

Ecohealth Competition for South, Southeast and East Asia

ASSESSING & MITIGATING HEALTH RISKS FROM POLLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF SMALL AND MEDIUM SCALE ENTERPRISES (SMES) INITIATIVE



Workshop Evaluation Report

CONTENTS

1. Do you consider that, in general terms, this workshop has succeeded on developing with clarity the concepts and methods of the ecosystem approach to human health?	3
2. More specifically, how useful will each of the following components be in your research?.....	3
a. presentation of the Ecohealth approach	3
b. ecosystem description	3
c. risk assessment.....	4
d. stakeholders and community participation	4
e. social and gender equity.....	4
f. transdisciplinarity	4
g. your own team work	5
3. How useful has been the time distribution of different activities during the workshop?	5
4. How useful are (or will be) the reading material you have received?	5
5. How useful are the comments on your concept notes you have received?.....	5
6. Do you consider that this workshop will be useful for other activities of your professional life?	6
7. To what degree has this workshop influenced your proposal, compared to your original concept note?	6
8. How do you rate the organization (logistics) of this workshop?	6
9. Overall, how do you rate this workshop?.....	6
 RANKING OF THE DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF THE WORKSHOP.....	8
TABLE 1: RANKING OF THE DIFFERENT WOKSHOP EVALUATION CRITERIA ACCORDING TO MEAN RATE GIVEN BY PARTICIPANTS.....	8
TABLE 2: RANKING OF THE DIFFERENT WOKSHOP EVALUATION CRITERIA ACCORDING TO % OF RATES ABOVE AND BELOW 8 GIVEN BY PARTICIPANTS.....	9

ASSESSING AND MITIGATING HEALTH RISKS FROM POLLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF SMEs

GOA WORKSHOP - JAN 24TH -28TH 2005 - PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION

At the end of the workshop, participants were asked to fill out the anonymous evaluation form (see attached form). Out of 27 participants, 22 forms were collected. Participants were asked to rate their responses on a scale of 1 (=very weak) to 10 (=excellent).

The average to all questions is of 8,3. Therefore, a rate of 8 should be considered as average and if over 50% of participants rated a component as above 8 (9 or 10) this should mean that this component was rated as more useful than others. The opposite goes when 50 % of participants rated a components as 7 or lower.

1. Do you consider that, in general terms, this workshop has succeeded on developing with clarity the concepts and methods of the ecosystem approach to human health?

The overall clarity of the Ecohealth approach in this workshop seems to be good with an average of 8,3. Answers varied from 6 to 10 with over 35% of participants rating this element over 8 and only 25% as below 8.

Most participants gave positive feedback on this question, for example:

“Well illustrated modules made simple enough to be understood by people of different disciplines. Very comfortable schedule too.”

One critic is that the issues of environmental pollution and ecological aspects were not dealt with enough compared to gender and participatory research. This person also rated the usefulness of the ecosystem description (4), transdisciplinarity (6) and time distribution (6) very low. However, he seemed generally satisfied with the workshop, which he rated 8. A second comment on uneven emphasis of different subjects was also made.

2. More specifically, how useful will each of the following components be in your research?

a. presentation of the Ecohealth approach

The presentation of the Ecohealth approach was one of the components participants found the least useful with an average rate of 7,6. Answers varied from 4 to 10 with only 25% participants rating this element above 8 while 45% rated as lower than 8. However, no comments were made concerning this presentation.

b. ecosystem description

The ecosystem description was rated as the least useful element of this workshop with the lowest average rate of 7,4. Answers varied from 4 to 10 with less 20% of participants rating this element as above 8 and nearly 40% of participants rating it lower than 8. As for the previous aspect, no comments were made on this point.

c. risk assessment

Risk assessment was rated as the most useful subject of the workshop with an average rate of **8,6**. Close to 70% of participants rated this element as above while less than 25% gave it a rate under 8 with answers varying from 5 to 10.

Although risk assessment is rated as the most useful subject, opinions vary concerning the depth in which it was presented. Indeed, some participants required more time on the subject while others considered it went too much into detail for this workshop.

One suggestion was made concerning the risk assessment sessions:

“Focussing on the principles of risk assessment and control could have been more helpful, even using the projects as exercise material.”

d. stakeholders and community participation

The usefulness of this component was rated with an average of **8,2** with answers varying from 3 to 10. Over 50% of participants rated this element as above average while less than 20% considered it below average.

Most comments suggested that the participatory research sessions could have been more in depth and that more time was needed to work more specifically on the subject. For example:

“We required more inputs on the exercises used for community & multistakeholder sessions.”

e. social and gender equity

Gender and social equity usefulness was evaluated with an average rate of **8,1**. Answers varied from 4 to 10 with over 30% of participants rating this element as above 8 and less than 20% of participants rating it lower than 8.

Most comments on the gender and social equity sessions were positive and expressed a greater understanding of the subject. One comment was that there should have been more focus on the context and that the social equity aspect should have been better developed during these sessions:

“In response to social and gender equity, the presenter provided the clear concept of gender, however the issue specifically on social equity is less clarified.”

f. transdisciplinarity

Risk assessment was rated as the least useful subject of the workshop with an average rate of **7,8**. It also was got the lowest rate of 2 with a maximum rate of 10. Over 30% of participants rated this element as above average and about 35% as lower than average.

A single comment was made on the subject:

“Transdisciplinarity is an enjoyable challenge.”

g. your own team work

Team work was rated as a useful element of the workshop with an average rate of **8,3**. Answers varied from 4 to 10 and close to 50% of participants rated this element as above 8 and less than 25% gave it a rate lower than 8.

A single request was made on the subject of team work:

“Some more group exercises could have been done involving different groups.”

3. How useful has been the time distribution of different activities during the workshop?

The time distribution of the different activities during the workshop is one of the components participants found of average usefulness with an average rate of **8,3**. Answers varied from 6 to 10 with close to 45% of participants rating this element above 8 while less than 30% rated it as lower than 8.

Both criticism on this matter was that more emphasis on specific different aspects of environmental pollution (regulations, policies, control) could have been made. For example:

“There should have been more emphasis on environmental pollution measurement / control / management techniques according to the main theme. Pollution-Toxicology-Health risks concepts would have been more useful.”

4. How useful are (or will be) the reading material you have received?

The reading material given during the workshop was rated as a useful element of the workshop with an average rate of **8,6**. Answers varied from 7 to 10 and 50% of participants rated this element as above 8 while only 20% gave it a rate lower than 8.

“Presentation and workshop material were very useful for us to integrate ‘Ecohealth pillars’ into our proposal”

This was the one comment made on the matter. The other comment was that the reading material should have been given before the workshop.

5. How useful are the comments on your concept notes you have received?

Comments given on the concept notes prior to the workshop were rated as the most useful element with an average rate of **8,6**. Answers varied from 6 to 10 with over 50% of participants rating this element as above 8 while less than 10% gave it a rate lower than 8. No comments were made on this question.

6. Do you consider that this workshop will be useful for other activities of your professional life?

Participants were almost unanimous in saying that the workshop will be useful in other activities of their professional life. This element was evaluated with an average rate of **8,9**. Answers varied from 7 to 10 with over 60% of participants rating this element as very useful and less than 10% gave it a rate of 7.

The only comment was that the workshop would be useful in dealing with social issues.

7. To what degree has this workshop influenced your proposal, compared to your original concept note?

The general opinion of participants is that the workshop has largely influenced their proposal in comparison to their original concept note. Indeed, this element received an average rate of **8,5** with answers varying from 6 to 10. Close to 45% participants rated this element as over 8 and only 15% as below 8.

Comments are unanimous, the workshop was very useful in bringing research project more into focus in particular to the three subjects presented during the workshop. For example:

“Yes, we are more focused on a single area to go in depth and assess the real situation for risk assessment and management.”

“Yes, specifically towards including gender/social equity building trust, community involvement, participation in project approach.”

8. How do you rate the organization (logistics) of this workshop?

The organisation of the workshop seems to be satisfactory with an average of **8,4**. Answers varied from 6 to 10 with close to 40% of participants rating this element over 8 and less than 30% as below 8.

Both comments on the organisation agreed that it was well organised but one suggested that it could have been better managed during the pre-Goa phase.

“Excellent overall organisation of this workshop.”

9. Overall, how do you rate this workshop?

Overall, participants seemed to have been satisfied by the workshop as they evaluated it with an average rate of **8,6**. Answers varied from 5 to 10 with over 50% of participants evaluating the workshop as above 8 and less than 10% as below 8.

Overall, most participants seemed to appreciate the workshop as most comments were very positive:

“The workshop was very useful in formulating concepts for holistic approach to human health. It also provides inputs for young researchers to refine their research approach.”

This is especially true concerning the facilitators:

“Excellent team of facilitators with useful innovative techniques and experience sharing and a well conceived training/workshop.”

However, some comments pointed out that the different participants backgrounds and the different type of subjects presented during this workshop created repetition for some participants.

One special request was also formulated:

“It would be better if future workshop is held in a more accessible place, near to basic facilities & infrastructure, so we can find dinner easily and refresh with shopping.”

RANKING OF THE DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF THE WORKSHOP

**TABLE 1: RANKING OF THE DIFFERENT WOKSHOP EVALUATION CRITERIA
ACCORDING TO MEAN RATE GIVEN BY PARTICIPANTS**

RANK	CRITERIA	MEAN
1	Usefulness of workshop in other activities of professional life	8,9
2	Usefulness of comments on concept notes	8,6
3	Usefulness of reading material	8,6
4	Usefulness of risk assessment	8,6
5	Overall rating of workshop	8,6
6	Influence of workshop on concept note	8,5
7	Logistics	8,4
8	Usefulness of time distribution	8,3
9	Clarity of Ecohealth approach	8,3
10	Usefulness of team work	8,3
11	<i>Usefulness of stakeholders and community participation</i>	8,2
12	<i>Usefulness of gender and social equity</i>	8,0
13	<i>Usefulness of transdisciplinarity</i>	7,8
14	<i>Usefulness of the Ecohealth approach presentation</i>	7,6
15	<i>Usefulness of the ecosystem description</i>	7,4

In this table, elements were ranked according to their average rate. The mean for all answers being 8.3, anything under this should be considered as needing to be improved. Therefore, all elements rated as lower than 8.3 have been marked in italics.

**TABLE 2: RANKING OF THE DIFFERENT WOKSHOP EVALUATION CRITERIA
ACCORDING TO % OF RATES ABOVE AND BELOW 8 GIVEN BY PARTICIPANTS**

RANK	CRITERIA	% > 8	% < 8
1	Usefulness of risk assessment	70	25
2	Usefulness of workshop in other activities of professional life	60	10
3	Usefulness of comments on concept notes	50	10
4	Overall rating of workshop	50	10
5	Usefulness of stakeholders and community participation	50	20
6	Usefulness of reading material	50	20
7	Usefulness of team work	50	25
8	Influence of workshop on concept note	45	15
9	Usefulness of time distribution	45	30
10	Logistics	40	30
11	Clarity of Ecohealth approach	35	25
12	Usefulness of gender and social equity	30	20
13	<i>Usefulness of transdisciplinarity</i>	30	35
14	<i>Usefulness of the Ecohealth approach presentation</i>	25	45
15	<i>Usefulness of the ecosystem description</i>	20	40

In this table, elements were ranked according to the percentage of participants considering the element as useful. Elements needing improvement are those that more participants found unuseful compared to the participants that rated the element as useful (reminder as above 8.3). Therefore, these element have been marked in italics.