

## Post-workshop survey results

Following the 6<sup>th</sup> Biennial NOAA Fisheries Economics & Social Science Workshop in San Francisco, CA, a survey was sent to participants to elicit comments about the workshop, as well as suggestions for future workshops. 49 of 66 workshop participants responded. Results are summarized below.

### Workshop agenda

#### Presentation and discussion length (48 of 49 respondents)

56% of respondents felt the scheduled presentation length (~15 minutes) was “just right.” However, 59% felt that the scheduled discussion length (~5 minutes) was “too short.” Throughout the survey, many respondents commented on the need for longer discussions.

In general, did you find the time allowance for each presentation:				
	Too long	Too short	Just right	No preference
Presentation length	19% (9)	15% (7)	<b>56% (27)</b>	10% (5)
Discussion length	7% (3)	<b>59% (27)</b>	35% (16)	0% (0)

#### Session preference (48 of 49 respondents)

52% of respondents would have preferred concurrent sessions versus 31% who preferred sequential sessions. However, based on the open-ended comments, the vast majority preferred a mix of the two; possibly joint, plenary sessions in the morning, with more specialized, technical, concurrent sessions in the afternoon. Learning or teaching sessions were also suggested.

One of the goals for this year's workshop was to avoid concurrent sessions so that everyone had the opportunity to attend every presentation. However, doing so decreased individual presentation length and limited the overall number and variety of presentations. Which of the following options do you prefer:			
	Sequential sessions, shorter presentations and discussions	Concurrent sessions, longer presentations and discussions	No preference
Session preference	31% (15)	<b>52% (25)</b>	17% (8)

Presentation/discussion balance (48 of 49 respondents)

Based on response averages (lower score = greater preference), paper presentations accompanied by a panel discussion and an “open discussion format” were the preferred formats for presenting and sharing information. Paper presentations, invited speakers, and keynote speakers were slightly less preferable.

Please rank your preference for the following: (1 = preferred; 5 = least preferred)						
	1	2	3	4	5	Response Average
Paper presentations (e.g., best papers)	21% (10)	13% (6)	<b>36% (17)</b>	19% (9)	11% (5)	<b>2.85</b>
Paper presentations + panel discussion (e.g., DAPs panel)	29% (14)	<b>38% (18)</b>	15% (7)	10% (5)	8% (4)	<b>2.31</b>
Invited speakers (part of a session)	10% (5)	25% (12)	<b>27% (13)</b>	19% (9)	19% (9)	<b>3.10</b>
Keynote speakers (independent of a session)	8% (4)	19% (9)	19% (9)	25% (12)	<b>29% (14)</b>	<b>3.48</b>
Open discussion format	30% (14)	<b>33% (15)</b>	15% (7)	7% (3)	15% (7)	<b>2.43</b>

**Open-ended comments – agenda** (33 of 49 respondents)

Overall comments/impressions

- Overall, the vast majority of comments referred to the lack of sufficient time for discussion. More discussion time should be a priority for the next workshop. It was also suggested that discussions be more focused and structured.
- Some respondents suggested having no presentations at all and focusing the entire workshop on structured discussions and learning sessions.
- One respondent felt that the meeting was “too busy and too grueling” overall.
- Another asked that all sessions on the last day end at 2pm “so we can see and do a few things in the city where the meeting is,” and start each of the first 2 days an hour earlier to make this happen.
- One respondent felt that having non-NOAA people at the meeting was inappropriate.
- Several of the respondents had positive overall comments about the workshop itself, stating it was useful to meet everyone and share disciplinary approaches.
- One respondent commented that “[w]e should have some more issue discussions prior to the meetings, so that we use the list to pose challenges that we face and have the workshops be an opportunity to really further discussions rather than begin them” at the workshop.

Paper presentations

- Several respondents commented that they liked the paper presentations in general; it was interesting to hear what other people do.
- One respondent suggested having problem-solving or agenda-setting structured discussions rather than paper presentations.
- Posters: A couple of respondents suggested having posters at future workshops.
  - One respondent suggested requiring all participants to design a poster on what they are working on to increase participation from the group and to help facilitate more “dynamic discussions” during scheduled poster sessions or throughout the day.

- Another respondent suggested requiring the presenters to design a poster that would be read by participants prior to their talk. Talks would then be limited to 5 minutes of key points followed by a lengthier discussion.
- Brown bags: Many respondents commented that talks previously given as brown bags or at other forums should either: 1) not be repeated at the workshop, or 2) be grouped into one session so that those who have already heard them can choose a different session to go to.
- Technical/specialized presentations:
  - Several respondents mentioned that too much jargon was used, particularly by the modelers. This made their presentations less accessible to non-modelers.
  - Many respondents suggested grouping the more technical, specialized talks into separate sessions to allow presenters to skip the preliminaries and get to the “nitty-gritty” discussions and “novel approaches.”

#### Panel discussions

- More discussion time for panels was needed. One respondent suggested at least 30-45 minutes should be set aside for discussion.
- Some comments referred to the structure of talks on the panels. One suggested that they be more focused on one specific topic across presentations to help initiate discussion.
- Some of the comments specifically mentioned the DAPs and bioeconomics panels. These comments ranged from the very positive, “[t]he DAP and ecosystem discussions were easily the best,” to the somewhat negative, “... have [panels] professionally facilitated.”

#### Time schedule

- Several respondents commented that better time keeping was crucial. It was rude to the attendees that day 2 ran so late.
- One respondent suggested building a “buffer zone” into the schedule to allow for overtime.
- Another respondent requested that if the agenda changes, please announce these changes at the beginning of the AM and PM sessions.
- Some respondents commented that presenters should be able to self-regulate themselves and organize their presentations better.

#### Agenda organization

- Sequential sessions: Several respondents had positive comments about the overall agenda organization with at least one person stating their preference for joint sessions because they provided an opportunity to hear the non-economic talks. However, shorter talks and a lot more discussion would have been preferred overall.
- Mixed format/“New Orleans model”: The majority of respondents commented that a mix of joint and concurrent sessions would be preferable, similar to the 2006 workshop in New Orleans. Concurrent sessions allow for greater diversity of topics; this is possible if more people volunteer to present their work.
  - One respondent suggested that presenters self-categorize their presentations as “general” or “non-general” to assist the workshop organizer.
  - One respondent commented that having the informal protected species roundtable “shunted to an awkward lunchtime setting just didn’t work” and would like to see concurrent sessions to remedy such scheduling in the future.

- Suggested formats: Many respondents suggested agenda formats.
  - 1/2 day of joint, general interest sessions; 1/2 day of concurrent, more specialized, technical sessions.
  - A mid-day interactive session between paper sessions.
  - A mix of papers in the AM when attention is best; more open discussion sessions in the PM.

#### More thematic focus

- Though several respondents liked the variety of workshop topics and presentations, others commented that the agenda was too open and should have been focused on pre-determined themes. Rather than basing the agenda solely on voluntary presentations which are then grouped into sessions, more “arm-twisting” from HQ was suggested to encourage more people to present.
- Suggested themes:
  - By science center/region: Many respondents suggested having sessions organized by science center/region to discuss the main issues in each region and how they are being addressed via research and management.
  - Issue/focus area: Many suggested having pre-determined themes rather than grouping presentations into sessions. Themes included:
    - rights-based management,
    - economic and sociocultural aspects of ecosystem approaches to management,
    - alternative valuation systems for protected species,
    - updates on research and management,
    - papers on research and management,
    - research related to case studies of fisheries economics and management, and
    - protected and endangered species.
  - Economics vs. anthropology/sociology: Several respondents suggested having a session or structured discussion on how economists and anthropologists/sociologists have “somewhat different objectives and ways of looking at things.” One respondent commented that there was a perceived “econ/social science tension” throughout the meeting that should have been discussed openly.

#### Teaching sessions:

- Several respondents suggested having “teaching sessions” focused on certain topics or updates on recent advances. One respondent commented that though a teaching session “is as bad as going back to school,” such a session would keep participants informed and knowledgeable about an area they do not normally work in. This respondent mentioned that the American Agricultural Economics Association (AAEA) does this. Suggested topics included:
  - recent advances in bioeconomic models,
  - input-output models,
  - regional economic analysis,
  - non-market valuation,
  - risk analysis,
  - MPAs,
  - cost-benefit analysis, and
  - recent advances in property rights.

## Food and beverage

### Overall comments (48 of 49 respondents)

80% of respondents' dietary needs were met. Most felt the variety and quantity of both food and drink was sufficient.

Please indicate whether your food and beverage needs were met in relation to the following:			
	Yes	No	No preference
Variety of food items	<b>89% (41)</b>	9% (4)	2% (1)
Variety of drink items	<b>85% (39)</b>	13% (6)	2% (1)
Quantity of food items	<b>91% (41)</b>	7% (3)	2% (1)
Quantity of drink items	<b>80% (37)</b>	17% (8)	2% (1)
Overall dietary needs	<b>80% (36)</b>	11% (5)	9% (4)

### Morning breaks (49 of 49 respondents)

Of the options available at the workshop, bagels were favored by most people and coffee cake was the least favorite. One-third of respondents liked having yogurt available. Muffins and breads received neutral ratings from 1/3 to 1/2 of respondents. My interpretation: muffins and breads are not necessarily favorites but will be eaten if available.

MORNING breaks. To help us plan for your menu preferences, please rank the following items: (1 = favorite; 5 = least favorite)						
	1	2	3	4	5	Response Total
Bagels	<b>43% (20)</b>	23% (11)	11% (5)	13% (6)	11% (5)	<b>47</b>
Muffins	20% (9)	<b>23% (10)</b>	<b>23% (10)</b>	20% (9)	14% (6)	<b>44</b>
Breads	2% (1)	14% (6)	<b>36% (16)</b>	23% (10)	25% (11)	<b>44</b>
Coffee cake	12% (5)	19% (8)	12% (5)	26% (11)	<b>31% (13)</b>	<b>42</b>
Yogurt	<b>30% (14)</b>	19% (9)	17% (8)	17% (8)	17% (8)	<b>47</b>

Afternoon breaks (48 of 49 respondents)

Of the options available at the workshop, fruit was the most popular and assorted brownies were the least favorite. Cookies were a little more popular than granola bars but both were still second to fruit. This is a healthy group!

AFTERNOON breaks. To help us plan for your menu preferences, please rank the following items: (1 = favorite; 4 = least favorite)					
	1	2	3	4	Response Total
Fruit	<b>63% (30)</b>	10% (5)	15% (7)	12% (6)	<b>48</b>
Granola bars	11% (5)	<b>33% (15)</b>	26% (12)	30% (14)	<b>46</b>
Cookies	15% (7)	<b>43% (20)</b>	32% (15)	11% (5)	<b>47</b>
Assorted brownies	22% (10)	15% (7)	24% (11)	<b>39% (18)</b>	<b>46</b>

**Open-ended comments – food and drink** (15 of 49 respondents)

Healthier items:

- A couple of respondents asked for healthier items in general. Many respondents specifically asked for fruit in the AM, and a few respondents asked for orange and other juices in the AM. Food and beverage options are limited by the hotel menu and our budget.

Other suggestions:

- One respondent asked for bottles of water. These were available in the PM.
- One respondent asked for cheesy poofs (like cheetos).
- One respondent commented that the food options were “too generous.”

**Workshop location, venue, etc.** (49 of 49 respondents)

Overall, San Francisco was a popular workshop location for respondents. Respondents were a little less enthusiastic about the Hilton's guest rooms, conference spaces, and services.

Please rate your overall satisfaction with the following:					
	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied
Workshop location, San Francisco	<b>73% (36)</b>	18% (9)	6% (3)	0% (0)	2% (1)
Workshop venue/services, the Hilton	<b>46% (22)</b>	40% (19)	10% (5)	4% (2)	0% (0)
Room accommodations	<b>53% (26)</b>	29% (14)	12% (6)	6% (3)	0% (0)
Conference spaces	<b>47% (23)</b>	45% (22)	6% (3)	0% (0)	2% (1)

## **Other workshop comments/suggestions** (25 of 49 respondents)

Though many of the open-ended comments entered in this section of the survey were included in sections above, some are listed below.

### Location and venue

- Though several respondents commented that the location was a fun, central location, a few respondents would have preferred a cheaper, smaller venue and one respondent would have preferred to be closer to the water and wharf. Since we chose to overlap our workshop with the National Stock Assessment Workshop (NSAW) and they had already committed to a location and venue, we simply piggy-backed.
- Some of the respondents had guest room and billing issues with the Hilton. Formal comments were sent to the Hilton to let them know.
- One respondent commented that the conference room temperature was too cold.
- One respondent wanted at least one year advance notice for the next workshop.
- A couple of respondents suggested future workshop locations. Both suggested Las Vegas, NV. Other locations included: Charleston, SC; Rocky Point, MD (NOAA Center); Miami, FL; San Diego, CA; and New Orleans, LA. The goal is to rotate workshop location by region. Past workshop locations: Woods Hole, MA (1995 and 1997); La Jolla, CA (2000); Silver Spring, MD (2002); and New Orleans, LA (2004).

### Overlapping with the National Stock Assessment Workshop (NSAW)

- At least two people were very supportive of scheduling future workshops concurrent with the NSAW and saw this year's attempt at overlapping with them a good first step in getting fisheries biologists and social scientists to interact. However, there should be more opportunities to interact during the workshop.

### Informal networking/socializing

- Several respondents wanted more opportunities to socialize, network, and continue discussions in an informal setting with both our group and with the NSAW. Outside activities and field trips were mentioned, as was possibly having a cocktail hour at a local restaurant. Overall, more informal opportunities to socialize and network are preferable.

### Participant accountability

- One respondent specifically asked for some accountability for workshop participants who do not show up for sessions. There was also some informal talk of this at the workshop.

### Equipment

- A couple of respondents suggested providing nametags to facilitate meeting more people and matching familiar names to faces. This was also mentioned during the workshop and post-workshop.
- One respondent suggested having a "wireless USB remote presenter with a 50+ foot range."