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1.1 Wrap Up

**Question or instruction for the discussion:**
Wrap Up

* Things that went well
	+ Conversations (#1)
		- agreed- great conversations. (#5)
	+ The second session went pretty smooth (#3)
	+ Breakout sessions seem to be a good size. (#4)
	+ collaborative conversations (#6)
	+ Well organized and great interactive sessions. (#7)
	+ The room sizes were about perfect. easy to discuss (#8)
	+ I liked the ability to choose groups, and this interface for "sticky note boards" isn't bad and worked well! (#9)
	+ reshuffling of the groups was tricky, but y'all pulled it off (#11)
	+ The smaller group sizes in the break-outs worked well for having focused discussion. (#12)
	+ we had a good number of people -- circa 10 -- that enabled lively conversation with everybody able to chime in (#13)
	+ this all went well - hadn't used any of the technology before (except zoom once or twice) but it was very smooth! (#14)
	+ kept on time (#15)
		- +1 (#19)
	+ Good discussion, group size. (#16)
		- +1 (#36)
			* Good discussion (#44)
	+ The topics were well-organized (#17)
	+ Excellent format for a very interactive breakout session, congratulations! (#18)
	+ Everyone was very willing to add comments and move them around to common threads (#21)
	+ Agree with all the comments on room size - was easy to get to know people and have real discussions (#26)
	+ Good discussion. No real zoom issues or anything. (#27)
	+ Good group and good discussion. (#34)
	+ Great moderator; very open discussions; thinking big (#35)
	+ Good size for some interactive discussion (#37)
	+ good discussions (#39)
	+ Good interaction - quiet time is excellent to enter input (#49)
	+ Nice discussion with a great breakout group (#51)
	+ Nice amount of time allocated for interaction as opposed to a lot of slide presentations (#57)
	+ brainstorming was good - needed a separate session for this? (#59)
	+ zoom worked well for person to person communication and bonding. (#60)
	+ Very good discussion and a good size of breakout rooms that allowed diverse opinion while being small enough to be productive (#61)
	+ I liked the structured questions to brainstorm with. (#62)
	+ Breakout rooms are working well. (#64)
	+ moderators did great in #4 (#69)
	+ I liked the opportunity to quietly think and write brainstormed ideas. (#74)
	+ thanks to ORISE/admins for quick response and lots of help in sessions (#75)
		- +1 (#81)
	+ Meeting a small group of fellow participants was really great (#79)
* Things I would change
	+ give moderators the ability to create boxes (#2)
	+ Probably less prompt boxes since they sometime didn't hit important questions. (#10)
	+ The prompt questions don't necessarily line up with what the boxes should be (#20)
	+ would like to be able to view boxes from previous sessions (#22)
	+ For some breakout rooms to question prompts did not align well with the topic (#23)
		- +1 (#40)
		- +1 (#53)
	+ There needs to be a separation between the brain storming and the idea collation stage. I think that this is something rather lacking in meetingsphere (#24)
	+ prompts that match the flow of the workshop better (#25)
	+ Too many different questions to answer in the first break-out. Not all of them on the critical path. (#28)
	+ I would like to learn what is going on in the other breakout groups (#29)
		- +1 (#63)
		- +1 (#66)
	+ Meetingsphere website: would like to be able to have the morning breakout in one tab and the afternoon breakout in another tab. We need to be able to refer to materials across sessions. (#30)
	+ The meeting sphere interface is not super intuitive and a google doc worked better for our session for concurrent editing (since concurrent editing of the same texts are not allowed in meeting sphere) (#31)
	+ need more time to achieve goals of idea generation phase. Take some away from the hallway discussions if necessary. (#32)
	+ Fewer prompt boxes (#33)
	+ fewer questions to respond to in sphere - too many and not enough time. (#38)
	+ Not sure why we are voting in each session; many/most of the topics we covered are equally important (#41)
	+ While meeting sphere had its advantages, maybe a simpler form like Google docs might help capture more notes and thoughts. (#42)
		- Agree! (#50)
	+ I found the voting very clunky when there were a lot of boxes with a lot of lines (#43)
	+ chat at the end of teh day was very nice but not long enough (#45)
	+ Ability for groups to choose their own boxes (#46)
	+ Could we default to using hand-raising to add a point to a discussion? (#47)
	+ Ability to group comments in meeting space was tough; some same themes crossed boxes (#48)
	+ too many platforms for messages all going on at the same time, very confusing in the beginning (#52)
	+ Need framing in plenaries for many of the groups it seems. (#54)
	+ Voting wasn't really useful (#55)
		- +1 (#68)
	+ The first session was hard because there was a lot to cover. So in retrospect maybe more time for that first one. (#56)
	+ ability to go to multiple sessions would have been nice (#58)
	+ Without the ability to see all of the comments in all of the boxes at once, voting was somewhat challenging (#65)
	+ i was very confused getting started with the breakout groups with so many electronic tools. once we got moving, it worked pretty well (#67)
	+ Too many windows to track (slack, meeting sphere, zoom chat, zoom voice) (#70)
	+ For those topics that got split up into multiple breakouts, it would be good to randomize among these for future days? (#71)
	+ Questions in cards were not always applicable - maybe just a single card for each session would have similar value and make it easier to follow as we're talking and typing (#72)
	+ Meetingsphere wasn't useful. Felt a simple google docs would have worked better (#73)
	+ Cards did not map well to orthogonal thoughts -- too much overlap so similar comments were split up among cards (#76)
	+ I was unsure about the voting mechanism in the first session. It worked out well for the second session (#77)
	+ question prompts were pretty vague, but worked alright in the end. (#78)
	+ i didn't find the comment into many colored boxes helpful. good to be organized by headings, but better if they were in the same window so we could organize across all of the areas more easily (#80)
	+ Yes, too many windows/tech (#82)
	+ wasn't clear what the outcomces of voting would be (#83)
	+ Not your fault, but there is quite a bit of down time due to assigning the various breakout rooms, etc. (#84)
	+ Not sure about how slack is meant to play a role here (#85)
	+ Not yet totally clear how the (excellent) discussions will converge into a report/recommendations (#86)
	+ Too many sessions that felt a bit similar. I would have liked to be in many different ones. (#87)
	+ The meeting sphere format made it hard to combine thoughts against different sticky notes. (#88)
	+ give more than 5 votes, or have a mechanism for grouping votes. Ratio of 40+ points to 5 votes does not provide insight. (#89)
	+ Use something other than meeting sphere to crate a report out at the end of 3 days. Similar to other DOE workshops. Joint / co-edited text with 1 to 2 hours of quiet typing. With zoom on for live discussion. (#90)
	+ The Meeting Sphere boxes for the afternoon breakout did not align with the goal for the breakout (implications & possible consequences). There wasn't a box to capture a full discussion on implications. (#91)