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 16 forms, which amounts to a response rate of 47% of the 34 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                        18.75%
   4                       68.75%
   5                        12.50%
   No response              0.00%

2. How would you rate the structure of the seminar?
   1                        0.00%
   2                        0.00%
   3                        12.50%
   4                       56.25%
   5                        25.00%
   No response              0.00%

3. How well did you feel that the seminar addressed the main topic?
   1                        0.00%
   2                        6.25%
   3                        6.25%
   4                       43.75%
   5                       43.75%
   No response              0.00%
4. How useful was the seminar documentation?
   1  0.00%
   2  0.00%
   3  0.00%
   4  50.00%
   5  50.00%
   No response  0.00%

5. How effective were the speakers?
   1  0.00%
   2  0.00%
   3  12.50%
   4  25.00%
   5  62.50%
   No response  0.00%

6. Was the cost acceptable?
   No  0.00%
   Yes 87.50%
   No response 12.50%

7. Did this seminar meet your expectations?
   No  0.00%
   Yes 93.75%
   No response  6.25%

8. What will you be able to take from this seminar back to your own organisations?
   Comments from participants include:
   - Starting point for cooperation with other initiatives
   - New co-operations; information exchange
   - Persistent Identifiers are an open topic
   - Better understanding of persistent identification options and implications
   - Knowledge
   - A good view of issues we weren’t aware of and some ideas as to solutions
   - Overview of important issues
   - Up to date information on persistent identifiers
   - Report of perspectives
   - A good overview of systems available and the issues relating to persistent identifiers
-A better understanding of persistent identifiers and valuable information from presentations
-Information about the state of persistence and involvement in future efforts of creating coordinated solutions

9. What else would you like to have seen covered at this seminar?

Comments from participants include:
- Broader focus and acceptance of other activities than DOI
- A summary of discussions
- More emphasis on future development
- Metadata practice
- Nothing – this was fairly thorough
- For this phase, subject was well covered
- Taxonomy of persistent identifier options with indications of their costs, implications, characteristics and objects for which they are suitable.

10. What did you like best about this seminar?

Comments from participants include:
- Communication, exchange and examples
- Split in persistence of identifiers infrastructure and applications
- The accommodation and the walk to/from UCC
- Presentations and ability to speak with participants
- Chance to hear experts on the subject
- Connections, first breakout, structure
- Topic covered completely
- Better quantity of educational presentations informed a broad, interesting debate. Well scoped.
- Speakers

11. What did you like least?

Comments from participants include:
- Breakout session overloaded by DOI and URN discussion
- Not sure if the scope of the seminar was exhaustive – what was left out?
- Lecture theatre wasn’t ideal for breakout sessions.

Participants’ Background

12. What kind of organisation do you work for?

Several participants did not complete this section. Of those who did respond, the majority represent public sector organisations and academic institutions.
13. What is your function?

Participants roles included:
- Librarians
- Project Managers
- Directors
- Development programmers
- Technical experts
- Archivists
- Researchers
- Information Management Analyst
- Content Provider

14. How did you hear about this seminar?

Most participants learned about the seminar through listserv announcements; the ERPANET web site, through communications with colleagues and through their organisations.

15. What motivated you to attend?

The majority of participants attended the seminar due to an interest in the topic. Other factors that were cited as incentives to attend include a general interest in digital preservation; a general interest in erpanet and quality of the speakers.

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Are there any topics that you would like to see ERPANET provide events in?

Comments from participants include:
- Second phase on same subject
- Different strategies for digital preservation management (e.g., risk based approaches; cost benefit analysis; practitioners reports)
- Aspects of long-term preservation; migration / emulation
- Implementation status and use of persistent identifiers