

Report

Introduction


The WP2 Workshop took place on 17th-19th May 2016 in Tel Hai College, in Tel Hai, in Israel.

At the workshop, there were 27 attendees.

The University of Montpellier has collected 19 “Before workshop surveys” and 19 “After workshop surveys”. More than 50% of attendees have completed the surveys, thus this report expresses the point of view of the majority of participants.

I. Before – After workshop surveys comparison


Most of questions in the Before and After workshop surveys were similar in order to be able to evaluate the evolution due to the meeting execution.




The majority of attendees who have completed the questionnaires before and after the workshop are satisfied or very satisfied regarding the workshop preparation and execution (more than 80%). It appears that after the workshop, the percentage of people very dissatisfied is bigger than before the workshop (from 5% to 11%).

This report will try to identify the reasons and to suggest what that could be improved for the next workshops.

WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEL HAI EVALUATION – MAY 2016




The information given to the attendees immediately before and during the workshop was considered helpful for all the participants who have completed the questionnaires.



The quality of the workshop organization/realization was considered above average for the majority of participants to the workshop.


WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEL HAI EVALUATION – MAY 2016



The agenda of the workshop was known by everyone before the workshop and most of people appreciated this agenda before the workshop. After the workshop, 29% of attendees who have completed the questionnaire judged the planned content below average.

It seems that the planned Agenda is different to the actual Agenda, and a lot of people are disappointed by this change. This is reinforced by the fact that most people approve the planned agenda.

It looks very important to effectively execute the planned Agenda as far as possible.




The time for interactions was considered above average for the majority of participants of the workshop. After the workshop, 5% of attendees judge the workshop agenda below average. A commentary given in the evaluation may explain this opinion: "Some parts of the


WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEL HAI EVALUATION – MAY 2016

agenda did not happen even if they were planned. The workshop could have been more fruitful if some parts of the second day would have been planned during the first day and vice-versa”.

The number of people disappointed by the effective agenda is significant, but the number of people disappointed by the effective time allocated to each topic is not so important. It means that the disappointment is mainly due to session that did not occur rather than to the effective time allocation deviation.






The workshop was considered productive for the majority of participants.









WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEL HAI EVALUATION – MAY 2016

The majority of participants considered very significant the WP2 Workshop in Tel Hai in the project.









WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEL HAI EVALUATION – MAY 2016








WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEL HAI EVALUATION – MAY 2016






WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEL HAI EVALUATION – MAY 2016







WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEL HAI EVALUATION – MAY 2016

7) Do WP2 Workshop purposes and goals are clearly defined and indicated?



7) Improvements for the next workshop/meeting/milestone: A list of actions and target date is defioned. everyone knows what their individual and group next steps are?





All the participants who have completed the questionnaires think that the objectives of the workshop are achieved or fully achieved. It is a unanimous though after the workshop.

II. Others questions

In the after workshop survey, some specific questions were asked to better understand possible discrepancies observed before and after the meeting.

8) Do you have any suggestions or comments?


BEFORE workshop: none

AFTER workshop:

- “Edna talked too much”
- “All the consortium partners should sit more together and share their insights”
- “Fulfill coordinated expectations and consult about the tools and rational of agenda with some of the participants”
- “Plan in advance the program with representatives of the group/ Focus directly on the assignments/ no need of external experts...”
- “Allocating enough time for each activity. Getting ideas from the partners”
- “Discussing via mail (or other technological tool) with potential partnership and coming more prepare to WS2 with a solid idea to promote”
- “It is important to listen what the group has to say and work around that. There is no need to constantly create new information”

WP2 WORKSHOP IN TEL HAI EVALUATION – MAY 2016

1B) Presentations: how satisfied are you with the overall quality of presentations/working group sessions?



Most of participants are satisfied by the quality of the presentations.

Suggestions for the next workshop:

First of all, it appears that it could be good to implicate more the consortium partners in the preparation of the agenda, or at least to plan in advance the program in consultation with the representatives of the groups.

It is very important for everybody to effectively execute the planned agenda. The time allocated to each topic can be slightly changed but no session should be cancelled.

It is also requested to everybody to prepare more the planned activities. Of course, this point is linked to the previous one: if people are involved in the preparation of a session, this session cannot be cancelled. For example, discussing via mail (or other technological tool) with potential partnership and coming more prepare to the workshop with a solid idea to promote.

Then, it could be interesting to listen what the groups has to say and to work around that.

Finally, it appears that there is no need to constantly create new information or to listen external experts.