Seminar Evaluation

Introduction
On the afternoon of the second day participants were handed out a feedback form and asked to complete it. ERPANET received back 15 forms, which amounts to a response rate of 24% of the 65 participants. It should be mentioned however, that several participants had to leave the seminar early to meet travel deadlines and could not complete the feedback form. The feedback form is split up into two sections. The first addresses the seminar itself and the second examines the background of the participants.

About the Seminar
The first five questions aimed at various aspects of the seminar. Participants were asked to judge these with values ranging from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

1. How would you rate the organisation of the event?
   1. 0.00%  
   2. 0.00%  
   3. 33.33%  
   4. 40.00%  
   5. 26.67%  
   No response 0.00%

2. How would you rate the structure of the seminar?
   1. 0.00%  
   2. 13.33%  
   3. 26.60%  
   4. 40.00%  
   5. 20.00%  
   No response 0.00%

3. How well did you feel that the seminar addressed the main topic?
   1. 0.00%  
   2. 0.00%  
   3. 33.33%  
   4. 26.67%  
   5. 33.33%  
   No response 0.00%
4. How useful was the seminar documentation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>60.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How effective were the speakers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>53.33%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Was the cost acceptable?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>86.67%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Did this seminar meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What will you be able to take from this seminar back to your own organisations?

Comments include:
- Current thinking from other disciplines - these will help us make better informed decisions as we develop our preservation strategies
- Thoughts on the archiving approaches / techniques in various disciplines
- Draft acquisition policy
- Incorporate relevant best practices into our operations
- Concepts, ideas, examples to help to define policies of selection, appraisal and retention of digital data - scientific or not
9. What else would you like to have seen covered at this seminar?

Comments include:
- We heard so much from the agency/management perspective and not enough from the sciences 'work practice' perspective
- Someone to talk about more general proteomic data; maybe also chemical/crystallography data. Repositories here may have different appraisal problems.
- Involve funders, publishers and IT specialists

10. What did you like best about this seminar?

The variety of scientific disciplines represented appears to have been a popular point among the majority of respondents to this question. The discussion sessions were also very popular.

Comments include:
- Learning about the activities in other disciplines
- Coverage of a wide range of scientific disciplines
- It appeared that the comfort to speak freely was most beneficial
- Variety of disciplines represented. It is comforting to know the problems faced are pretty universal.
- Provided clear and broad perspective of archiving approaches by various institutions/disciplines; dynamic exchanges among groups

11. What did you like least?

Some felt that the presentations were too long and too abstract.

Comments include:
- Too many people talking too much with too little relevance and at too high a level of abstraction, so that discussions didn't converge
- Lack of examples on existing appraisal policies

Participants’ Background

12. What kind of organisation do you work for?

The majority of respondents work for public sector organisations.
13. What is your function?

The majority of respondents were archivists, records managers and project managers.

14. How did you hear about this seminar?

Most respondents heard of the workshop through listservs, colleagues and the ERPANET web site.

15. What motivated you to attend?

Most respondents had an interest in the topic and a general interest in preservation activities. A few also had an interest in ERPANET as a project.

16. Are you likely to attend other ERPANET events in the future?

The vast majority of respondents indicated that they would attend a future ERPANET event (over 86%). The remainder indicated that they would like to attend future events but are not sure on time restraints and organisational approval at this point in time.

17. Any other topics that you would like ERPANET to provide events in?

Topics that respondents would like to see addressed include more on general preservation, appraisal, and archiving practices across disciplines.