

FLARE network

First Annual Conference, November 27-30, 2015

Participant Feedback Survey Summary (n=89)

1. How did you hear about FLARE?

- Colleagues/Word of mouth (n=59, 66%)
- Email Listserve (n=20, 22%)
- FLARE website (n=3, <1%)
- Other website (n=7, <1%)
- Listserves/websites mentioned: Forests Listserve, Society Ethnobiology, IISD, Ecolog, IFRI, CIFOR, UW Madison Geography Dept, SSWG, PCLG, CAPRI, IASC, EII, www.cef.cfr.ca, google search on conferences

2. Reason for attending

- Content (n=58, 65%)
- Networking (n=56, 63%)
- Professional development (n=34, 38%)
- Other: To present work, organize a session, develop partnerships, to engage with researchers on similar topics, learn from experts, brainstorming opportunities with key people, COP21 visit, for the non-disciplinary opportunity bringing together multiple perspectives (doesn't happen often)

3. Overall satisfaction with the conference

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Conference content	n=46, 52%	n=38, 43%	n=1	n=1	n=0
Conference format/structure	n=41, 46%	n=41, 46%	n=3	n=3	n=0
Registration process	n=74, 83%	n=10, 11%	n=2	n=0	n=0
Venue	n=72, 81%	n=12, 13%	n=2	n=1	n=0
Cost/value for money	n=60, 67%	n=16, 18%	n=3	n=1	n=0

4. If the opportunity were available, in which of the following ways would you be likely to engage with FLARE in the future?

- FLARE Conference 2016 (n=77, 87%)
- Theme or product specific workshops or meetings (n=63, 71%)
- Email listserve (n=51, 57%)
- Online discussion forum (n=27, 30%)
- Other: Working groups (experimental approaches; forest governance implementation); joint papers and research collaborations (conceptual syntheses, meta-analyses, case studies etc.); special issues; writing workshops; data sharing; mentoring relationships and friendly peer view; organize sessions at other conferences (ISSRM, National Convention of Society of American Foresters); influence funders to support this kind of work and ability to share beyond scholars.

Institution type:

- University (n=54)
- NGO (n=21)
- Government agency (n=2)
- Funding agency (n=2)

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Content: Wide breadth of topics and participants, but even more diverse perspectives needed, including multiple disciplines and more qualitative methodologies. More representation by Global South practitioners, policy makers, and maybe even R&D representatives is needed, in order to connect research to policy and practice (be more action-oriented).

Format/structure: More time and space for discussion, both within and between sessions. Fewer parallel sessions (or longer conference). More tightly connected talks in each session. Better moderation and tighter focus in plenary sessions. More summing up and “so what” discussion is needed. Need more dialogue, which is the essence of a “community of practice.” Consider roundtable sessions to enable small group discussion.

Registration process: Very organized, but could use a better website, and a clear timeline of deadlines.

Venue: Beautiful! A few comments on the need for IT/tech support, stuffiness and size of rooms, distance between rooms, and lack of space/chairs for small group conversation.

Cost: Conference cost was very reasonable (especially including dinner), but travel, accommodation in Paris was very expensive. Consider Global South next time?

General: FLARE can play a real, supportive, and inspiring role in interdisciplinary research, the use and sharing of data, and connecting research to policy and practice.