very good coverage of information presented, covered all aspects of RM issues.

MEALS/Hotel & Conference Facilities, General Sessions.

Good timely info.

The many projects that was presented. The break out sessions.

1. The different programs presented. Knowing what is available will reduce duplication of efforts.
2. Networking – more partnership and working together will come out of it.

Very interactive.

Gave an opportunity to get together and share information, to network and form new partnerships.
Excellent program. Well organized, educational, enriching experience and great opportunity for net-work, team building for future programs in RME.

Good range of programs presented in the breakout sessions. General sessions also were good. Booklet of abstracts was a great idea. Facilities were excellent.

1. Contacts
2. Seeing what others are doing
3. Liked having 4 options.

Breakout groups.

Diversity of information; quality of information; quantity of information.

Opportunity to see how RME funds are spent & to evaluate whether these would be appropriate in our regions.

Contacts, materials, coordination of activities. Pre-conference activity – Finpack, etc.

Concurrent sessions are always interesting, timing was good (night after RME act passed), joint relationship with RMA and Extension.

Networking opportunities.

Breakout sessions.

Great sharing of ideas – great variety of successful programs – very timely subject.

The Informal Show-n-Tell! It’s fun to come to an interactive workshop just to have open sharing of programs = to share, not to critique. Good Food!

The concurrent sessions were useful to get ideas and materials on RME. Sometimes I had to choose between two or three breakout presentations, but the “learning fair” provided an opportunity to get information on presentations I did not attend. There was a lot of education opportunities and information available in a two-day time period, but it was structured in a manner that provided sufficient breaks. I would keep the format of the program the same. Food and accommodations were excellent.

Good presenters. Wide range of topics.

PNW decision aids, both lunch speakers, Brumfield, networking, the trophy wife, the facilities – food was great, Geo. Patrick/Wes Musser choice, Finpack pre-conf. mtg.

I thought the workshop was excellent – all sessions & format.
Info & Exposure to the broad range of RM projects and education programs, RMA and Extension all together.

Array of educational opportunities, Thanks for going beyond commodity coverage and including some specialty crops, vegetables – hort crops; Jon Newkirk efforts! Central location in U.S.

What was bad about the workshop?

Location “Airport Noise.” Mostly “show and tell.” Hard to apply most breakouts across the nation. Very state specific. Some appeared to be taken presentations to show diversity only. Room too cold!! Mostly crop based.

Don’t call this an “extension RME Conference” – just “RME Conference.” Some of the best ideas come from outside extension. I also suggest that you have no more than 3 concurrent breakout sessions going on at any one time. Too many sessions competed with each other for attendees. Also, try to make sure major program presentations don’t compete against each other.

In pre-conference messages, it was promised that this conference would not be the “dog & pony show” that the 1997 Kansas City RME was and would include more content. Unfortunately, this message did not happen. The “Big Dog” show was in poor taste. The 5 “Extension Dogs” sure patted each other on the back. The time could have been better spent with addressing more RME projects or issues.

Not bad – just a little weak – the partnership panels. I’d like to hear more about overcoming barriers & jealousy & egos. Dangerous to run to 5:00 pm on the end day of a 2-day conference.

Needed significantly less time on partnerships with a couple of focused presentations and/or comparison of notes in advance to reduce redundancy. Lists of partners by state wasn’t useful.

Too many simultaneous break out groups – maybe 3 but not 5.

Not enough sodas on breaks, not enough seating in general groups, as well as concurrent sessions.

With the pre and post activities, probably wore people out a bit – not much you can do about that.

Long plenary session, long concurrent sessions, lack of more direct contact between program participants and program organizers.
Not having the opportunity to attend some breakout sessions.

No complaints.

Rooms a little cool (temperature), lunch space was crowded.

Late a.m. programs were not well planned/implemented. Monte was not specific enough in addressing “real” ag issues not why but “how.” Panels had little benefit and limited sharing (more like an AgEcon version of musical chairs).

The B.S. artist with 2 hours of overheads the first day. If USDA paid for this jerk, the USDA should be embarrassed. Too much on partnerships.

Lunch too large & rich – made me sleepy. Too many sodas.

Hotel wasn’t particularly good (keeping coffee available, food service not good – but price was right).

1. length – condensed schedule – 2 → 3 days.
2. the “dog” discussion – good old boy network once again, tooting own horn – enough is enough – USDA is one entity.

So many good topics that I had to make choices on and could not attend. Noon lunchroom are very crowded.

1. Got very tired by the end.
2. Most programs were in traditional (Ag Econ type) areas. More needed in human, legal/environmental areas.

There could have been better structure to the panel discussions. There were good ideas and comments there, I just had to work pretty hard to get them out.

Zero.

Nothing. Re the programming, some of the panelists on the a.m. had a difficult time keeping under their time limits.

Resource list (catalog) available up front or sent out after the session.

No doughnuts – Wes couldn’t stop complaining.

Lunch room was too small. Food was good but would have been more relaxing if the room wasn’t so crowded.

Unable to view as many of the concurrent topics as I’d like – but given the time available, that couldn’t be helped.
So-so “big” name speaker 10 a.m. 1st day – yawns……

Absolutely nothing!

Not being able to hear about all of the projects.

No really big problems or suggestions – perhaps end the conference a bit earlier in the day?

Some of the sessions were done in a hurry, maybe add ½ day.

Partnership panel was too long, quite redundant, and didn’t report much new information. Too much time spent recognizing the efforts of leadership team. (Should be done, but perhaps more briefly and during lunch)

Many sessions Wednesday – “partners” repetitive & dull, some of the breakouts lacked evaluations integrity and credibility.

Nothing.

Materials not available to take home, poor quality of break out sessions, product of Risk Funding having not been much.

Not enough hand-outs.

Some of the sessions were too long.

The two hour speaker could have done it in an hour.

You can’t find nothing.

Thought it was all great. Keep the coffee flowing.

No opportunity to experience St. Louis, MO.

It wore me out! Very intense.

Some presenters not well prepared (few).

Nothing.

Too many presentations/presenters in certain sessions particularly on Day 2.

Location, closer to city or within city limits.
Too much time spent with partnership panels. Monte H. had a lot of good information, but too much, too fast.

Excellent planning.

Needed more short breaks, many of the overlays/slides were too busy, some presentations were too general.

The v. full Monty, business plan (important could be better), the beer.

Nothing.

Monte – about 1.5 hours less.

If we do it again, what would you do differently?

Have another meeting in about a year to continue having materials and experiences. This conference was the best National RME meeting I’ve been too/attended in 25 years of extension service.

Cover what is risk not some computer model to appear to be solving this problem. Do you really see risk from the producer’s point of view? Program that County faculty could use in the field. Design a better evaluation instrument!! Don’t livestock have risks also?!

1. Provide an attendance list for all attendees when they check-in.
2. Provide a central table near registration where handout materials from all sessions could be picked up (for those sessions we could not attend).
3. Provide better publicity for how to get a booth at share fair.

1. Allow more time for “some” of the breakout sessions.
2. Have RME Conferences more often than every 3 years.
3. Have an ending session for a unified message to the attendees of “Where do we go from here?” This way efforts are not duplicated and specific areas are targeted.
4. Repeat “some” of the breakout sessions. I had a hard time deciding which one to attend. I couldn’t be in 2 places at the same time.
5. Let both CSREES (Extension) and RMA jointly plan the next conference. “NO DOG AND PONY SHOW” or “BIG DOG” show – PLEASE.

Wouldn’t change a thing. Nice job! Next meeting – full partner meeting with selected producer clientele panel (partners get to invite their prize clients).
Add a breakout session that allows people who are interested in partnering a chance to sit down together and start some planning.

Would like to have all power point presentations from all sessions on website. Needed greater lead time and/or greater circulations of call for proposals. Would like to have annual sharing conference.

Have checks ready when we leave. End program slightly earlier – tight for 6:30 flight.

Have speakers talk about project follow-up and follow-through (i.e., What IMPACT did your project have.” There were many good projects and workshops done. However, very little was said about impacts. Without knowing the impact of a program, why would I want to undertake it? I came here to find what works, not just find a project menu. Suggestion: Have real students provide testimony of impact had on their life.

Each one probably needs a new set of projects, ideas, events, etc. Timing is a big factor.

AM: Mix plenary and concurrent workshops. PM: Do the same. Conference organizer (program leaders) should make efforts to directly contact program participants. Involve more people by chairing parts of concurrent sessions.

Maybe to follow N.G.R. Tri-annual Farm Management Conference.

Nothing.

Bring in farmer panel to get their perspective.

More focused concurrent sessions with handouts/packets to replicate program. Three-ring notebook with sections. Materials all 3-hole punched.

My interest is on what is discussed in research, not process stuff about how an extension series was organized. I can do the latter and so could/can most who attend these meetings.

Provide list of participants and contact information.

Invite some farmers who participate in the RME workshops to the meeting or encourage the extension economists to bring a few farmers to the meeting.

The second day in the beginning – partnerships – dragged on too long.

More examples of local county activities. Grass roots.

What would the possibilities of repeating some session be?
1. Encourage those not presenting to share any materials used/developed with others.
2. Encourage greater emphasis on weaknesses of programs done. What would they do to improve?
3. Put key web sites in program booklet and/or risk management web site.

Start noon on day one and end on noon of day three.

Same approach will work well.

Invite some users of risk management tools (farmers, ranchers) to present some of their concerns, experiences to the audience. Overall, a very good program.

A master CD disk with most of presenters power point slide sets on them would be fantastic to have as a resource! Very acceptable layout and method. Time lines were good, busy, fast paced is what I need! Some spin off options like Finpack a good method to get me here, would like to see more of this type. Pre- post-intern options. Email, web page, phone and fax handout by each presenter that list’s their demo/presented infor what is available, cost and order/requesting options for participants. Do not want to carry it home but would like to now request, order, purchase materials on the programs that seem to have value for me to use!

Start on Monday. Only 1 hour of Monte Hemenover.

Not much really. The conference was good. Better than I expected.

Please do it again – 2 yrs. from now. Just like cooking – same ingredients, hope it tastes as good.

Yes, do it again – every two years.

Better location. Too much food.

Try to find a way so different states can communicate what they are doing to eliminate some of the duplication.

Next time invite rep’s from banking/agribusiness for panels/speakers.

Allow more time. Have this meeting every year.

Reduce time spent in large group sessions and allow more time for concurrent papers. We should do it again. Great job.

Would like to have more hardcopy reference handouts (a notebook containing all presentations).
Building an evaluation plan into various program processes (expected impacts?) – get evaluation technical assistance involved.

Nothing.

Have a lot more to offer those that come. Educational materials to take home to use. Get program together for public awareness.

Add another half day for presentations.

Nothing.

More speakers like the marketing group.

Incorporate tours, site seeing and related field risk management opportunities.

I prefer mid-day to mid-day. Makes the sessions a little shorter. Would have liked some time to discuss specific issues with others of similar interest in a more structured way, e.g., an optional late afternoon session.

Most of information could have been presented in 15-30 minutes. 10 min. break between all sessions. Maybe limit topics to central theme – narrow/ or only 2 themes.

Overall an excellent program. It would be difficult to improve.

Reduce number of presentations, add time for discussion and or planning for regions.

Wait for at least two years and provide a similar format.

Would like some technical information about how various risk management tools interact – e.g., crop ins. & forward pricing, lease contracts and yield risk, risk aspects of contracts for specialty crops and livestock – how to aggregate these to evaluate the risk position of the total business. General session on working with low resource producers.

Provide list of attendees.

Motel was not prepared to check people in and out of the motel. However, they handled the meals and breaks in an excellent fashion. Get any additional $ out before November, 2000. Otherwise, we will lose a complete year of enhanced programming.

Look for more private sector partners to invite to get them more involved in RME – companies, associations, etc.

Abstracts needed for general sessions OR Handouts at a minimum. Would be nice to see more private sector partners in attendance.
Don’t know how it could be improved except would like more on alternative trends such as organic markets and direct markets.

Add market diversification, direct marketing alternatives; the rest of ag will be working for multinational corporations such as poultry producers are now. Could we add Canadian producers and educators?