

Social Security Co-ordination and Social Security Reforms

EVALUATION OF THE REGIONAL SEMINAR ON PENSIONS

9-10 MARCH 2009, ZAGREB (CROATIA)

In the framework of the “Social Security Coordination and Social Security Reforms” (SSCSSR) Programme, a European Commission and Council of Europe Joint Programme to further develop social security institutions in the Balkan Region and Turkey, the Secretariat of the Programme organised, following the Action Plan, a Regional Seminar on Pensions in Zagreb, Croatia.

At the end of the end of the Seminar, and in order to allow the Secretariat to evaluate its overall content, the quality and relevance of the speakers’ interventions, the availability and assistance of the Secretariat and the overall organisation of the event, an evaluation report was distributed to all participants.

This report has been prepared on the basis of the 24 evaluation forms received at the Secretariat from a total of 24 participants.

The Beneficiary Parties were represented as follows:

- 2 representatives from Albania,
- 6 representatives from Bosnian & Herzegovina,
- 3 representatives from Croatia,
- 4 representatives from Macedonia,
- 3 representatives from Serbia,
- 3 representatives from Turkey and
- 3 representatives from Kosovo¹.

Five experts were responsible of conducting the workshop. However, for technical reasons, one of them (Prof. Dr. Gijsbert Vonk) was not mentioned in the evaluation forms.

It has to be noted that the forms were anonymous and, consequently, the results obtained could be accepted as not being influence by external factors.

The results are based on a percentage, on the basis of the evaluation forms received.

¹ All reference to Kosovo, whether to the territory, institutions or population, in this text shall be understood in full compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and without prejudice to the status of Kosovo.

1. Content

Did the content of the course fit your needs and expectations?

On a very large scale	25%
On a large scale	70,8%
Partially	4,2%
On a small scale	-

2. Experts (speakers)

Please evaluate the interventions provided by Dr. Prof. Danny Pieters with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

Quality		Relevance	
Very good	66,7%	Very relevant	47,8%
Good	33,3%	Relevant	52,2%
Average	-	Simply interesting	-
Poor	-	Irrelevant	-

Please evaluate the interventions provided by Dr. Prof. Paul Schoukens with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

Quality		Relevance	
Very good	70,8%	Very relevant	43,5%
Good	29,2%	Relevant	52,2%
Average	-	Simply interesting	4,3%
Poor	-	Irrelevant	-

Please evaluate the interventions provided by Mr Yves Stevens with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

Quality		Relevance	
Very good	58,3%	Very relevant	60,9%
Good	29,2%	Relevant	21,7%
Average	12,5%	Simply interesting	17,4%
Poor	-	Irrelevant	-

Please evaluate the interventions provided by Mr. Paul Roels with regard to their quality and relevance for yourself and your work:

Quality		Relevance	
Very good	37,5%	Very relevant	39,1%
Good	50,0%	Relevant	43,5%
Average	12,5%	Simply interesting	17,4%
Poor	-	Irrelevant	-

3. Organisation

How would you rate the overall organisation of the course?

Very good	75,0%
Good	16,7%
Average	8,3%
Poor	-

How would you rate the meeting facilities provided?

Very good	62,5%
Good	37,5%
Average	-
Poor	-

How would you rate the hotel accommodation and food provided?

Very good	68,2%
Good	27,3%
Average	-
Poor	4,5%

How would you evaluate the availability and assistance provided by the Secretariat?

Very good	91,7%
Good	8,3%
Average	-
Poor	-

4.- Other comments/suggestions:

Some participants indicated that the content of the agenda was a bit different from the areas to be covered. Other participants indicated that the religious aspects of participating in social security schemes covered by Mr. Roels represent a sensitive issue. Another comment was concerning the comparative analysis presented by Prof. Vonk that was not found relevant to the topic of the seminar. A number of participants indicated that they should have received the hard copies of all the presentations in advance. Some participants were of the opinion that a per diem should be paid on top of accommodation and meals provided (or that the visa costs should be reimbursed immediately). Some participants expressed their satisfaction and wish to be involved in further activities in this area.

CONCLUSIONS

The figures included in this report can be considered as representatives of the overall organisation and evaluation of the event, feedback was received from all the 24 participants by the Secretariat.

As far as the content is concerned (Chapter One), it can be stated that the workshop satisfied, to a large (very large) scale, the expectations of the participants.

As far as the interventions of the speakers are concerned (Chapter Two), the majority of participants agreed that the quality and relevance of the interventions of the four speakers was either good/relevant or very good/very relevant. However, there were concerns expressed regarding the relevance of some presentations in the agenda to the overall topic of the seminar (Chapter Four).

As far as the hotel accommodation, meeting facilities and catering services (Chapter Two), the majority of participants have rated them as very good (good).

As far as the organisational aspects of the event (Chapter Three), the majority of participants have rated the overall organisation together with the assistance of the Secretariat as very good.