

**LEARN Workshop: Embedding Research Data as part of the research cycle. -
29th January 2016 at Senate House, London**

LEARN Workshop evaluation

Where appropriate respondents scored each question using a scale of 1-5 where 1 = Poor and 5 = Excellent

1. How suitable was the venue for the London LEARN Workshop?

| Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | Weighted Average |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Respondents | 0 | 1 | 3 | 18 | 27 | 49 | 4.45 |
| % | 0.00% | 2.04% | 6.12% | 36.73% | 55.10% | | |

2. How adequate did you find administrative and catering arrangements for the Workshop adequate to support the success of the event?

| Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | Weighted Average |
|-------------|----|----|-------|--------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Respondents | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 27 | 49 | 4.49 |
| % | 0% | 0% | 6.12% | 36.78% | 55.10% | | |

3. How did you rate the paper by Professor Geoffrey Boulton?

| Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | Weighted Average |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Respondents | 1 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 33 | 49 | 4.55 |
| % | 2.04% | 2.04% | 2.04% | 26.53% | 67.35% | | |

4. How did you rate the paper by Dr Paul Ayris?

| Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | Weighted Average |
|-------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Respondents | 1 | 1 | 6 | 24 | 17 | 49 | 4.12 |
| % | 2.04% | 2.04% | 12.24% | 48.98% | 34.69% | | |

5. How did you rate the paper by Professor Sabina Leonelli?

| Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | Weighted Average |
|-------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Respondents | 1 | 1 | 8 | 20 | 19 | 49 | 4.12 |
| % | 2.04% | 2.04% | 16.33% | 40.82% | 38.78% | | |

6. How did you rate the paper by Dr Peter Murray-Rust?

| Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | Weighted Average |
|-------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Respondents | 2 | 3 | 6 | 20 | 16 | 47 | 3.96 |
| % | 4.26% | 6.38% | 12.77% | 42.55% | 34.04% | | |

7. Was there enough time for questions and discussion after each plenary paper?

| | No | Yes | Total |
|-------------|-------|--------|-------|
| Respondents | 4 | 44 | 48 |
| % | 8.33% | 91.67% | |

8. How useful were the afternoon Workshops spaces to express your own views and opinions on research data management?

| Score | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Total | Weighted Average |
|-------------|----|----|--------|--------|--------|-------|------------------|
| Respondents | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 | 20 | 46 | 4.33 |
| % | 0% | 0% | 10.87% | 45.65% | 43.48% | | |

9. Did the feedback session after the 4 afternoon Workshops enable you to get a general picture of the state of play in research data management?

| | No | Yes | Total |
|-------------|--------|--------|-------|
| Respondents | 16 | 30 | 46 |
| % | 34.78% | 65.22% | |

10. Is there any other comment you would like to make about the LEARN London Workshop to inform future events from the Project?

Workshops should be centred on less questions. I expect more practical information & guidelines (along the lines of the proposed toolkit and model RDM policy). Summarizing: more to the point meeting agenda, more concrete deliverables at the end of the day

Very well organized and informative. Catering was good too, although it was a bit tricky eating the cooked lunch standing up.

I found it really refreshing to hear from researchers who are very experienced in making data available for re-use - many similar events are too funder or admin-led. The inclusion of data text mining was really useful because this is too often overlooked and is important. More researchers need a better understanding of how to make their data open in a useful way. There is a lot of anxiety about open data.

The discussion after Peter Murray-Rust's keynote was unnecessarily acrimonious.

An excellent overview and discussion on overarching issues affecting research data management in Europe. Looking forward to subsequent sessions.

The whole event ended on a somewhat sour note following Dr Murray-Rust's exchange with a representative from Elsevier. The event organisers could have done much more to temper this exchange and end on a more positive note. Whilst not relevant to the event organisers, I also felt that Dr Murray-Rust could have handled things in a more dignified manner.

The feedback session was too brief in my opinion - I know the feedback from my group did not always express what I had felt were the most important points.

Fantastic event. If only there were more like this.

Suggestion for afternoon workshops - feedback in plenary: maybe a resumé for all 4 groups (prob. by Paul Ayris) would have been useful. We propose the following formula: Three parallel round tables (RT), each chaired by two moderators (LEARN Project partner). Each of the round table will be assigned to a maximum of 2 dedicated topics and geared to answer some questions. The main outcomes of each RT shall be presented through the moderators in form of a short report containing common position statements. Formula: Rotation principle, 30 min. per RT (20 min. discussion, 5 min. for chairs to re-collect, 5 min. change RT).

Overall, an excellent and informative event but I felt the feedback from the afternoon workshops was a little rushed and unclear.

I have not provided answers for the afternoon sessions because I did not stay. I do not know what you were attempting to achieve with the session but the impression was given that you know nothing about all the hard work that has been done by a variety of actors across the sector in supporting research data management activity, and there was almost nothing of any value in what was said, other than as a revision exercise of the problems and challenges entailed in managing and sharing research data. It was a waste of a morning, I'm afraid.

It was interesting to hear views from colleagues at other institutions during the afternoon workshop but maybe the facilitator could have done more to manage the discussion as some people seems to get a bit carried away on certain topics.

I really enjoyed the day. It was very inspiring and a welcome reality check. Thanks very much.

Often RDM events focus very much on the practicalities and it was refreshing to consider the philosophy of "open" and its variety of potential meanings.

I would like to see more speakers and examples from people working in an arts, humanities and social science environment. I think at times the colleagues moderating discussions might have perhaps intervened a little sooner than they did as some of the discussions were taken over by colleagues with strongly opposing views, or strongly held opinions.

I'm not sure how useful the feedback session was, it was a bit long and repetitive. Not picking, though; very interesting day, nice to be talking more principles than details/compliance.

I felt the feedback was very repetitious as the 4 groups had the same questions, although I appreciate that this is really hard to organize and coordinate. Perhaps the feedback could be omitted? or the rapporteurs could take charge of particular questions? I found the discussion within the workshop session great and really useful.

We may need more time for discussions and action plans

Three of the four plenaries were strong on principles but weaker on use-case examples. There ARE researchers out there who have been managing their research data in innovative and transferrable ways, and we need to hear about them. A list of actions rather than aspirations please.

I think the break-out sessions in the afternoon were useful, but the reporting afterwards was confusing, so you might look for another formula for this. Overall a successful event. Congrats!

Excellent Workshop. Very informative. Thank you
