

**PIEF National Workshop
25 – 26 February 2010
Program and Speaker Evaluation Summary**

Forms distributed: 87

Forms received: 31

On a scale of 1 to 5, where **1 is poor and 5 is excellent**, would you please rate by circling the number corresponding to your assessment in each category:

	1	2	3	4	5
Format			6%	68%	26%
Relevance / interest of program			6%	52%	42%
Calibre of speakers			6%	57%	37%

Which part/s of the workshop did you find most useful/relevant?

- Presentation by Robert Randall
- Strat. plan
- All parts fitted well together
- Branding discussion with Mark Paterson
- Objectives/purpose – world café discussion
- Curriculum discussion
- Meeting a diverse range of people with similar passions
- Exchanging ideas and knowledge
- Talking with other colleagues
- Relevant resources, up to date information
- Networking between like educators
- State workshops
- Marketing session
- Definitely networking
- Great mix of people, great collection of experience, Australia wide
- Meeting opportunities for networking ✓✓
- Robert Randall’s outline of National Curriculum developments and our ability to influence it
- Opportunity to network with Ag providers and find out what PIEF is about
- The session that involved “doing” rather than just “listening”, these sessions were very productive and quite stimulating. The continued variation of group structure was outstanding
- Finding out more about the role of PIEF and having an input into its future directions
- Meeting a range of stakeholders
- How range of people and resources can support education/teachers and implementation of curriculum in Victoria and Australia

- Being able to directly contribute
- World café allowed for lots of different views, thinking styles
- Networking, lots of discussion
- Being amongst like-minded people – very motivating
- Great networking opportunities
- Opportunity to participate in branding exercise and identifying critical tasks/focus for PIEF
- Discussion after Randall, world café, branding
- Opportunities for State discussions
- Brand definition
- World café
- Rob Randall
- Meeting directors, understanding the background
- The world café – I'm going to use that
- Café session and engagement by members and attendees
- ACARA – Robert Randall, world café
- Group think tanks
- Enthusiastic groups teachers/industry/government
- Talk of how to go forward
- Networks, ideas sharing, involvement in process
- Opportunities for facilitated discussion
- National curriculum
- Branding, world café
- Planning/discussion
- The workshop pulling out big steps forward for PIEF. Also, Malcolm Brown's session was great
- Robert Randall, world café
- World café

At the next PIEF Workshop I would like the Program to include:

- Primary School education input through teachers or department advisors
- Further developments through ACARA/Australian Curriculum/acceptance by State authorities
- A draft business plan
- Completely dependant on what has been achieved by that time
- More teacher input ie. how is PIEF to link to education
- ACARA update re National Curriculum and where agriculture/PI sits
- State priorities and means of sharing/working together
- A higher emphasis on VET
- Opportunities for the sectors/stakeholders to present their "collective" needs/wants/reviews re PIEF eg. Teachers (high school and primary) – industry reps – resource providers and producers – government reps
- Section for people from infants/primary sector to outline their needs/issues
- Case studies from the school/Tafe sectors on innovative delivery of primary industries teaching
- More time for State groups to work together
- Very keen to work with ensuring resources of a quality nature are available for teachers in the classroom. Working with ideas to ensure a stable funding model to ensure PIEF is viable and effective
- Achievements in relation to strategic plan, impediments and successes

- Next steps – informed by stakeholders
- Similar program again – it worked well
- Evaluation of recommendations from 2010 workshop – were they implemented? Did it work?
- Clear definitions on PIEF’s role/goal for common understanding
- More time in less groups
- Update – progress made
- Analysis of Australian curriculum and opportunities and linkages
- Survey a wider group of educators and students – what do they want?
- Showcases on initiatives and discussions on up-scaling
- An opportunity for Industry to say what they want
- Attract decision makers, test strategic direction, review outcomes and risks
- Success stories
- Consider why it is we have PIEF, what one thing would/could have happened to head off this need?
- More of the same. Opportunities to look at a range of resources readily available
- Updates on how the foundation has progressed, where to next
- Progress to date
- Update on process so far and where PIEF Board hope to go
- Something from teachers
- Engage some university students

Three things that most impressed me about the workshop were:

- Level of enthusiasm of participants right up until the end of day 2
- Compulsory moving around between each session
- Variety of participants that attended
- Achieved a lot, efficient info collection
- Roving microphones provide good communication
- Well organised format
- Commitment of audience and board
- Breadth of representation across stakeholders
- Support for our (KONDININ) resources collaborative discussion
- Dinner – lovely setting and folks, Ralph’s MC skills, wide range of people attending
- Variety of stakeholders, national involvement
- The congeniality and professionalism of the delegates
- Joint shared vision
- Ag ed. generally the goal (couple not)
- Methodology
- A good mix of articulate people with relevant experience
- Good opportunities to network – changing tables etc
- Very good tone – no “precociousness” by attendees no “rows to hoe”
- Quality of the presenters – workshop activities – the energy of participants
- Quality and enthusiasm of the participants and their ideas
- Leadership and empathy by Cameron Archer
- Common goal of all and the energy/labour they prepared to give
- Finding out about what actions have been undertaken so far

- Strategies used ie swapping tables, world café activity, method of providing feedback on branding etc
- Level of participation, great mix of people and expertise
- Clear information about what PIEF is, opportunity to contribute ideas, networking opportunity
- Enthusiasm, willingness to hear views/listen to others, feelings of camaraderie in this venture
- Variety of delegates, enthusiasm of presenters
- Positive, committed attitudes
- Will to do something/energy/enthusiasm
- The amount of expertise in the room
- Sustained enthusiasm, good will, engagement
- Clarity of purpose
- Openness and opportunity to network
- Value of individual opinion
- The level of enthusiasm/passion in the room, that I felt we got somewhere, that we have follow-up activities to kick things off
- Level of interest from attendees and range of knowledge across the value proposition
- Organisation
- Program was good, good variety of activities and speakers, excellent opportunity to remark
- Organisation, passion, networks – people
- The people who came
- Broad range of stakeholders, lots of smart people – nevertheless we were able to reach a consensus
- Changing tables – networking
- Group discussions
- Information provided
- Board member role participation, good sequence and process, moving people around
- Speakers, passion, processes in place with PIEF
- Broad range of attendees
- Ability to network

Three things that could be done better at the next workshop are:

- Currie Consulting was not very useful – expected better
- Last session was rather over-done, we had lost interest by then, our group thought we had already answered these questions
- Better sequence ie strat. plan first
- Allocation of more time for State discussion
- Organisation/direction of State bodies
- Divide into sectors – territory? Careers – down? Primary – secondary
- What are messages and how do we get these into schools – different from career promotion
- No fisheries/forestry here?
- Program could be a little better structured to flow better (better mix of light and heavy topics)
- Program facilitated better for topics – need specifically worded questions to address (questions too broad) – less questions to allow better in-depth discussion – more independent professional facilitating when asking for views/group discussion (better understanding of the way groups are working)
- Final session too long – suffered burnout



- Issues need to be looked at board level
- Round tables would encourage interaction
- Ralph's last activity on objectives – overkill – all exhausted and drained
- Air-conditioning a bit cool – very minor issue
- It was pretty good this time around
- Break out rooms for group work – it was hard to hear people
- Not so many heavy things to think about (end day 2)
- Group table settings
- Some context or stories about what issues are being faced, RDC or industry groups
- Include some student leaders in the next workshop – what do they have, want or need?
- Reflection and commitment
- Get more Industry partners involved, get more universities involved, a less “echoey” room
- Context and strategy from Board
- Focus on what is deliverable VS short-medium term VS long term
- All good!!
- Drinks – water/OJ available with lunch
- Change of venue for dinner?
- More discussion time
- Better hall – acoustics/lights

<u>Overall</u>	Poor		OK		Excellent
Venue			13%	58%	29%
Location			4%	48%	48%

<u>Social Program</u>	Not enjoyable				Very enjoyable
Workshop			7%	41%	52%
Dinner					

	Too much social		OK		Too much formal
Social & Formal			84%	6%	10%
	Poor		OK		Excellent
Catering		10%	13%	30%	47%
Pre-workshop administration		7%	23%	37%	33%
On-site registration			3%	57%	40%
Seating	4%		32%	35%	29%
Visuals & Acoustics	4%	13%	39%	22%	22%
Overall the workshop was			7%	43%	50%
Overall the program was			6%	55%	39%

Other comments:

- More information about accommodation needed to be available. This should have been accessible when registration was completed
- I look forward to the next steps for PIEF
- Very interested to see pace of development from here and how structure will develop underneath the board level
- No representation from NT?
- Primary industries big picture BUT most only concerned with Ag. – this is not a problem but should it be acknowledged and not paid lip service to fisheries/forestry and other odds
- Not as relevant to post secondary provision as I thought it might have been
- Prefer round tables – discussion much easier
- A most enjoyable experience – well done and congratulations to the organisers
- Well done by Ralph
- Poor check-in to hotel
- Thank you to Cameron and the organising group and board for this opportunity to support agricultural education
- Be sure to capture the will and enthusiasm of people/members to help
- Does the development of assessment criteria etc provide another opportunity for industry through PIEF to have an input of what they want to know?
- Thank you for hopefully capitalising on this window of opportunity!
- Make sure you keep communicating once this thing is over. You've included us now. You need to keep the momentum and commitment going.
- Not enough time to discuss questions in strategic planning session. You've got to re-look at the funding strategy. Big business will contribute, but not 75K
- Overall workshop very positive, but not having industry decision makers does not anchor potential long term investment required for success
- Interesting to see how the foundation evolves
- How will the website link to resources? Or will they be found on the website?
- This has been a great workshop!
- Great event and workshop, I can't wait to see future feedback!