


152th EAAE Seminar

Emerging technologies and the development of the agriculture

August 30th – September 1st, 2016

Novi Sad, Serbia

1. How did you initially find out about the Seminar?



1.1 From the EAAE: website **1** **2.3 %**

1.2 From the EAAE: e-mail/NewsFlash **4** **9.3 %**

1.3 From the organizers: website **3** **7 %**

1.4 From the organizers: e-mail **18** **41.9 %**

1.5 From a direct communication from somebody who knew about the Seminar **16** **37.2 %**

1.6 By word of mouth **0** **0 %**

1.7 Other (please specify) **1** **2.3 %**

Other (please specify):


- Italian Association of Agricultural and Applied Economics

Comments (if any):


- Well organized

2. How easy was it to obtain information about the Seminar?


2.1 From the EAAE website



2.2 From the Seminar website



2.3 By e-mail to/from the Local Organising Committee




Comments (if any):


- There was no website

3. How important were the following factors in your decision to attend the Seminar?

3.1 Location




3.2 Theme of the Seminar




Not important at all	0	0 %
Not important	2	4.7 %
Neutral	2	4.7 %
Important	18	41.9 %
Very important	21	48.8 %

3.3 Having a paper accepted




Not important at all	2	4.7 %
Not important	2	4.7 %
Neutral	9	20.9 %
Important	15	34.9 %
Very important	15	34.9 %

3.4 Time of the Seminar



3.5 Cost of the Seminar (registration fees)




Comments (if any):


- Costs of the Seminar very high and not acceptable for many of my colleagues and the main reason why they did not want to participate on the Seminar.

4. What is your opinion about the following aspects of the Seminar website?


4.1 Quantity of information



4.2 Clarity of information




4.3 Registration procedure



Very poor	1	2.3 %
Poor	0	0 %
Fair	7	16.3 %
Good	15	34.9 %
Very good	20	46.5 %

4.4 Abstracts/papers upload procedure




Very poor	2	4.7 %
Poor	0	0 %
Fair	7	16.3 %
Good	18	41.9 %
Very good	16	37.2 %

Comments (if any):

- Proper answers are N/A, cause all information came directly from organizers
- There was no website
- Didn't use website


5. The description of the procedure for the selection of papers given in the Call for papers and on the website of the Seminar was?



Very poor	0	0 %
Poor	0	0 %
Fair	6	14 %
Good	24	55.8 %
Very good	13	30.2 %

Comments (if any):


6. In your opinion, how fair and transparent was the selection procedure for paper submissions?



Not fair and transparent at all	0	0 %
Not fair and transparent	2	4.7 %
Neutral	9	20.9 %
Fair and transparent	13	30.2 %
Very fair and transparent	16	37.2 %
N/A	3	7 %

Comments (if any):

7. Where you able to attend the Seminar for its entire length?




Yes **32** **74.4 %**

No **11** **25.6 %**

Comments (if any):

- Arrived just after the first plenary session
- I didn't attend only the last day

8. Your overall assessment of the scientific quality of the Seminar is:



Very poor **0** **0 %**

Poor **2** **4.7 %**


Fair **1** **2.3 %**

Good **16** **37.2 %**

Very good **24** **55.8 %**

Comments (if any):

9. The balance between plenary and contributed paper sessions was:



Very poor	0	0 %
Poor	1	2.3 %
Fair	2	4.7 %
Good	26	60.5 %
Very good	14	32.6 %


Comments (if any):

9.1 If you gave a “Very poor”, “poor” or “Fair” response, please, tell us about the imbalance:


- Two parallel sessions compared to three plenary ones
- No poster section
- Procedure

10. The quality of the different components of the Seminar was:


10.1 Plenary session 1 (Presentation by Swinnen & Brummer)



10.2 Plenary session 2 (Presentation by Lovre & Subic)




10.3 Plenary session 3




Very poor	1	2.3 %
Poor	0	0 %
Fair	5	11.6 %
Good	8	18.6 %
Very good	23	53.5 %
N/A	6	14 %

10.4 The contributed paper sessions you attended



Very poor	0	0 %
Poor	0	0 %
Fair	4	9.3 %
Good	14	32.6 %
Very good	24	55.8 %
N/A	1	2.3 %


10.5 The poster sessions you attended



Very poor	1	2.3 %
Poor	1	2.3 %
Fair	5	11.6 %
Good	10	23.3 %
Very good	10	23.3 %
N/A	16	37.2 %


Comments (if any):

11. Did you choose to stay in one of the Hotels suggested by the organizers?




Yes	11	25.6 %
No	32	74.4 %

11.1 The price/quality ratio of the Hotel where you stayed was:




Comments (if any):

12. The location of the venue of the Seminar (easy to reach? close to the Hotels?) was:



Comments (if any):


13. The venue of the Seminar (rooms and facilities) was:



Not functional at all	1	2.3 %
Slightly functional	1	2.3 %
Moderately functional	2	4.7 %
Very functional	24	55.8 %
Extremely functional	15	34.9 %

Comments (if any):

14. The coffee breaks and lunches provided at the Seminar venue (quality/quantity/logistical arrangements) was:




Very poor	0	0 %
Poor	2	4.7 %
Fair	5	11.6 %
Good	18	41.9 %
Very good	18	41.9 %

Comments (if any):

- The lunch of the second day was extremely poor

15. The social dinner was:




Very poor	0	0 %
Poor	0	0 %
Fair	2	4.7 %
Good	9	20.9 %
Very good	18	41.9 %
N/A	14	32.6 %

Comments (if any):

- No attend
- I did not attend

16. The services received vis a vis the registration fees you paid were:



Very poor	0	0 %
Poor	0	0 %
Fair	9	20.9 %
Good	19	44.2 %
Very good	15	34.9 %

Comments (if any):

- Didn't use this option

17. What did you like the most about the Seminar?

- Plenary session 1
- Location
- Nice venue, helpful organizers
- Plenary session
- Contributed papers
- The topic
- New knowledge in lectures
- Lectures were excellent, new insights
- Introduction lectures
- Quality of papers
- NETWORKING

- Organization
- Plenary part and sessions
- Possibility to exchange research experience
- People
- Good presentations and personal contacts with colleagues
- Lectures
- Lectures about the possibilities of application of new technologies in agriculture, such as GPS, information systems in agriculture ...
- Topic
- Organization
- Lunch
- Possibility to exchange information and knowledge with colleagues
- Topics of scientific papers


18. Is there anything you disliked about the Seminar?

- No
- No
- Too few contributed papers; too few international participants
- Too few participants, and consequently a too narrow geographical focus for an international seminar and too low scientific quality
- The "official" language was Serbian
- The lack of translation by Sessions
- Missing translations sessions
- TIMENING
- No
- The lunch given second day was insufficient and poor
- Business participant

19. Further comments or suggestions for future EAAE Seminars?

- No
- Please coordinate the seminar evaluation procedure better: It is now the third time I fill the questionnaire: on location, by email from the Serbian organisers and now on the EAAE website.
- It is good to include new Countries and local associations, but it is a process that needs to be guided.
- Expand topics
- Increase the number of participants and expand topics
- No
- End of year timing
- To choose towns with airports
- More foreign people
- I do not have any comment or suggestions.
- Continue with good experience
- The best
- Pay attention to the economic aspects as crucial in the development of agriculture

Number of daily responses



Total number of responses

43