



Evaluation WS0.5: **ENFSI-DWG conference, Bled 10th-12th May 2016, Slovenija**

participants: 80
number of evaluation forms returned: 71

notes DWG Steering committee members (5) and Organizer - Chair (Klemenc 1) did not evaluate

Results: Number of votes

| How would you rate meeting organization? | Poor | | Average | | Excellent | total number of responses |
|--|-------------------|---|---------|----|----------------|---------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Overall organization | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 62 | 70 |
| Meeting announcements/information (web) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 51 | 69 |
| Registration process | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 50 | 65 |
| Site/Location | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 60 | 71 |
| Accommodation | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 52 | 71 |
| Meeting rooms and facilities | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 51 | 71 |
| Lunches | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 55 | 71 |
| Social program | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 56 | 69 |
| Transportation (from/to the airport) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 48 | 51 |
| | | | | | | |
| How would you rate the prices? | Low | | Average | | High | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Registration fee | 0 | 2 | 46 | 18 | 3 | 69 |
| Accommodation | 0 | 2 | 48 | 15 | 4 | 69 |
| | | | | | | |
| The meeting achieved the following objectives? | Strongly disagree | | Agree | | Strongly agree | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Active participation was encouraged | 0 | 3 | 17 | 27 | 23 | 70 |
| The discussion during the meeting was productive | 0 | 3 | 13 | 28 | 27 | 71 |
| The venue met the needs of the group | 0 | 0 | 8 | 24 | 37 | 69 |
| The meeting program fulfils your expectations | 0 | 2 | 4 | 25 | 38 | 69 |
| | | | | | | |
| How would you rate the scientific programme? | Poor | | Average | | Excellent | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Programme book with Abstracts | 0 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 50 | 70 |
| Overall quality of presentations | 0 | 0 | 8 | 35 | 27 | 70 |
| Short presentations/Bring your slides | 0 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 33 | 69 |
| Oral presentations | 0 | 0 | 7 | 32 | 30 | 69 |
| Poster presentations | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 36 | 69 |
| Presentations from DWG subcommittees | 0 | 0 | 9 | 28 | 27 | 64 |



Results: in %

| How would you rate meeting organization? | Poor | | Average | | Excellent | sum (%) |
|---|-------------------|---|---------|----|----------------|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Overall organization | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 89 | 100 |
| Meeting announcements/information (web) | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 74 | 100 |
| Registration process | 0 | 2 | 5 | 17 | 77 | 100 |
| Site/Location | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 85 | 100 |
| Accommodation | 0 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 73 | 100 |
| Meeting rooms and facilities | 0 | 0 | 1 | 27 | 72 | 100 |
| Lunches | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 77 | 100 |
| Social program | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 81 | 100 |
| Transportation | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 94 | 100 |
| How would you rate the prices? | | | | | | |
| | Low | | Average | | High | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Registration fee | 0 | 3 | 67 | 26 | 4 | 100 |
| Accommodation | 0 | 3 | 70 | 22 | 6 | 100 |
| The meeting achieved the following objectives? | | | | | | |
| | Strongly disagree | | Agree | | Strongly agree | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Active participation was encouraged | 0 | 4 | 24 | 39 | 33 | 100 |
| The discussion during the meeting was productive | 0 | 4 | 18 | 39 | 38 | 100 |
| The venue met the needs of the group | 0 | 0 | 12 | 35 | 54 | 100 |
| The meeting program fulfils your expectations | 0 | 3 | 6 | 36 | 55 | 100 |
| How would you rate the scientific programme? | | | | | | |
| | Poor | | Average | | Excellent | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Programme book with Abstracts | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 71 | 100 |
| Overall quality of presentations | 0 | 0 | 11 | 50 | 39 | 100 |
| Short presentations/Bring your slides | 0 | 0 | 10 | 42 | 48 | 100 |
| Oral presentations (»scientific«) | 0 | 0 | 10 | 46 | 43 | 100 |
| Poster presentations | 0 | 0 | 10 | 38 | 52 | 100 |
| Presentations from DWG subcommittees | 0 | 0 | 14 | 44 | 42 | 100 |