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Methodology

Evaluation research on the organization and production of the ESRS Congress in Krakow was conducted from early August through the end of September 2017. The online survey was sent to all Congress participants via e-mail using the addresses provided by them during the Congress registration. Answers were collected from 157 Congress participants, which should be seen as a good result considering the total number of registered participants (375). The survey consisted of 16 questions of varied complexity and included 3 open-ended questions.

The following report was composed according to various theme areas and is not directly corresponding with the order in which the questions were asked. The authors think that such data presentation (focusing on particular themes) will be more accessible to the recipients of the report.

General data

Among the participants of the 27 ESRS Congress the vast majority were individuals for whom it was the first Congress organized by ESRS (42%) that they attended or people who only occasionally participated in this type of ESRS congress (41%). Only 17% of respondents claimed that their participation in such events was regular.

How often do you attend ESRS Congresses? (Please, choose only 1 answer)

- Regularly 42%
- Occasionally 41%
- This was my first time 17%
The majority of respondents were not ESRS members. It should be noted, however, that almost one third of respondents (30%) declared willingness to become members of the society while 28% of respondents did not present such plans. 42% of respondents were current members of ESRS.

When analysing the respondents’ gender, the vast majority of Congress participants were women (61%). Men made up 36%, while 3% of respondents chose the answer “prefer not to say”.
It should be noted that congress participants were quite diverse in terms of age. The youngest ones, aged 35 and under, made up 28% of respondents. In other age groups the following was the case: 44% were participants aged 36-50, 21% were individuals aged 51-65, while 5% of respondents were 66 years old or older. 2% of respondents stated that they would “prefer not to say” when answering that particular query.

**Academic value of the Congress**

The respondents were asked to what extent the particular events of the Congress were helpful to their academic work. The answers should be treated as indicators of the actual value of the entire event.
Congress participants were decidedly satisfied with the academic quality they experienced in working groups. As many as 90% of respondents expressed satisfaction regarding the academic level of the Congress. Almost half of respondents (46%) recognized the academic level of the Congress as very good. Only 2% of respondents evaluated the academic level as low (1% as very low) and 7% of respondents were neutral on this matter.

The range of topics in the working groups was also well received by the vast majority of respondents (89%). Additionally, more than half of all respondents (54%) evaluated the range of
topics as very good and only 2% as poor. The remaining 8% of respondents stayed neutral on this matter.

One of the events at the Congress was the students’ pre-conference workshop. A pre-conference meeting was held before the main events of the Congress and its participants were Ph.D. program students. This explains the high percentage of those who did not participate in the pre-conference (78%). With the “not applicable” answers are excluded from the analysis, 46% of respondents evaluated the usefulness of the pre-conference as very high, 23% as high and 31% as neutral. None of the respondents expressed a negative opinion about the pre-conference.

Plenary session 1 - Natalia V. Mamonova

![Pie chart for Plenary session 1 - Natalia V. Mamonova]
Plenary sessions were also evaluated in term of their usefulness for academic work and publications that the Congress participants were working on. The first plenary session conducted by Natalia V. Mamonova attracted the highest number of respondents while 23% of respondents chose “not applicable” as their answer. More than half of respondents had a positive evaluation of the first plenary session (19% rated it as “very good” and 40% described it as “good”). Only 14% of respondents expressed a neutral opinion and 4% presented a negative evaluation of the event (4% of “fairly poor” answers).

Over one fourth of respondents did not participate in the second plenary session conducted by Annette Desmarais (27%). Half of the respondents who attended the session evaluated it quite positively (21% called it “very good”, 32% said it was “fairly good”). The percentage of respondents that evaluated the session as neutral or negative was similar to the evaluation of the first plenary session and accounted for 15% and 5% respectively (3% of “fairly poor” answers and 2% of “very poor answers”).
The form of the third plenary session was rather unusual. Instead of a typical lecture followed by discussion the performance plenary session – “We, pig country” was organized. The evaluation of the performance by Lucas de Man was unanimously positive. As many as 71% of respondents thought that the session prepared in such a performance-oriented manner was useful in their academic work. It should be noted, however, that 60% of respondents gave this session the highest note on the 5-grade scale. Only 2% of respondents expressed neutrality on this matter. The same percentage of respondents (2%) expressed a negative opinion about the session. Exactly 25% of respondents did not participate in the third plenary session.
The last plenary was conducted by Patrick H. Mooney, Jan Douve van der Ploeg and Paweł Starosta. Exactly half of the respondents expressed positive evaluation of this session. One fourth of respondents gave this session an extremely high note (25%) and the same percentage of respondents evaluated it as “fairly good” (25%). The session was viewed as neutral by 15% of respondents and evaluated negatively by 9% of respondents (6% of “fairly poor” answers, 3% of “very poor” answers). A little over one fourth of the respondents did not participate in the Congress closing session (26%).
During the congress three parallel breakout sessions were organised. As is presented in the above chart, the answers related to breakout session 1: “Participatory filmmaking and documentaries in rural research and development” showed that it was not very popular among respondents. Almost three fourths of survey participants did not participate in this event. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that those who participated in breakout session 1 had predominantly positive opinions about it. As many as 77% of respondents positively evaluated this event (37% of “very good” answers, 40% of “fairly good” answers). 23% of respondents were neutral in their evaluation.

The number of respondents who participated in breakout session II: “The role of Research Study Groups in ESRS”, was similar to the number of respondents participating in breakout session I. 75% of respondents marked the answer “not applicable”. The participants had a predominantly positive evaluation of this event. A total of 74% of respondents evaluated the session positively, including 41% with “very good” responses, and 33% with “fairly good” responses. Almost one fourth of respondents (23%) expressed a neutral attitude, while 3% of those surveyed expressed a negative opinion about the session choosing “fairly poor” for their answers.
A somewhat larger number of people took part in breakout session III: “Action research and ethics” (31%). Out of those who participated, 84% of respondents had a positive opinion on the usefulness of this event. Their evaluation included 49% of answers describing it as “very good” and 35% of answers calling it “fairly good.”

The lunch with the authors was attended by 38% of respondents. Just as with the previously analysed events accompanying the Congress, it should be stated that people who attended the lunch with the authors viewed it positively in terms of its usefulness to their academic work. Close to one third of respondents (32%) evaluated its usefulness as very good and 38% of respondents evaluated it as good. It should be noted that over one fourth of the respondents (27%) were neutral in their evaluation, stating that it was “neither poor nor good”). Only 3% of respondents expressed negative
opinions about the lunch with the authors (2% of “very poor” answers and 1% of “fairly poor” answers).

Academic aspects of the Congress program received many positive opinions in the comments section of the evaluation survey. The respondents praised the diverse topics of particular working groups. It was appreciated that in many cases the group work was organized in a non-standard manner. Networking possibilities created by Congress were regarded as highly important. The possibility to meet renowned researchers who worked on similar topics was considered to be a valuable experience. The Congress can bring tangible effects in terms of expanding the cooperation between the academics from various countries.

Some controversies were noted in regards to plenary sessions. The opening and the closing plenaries were the most criticized. The former was said to be too long and its official speeches were considered unnecessary. Several people noted that in the final session that summarized the Congress the guest speakers were three white men of similar age and no women. On the other hand, some participants noted that in the remaining plenaries women presented hour-long presentations and there were no presentations by men. According to one participant women dominated in work groups. Although the academic program was appreciated for its rich content and variety, those two qualities were still considered problematic by some. According to a handful of respondents, there were so many interesting work groups that it was not possible to attend them all. It was often the case that the work groups dealing with similar topics had their meetings at the same time.

**Communication channels**

The Local Organization Committee (LOC) of the 27th ESRS Congress used the multiple channels of communication including the Congress website, Facebook and e-mail communication. The participants in the evaluation survey were asked to evaluate using a 5-point scale.

**Website**

The vast majority of respondents expressed positive opinions about the Congress website. 28% of them marked their answer as “very good” and 47% as “fairly good.” Only 11% evaluated the website negatively with 1% of them marking their answer a “very poor”, and 10% as “fairly poor.” 14% of respondents expressed neutral opinions on the ESRS Congress website.
When analysing the Congress website it should be pointed out that Congress Proceedings only became available 2 months after the Congress ended, which disappointed many participants.

**Facebook**

Currently, social media are recognized as very important channels of communication and they allow for building network relations. Therefore, the communication tools used by the organizers of the ESRS Congress included Facebook. As can be seen from the answers in the survey, only half of respondents used this channel of communication. This may be hard to explain considering the popularity of Facebook and how easy it is to use. Among the respondents who used Facebook, almost one third described their level of satisfaction as “very good” (31%) and 41% as “fairly good.” Only 4% of respondents had a negative opinion on this channel of communication and almost 25% expressed a neutral opinion.
E-mail

E-mail was another channel of communication that enabled the contact of Congress participants with the Local Organising Committee (LOC). Slightly more than half of respondents used this form of contact (53%) while 34% did not communicate with LOC by e-mail. 13% of respondents could not remember if they communicated with LOC by e-mail.
Respondents were asked to evaluate their level of satisfaction about the answers to their questions sent by e-mail and received from LOC; 1 meant the highest level of satisfaction and 5 meant the lowest opinion.

Among the respondents who communicated with LOC via e-mail, the vast majority were very satisfied with the answer received (61%) or just satisfied (26%). 9% of respondents who used this form of contact evaluated their experience as a 3 on the 5-point scale, 1% as a 4, while the lowest mark was given by 3% of respondents.
The process of abstract submission was among the most important communication activities that participants engaged in via e-mail with people responsible for the organization of the ESRS 2017 discussion panels. Although 85% of respondents were generally satisfied with that process it should be mentioned here that the percentage of highly positive answers (such as “very good”) was much lower (39%) than the level of satisfaction presented in evaluation of LOC answers sent by e-mail. Almost half of respondents evaluated the process of abstract submission as “fairly good” (46%) and 8% were neutral. Only 4% of respondents expressed negative opinions and 3% of respondents chose the “not applicable” answer.

**Lunch breaks and coffee breaks**

Providing a lunch break and the proper environment for such a break are usually quite important in organizing various congresses and conferences. For Congress participants it is quite vital to be able to catch a break and energize before the next work panel. Even a strongly positive evaluation of a coffee break can be a source of satisfaction for the Congress organizers. Almost all respondents had positive opinions about them (96%) with 81% of respondents giving them the highest note (“very good”), and 15% choosing the “fairly good” answer. Only 2% of respondents remained neutral on this matter and another 2% evaluated them negatively.
Lunch breaks received a similar evaluation. As many as 93% of respondents evaluated them positively; 80% of them chose the answer “very good,” and 13% opted for “fairly good.” Only 4% of respondents were neutral about the lunch breaks and 2% had negative opinions of them. Only 1% of respondents did not participate in lunch breaks.

As can be inferred from the answers given to an open question, meals were among the most highly praised aspects of the Congress. The majority of respondents combined their evaluation of lunches in an open question with their overall highly positive opinion of the entire Congress. They
emphasized that the food was of good quality, with no queuing for the lunch tables. Therefore, the lunch breaks went smoothly and provided ample opportunities for spending time with other Congress participants in a friendly atmosphere.

Some negative opinions on meals appeared in open questions. Although their number was very low, their content deserves some attention. One of the respondents stated that the large variety and quantity of food was contradicting the idea of sustainable development that the Congress featured in discussion panels. This person also expressed fears about wasting large quantities of food served during the Congress. Very few people complained about the taste of the food and lack of local products. These negative opinions constituted an insignificant minority.

Related events

During the ESRS 2017 in Krakow, lots of events were organized in connection with the Congress, including day trips, lunch with the authors, the performance of “We, pig country” and the congress dinner. Individuals participating in the survey were asked to evaluate these events.

Trips

In the 27th ESRS Congress in Krakow the congress trips were included in the congress fee. What do you think about this solution? (Please, choose only 1 answer)

- 73% It was a good solution. Congress trips should be included in congress fee
- 15% It was a bad solution. Congress trips should not be included in congress fee
- 12% I have no opinion

At first the respondents were asked to express their opinions on the LOC decision to include the trip fee in the conference fee. They were to evaluate whether such an idea was good or not and
whether it would be better to exclude trip-related fees from the general Congress fee. Almost three fourths of respondents (73 %) thought that the LOC solution was good (73%), and only 12% of respondents expressed opinions that the trip related fees should not be part of the Congress fee. 15% of respondents did not have an unequivocal opinion on this matter.

It should be noted that the percentage of respondents participating in the Congress trips (75%) is very close to the percentage of respondents who thought that including the trip fee in the overall fee was a good idea. More than one fourth of respondents thought that such solution was not good and such percent is consistent with the percentage of people who did not participate in the Congress trips.

Respondents who participated in Congress trips were asked additional questions about various aspects of trip organization. First, they were asked general questions about their satisfaction from the quality of trip organization. A significant majority (77%) was satisfied, and less than 20% of respondents expressed the opposite opinion. 4% of respondents did not have any opinion.
In the follow-up questions the respondents were asked to report whether the trip they took was interesting for them. The vast majority (76%) agreed with the statement “My Congress’s trip was interesting.” However 21% of respondents had a negative assessment of their trips and, and 3% had no opinion.

An equally large percentage of respondents had a positive opinion of meals and drinks served during the Congress’s trips. Large majority of respondents who took part in a Congress trip (79%) were satisfied with both the meals and drinks. Dissatisfaction with the meals was expressed by 15% of respondents while drinks on the trips were negatively viewed by 13% of respondents. A similar
percentage of respondents did not express any opinions on meals and drinks (6% and 8% respectively) served during the Congress trip.

The translation of presentations during the trips was considered very important by the LOC. It enabled the participants to better understand the issues discussed during meetings with the representatives of organizations, institutions, farms, and enterprises that were visited. Thanks to interpreters, the majority of respondents were able to understand the speeches, presentations and addresses that took place on the trip. Nearly three fourths of respondents that participated in the trips stated that organizers provided adequate translation and interpretation services. However, 19% of respondents had a rather unfavorable opinion of these services, while 7% did not have any opinion on this matter.
Answers to the question about the desire to visit the Małopolska region again provided an important indicator of the quality of the organized trips. It can be inferred from the expressed opinions that individuals who took part in Congress trips were satisfied with them and felt encouraged to visit the Małopolska region again. As many as 89% of respondents agreed with the statement “I would like to visit the Małopolska region again,” while 4% of respondents did not agree with that statement and 7% of respondents did not have any opinion on the matter.

Collected in the quantitative manner, positive opinions on the Congress trips should be compared to statements from the open questions. Their analysis shows that the trips also brought
some positive and negative feelings. Many people claimed that the trips were some of the best aspects of the Congress. The trips were appreciated because of their programs and because they gave participants good opportunities to meet new people and make new acquaintances. On the other hand, there were some critical voices. The critics pointed out the fact that the trip programs were greatly focused on presenting Małopolska as an interesting region, and the agricultural issues were overlooked. Some people claimed that they were disappointed with the trips because the program of the actual visit was not the same as the description they had been provided prior to the Congress. The short trip descriptions they read before the Congress did not give some participants the sense of a conscious choice. A few individuals expressed some criticism about organizational aspects of the trips, including meals, quality of translations/interpretation services and selected elements of the program. It should be stated that these types of problems were not common – they could be seen as isolated cases on some routes. Additionally, several respondents repeated in their answers to the open questions what they said in their responses to the multiple choice question, namely, that the downside of the trip stemmed from the fact that the cost of the chosen trip was included in the general Congress fee.

**Luncheon with the authors**

Luncheon with the authors was another event organized as a part of the ESRS 2017 Congress. Less than half of all respondents (46%) participated in that event. Those who did expressed largely positive opinions about it. For 58% of them it was a very good endeavor and for 17% it was good. Only 4% of respondents who participated in this event gave it a negative note and 21% of respondents were neutral.
Congress dinner

Dinner in a mansion outside of Krakow was an important event accompanying the ESRS 2017 Congress. The respondents who attended it expressed good opinions about it. More than three quarters of respondents saw that event as very positive (76%) and 12% considered it to be good. Only 3% of respondents expressed negative opinions about the Congress dinner and 9% were neutral.

Performance “We, pig country”

The performance of “We, pig country” was assessed quite positively. As many as 73% of all respondents expressed positive opinions about this performance (65% called it “very good”, 8% called it “fairly good”) and 2% gave it a neutral evaluation. It is worth emphasizing that none of the respondents expressed a negative opinion of the performance. All these values would look even more optimistic if we excluded from the analysis the 25% of respondents who did not participate in this event. It should be noted that the one fourth of respondents who did not attend the performance constituted a rather low percentage. Then the percentage of satisfied respondents is very close to 100% (97%) with 3% of respondents expressing neutral opinions.
The performance was one of the most appreciated aspects of the Congress, which was reflected in the answers to the open-ended questions. The respondents liked the idea of including artistic expression in the conference program. A significant number of people liked the fact that academics were looking for new ways to express important ideas and thought that such a trend had a future and was worth continuing. The play was praised for the quality of its acting, script, etc.

**Congress materials (program, gadgets, book of abstracts)**

Promotional materials were prepared especially for the ESRS 2017 Congress. The printed program was evaluated separately from the other goodies/gadgets that were given to every Congress participant in a special gift bag.
The respondents had a generally positive opinion about the printed program of the Congress. For 57% of them the printed program of Congress was “very good”, and for 29% it was “fairly good”. Only 7% of respondents had negative opinions of it and another 7% remained neutral. It should be noted here that in answering this question some respondents reported having difficulties in working with the printed program. This may indicate a need for a more clear presentation of the schedule of particular events.

Other Congress' gadgets in the Congress' bag

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Fairly good</th>
<th>Neither poor nor good</th>
<th>Fairly poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar opinions on other promotional materials were expressed by the participants of the Congress. Half of the respondents (exactly 50%) evaluated the contents of gift bags as very good and close to one third of respondents (33%) described them as good. 11% were neutral on the matter and 4% had negative feelings about the gift bag. Interestingly 1% of the respondents (1 person) claimed that he or she did not receive the Congress gift bag.

**General opinions about the Congress**

**Atmosphere**

Among the general questions related to the Congress there was one in which participants were asked to evaluate the social atmosphere. It is worth underscoring the fact that there were no answers with negative notes and only 2% of respondents had neutral opinions about its social atmosphere. 98 of respondents expressed positive opinions about its atmosphere and 71% of them gave it highly positive notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social atmosphere of the Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither poor nor good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many people indicated in the open questions that the atmosphere of the Congress made a really good impression on them. The atmosphere was understood in various ways but generally the respondents stated that they felt comfortable during conference panels surrounded by friendly and smiling organizers. The respondents stated that the good organization of the entire event was a significant factor in creating a good atmosphere. It was equally important that the Congress was a good occasion to meet old friends and make new ones.
None of the respondents stated in open questions that the atmosphere of the Congress was unpleasant or inappropriate. One of the respondents even said that with all the wonderful aspects of the Congress its weakest point was its inevitable end.

**Organization of the Congress**

Easy and effective registration was important to the Congress participants. The online registration system for the ESRS 2017 Congress received a positive evaluation. 83% of all respondents expressed such opinion and 47% of them marked the answer “very good” and 36% “fairly good.” Only 7% expressed negative opinions and 10% were neutral on this matter.

During the Congress, each participant was required to register at the designated registration centre. 94% evaluated the registration process positively 78% with “very good” ratings and 15% with “fairly good” ratings. Only 1% gave a negative evaluation to the registration process while 5% were neutral on the matter.
A large number of Congress participants took part in the welcome reception, where they could receive answers to various questions related to the organization of the ESRS in 2017. Only 14% of all respondents did not make use of the welcome reception, which clearly shows the importance of this aspect of the Congress. Among those who utilized the assistance of the welcome reception, the vast majority evaluated it positively (72% responses of “very good”, 12% responses of “fairly good”). Only 1% of respondents had a negative opinion of the welcome reception. Another 1% of respondents were neutral about it.

The survey participants were also asked to present their overall opinion of the Congress. Their answers indicate an unequivocally positive opinion of the quality represented by the ESRS 2017.
Congress. As many as 96% of respondents had a positive opinion of the Congress, including 59% of highly positive notes and 37% of respondents who chose the “fairly good” answer. Only 4% of respondents expressed neutral opinions of the Congress. None of the respondents gave the Congress a negative evaluation.

The organizational aspects of the Congress were highly praised and resulted in the overall positive evaluation of the whole event. In open questions the vast majority of respondents stated that they considered the good organization of the Congress its most notable asset. The punctuality of the organizers was also highly regarded, as well as the organizers’ attention to detail. While praising the organization of the Congress, many respondents stated that it was impossible for them to point out any of its weaknesses. Dozens of positive notes were given to the site selection/location of the Congress, as Poland was seen as a highly attractive country worth exploring. Krakow was considered even more attractive with a large number of people reported being enchanted by this city. The respondents were quite impressed with Auditorium Maximum and the Jagiellonian Law School, where the Congress sessions took place.

There were only two negative opinions expressed in open questions regarding the organization of the Congress. One person complained about the lack of free drinkable water (in water fountains) for the participants of the Congress. More than a dozen people reported that the program was too intense, with late returns from the Congress trips and a rather late Congress dinner, which did not allow the participants to adequately rest before the next working day. It was also stated that the events that accompanied the Congress were time-consuming and took away from time that the participants could spend sightseeing interesting places, such as Krakow.
Participation in the ESRS Congress in Trondheim (2019)

Finally, attention should be given to the attitudes of respondents towards the next ESRS Congress, scheduled to take place in Trondheim (Norway) in 2019. The respondents were to evaluate their potential interest in that event on a 5-point scale. The answers show that 27% of respondents were very interested in participating. Slightly more than one third of respondents (34%) were quite interested but not as much as the previous group. Another one third of respondents (31%) were moderately interested. For 7% of respondents the potential participation in ESRS 2019 had a rather low value, and extremely low for 1% of respondents.

As the most important factors that influenced decisions to attend the ESRS Congresses in the future were the following issues: acceptance of my abstract(s) (68%), programme (61%), cost (54%), networking opportunities (46%), and dates of the Congress (45%). Geographic location was somewhat less significant (30% of “very important” answers). The least important aspects in this regard were field trip topics and social events.
What factors are important to your decision to attend future ESRS Congresses? (%)

- Very important
- Fairly important
- Neither important nor unimportant
- Fairly unimportant
- Completely unimportant

Factors:
- Programme
- Cost
- Networking opportunities
- Location
- Dates of the Congress
- Field trip topics
- Social events (congress dinner, trips, etc.)
Recommendations

1. **It is recommended that the Congress Proceedings should be prepared before the beginning of the Congress.** The publication should be made available at the moment of Congress opening.

2. **During the Congress attention should be given to the organization of coffee breaks and lunches.** It appears to be a significant factor in the evaluation of the entire event. The organizers should therefore aim for the availability and diversity of meals and drinks for participants as well as the prevention of avoidable food waste. It was also recommended that the menu would include more local products.

3. **Including the theatre play in the program of the Congress was seen as the right move. In the future, more performances should be held.** Not only do they enrich and diversify the program but also have an educational dimension. They allow for the consideration of academic problems from a different perspective and provide a good occasion for discussion on various forms of expression that scientists can use.

4. **In the future the number of working groups and the number of presentations and speeches has to be well balanced.** Perhaps they need to be grouped in wider theme categories that would not overlap. The issues of gender and race diversity were also problematic. **Some respondents clearly stated that gender and race criteria should be considered** when selecting speakers for plenaries and working groups alike. **In the future, an emphasis on networking between academics may be vital** as the respondents reported that this one of the most important aspect of the Congress that in the future may impact the quality of academic work of various participants.

5. **Employing a person responsible for checking the e-mail box and responding to messages** was a good move of the Local Organising Committee. Lots of questions were sent to that box during Congress preparation, its duration, and also after it ended. The ongoing exchange of information was very helpful with proper organizing of the event and increased the comfort of the participants.

6. In the open questions some interesting proposals were made that could be helpful in improving the quality of the trips during the subsequent ESRS Congress. First of all, it was noted that the trips should have different timing allowing for earlier return. Second of all, in the future more attention should be given to trip descriptions. **It was seen as necessary to include detailed and thorough information on routes, distances that need to be reached as well as on places to visit**— these issues are especially important to people with disabilities. The third group of suggestions was also very important. It was suggested that
the trips should be more like study visits. **Particular trips should be focused around various academic problems related to the Congress topics.** Certainly, **topics more strictly related to agriculture should be more present.**

7. **Including trip fees in the Congress fee was seen as a good idea.** Such a solution was positively evaluated by large majority of respondents.

8. The breakout sessions did not generate much interest. This could be caused by the intensive program of the Congress. Those who did attend evaluated them positively. **In the future it may be helpful to come up with a program for the Congress that would allow participants to attend academic discussion and still have time for resting and exploring the local attractions of the Congress location.**

9. The printed program of the Congress was very important to the respondents. In a way, it was a map that allowed the participants to choose the most important events and accordingly plan their attendance in the Congress. In the future it is recommended that more attention be given to the quality and clarity of the program contents. It may be a good idea to prepare the program in an electronic format that could be easily read on smartphones.