Summary of replies to the evaluation questionnaires

1. Participants in the meetings were asked to fill in an evaluation questionnaire at the end of the meeting. Below is the summary of the evaluation questionnaires received from the participants of the 2012 November Workshop on Education indicators for Millennium Development Goals.

2. There were a total of 24 participants of whom 17 filled the evaluation questionnaire (71%). About half of the respondents were representatives of National Statistical Offices, of which 6 were from visiting countries. The other respondents were from other Government Institutions (7) or International Organizations (2).

3. Overall, participants were very satisfied with the workshop. A majority qualified the Content and Documentation of the workshop as ‘excellent’ and the remaining as ‘good’. Although one person found the Organization of the workshop ‘unsatisfactory’, all others qualified it as either ‘good’ or ‘excellent’.

4. Three quarter of the participants found that the duration of the Workshop was about right. A quarter would have wanted a longer workshop while none responded that it was too long.
5. Regarding the structure of the Workshop and allocation of time between presentations, the far majority found it about right while the remaining were equally divided between more time needed for presentations and more time needed for the discussion (note: 1 person each).

6. The substantive items of the final Agenda consisted of three presentations by international organizations:
- ‘Monitoring of education indicators in national MDG reports’ provided by the representative of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe on the coverage and discrepancies of education indicators for MDGs;

- ‘Education related MDG Indicators: Policy implications’ provided by the director of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) which dealt with the role of data collection, analysis and statistics;

- ‘Education related MDG indicators: methodology and issues’ provided by an expert from the UNESCO Institute of Statistics where the focus was on methodological issues.

The participants’ assessment of these three substantive items of the Meeting agenda was positive. The far majority found them very useful. For each item there was only one person who considered it partly useful and none found it not useful.

7. Six countries shared and discussed their national practices in producing education indicators for MDGs for their respective country. The respondents were more or less equally split between ‘very useful’ and ‘partly useful’. The latter was more often selected by representatives from Ministries. None however found the presentations ‘not useful’.

8. Each of the presentations was followed by questions and discussion. Equal time was allotted for presentation and discussion. Due to the cancellation of two presentations, more time was actually available for questions and discussion. Regarding the structure and the outcome of the discussions, respondents were in general satisfied. Of the three answer categories ‘good’, ‘satisfactory’ and ‘poor’, at least 60% responded ‘good’ for discussion part of the substantive items while only one respondent reported in two cases ‘poor’.
9. According to 80 per cent of the respondents to the questionnaire there was sufficient discussion of problems specific for their country.

10. There was only a limited response to the open questions of the Questionnaire.

**Conclusions and recommendations**

11. There were several challenges with organizing the workshop. The languages of the meeting were English, Albanian and Russian. It was difficult to find good Russian interpreters and interpretation between English and Russian was through Albanian which impacted the quality and accuracy. Not all presentations were available on time for translation. Additionally, there were last minute cancelations of presentations. Originally, there were more presentations focusing on policy implications however all three presentations that were planned to be provided by representatives from Ministries (of Education) were cancelled (and in two cases replaced by a presentation by a representative from the National Statistics Office of the country).

12. For the workshop funds earmarked for a National workshop in Albania and for a Study Tour for a selection of countries from the UNECE region were combined. Although organization started six months before the date of the workshop, all funds became available on the correct lines at a much later stage. Several preparatory issues such as visa for participants visiting from abroad and the identification of participants and presenters from the host country were only resolved shortly before the start of the workshop. Most flight connections between the place of origin of the participants and Tirana were not ideal and led to inconvenient travel arrangements for some participants.

13. Despite these challenges, participants were positive about the organization of the workshop. However, improvements/recommendations can be made such as:

- Making all translated material available for participants by setting earlier and stricter deadlines for submission;
- It is important to allow sufficient time for country presentations however, there should be focus on best practices and national challenges in order to make the presentations more relevant for other participants;
- Reserve at least half of the time for questions and discussion;
- Limiting the meeting to one or two working languages. This will however limit the participation of those who command these languages. An alternative is to budget for the additional costs of interpreters from outside the country;
- Choose a workshop venue for a regional workshop with good international connections;
- Make sure that the agenda covers sufficient items for all participants, i.e. for non-statisticians if they are invited.
- Start planning of participants that are not representatives of the Statistics Offices at an earlier stage and follow-up more carefully regarding their participation;