

New Summary Report - 07 July 2016


1. Please rate the following aspects of the conference:

	Poor	Fair	Average	Very good	Excellent	Responses
Overall conference	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 7.9%	11 28.9%	24 63.2%	38
Usefulness of sessions/presentations	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	5 12.8%	17 43.6%	16 41.0%	39
Quality of speakers/presenters	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 10.3%	22 56.4%	13 33.3%	39
Facilities	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	6 15.4%	13 33.3%	19 48.7%	39
Materials	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	4 10.5%	33 86.8%	38
Registration process	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 5.4%	6 16.2%	29 78.4%	37
Food/beverage	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	1 2.6%	5 13.2%	31 81.6%	38
Keynote lecture (Rampley)	0 0.0%	1 3.2%	5 16.1%	12 38.7%	13 41.9%	31
Keynote lecture (Fuhrmeister)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 15.2%	9 27.3%	19 57.6%	33

2. Additional comments on any of the aspects above:

Count	Response
1	An enormous effort on the organisers's side, intelligent and tactfull. Thank you.
1	Can be continued, more discussion needed
1	Registration process: it would have been good to have the possibility to pay by credit card
1	Very good organisation
1	You should continue it
1	The moderation was unequal throughout sessions, ones are focused on being on time, other on quality of discussion despite being late.
1	Lunch and dinner were excellent but coffee breks with instant coffee from packing were very bad solution
1	It's a pity that colleagues from History Department from the same faculty did not know about the conference. Also, Museum of Contemporary Art Zagreb. You should send call for the conference to the different media and groups
1	The conference was very well organised, especially when considered the scale of the event. I also felt that there was a very relaxed, open atmosphere which the organisers helped to create

3. Please choose the number of the most appropriate response for you: The conference was:



Value	Percent	Count
Much worse than expected	0.0%	0
Somewhat worse than expected	2.6%	1
As expected	39.5%	15
Somewhat better than expected	31.6%	12
Much better than expected	26.3%	10
Total		38

4. What did you like most about the conference?

Count	Response
1	Diversity
1	Friendliness of the organisers, informality, ambition of the project, catering
1	International participants
1	Many different topics
1	Mostly I liked the session about art and politics in museum and institutional topics
1	Opportunity to meet new scholars
1	Organisation and the quality of speakers and presentations
1	Organisation was very good
1	Participants from the former Soviet bloc (regional character)
1	Presentations
1	The different topics presented
1	The diversity of the presentations
1	The nice atmosphere, good organisation
1	The professional way of organising the conference. The precise timetable.
1	The variety of scholars and disciplines; the academic curiosity
1	The variety of topics, good time keeping
1	To learn nice persons
1	Various topics, some of them really good
1	professional organisation, being on time, keeping the time, friendly atmosphere
1	The diversity of topics from multiple cultural backgrounds. This is very important to the development of a global art history which builds international networks and challenges the dominance of the Western canon.
1	The interdisciplinarity of the conference was valuable! Very valuable! There is always time to narrow down field of research. Great conference, great organisation. Thank you for organising this amazing events!
1	It was overall very well organised. + schnapps. The book of abstracts is especially nicely done. I heard lots of useful and interesting papers and it was good to meet so many colleagues.


5. What did you dislike about the conference?

Count	Response
1	Dull lectures, boring details
1	Lack of AC
1	Lack of AC, weak WiFi
1	Maybe the programme too charged
1	More time for discussions would have been needed.
1	Quality of papers, regional scope
1	Schedule! Same of similar topics on the same time in different sessions
1	Session rooms could have been a bit closer to each other
1	Some lectures were in the same time, what is obvious when it comes to so big conference
1	The Library room had some technical problems
1	The timetable for presentations. Hard to get from one room to the next
1	Too little interdisciplinarity
1	Too many panels at the same time, too little time for discussion
1	I believe that the facilities could have been better - more intimate spaces (as was A126) but also the air conditioning could have been better.
1	Nothing really - overall, I enjoyed it very much. Maybe there could have been a little more time for discussions.
1	I would have probably organised the 3 days not according to chronological order, as it seems to be. Maybe each day could have had 1 room for a different theme, so that all sessions about the same theme.
1	There were too much sessions at the same time, so sometimes it was not possible to hear all presentation, which I had interest about.

1. Please rate the following aspects of the conference:

	Poor	Fair	Average	Very good	Excellent	Responses
Overall conference	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 7.9%	11 28.9%	24 63.2%	38
Usefulness of sessions/presentations	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	5 12.8%	17 43.6%	16 41.0%	39
Quality of speakers/presenters	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 10.3%	22 56.4%	13 33.3%	39
Facilities	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	6 15.4%	13 33.3%	19 48.7%	39
Materials	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	4 10.5%	33 86.8%	38
Registration process	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 5.4%	6 16.2%	29 78.4%	37
Food/beverage	0 0.0%	1 2.6%	1 2.6%	5 13.2%	31 81.6%	38
Keynote lecture (Rampley)	0 0.0%	1 3.2%	5 16.1%	12 38.7%	13 41.9%	31
Keynote lecture (Fuhrmeister)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 15.2%	9 27.3%	19 57.6%	33

3. Please choose the number of the most appropriate response for you: The conference was:



Value	Percent	Count
Much worse than expected	0.0%	0
Somewhat worse than expected	2.6%	1
As expected	39.5%	15
Somewhat better than expected	31.6%	12
Much better than expected	26.3%	10
Total		38

Value

Percent

Count

Total

