

# Symposium Evaluation Form

This form allows you to provide feedback on various aspects of the **First International Symposium on Analytical methods in Philately** as well as suggestions for the future. You may complete all or part. Responses are completely anonymous. Each criterion may be scored 1-5. The list below describes the general weights. Thank you for your participation.

- 1 – Terrible
- 2 – Could be greatly improved
- 3 – Adequate
- 4 – Very good
- 5 – Excellent

## THE MEETING ORGANIZATION AND FACILITY

You found the **Symposium** organization: \_\_4.7

You found the meeting facility: \_\_3.8

***It was unfortunate that the larger NPM meeting room was being used by the Gross Gallery construction team. There was no question that the seating was cramped.***

The quality of audio/video equipment was: \_\_3.6

***This is actually a better rating than might be expected. There is no question that we should have had a microphone for the speaker, and, if possible, the questioners.***

The catering was: \_\_4.4

## THE PROGRAM

The selection of presentation topics was: \_\_4.7

The technical level of the presentations was: \_\_4.4

The number and length of breaks was: \_\_4.1

The adherence to the program schedule was: \_\_4.6

The usefulness of brainstorming session was: \_\_4.2

The Panel discussions were: \_\_3.9

***There should have been a little more formal organization of the panels.***

The Wednesday workshop was: \_\_4.9

***The usefulness and importance of the workshop was self-evident. There was a tremendous amount of enthusiasm. We were fortunate to have manufacturer's reps helping.***

Opportunities to meet with fellow attendees were: \_\_4.5

Would you like an opening or closing banquet (Y or N)? \_\_N (84%)

***Most thought that the Sunday dinner at the pub was a good idea (we had 37 attendees!), but a more formal banquet setting was not a plus.***

#### **THE SPONSORED HOTEL (If you stayed at the Kellogg Conference Center Hotel)**

How did you find the rooms? \_\_4.1

How was the breakfast? \_\_4.1

Would you stay at this hotel again (Y or N)? \_\_Y (82%)

***There were comments about the logistical inconvenience of the hotel as well as the neighborhood. This was made clumsier by the need to use multiple shuttles to get to the NPM. The problem is that hotels close to the NPM (for example, the Phoenix and George) are significantly more expensive.***

#### **INTO THE FUTURE**

Would you plan to attend a ***Second International Symposium*** (Y or N)? \_\_Y (100%)

Would you recommend attending a future ***Symposium*** to your colleagues(Y or N)? \_\_ Y (100%)

Do you think you would personally use any of the technology presented (Y or N)? \_\_ Y (100%)

Do you think others you know might use any of the technology presented (Y or N)? \_\_ Y (100%)

Could you please give the three geographical locations you would prefer for a ***Symposium*** (e.g. Washington, NY, London, etc.):

***While there was some support for other venues, the overwhelming vote was for the NPM because of the ability to have the hands-on workshops***

---

How often do you think the International ***Symposium*** should be held (2, 3 or 4 years)? \_\_2 (70%)

***This was again the overwhelming choice. This is probably optimum for having quality research papers.***

What time of year do you think the ***Symposium*** should be held? \_\_\_\_\_

***Most liked the November time frame or other off-season times.***

Do you have any other comments or suggestions?

Some of the many interesting comments relative to the actual Symposium included:

Perhaps attendees can form groups and suggest possible research projects

Can we get some younger philatelists to attend the next Symposium?

Should we start at 9:00 AM rather than 8:00 AM?

Encourage this Symposium's attendees to be presenters at the next Symposium.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---