

# Natick 360

Honoring Our Past. Planning Our Future.



## Strategic Choices Weekend Evaluations June 8-10, 2007

### Introduction

The Town of Natick hosted the Strategic Choices Weekend, June 8-10, 2007, at Kennedy Middle School in Natick. This weekend was a key event in the year-long *Natick 360* strategic planning process.

The weekend event started *Natick 360's* phase 4, Our Strategic Choices. The previous phase 3, Our Strategic Options, culminated with the June 6 acceptance of a 54-page Strategic Options report by the five boards and committees that sponsor the *Natick 360* process. The Strategic Options report was the basis for activities at the Strategic Choices Weekend; it is available free at [www.Natick360.org](http://www.Natick360.org), and at all Natick public libraries.

Elements of the Strategic Choices Weekend included:

### Kickoff Event, Friday, June 8, 2007

Craig Ross, co-chair of *Natick 360*, and Carole Gloff, Chair of the Board of Selectmen welcomed participants to the event. They acknowledged State Sen. Karen Spilka, State Rep. David Linsky, and Natick resident Doug Rubin, Governor Patrick's Chief of Staff, among the 108 participants. Martha White, the Town's Acting Administrator, delivered her annual Budget Message, warning about future budgetary challenges as Town reserve funds are depleted. David Parish, co-chair of *Natick 360*, introduced keynote speaker Marc Draisen, Executive Director, Metropolitan Area Planning Council, who described the MetroFuture regional planning initiative. The Focus on Natick photography exhibit, cosponsored by *Natick 360* and TCAN, recognized Elyssa Conley for her "Favorite Photo" of a rower on Lake Cochituate.

Participants were asked to complete a brief evaluation form, and 55 participants did; a summary of these evaluations is below. Participants' comment on the workshops are reported verbatim in Appendix A.

### Weekend Workshops, June 9-10, 2007

On a rainy Saturday and Sunday, 141 Natick residents came together to choose how they want Natick to improve over the next five years. Residents could attend any of the six 2½-hour workshops at Kennedy Middle School. Professional independent facilitators led each workshop.

Workshop participants considered the 29 options described in the Strategic Options report, categorized under seven focus areas:

### Summary

*Natick 360* is the Town's strategic planning process, organized in four phases:

1. Our Community Yesterday and Today
2. Our Shared Vision
3. Our Strategic Options
4. Our Strategic Choices

Strategic Choices Weekend started the fourth phase.

Friday evening the Acting Town Administrator addressed the Town's budgetary challenges, and the Executive Director of MAPC described MetroFuture, a regional planning initiative.

In weekend workshops 141 residents came together to choose the most important among 29 strategic options.

Evaluations of the weekend were very positive, with 90% to 92% satisfaction rates.

Town Meeting authorized the *Natick 360* process in 2006. Sponsoring boards and committees include:

- Board of Selectmen
- Conservation Commission
- Finance Committee
- Planning Board
- School Committee

*Natick 360* is overseen by the 9-member Strategic Planning Oversight Committee. Consultants Blackerby Associates, Inc., manage and facilitate the project.

- Continuous improvement of public education;
- Increasing civic engagement and leadership;
- Improving Natick’s environment, health and safety;
- Enlivening Natick Center;
- Improving the Town’s infrastructure and transportation options;
- Planning for change and managing growth;
- Town financing strategies.

Each strategic option was stated as a goal, such as, “Continue to improve educational outcomes for students of all abilities at all levels,” “Increase open space and accessibility” or “Improve traffic flows on major routes.” For each strategic option, the report included background information and listed potential activities that, if implemented, would advance the Town toward the goal.

Participants first chose their personal list of the “top-ten” most important strategic options, and in small groups of 3-5, reached consensus on a top-ten list. They then developed consensus on the top 10-12 options most important to a larger group of 6-12, and for those items decided whether implementation should occur in the short-term (1-2 years), medium-term (3-5 years) or long-term (6+ years). All the session’s small groups came together to review each others’ work, to identify what they like about each group’s report and to raise issues that may develop from each group’s priorities. Participants then voted for the small group report they felt best met their individual preferences.

The results of these Strategic Choices workshops will be used to develop a survey instrument that will be administered to a scientifically-selected random sample of Natick residents.

At the end of each workshop, participants were asked to complete a brief evaluation form, and 120 participants did. A summary of these evaluations is below. Participants’ comment on the workshops are reported verbatim in Appendix B.

### Kickoff Event Evaluations

The Friday kickoff event evaluation form included five items, and asked participants to rate the program on a five-point scale. The items and the associated scales are:

1. The meeting purposes were achieved.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
2. This meeting helped me become more aware of the Natick 360 strategic planning process.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. This meeting helped me learn more about Natick’s current financial condition.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
4. This meeting helped me learn more about regional planning activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
5. My rating and comments on the meeting overall:	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Not Effective				Highly Effective

Each item also provided space for participant comments. Appendix A reports those comments verbatim, with the participant’s associated rating and a note whether the comment was signed.

Participants submitted 55 questionnaires. Table 1 summarizes the number of responses received, showing the number and percentage of ratings for each item on the questionnaire. With 55 questionnaires and five ratings per questionnaire, the possible total is 275 individual ratings, but some questionnaires did not include ratings for all five items.

When evaluating these types of ratings, three measures are important indicators of success:

- *Satisfaction Rate* is the percentage of ratings that were either 5 (“Strongly Agree” or “Highly Effective”) or 4 (“Agree” or one step below “Highly Effective”). A satisfaction rate above 65% is considered good. In this case, participants were very satisfied with the Friday event: the satisfaction rate ranges from 87% to 96%; the global (all results together) satisfaction rate is 92%.
- *Excellence Rate* is the percentage of ratings that were 5 (“Strongly Agree” or “Highly Effective”). Any excellence rate above 20% is considered good. The excellence rate ranges from 31% to 55%, with a global excellence rate of 44%. Nearly half the participants rated the workshops in the excellent range (“Strongly Agree” or “Highly Effective”).
- *Dissatisfaction Rate* is the percentage of ratings that were 1 (“Strongly Disagree” or “Not Effective”) or 2 (“Disagree” or one step above “Not Effective”). A dissatisfaction rating above 10% generally indicates a serious problem. Participants generally were not dissatisfied with the Friday event: the dissatisfaction rate ranged from 0% to 7%; the global dissatisfaction rate was 2%. All four respondents who gave a “Disagree” rating to item 3 (This meeting helped me learn more about Natick’s current financial condition) commented that they had heard the presentation before, most in Town Meeting.

**Table 1. Responses to Friday Event Evaluation Forms**

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses
1. The meeting purposes were achieved.	0 0%	0 0%	5 9%	32 59%	17 31%	54 100%
2. This meeting helped me become more aware of the Natick 360 strategic planning process	0 0%	0 0%	2 4%	32 59%	20 37%	54 100%
3. This meeting helped me learn more about Natick’s current financial condition.	0 0%	4 7%	3 6%	20 37%	27 50%	54 100%
4. This meeting helped me learn more about regional planning activities.	0 0%	1 2%	1 2%	23 42%	30 55%	55 100%
	<b>Not Effective</b>				<b>Highly Effective</b>	
5. My rating and comments on the meeting overall:	0 0%	0 0%	6 12%	22 42%	24 46%	52 100%
<b>Total Responses</b>	0 0%	5 2%	17 6%	129 48%	118 44%	269 100%

## Workshops Evaluations

The Saturday and Sunday workshops evaluation form included five items, and asked participants to rate their workshop on a five-point scale. The items and the associated scales are:

1. The workshop purposes were achieved.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
2. The workshop discussions addressed the issues that are most important to me.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
3. I had an opportunity to express my views fully on the issues discussed.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
4. My rating and feedback on the leaders of the workshop small group discussions:	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Not Effective				Highly Effective
5. My rating and comments on the meeting overall:	<input type="checkbox"/>				
	Not Effective				Highly Effective

Each item also provided space for participant comments. Appendix B reports those comments verbatim, with the participant's associated rating and a note whether the comment was signed.

Participants submitted 120 evaluation questionnaires.<sup>1</sup> Table 2 on the next page summarizes the number of responses received, showing the number and percentage of ratings for each item on the questionnaire. With 120 responses and five ratings per response, the possible total is 600 individual ratings, but some questionnaires did not include ratings for all five items.

When evaluating these types of ratings, the same three measures are important indicators of success:

- *Satisfaction Rate* is the percentage of ratings that were either 5 (“Strongly Agree” or “Highly Effective”) or 4 (“Agree” or one step below “Highly Effective”). A satisfaction rate above 65% is considered good. In this case, participants were very satisfied with the workshops: the satisfaction rate ranges from 87% to 94%, and the global (all results together) satisfaction rate is 90%.
- *Excellence Rate* is the percentage of ratings that were 5 (“Strongly Agree” or “Highly Effective”). Any excellence rate above 20% is considered good. The excellence rate ranges from 33% to 60%, with a global excellence rate of 44%. Nearly half the participants rated the workshops in the excellent range.
- *Dissatisfaction Rate* is the percentage of ratings that were 1 (“Strongly Disagree” or “Not Effective”) or 2 (“Disagree” or one step above “Not Effective”). A dissatisfaction rating above 10% generally indicates a serious problem. Participants generally were not dissatisfied with the workshops, as the dissatisfaction rate is never higher than 2%.

<sup>1</sup> One questionnaire was submitted on the form prepared for Friday evening's program. Two items on that form are identical to items on the Saturday-Sunday form, items 1 and 5, so responses for those two items are included in the data.

**Table 2. Responses to Saturday and Sunday  
Workshops Evaluation Forms**

<b>Items</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Total Responses</b>
1. The workshop purposes were achieved.	0 0%	0 0%	12 10%	66 55%	42 35%	120 100%
2. The workshop discussions addressed the issues that are most important to me.	0 0%	2 2%	9 8%	68 58%	39 33%	118 100%
3. I had an opportunity to express my views fully on the issues discussed.	1 1%	2 2%	4 3%	41 34%	71 60%	119 100%
	<b>Not Effective</b>				<b>Highly Effective</b>	
4. My rating and feedback on the leaders of the workshop small group discussions:	2 2%	2 2%	11 9%	48 40%	56 47%	119 100%
5. My rating and comments on the meeting overall:	0 0%	1 1%	11 9%	52 44%	54 46%	118 100%
<b>Total Responses</b>	3 1%	7 1%	47 8%	275 46%	262 44%	594 100%

# Natick 360

Honoring Our Past. Planning Our Future.



## Appendix A. Kickoff Event Evaluations Verbatim<sup>2</sup> Participant Comments

**1. *The meeting purposes were achieved.***

Rating	Comments	Signed?
4	Good thumbnail view of past efforts & I hoped for directions for future.	Yes
3	What was the purpose supposed to be?	
3	I wish that we went over the issues in the thick booklet instead of having the speaker.	
5	Good organization.	Yes
5	Great agenda	Yes
4	Good kickoff	Yes
4	Could have included more people – tough time of year – Fri. night very hard. Do not have an alternative, however.	Yes

**2. *This meeting helped me become more aware of the Natick 360 strategic planning process.***

Rating	Comments	Signed?
5	Humbled by the amount of work already done!	Yes
4	I was already pretty aware of the process.	Yes
5	This was the first session I've been to and I learned a lot!	Yes
4	Already aware.	
	I knew of process & participated	
5	Transportation & growth	Yes
5	Good	Yes

<sup>2</sup> Spelling and punctuation have been corrected.

**3. This meeting helped me learn more about Natick's current financial condition.**

Rating	Comments	Signed?
2	Martha's information happened to be redundant to me; however, it was very good, and should have been included regardless.	
	Although I didn't learn more about our financial condition (3rd time I've heard it), I feel Martha does a very good job of explaining Town finances.	
5	I will not despair of being able to stay here!	Yes
4	A bit alarming!	
5	Excellent presentation! Could Ms. White make this available to the general public? Maybe <i>via</i> Pegasus, web or open meeting?	Yes
2	I'm a Town Meeting Member so I heard all this.	Yes
2	Already aware	
3	A lot of this seems like pure speculation.	
5	More emphasis on this going forward.	Yes
2	Already know as Town Meeting member	Yes
4	This forum should not be the only forum for making Town members aware of the situation.	Yes
4	Same as at Town Meeting	Yes
4	I'm also a TM member – so did just hear this. Think this was still a good component.	Yes

**4. This meeting helped me learn more about regional planning activities.**

Rating	Comments	Signed?
4	MAPC plans were clear, but implementing those plans was almost entirely absent; I caught the line, "zoning to make a dramatic change."	
4	I would have appreciated a little more detail about some of the assumptions driving the MAPC forecasts	Yes
5	Need more info to Boards on MetroFuture; people are clueless about the water by not the traffic	
5	Excellent!	Yes
5	Very heartening to see the amount of ____, <sup>3</sup> research, consultation & planning going on for us to use as resources.	Yes
5	Great presentation; very informative.	
5	Fascinating presentation by Marc Draisen. Would have been good to have some written info – reference list or web sites, etc.	Yes
5	Good presentation – MAPC info tells me Natick, with our HOOP, etc. districts, is on track. Now let's get the garage built.	
5	Good presentation from Marc Draisen. Very appropriate.	
4	Already somewhat aware.	
5	Would like it if the speaker had stayed to answer more questions.	Yes
5	Good keynote – MetroFuture	Yes

---

<sup>3</sup> Illegible.

**5. My rating and comments on the meeting overall:**

Rating	Comments	Signed?
	The regional planning speaker I found particularly informative & specific	Yes
4	Good – It helped me to identify new problems; bad – it helped me to identify new problems.	Yes
5	Marc Draisen was excellent – very good speaker	
4	I also with the presentation had highlighted how the goals & objectives of the Natick 360 process coordinates or fit with MAPC goals.	Yes
5	Great meeting – well planned & organized. Enjoyed keynote address (Marc Draisen did an outstanding job in his presentation).	
3	I enjoy hearing “big” picture presentation that connect to daily living.	Yes
5	Wasn’t going to come (4 kids, we both work fulltime) – am so glad I did; will continue to be involved.	Yes
3	A bit boring. Keynote speaker good.	
4	More time for questions would be a plus.	
5	Opened my eyes to a lot.	
5	Well done!	
4	Finance update too long.	
	Great to have the photos on screen during seating.	
4	We have not talked about the speakers issues & how they relate to our packet.	
4	What is Natick’s municipal credit rating? What % do Town employees contribute to health insurance? What is the composition of the Town’s long-term debt?	Yes
5	The Strategic Options report should have been double-sided printed.	
5	Thank you all for skillful planning	Yes
5	Nothing truly new in the world of planning – Good points: clustering. Bad: Eminent domain – planning in terms of manufacturing – should be thinking in terms of services / impact of Internet – eliminating an area portion of commuting – incentives to businesses to avoid office ___ <sup>4</sup> services – birth control / population issues world wide – we will eventually run out of space everywhere if not addressed. “Pogo was right.”	
4	Very informative. Room was very warm.	Yes
5	Great job. Thank you.	Yes
	Thank you for all the work. This is a great process & worth coming out for – even after Town Meeting & many other events! Thank you!	Yes

---

<sup>4</sup> Illegible.

**Natick 360**  
Honoring Our Past. Planning Our Future.



**Appendix B. Workshops Evaluations  
Verbatim<sup>5</sup> Participant Comments**

**1. The workshop purposes were achieved.**

Signed?	Rating	Comments	Signed?
1	5	Larger groups would have been better (i.e., small group was only 2-3 people)	
1	3	What were the purposes?	
1	4	If it could have been possible, pre-registered folks could have had the report in advance. However, the 50-page report had a lot of rich detail which couldn't be used in the "quick & dirty prioritize them"	
1	5	This is a great well-organized process, to help forge consensus	Yes
2	4	Great facilitators	Yes
2	5	Excellent experience	Yes
2	3	Every service the Town provides cost money; we must be more aware of what costs what!	Yes
2	3	The emphasis on priority versus cost and where the money would come from was lost. The excellent materials weighting the costs were not well used, which is too bad.	Yes
3	4	Emphasis on browsing strategic options package before attending.	Yes
3	5	Our group made concrete decisions	Yes
3	4	We needed a little more time to consult the Strategic Options Plan, where the details altered debate.	Yes
3	4	A little difficult to work through issues for consensus, but we did pretty well; could have used more time	
3	4	I would have preferred combining best elements of both groups at the end.	
5	5	Kevin was very skillful – group members extremely pleasant & worth while	Yes
5	4	Good discussion with substance	
5	4	Ran out of time, some contributors had too many changes to the items	
5	3	Interpretation of #7 option and the rest of the options was not done the same by each of the groups.	
6	5	Well done	Yes

<sup>5</sup> Spelling and punctuation have been corrected.

**2. The workshop discussions addressed the issues that are most important to me.**

Session	Rating	Comments	Signed?
1	4	Mostly but not at same level of importance.	Yes
1	5	Yes	
1	4	Except affordable housing	
1	4	Overall I felt comfortable with the items my group chose, but did not enjoy the process. See 3.	
1	4	Mostly	Yes
1	4	I really came to listen to other people's point of view.	
1	4	My priorities were not discussed in detail, but I was able to express my specific concerns	
2	2	Not enough time to discuss opinions that differs from the rest of the group	
2	4	In my group the over-arching concern for the environment did not come up strongly – It's the elephant in the room.	Yes
2	4	Regionalization is such a complex issue – an education on the issue needs to take place	Yes
2	4	A comprehensive list of issues & problems.	Yes
2	4	All the topics were well vetted from last Fall's discussion. The were all	Yes
3	5	Our group of the three worked well and easily integrated with the other groups	Yes
6		The small group discussion was helpful. The coming back together was, especially the latter part, was not helpful and wasted time and took away from last activity.	
6	5	Traffic is a huge problem that was said to be a problem but hopefully will be addressed.	Yes
6	4	I would like to see more emphasis placed on our schools and how they shape our Town & neighborhoods	

**3. I had an opportunity to express my views fully on the issues discussed.**

Session	Rating	Comments	Signed?
1	5	Yep	
1	2	the process was not comfortable because some people acted as if it were a decision-making meeting – rather than putting together ideas – and did not respect others' knowledge	
1	3	Same as above	
3	5	I brought up new High School in our group of three, and brought up financial issues (5.d. & 7.b.) in large group.	Yes

**4. My rating and feedback on the leaders of the workshop small group discussions:**

Session	Rating	Comments	Signed?
1	2	Uninformed; kept leaving	
1	4	Our group facilitator (Mel) was quiet & subdued	
1	5	Great job.	
1	3	OK	
1	1	She needed the participants to explain the process	
1	1	I think the process was not clear and leader had a hard time helping with it.	
1	3	Facilitator was unclear on how to prioritize leading to discrepancies in prioritization.	
1	5	Blue leader was excellent	
1	3	OK – but not totally clear on directions, low energy	
1	4	Very good but needed to put off discussion sooner for time considerations.	Yes
2	4	Facilitators should firmly enforce following the process (don't allow "deviations")	
2	5	May want to "randomly" assign to the "mini-groups" so that like-minded people aren't necessarily together	Yes
2	3	There were some mixed instructions; they slowed the decision process	Yes
3	2	Leader was too quiet	Yes
3	4	Groups were not held to the same time constraints; some discussion got shut down to quick & other group was late	
3	4	I don't feel the discussion was introduced and framed well enough at the beginning	
3	5	Great!	Yes
4	4	I would have liked to see more time discussing rather than "reading" the statements – we did that Friday – I understand it warms people up but took valuable discussion time.	
4	4	Our group discussion was highly effective. The last session where the groups were together was not very effective.	Yes
5	5	See above	Yes
5	4	Kept us on track mostly.	
6	5	Kevin: highly effective; Phillip: not effective	
6	4	Some advocacy stated at end of session	Yes

**5. My rating and comments on the meeting overall:**

Session	Rating	Comments	Signed?
1	5	Very worthwhile. I hope the recommendations are used	Yes
1	4	Thanks	Yes
1	3	Would have been more effective to have time to read reports – most came in cold.	
1	5	This needs to be an ongoing effort – revisit periodically	Yes
1	5	Great job, very well planned	
1	4	The process is highly loaded with people already involved in Town process which distorts	Yes
1	5	Last voting part ineffective	
1	5	Still not sure exactly how N360 will integrate into the school government actions	Yes
1	5	Everything went well – except we needed a little more discussion time in the end with all the groups together	Yes
1		Depends what is next – I think the material documents were important and informative but very complicated to read and refer to at this meeting. A concise, short version would have been helpful, or at least a quick overview of what we were looking at! Also, the print of page was too small and hard to see off the wall.	
1	3	Would have liked more real discussion, less driven by “the rating process.” The budget – raise tax/cut services – deserved more discussion	
1	4	The final task (setting time frames) was confusing and not clearly defined.	
1	5	Great idea to break down into smaller groups and aggregate to build consensus. It fostered great discussion	Yes
1	3	The process of building consensus within small groups of 8 people & then presenting these to the session as a whole resulted in every option being a priority. Did any actionable ideas come out of this? Please call if you would like clarification.	Yes
2	4	Thank you for this opportunity to be a little more aware of my community.	
2	5	Great job and thanks	Yes
2	4	Propose to use the report (options, relative cost) as a basis for the discussion	
2	5	Great!	Yes
2	5	Great job – Let’s be sure Natick finds a way to keep this kind of interaction going	Yes
2	5	Like HS with community center idea. Traffic must be addressed, or people will leave!	
2	4	No measure of performance; too many residents feel Natick is now efficient	Yes

Session	Rating	Comments	Signed?
2	4	I think this type of strategic planning needs to be a permanent ongoing process & committee	Yes
2	3	Unsure that dissenting opinions were aired at the final area. The question of what was missing from the group's plan.	Yes
2	5	The large group meeting at the end also drove creative thinking! Really terrific having different views together for a fantastic & productive brain-storming.	Yes
2	4	Hopefully this doesn't stop at this point	Yes
3	4	Overall a great opportunity & challenge for us	
3	4	Thanks. I enjoyed and appreciate the time.	
3	5	This is an incredible project! Good work!	Yes
3	4	Perhaps we could all work harder on increasing the number of participants; <i>i.e.</i> , take a 2nd look at PR	Yes
3	4	Excellent meeting, enjoyable, productive	
3	4	Excellent at evaluating the choices that were on the table and refining them a bit. Didn't have a chance to add options that weren't listed already.	
3	5	Excellent discussion!	
3	5	Thank you.	
4	5	Thank you – wish more people were here	
4	5	There were many involved people that had a lot to offer. Thank you.	
4		A little too long. Last full group session a little redundant.	
4	4	Please share the 360 ground rules for group process to the 5 sponsoring boards for consideration/adoption!	Yes
4	4	Process is messy & rushed but enough has filtered through the screen of previous discussions to end of being valuable. Thanks for all the hard work!	Yes
4	4	I like having to opportunity to meet new people and have content-rich discussion	
4	4	Workshop 4 – last meeting of both groups was a little confusing – the writing on the sheets was too small.	
5	5	So glad I came.	Yes
5	4	Would be better to have more newcomers to local government.	
5	4	Some topics, in my opinion, focused too much time on non-strategic issues	Yes
5	5	Very encouraged to see the results so similar among the 3 groups!	
5	5	Comfortable environment. Good way to meet neighbors. Continuity from last autumn's session appreciated.	Yes
5	4	Should have spent more time determining priorities rather than going around the room to read off the papers.	
5	4	Informative, but financing strategies seemed to prevent a concise discussions during summary sessions	

<b>Session</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Signed?</b>
6	3	Would have been more effective if we knew more – but that was up to us, too! Feels dangerous to have people voting/prioritizing who don't get/understand it all!	Yes
6	5	Great process! Excellent facilitators!	
6	4	I found this particular workshop to be a wonderful example of the democratic process!	Yes