**Feedback analysis of the Training School in Novi Sad (July, 2023)**

**Analysis provided by Dr. Radenko Matic**, Sport Management/Faculty of Sport and Physical Education, Uniersity of Novi Sad

**Table 1.** Were the presented topics in general understandable? (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Good | 8 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 36.4 |
| Very good | 14 | 63.6 | 63.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Note: 1 (poor), 2 (reasonable), 3 (good), 4 (very good)

**Table 2.** How do you evaluate the content of the keynote presentations from a professional point of view in general? (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Reasonable | 1 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Good | 7 | 31.8 | 31.8 | 36.4 |
| Very good | 14 | 63.6 | 63.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Note: 1 (poor), 2 (reasonable), 3 (good), 4 (very good)

**Table 3.** To what extent do the presented keynote presentations of multidisciplinary innovation for social change give you new knowledge? (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Reasonable | 3 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 13.6 |
| Good | 6 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 40.9 |
| Very good | 13 | 59.1 | 59.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Note: 1 (poor), 2 (reasonable), 3 (good), 4 (very good)

**Table 4.** To what extent do you think the presented keynote presentations on multidisciplinary innovation for social change may be useful in your future work? (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Reasonable | 3 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 13.6 |
| Good | 4 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 31.8 |
| Very good | 15 | 68.2 | 68.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Note: 1 (poor), 2 (reasonable), 3 (good), 4 (very good)

**Table 5.** How easily do you think the keynote presentations (based on the presented content) of on multidisciplinary innovation for social change can be used? (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Reasonable | 1 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Good | 6 | 27.3 | 27.3 | 31.8 |
| Very good | 15 | 68.2 | 68.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Note: 1 (poor), 2 (reasonable), 3 (good), 4 (very good)

**Table 6.** Please evaluate the design and structure of the 2nd SHIINE COST Training School Novi Sad 2023? (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Reasonable | 1 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Good | 5 | 22.7 | 22.7 | 27.3 |
| Very good | 16 | 72.7 | 72.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Note: 1 (poor), 2 (reasonable), 3 (good), 4 (very good)

**Table 7.** Comparative analysis of characteristics of presented materials (all questions in %)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Characteristics | 1  Poor | 2  Reasonable | 3  Good | 4  Very good | Total  (%) |
| Question 1 | Understandable | 0 | 0 | 36.4 | 63.6 | 100 |
| Question 2 | Content (professional view) | 0 | 4.5 | 31.8 | 63.6 | 100 |
| Question 3 | New knowledge | 0 | 13.6 | 27.3 | 59.1 | 100 |
| Question 4 | Useful in future work | 0 | 13.6 | 18.2 | 68.2 | 100 |
| Question 5 | Easy for using | 0 | 4.5 | 27.3 | 68.2 | 100 |
| Question 6 | Design and structure | 0 | 4.5 | 22.7 | 72.7 | 100 |

**Graph 1.** Comparative analysis of characteristics of keynote speaker’s presentations and design and structure of training schools (%)

Participants at the 2nd SHIINE COST Training School with the highest mark (4 – very good) evaluated these characteristics (Table 7, Graph 1): understandable (63.6%), content (professional view) – 63,6%, new knowledge – 59.1%, and as useful in future work and Easy for using (68.2). The design and structure of 2nd SHIINE COST Training School Novi Sad 2023 was excellent regarding that 72.7% of participants evaluated this characteristic with the highest mark 4.

Further analysis included dividing all data into two categories: 1) reasonable (responses 1 and 2) good and very good category (responses 3 and 4). These results showed us to what extent participants are satisfied with all measured characteristics.

**Table 8.** Comparative analysis of characteristics of keynote speaker’s presentations and design and structure of training schools (adapted results) (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Characteristics | 2  Reasonable | Responses 3 and 4  Good + Very good | Total  (%) |
| Question 1 | Understandable | 0 | 100 | 100 |
| Question 2 | Content (professional view) | 4.5 | 95.4 | 100 |
| Question 3 | New knowledge | 13.6 | 86.4 | 100 |
| Question 4 | Useful in future work | 13.6 | 86.4 | 100 |
| Question 5 | Easy for using | 4.5 | 95.5 | 100 |
| Question 6 | Design and structure | 4.5 | 95.5 | 100 |

**Graph 2.** Comparative analysis of characteristics of keynote speaker’s presentations and design and structure of training school (adapted results)

If we sum responses 3 (good) and 4 (very good) we got results (Table 8, Graph 2) that all measured characteristics are on a high level. In general, more than 85 % of all participants are satisfied and agreed with all measured characteristics.

All participants agreed that the keynote speaker’s presentations were understandable (100 %). Furthermore, most of the participants see these keynote speakers’ presentations as very easy to use (95,5%), professional content (95,4%), and well-designed and well-structured (95.5%). Lastly, every 8 or 9 of 10 participants consider that these keynote speakers’ presentations contribute to new knowledge and be useful in future work.

In this statistical report based on Means (Table 9), we can conclude, based on participant’s attitudes about the keynote speaker’s presentations, that they evaluated them as understandable (3,64/4,00), ideas easy to use (3,64/4,00). Also, the design and structure of the 2nd SHIINE COST training school was created and realized in well-design manner (3,68/4,00).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 9.** Descriptive statistics of measured characteristics (Mean. Median. and Standard Deviation) | | | | | | | |
|  | | Understandable | Content (professional view) | New knowledge | Useful in future work | Easy for using | Design and structure |
| N | Valid | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 212 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | | **3.64** | **3.59** | **3.45** | **3.55** | **3.64** | **3.68** |
| Median | | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| Std. Deviation | | 0.49 | 0.59 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.58 | 0.57 |

Finally, we can conclude that the quality of the 2nd SHIINE COST Training School Novi Sad 2023 satisfied the intentions of COST members organizers, and all participants overall.

**List of interesting comments:**

To summarize the most relevant and interesting comments, we focused on three main aspects. Firstly, improvements of the social innovation hackathon. Their answers expressed longer time needed for working in the hackathon: ”Better time management”, ”Better planning”, ”More time and spaced”, ”Longer time”, „May be it should be longer and in bigger teams”, ”More time to work on ideas”,” Having more time for projects”, ”To start the hackathon in the first day”, ”If it lasts longer, it would be more beneficial”.

The participants also put a relevant emphasis on some possibilities they had: ”Learn how to work in bigger teams”, ”How to become a social innovator”, ”Creating the prototype. Generating new ideas”, ”Practical examples of social innovations”, ”Presentation from keynote more focused on practicalities and tools for the hackathon”, ”Improvement of healthy life habits”, ”Practical application of ideas”, ”Presentation about creative thinking”, ”Switch from dystopia to utopia”.

Small but important details had a special role: ”Good energy”, ”A lot of inspiration”, ”Vegan milk for coffees”.

The second aspect is dedicated to the keynote presentations. They sounded very sincere: ”It was very good for me to see other perspectives”, ”Very good interaction, very interesting hackathon”, ”Creative thinking and developing local social innovation labs”, ”Sharing ideas and meeting new people”, ”A huge support from local organizers”, ”The presentations of hackathon projects”, ”Knowledge and mentoring. Exchange”, ”New knowledge learning from so many creative people”, ”Working in a multicultural team”, ”Creative thinking and Innovator toolbox”, ”Opportunity to work with professionals from different fields”, ”I would like to see more practical tools for working in group”, ”Opportunity to slow down, meet others, talk and get to know each other’s and different perspective”.

The third aspects are related to the advice for future hackathons. The participants suggest: ”To organize more training schools”, ”Ideas for different faculties”, ”Go out in the community”, ”It should be longer with more keynote presentations”, ”Trainings, volunteering, changing the educational system”, ”To invite more people from business and students from high schools in order to prepare them and to sensibilize them for the importance of social innovation”, ”I think that in the future the next hackathon should focus on problems with soil, agriculture, healthy food, problems with water, pesticides. We need social innovation in this area”, ”More interactive learning presentation”.