



## Imprint

Association ICCHP  
Altenbergerstr. 69  
4040 Linz  
Austria

<http://www.icchp.org>  
[icchp@jku.at](mailto:icchp@jku.at)

Photos/ Pictures: Association ICCHP, [www.sxc.hu](http://www.sxc.hu) and  
Radek Pavlicek, Teiresias, Masaryk University Brno, Czech Republic

## Content

Abstract.....	5
Introduction .....	7
Description of Approach .....	7
The questionnaire .....	8
The Panel .....	8
First Results.....	8
Evaluation Results.....	10
Results by Categories.....	10
First timers, Enjoyment and Recommendations.....	10
Dissemination and Getting to Know ICCHP .....	10
Rating Diverse Dimensions of ICCHP .....	11
Additional Remarks and Feedback 2014.....	13
Comparison of ICCHP 2014 to former editions of ICCHP.....	13
Information about ICCHP .....	13
Enjoying ICCHP .....	13
Recommending ICCHP .....	13
Timeline: Rating Diverse Dimensions of ICCHP .....	14
Appendix A.....	15
Questionnaire .....	15
Evaluation of ICCHP 2014 .....	15
Appendix B.....	16
Tables and Pictures.....	16
Pictures.....	16
Tables.....	16



## Abstract

Every event since 2008, ICCHP undergoes an evaluation procedure to check the goal attainment in terms of organization, relevance of topics and other important categories that might be of influence for the enjoyment of our visitors and participants.

In 2014, 33 persons took part and gave their feedback.

In 2014, ICCHP was held within the premises of Université Paris 8 – Vincennes St. Denis in France.

Besides 2014 results, this evaluation report will also have a look on former ICCHP evaluations and present how the evaluation results changed over 4 ICCHP editions.

"Thank you" to all the people that took the opportunity and gave us their remarks and feedback!

ICCHP Organizing Team



figure 1: ICCHP flag on Building D, the conference venue

	Mon, July 7	Tue, July 8	Wed, July 9	Thu, July 10	Fri, July 11		
8:00							
8:30							
9:00	<b>Preconference</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops</li> <li>Seminars</li> <li>Tutorials</li> <li>Meetings</li> <li>YRC</li> <li>SS12 Coding Competition</li> <li>ICCHP Summer University</li> </ul>	<b>Preconference</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops</li> <li>Seminars</li> <li>Tutorials</li> <li>Meetings</li> <li>YRC SS12 Coding Competition</li> <li>ICCHP Summer University</li> </ul>	<b>ICCHP &amp; Media4D</b> Joint Opening Session and Keynote 9:00 - 10:30 	<b>Session D</b> Start: 8:30	<b>Session G</b> Start: 8:00		
9:30							
10:00							
10:30							
11:00					<b>Session A</b> Start: 11:00	<b>Plenary Session</b> Keynote 11:00 - 12:30 	<b>Session H</b> Start: 10:30
11:30							
12:00							
12:30							
13:00							
13:30							
14:00			<b>Session B</b> Start: 14:00	<b>Session E</b> Start: 13:30	<b>Plenary Session</b> Keynote and Panel Discussion Start: 13:30 		
14:30							
15:00							
15:30							
16:00							
16:30			<b>Session C</b> Start: 16:30	<b>Session F</b> Start: 16:00	<b>Farewell Party</b> Start: 15:30 Open to all ICCHP participants		
17:00							
17:30							
18:00							
18:30			<b>Social Dinner</b> "Come as You Are and Get Involved" Apéro: 18:30 Dinner: 19:00 				
19:00							
19:30		<b>Welcome Cocktail</b> Start: 19:00 Open to all ICCHP participants					
20:00							
20:30							
21:00							
...							

figure 2: ICCHP 2014 Schedule and Timetable

## Introduction

### Description of Approach

This document was compiled from a survey carried out with an online questionnaire handed to all participants at ICCHP 2014 taking place from July 9 – 11 (Pre-conference July 7 – 8) 2014 at Université Paris 8 – Vincennes St. Denis.

The online questionnaire was reachable over QR code as well as via website link and available for all registered participants on site. There were also paper versions to be filled in and handed to ICCHP staff at Registration and / or Info Desk.

Again, participants were asked to provide contact details in order to get the evaluation results if wanted.

The questionnaires were made anonymous and the data collected was stored securely and only to serve as source of answers. The provided eMail addresses were used to send the report with results where requested.

A contact address for questions and feedback concerning the questionnaire was given and the questionnaire was tested for accessibility.



figure 3: The audience is listening.

## The questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) was structured into 4 major parts:

General information (questions like: „Is this your first time here at ICCHP?“ or „How did you find out about ICCHP?“), questions on more specific information concerning ICCHP 2014 like „Did you enjoy the conference?“ or „Would you recommend ICCHP to colleagues / fellows?“, a part on rating this year's performance on a 5 items scale from „Excellent“ to „Very poor“ with a possibility to sort out answers that were not applicable („N/A“) consisting of 21 rather detailed categories and a free text possibility for additional comments and remarks that can be found in original throughout this report marked as "citation".

## The Panel

The panel consisted – as written above – from all participants on site taking part in ICCHP 2014. ICCHP 2014 enjoyed welcoming 376 registered guests from all over the world taking part. 33 of them took the time to fill in the questionnaire and giving/sending it back, what means a ratio of 8.78 %, what has to be considered in interpreting any result.

## First Results

17 people that answered our questionnaire attended ICCHP for the first time.

14 persons attended ICCHP already during the last years and 2 persons refrained from answering.

27 persons enjoyed the conference, 26 would recommend it to friends and (research) fellows, 3 disliked being at ICCHP 2014, two of them would not recommend ICCHP to their contacts.

The three persons that disliked being at ICCHP 2014 rated categories like "Relevance of Conference", "Presentation Facilities", the Specific Needs Support and e.g. "Coffee Breaks" quite good (even excellent), but were critical concerning the reviewers' feedback, the provided internet connection (that "asked for re-login with http every time") or the food provided for lunches that "

One person – identifying him/herself as "developer" - specified that he/she would not recommend ICCHP to other developers as it "is very theoretical" and stated the "whole conference to be very well organized but with a lack of personality. Web development conferences are distinctly different. I can only recommend to visit one of the great events like BeyondTellerrand (Düsseldorf/Berlin) or Fronteers (Amsterdam)."

This person also gave some hints: "Improvements can be made on the background if there are no slides present, for example at the keynote session. A simple prepared backdrop in Powerpoint could have covered the mess of that windows desktop. Prepend and append that backdrop to the slides of the keynote speaker, and there is a smooth transition between the sections." He / she revealed furthermore to be "personally not a fan of the multi-track format, and having different topics starting arbitrarily in those tracks made it worse" and also "don't think that a price of 600€ is something web developers (who are not the target group) would usually pay. Also I would have done great without another rucksack to carry around."

Obviously the location, the venue (especially the room facilities) were of high interest for our participants 2014 as most of the textual feedback dealt with it.

Just to mention some of them:

"quite disappointing", "tired but with good layout", "not good. Especially, the toilets are mostly broken and dirty. That was far from accessibility!" or even "Very disappointed by the venue - not appropriate for a 21st century conference. Dirty toilets, flashing fluorescent lights in most lecture halls, poor lighting making screen barely visible etc.". Other remarks concerning the venue comprised: "I think that location was not well-chosen, but the conference in general was very good", or "I know the organization team did their best but who decided to run ICCHP at this location? Located far away from the center in an almost dangerous region, dirty and scruffy. I haven't seen any advantage to the locations of the past ICCHPs" and "Please do not again host this great conference in such a venue again. Though the basilique was definitely a highlight, St. Denis itself and especially the university site is not an appropriate location for ICCHP" - but some guests even felt at risk: "was in a surprisingly shady neighborhood. Honestly, I was a bit shocked when exiting the metro for the first time... A lot of trip guides suggest to avoiding the North and North-East of Paris. I have to admit that I didn't feel save around that area of St. Denis."

The "location issue" was of high importance for our guests and participants as in general, free text input within "remarks" and "feedback" sessions reveal concerns of (highly) unhappy participants or are used to thank the organization team for their efforts so this seems to be a focal point for future decisions on possible ICCHP venues as also oral, not standardized feedback during the conference showed concern about the venue and the surrounding.



figure 4: Networking at ICCHP 2014

## Evaluation Results

The questionnaire consisted of the following main parts (see Appendix A for the whole, original design):

- Participants background and enjoyment (to tick)
  - First time at ICCHP?
  - How did you get to know about ICCHP?
- Rating of diverse dimensions of ICCHP (to rate – 5 item scale with n/a possibility)
- Rating of enjoyment / satisfaction (to tick with combined open text input for extreme categories)
  - Did you enjoy the conference?
  - Would you recommend ICCHP to colleagues / fellows?
- Additional Remarks, feedback and comments (open, free text)

## Results by Categories

### First timers, Enjoyment and Recommendations

As stated above, 17 of 33 people that gave their feedback attended ICCHP for the first time. Amongst them were 15 that enjoyed being at ICCHP 2014, one person that did not enjoy his/her stay and one person that did not answer the question on enjoyment. The vast majority of "first timers" (11) that answered also the question on recommending ICCHP to friends and fellows enjoyed the conference and would recommend it, 1 person did not enjoy it, but would recommend it and 2 persons would not recommend it, but enjoyed it.

For the "returners", there were 12 people who enjoyed ICCHP 2014 and would recommend it and 2 persons that did not enjoy it but would recommend it.

### Dissemination and Getting to Know ICCHP

Concerning the dissemination and PR for ICCHP, the following possibilities were asked (and answered), multiple checking was possible as it might be that more than one channel was used to reach our prospective participants:

- ICCHP-Call (checked by 13 participants, including 3 first timers)
- (First) Announcement (6 participants, 2 first timers)
- Project Partner(s) (8 participants, 7 first timers!)
- Friend(s), fellow(s) (8 participants, 7 first timers!)
- on the internet (8 participants, 5 first timers)
- Other(s) (6 participants, 2 first timers)

Concerning the "other means of transport" for ICCHP news were listed:

- "Fixed item on our agenda" (two participants)
- Single nominations for:
  - "Springer publications", "IKT-Forum 2013", "Academic Mailing list" and "SS12 organizer".

Obviously, ICCHP is – at least concerning the people answering our questionnaire – a "word of mouth" event, especially for new people.

### Rating Diverse Dimensions of ICCHP

The core of the survey dealt with the diverse dimensions of ICCHP, from venue over feedback from reviewers till the quality and variety of lunches provided are part of this closer look.

Seen from feedback (see table 1 below), the "Staff on site" was rated best, followed by the "Relevance of the Conference an itsTtopics" and the "Timeframe for Submissions" and the "Organization on site".

At the end of this list the items: "Lecture Halls", "Location and Surrounding" as well as "Other Room Facilities" what underpins the results presented above (section "First Results") that our participants rated this year's venue quite critical.

**Table 1: Ranking and satisfaction of our guests at ICCHP 2014 that answered the questionnaire where 1 means "excellent" and 5 means "very poor"**

**N = 33, "missing" values and "not applicable" were neither counted nor computed here.**

Rank	Item / Category	Satisfaction					Statistics		
		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Median	Mode
1	Staff on Site	14	13	1	0	0	1,54	2	1
2	Relevance of Topics, Conference	14	12	4	0	0	1,67	2	1
3	Timeframe for Submissions	10	13	1	1	0	1,72	2	2
4	Organization	15	9	4	2	0	1,77	2	1
5	Transport	7	6	1	0	1	1,8	2	1
6	Speakers' Corner	5	9	5	0	0	2	2	2
7	Social Events	8	12	3	3	0	2,04	2	2
8	Our Performance	9	13	5	3	0	2,07	2	2
9	Knowledge gained	6	16	4	2	1	2,17	2	2
10	Specific Needs Services	4	17	1	4	0	2,19	2	2
11	Session Chairs	5	13	9	3	0	2,33	2	2
12	Reviewers' Feedback	5	9	8	2	1	2,4	2	2
13	Quality of Presentations	4	12	12	2	0	2,4	2	2,3
14	Quality of Proceedings	4	11	12	2	0	2,41	2,5	3
15	Presentation Facilities	10	7	6	2	4	2,41	2	1
16	Internet Connection	8	8	7	7	0	2,43	2	1,2
17	Coffee Break	4	11	9	6	0	2,57	3	2
18	Lunches	3	9	9	4	2	2,74	3	2,3
18	Lecture Halls	5	5	8	8	4	3,03	3	3,4
20	Location and Surrounding	6	4	4	8	8	3,27	4	4,5
21	Other Room Facilities	4	4	4	10	7	3,41	4	4

These results were checked on differences between "first timers" and people returning o ICCHP to see interdependencies from former experiences.

First of all, we want to mention that 33 people answered to our questionnaire what keeps us from using elaborated statistical tests, but allows at least an overview. The following ranking shows differences, where "Returners" showed constantly better ratings for most items then "First Timers" but that ALL those differences are only in an area between 0,04 to 0,7 (for intra-group differences).

Table 2: Ranking of Categories (ICCHP Dimensions) divided by "ICCHP Returners" and "First Comers"

Returners		First Timers
Staff on Site		Timeframe for Submissions
Relevance		Staff on Site
Organization		Transport
Timeframe for Submissions		Organization
Speakers' Corner		Relevance
Knowledge gained		Social Events
Transport		Our Performance
Specific Needs Services		Speakers' Corner
Our Performance		Session Chairs
Quality of Proceedings		Presentation Facilities
Quality of Presentations		Internet Connection
Social Events		Knowledge gained
Lunches		Specific Needs Services
Session Chairs		Reviewers' Feedback
Reviewers' Feedback		Coffee Break
Presentation Facilities		Quality of Proceedings
Internet Connection		Quality of Presentations
Coffee Break		Lecture Halls
Lecture Halls		Lunches
Location and Surrounding		Location and Surrounding
Other Room facilities		Other Room facilities

Lessons to be learnt from these two rankings might be that the performance 2014 was not bad compared to other conferences out there, but that it was not complying to "ICCHP standards" our participants are used to – especially for the items dealing with venue and location that were last in both views.

### Additional Remarks and Feedback 2014

Most of the given feedback in free textual format dealt with the location and the venue (like described in chapter "First Results", where our participants (especially the ones coming back to ICCHP) expressed their concerns connected to "location and surrounding" and "Room Facilities".

All in all, 22 of the 33 persons filling in our questionnaire gave this kind of feedback.

## Comparison of ICCHP 2014 to former editions of ICCHP

As this kind of evaluation is carried out since ICCHP 2008, a closer look to the development of ratings can be made.

### Information about ICCHP

Table 3: Timeline 1: How did our participants receive information on ICCHP

How did our guests get to know about ICCHP?	2008	2010	2012	2014	Total
<b>First Announcement</b>	3	5	2	6	16
<b>Call for Papers</b>	8	12	10	13	43
<b>Friends and (Research Fellows)</b>	11	6	7	8	32
<b>(Research) Projects</b>	9	3	3	8	23
<b>Internet</b>	8	5	4	8	25
<b>Other</b>	1	3	2	6	12
<b>Total</b>	40	34	28	49	151

The Call for papers and "words of mouth" from research fellows / friends and project partners are the promoters of ICCHP.

### Enjoying ICCHP

Table 4: Timeline2: Did you enjoy ICCHP?

Did you enjoy ICCHP?	2008	2010	2012	2014
<b>Yes</b>	100%	94%	95%	90%
<b>No</b>	0%	6%	5%	10%

A substantial ratio of our participants answering the ICCHP evaluation questionnaires enjoyed ICCHP conferences.

### Recommending ICCHP

Table 5: Timeline3: Will you recommend ICCHP to your friends and (research) fellows?

Will you recommend ICCHP to friends and (research) fellows?	2008	2010	2012	2014
<b>Yes</b>	21	21	17	26
<b>No</b>	1	1	2	2

Another indicator for the satisfaction of our guests is the answer to the question if they would recommend their research surrounding to present their topics at ICCHP. Every edition, more than 90% of our respondents told us that they will "spread the word".

### Timeline: Rating Diverse Dimensions of ICCHP

Rating diverse dimensions of a conference is a huge task for attendees. In most cases, there are a set of different influencing factors that show their impact on totally different items that – on a first glance – are not connected to them.

Furthermore, the numbers of respondents are in most cases not sufficient to create a valid sample that stands for the whole population of attendees, but these data can give a glimpse on what is / was going on on site.

Through the collection of data since 2008, there is the possibility to compare data and answers.

**Table 6: Timeline4: Rating diverse dimensions of ICCHP (mean of all collected data, where 1 means "very poor" and 5 means "excellent")**

	2008	2010	2012	2014
<b>Session Chairs</b>	4,18	3,51	4	3,67
<b>Coffee Breaks</b>	4,09	4,28	4	3,43
<b>Speakers' Corner</b>	4,18	4,05	4	4
<b>Lecture Halls</b>	3,52	3,35	4	2,97
<b>Internet</b>	4,75	4,34	4	3,56
<b>Knowledge Gained</b>	4,36	3,84	4	3,83
<b>Lunch Breaks</b>	3,9	3,61	4	3,26
<b>Organization</b>	4,64	4,31	4	4,23
<b>Other Room Facilities</b>	4	3,43	4	2,59
<b>Performance</b>	4,52	4,23	4	3,93
<b>Presentation Facilities</b>	3,91	4	4	3,59
<b>Presentations</b>	3,45	3,58	3	3,6
<b>Proceedings</b>	4	4,1	4	3,59
<b>Relevance</b>	4,32	4,24	4	4,33
<b>Specific Needs Services</b>	4	3,39	4	3,81
<b>Social Events</b>	4,79	4,46	4	3,96
<b>Staff On Site</b>	4,57	4,58	4	4,46
<b>Timeframe Submission</b>	4,3	4,23	4	4,28
<b>Transport</b>	4,4	4,44	4	4,2

## Appendix A

### Questionnaire

#### Evaluation of ICCHP 2014

Please give us your feedback in order to make ICCHP better and more enjoyable for you, our distinguished guests!

##### 1. Is this your first time here at ICCHP?

(Tick appropriate answer / rating)

Yes  No

##### 2. How did you find out about ICCHP?

(Tick all appropriate answers – multiple choices possible)

ICCHP-Call  (First) Announcement  Project Partner(s)  
 Friend(s), fellow(s)  on the internet  Other(s): \_\_\_\_\_

##### 3. Did you enjoy the conference?

(Tick appropriate answer / rating and give us a short comment if appropriate)

Yes  No, because \_\_\_\_\_

##### 4. How would you rate the...

(Please tick appropriate answer / rating):

Excellent    Good    Average/Poor    Very poor N / A

1. relevance of the contents / topics of ICCHP?
2. timeframe for preparing papers?
3. reviewers' feedback?
4. quality of the papers or proceedings?
5. presentations?
6. session chairs?
7. lecture halls?
8. presentation facilities?
9. speakers corner?
10. provided internet connection?
11. other room facilities?
12. location and infrastructure?
13. coffee breaks?
14. lunches?
15. social events?
16. specific needs support?
17. transportation?
18. staff on-site?
19. knowledge gained?
20. organization of the conference?
21. our performance this year (overall)?

##### 5. Would you recommend ICCHP to colleagues / fellows?

(Tick appropriate answer / rating)

##### 6. Your additional comments / remarks / feedback:

##### 7. Please enter your email address if you want us to send you an overview of the feedback

## Appendix B

### Tables and Pictures

#### Pictures

figure 1: ICCHP flag on Building D, the conference venue.....	5
figure 2: ICCHP 2014 Schedule and Timetable.....	6
figure 3: The audience is listening.....	7
figure 4: Networking at ICCHP 2014.....	9

#### Tables

Table 1: Ranking and satisfaction of our guests at ICCHP 2014 that answered the questionnaire where 1 means "excellent" and 5 means "very poor" N = 33, "missing" values and "not applicable" were neither counted nor computed here. ....	11
Table 2: Ranking of Categories (ICCHP Dimensions) divided by "ICCHP Returners" and "First Comers" .....	12
Table 3: Timeline 1: How did our participants receive information on ICCHP .....	13
Table 4: Timeline2: Did you enjoy ICCHP?.....	13
Table 5: Timeline3: Will you recommend ICCHP to your friends and (research) fellows? .....	13
Table 6: Timeline4: Rating diverse dimensions of ICCHP (mean of all collected data) .....	14

