



22th Output  
2<sup>nd</sup> EUROPEAN WORKSHOP REPORT

[This report should be made to report activities related with the project namely:  
Meetings, work packages reports, quality report and other activities.]

Partner in charge: University of Salford UK

---

Date: May 2015

---

Location n/a

---

Participants\* Gordon Fletcher, David Kreps, Aleksej Heinze and Alex Camm and Ann Berry

---

Type of report: Analysis of the Questionnaires and Reports from the second Professors Workshops that have taken place across Europe

---

**1. Objectives and general description of the activity**

---

The objective of this report is to understand how we can improve the workshop for the future and suggest changes that can be made to the workshop.

**2. Activity implementation (when applicable)**

---

Reports were compiled from all partners who used the workshop toolkit that we developed at Salford.

The partners that ran workshops were:

Partner 1 – ISCTE

Partner 3 – University of Salford

Partner 4 – AHE

Partner 5 – USGM

Partner 7 – IRSA

Partner 8 – VFU

Partner 10 – PA

The workshops consisted of the following format:

- Introduction to the concept and history of Crowdsourcing



With the support of the *Lifelong Learning Programme* of the European Union.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein



- How crowdsourcing can increase collaboration with companies and public or non-profit organizations.
  - “A Cat and Mouse Story” - case study  
Video link: - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zI9MwD0VZXM>
  - Workshop Activity – Continue to solve the ‘Cat and Mouse’ problems, exploring what they could do.
  - Solution – Challenge Academy Website
  - Introduce the platform to the participants and ask them to open a test account
  - Working in pairs participants :  
Give us 3 examples that would work here (on post-its) share with each other?  
Give us 3 methods where you could use it – PhD’s, dissertations etc  
Can you think of 3 people that you can contact now that would be interested in this platform?  
Contact them NOW!  
Report your discussion to the group
  - Complete the workshop questionnaire
- 

### 3. Outputs (when applicable)

---

Each partner was asked to produce:

- A workshop Report
  - Pictures of the event
  - Questionnaires from the participants of the workshop
- \*Please see attached documents

### 4. Activity evaluation (when applicable)

---

From analysing the workshop reports and the participant questionnaires we were able to identify where we may need to alter the workshop in order to improve it for the future. Initially we found this to be quite difficult due to the fact that the majority of the comments from the workshops were related to the difficulties that had been experienced with the platform and were not specifically related to the design/layout or individual elements of the workshop itself. However we have still been able to gain an insight into what is working well and what needs improving in relation to the workshop and the results are shown below.



With the support of the *Lifelong Learning Programme* of the European Union.

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein

## Participants

Partner	Participants	Companies	Academics	Students	HEIs
Partner 1 – ISCTE	22	3	3	12	4
Partner 3 – University of Salford	21				
Partner 4 – AHE	15	0	8	2	
Partner 5 – USGM	32	17	11	4	
Partner 7 – IRSA	34	11	11	12	
Partner 8 – VFU	43				
Partner 10 – PA	29	3	3	23	
Totals	196				

## Quantitative Research Results

There were 196 questionnaires completed across the 7 partners involved and the collective statistics (not including P05-USGM who did not provide the statistics) from the 164 questionnaires for which statistics are available show the following results:

<b>COMBINED RESULTS</b>	<b>Not likely</b>	<b>Likely</b>	<b>Very likely</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>1. How likely will you be using Challenge Academy</b>	10%	51%	39%	0%
<b>2. Do you feel confident in using the Challenge Academy platform?</b>	<b>Not competent</b>	<b>Competent</b>	<b>Very competent</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
Creating your profile	3%	47%	43%	7%
Creating challenge	23%	53%	17%	7%
Assigning students	17%	60%	15%	8%
Finding challenge	14%	51%	24%	11%
Claiming a challenge	14%	36%	25%	25%
	<b>Not confident</b>	<b>Confident</b>	<b>Very confident</b>	<b>No Answer</b>
<b>3. Confident about formulating and identifying a suitable Challenge Academy challenge?</b>	23%	59%	16%	1%
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No Answer</b>	
<b>4. Can you think of 3 people that you can contact now that would be interested in this platform</b>	83%	13%	4%	0%



This compares to the results of the First Workshops below:

	<i>1st</i>	<i>2nd</i>	<i>1st</i>	<i>2nd</i>	<i>1st</i>	<i>2nd</i>	<i>1st</i>	<i>2nd</i>
	<i>Not likely</i>	<i>Not likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Very likely</i>	<i>Very likely</i>	<i>No Answer</i>	<i>No Answer</i>
<b>1. How likely will you be using Challenge Academy</b>	9%	10%	35%	51%	56%	39%		0%
<b>2. Do you feel confident in using the Challenge Academy platform?</b>	<i>Not competent</i>	<i>Not competent</i>	<i>Competent</i>	<i>Competent</i>	<i>Very competent</i>	<i>Very competent</i>	<i>No Answer</i>	<i>No Answer</i>
Creating your profile	6%	3%	45%	47%	49%	43%	0%	7%
Creating challenge	17%	23%	50%	53%	28%	17%	5%	7%
Assigning students	22%	17%	41%	60%	25%	15%	12%	8%
Finding challenge	8%	14%	47%	51%	44%	24%	1%	11%
Claiming a challenge	17%	14%	37%	36%	30%	25%	16%	25%
	<i>Not confident</i>	<i>Not confident</i>	<i>Confident</i>	<i>Confident</i>	<i>Very confident</i>	<i>Very confident</i>	<i>No Answer</i>	<i>No Answer</i>
<b>3. Confident about formulating and identifying a suitable Challenge Academy challenge?</b>	5%	23%	51%	59%	43%	16%	1%	1%
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>		<b>No Answer</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>4. Can you think of 3 people that you can contact now that would be interested in this platform</b>	84%	83%	15%	13%		4%	1%	0%





The statistics from the questionnaires show that during the 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop even more people than during the first workshop were 'likely' or 'very likely' to use the Challenge Academy Platform after attending the workshop which is a very positive sign and shows that the workshop is promoting the idea of crowdsourcing and the platform well, and that it improved from the first to the second. The results also show that the majority of people feel 'competent' or 'very competent' in using parts of the platform and creating a challenge and creating a profile. 22% of people however, did not feel competent in assigning students and 17% did not feel competent in either creating a challenge or claiming a challenge **so it is suggested that we look at how we can improve communicating these function within the workshop.**

#### Main Qualitative Feedback Themes:

The main themes that were found from the comments in the questionnaires and partner reports were:

##### **1. Problems with the platform**

All partners continued to experience problems with the platform and its usability on the day of the workshop. The platform continues to present problems regarding responsiveness, failing to work fully in devices other than full-size laptop and desktop computers. One comment seems to sum up many others: "Generally it looks like an 'expert' driven system, it looks very technical and could benefit from having to introduce users to the system before using."

This caused a lot of the participants' feedback to be in relation to the platform and how it could be improved rather than discussion relating to how they could use the platform and disseminating information to friends/colleagues and business.

##### **2. Difficult to condense information into the time frame of the workshop**

Partners reported that the workshop was difficult to fit into the time allocated and that participants would discuss at length information relation to Crowdsourcing and the platform, and wanted longer to test the platform.

##### **3. The Workshop aided good participation levels**

All partners received a high level of participation and feedback from the professors that attended and the information provided in the presentation and video worked well to start discussion relating to Crowdsourcing and the uses of the platform.



*With the support of the [Lifelong Learning Programme](#) of the European Union.*

*This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein*



#### **4. Language Errors**

Some partners continued to report problems with the spelling and grammar on the platform and the need for this to be proof read.

#### **5. Intellectual Property**

Some partners continued to say that participants were concerned about the issues surrounding Intellectual Property and who would own the rights to ideas generated via the platform. Professors and business owners would like to have a solid understanding of how this would be implemented/monitored for those using the platform.

---

### **5. Recommendations**

---

We suggest the following ways to improve the workshops based on the themes presented above:

#### **1. Problems with the Platform**

- The platform still needs more amendments in line with the feedback provided by partners to ensure that it is more user friendly and does not contain errors. This will make the workshop easier to run for all partners. We have to remember this is what new users will be experiencing for the first time as well.
- The platform needs to be compatible for tablets and mobile devices to make it easier for people to access.
- Partners need to spend time working with the platform before they hold a workshop to ensure they are comfortable with it/can report any issues to Partner 1 prior to the workshop taking place.

#### **2. Difficult to condense the information into the timeframe of the workshop**

- Each Partner is able to decide the length of the workshop for themselves
- You can also move around any element of the workshop, it is for you to decide what suits you and your participants best. The main concern is that the outputs are met.

#### **3. The workshop aided good participation levels**

- No improvements necessary

#### **4. Language Errors**



*With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union.*

*This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein*



- Language errors should be reported to ISCTE and these should be amended as soon as possible where necessary.

## 5. Intellectual Property

- We should add a section into the workshop that addresses Intellectual Property. Firstly we should ensure that we are clear as a project what response to give to participants, this needs to be discussed at the next partners meeting.
- Once this has been decided we should add this into the presentation and also onto the platform so that all users of the platform are clear and understand their rights.

## 6. Workshop Training Elements

- Improve the training elements of the workshop in relation to:

Assigning Students

Creating a Challenge

Claiming a Challenge

We believe those who are running the workshops should spent more time focusing on these areas to ensure that the participants feel competent in how to use these areas of the platform.

If the trainer needs further assistance in how to use the platform before teaching others please make this known us so we are able to introduce extra information in this area.



*With the support of the [Lifelong Learning Programme](#) of the European Union.*

*This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein*