

Research School 2nd Open Seminar “Entrepreneurship, Health, and Innovation”
Evaluation Summary

In the Seminar on November 12th 34 participants took part. The evaluation form was completed by 16 of them including 8 PhD students, 5 HH employees and 3 guests.

1. Please, evaluate how much you were satisfied with the various aspects of the Seminar (10-point scale):

	Means
The Seminar program structure and content	8.9
Content of KK-projects presentations	8.1
Presence of invited guests	8.4
Content of the guests’ presentations	8.1
Poster session (brief oral introductions, content, interactions)	8.4
Round table discussion	8.1
Overall organization (information, location, lunch, etc.)	9.4

2. Some of the participants’ comments to their evaluations of the Seminar on 12/11/13:

- A highlight was an inspiration I got being present the whole day (S).
- Very well organized! Great structure where a lot of interesting projects were presented in a concise and professional way. Excellent time-keeping by everyone involved.
- Content was diverse and presented in a thought-provoking manner (G).
- It was a good mixture in the contents and it was good that the PhD students could give a short pitch on our topics. However, we are more internal than external representatives but still it was a good mixture of external guests and their participation was highly appreciated (S).
- Round table discussion was very good. (E).
- The brief oral introductions and the poster session was a great way to know what’s going on in the other departments of the University and possible opportunities for collaboration. It was encouraging to interact with the industrial representatives and get a global perspective on the innovation drive in the current and future markets. The round table discussion was highly stimulating (S).
- Very interesting round-table discussion (S).
- One highlight for me was to meet persons with different backgrounds and find that we had much in common. The form for poster presentation with “an appetizer” was excellent. I also had hoped for more engagement from younger people in the round table discussion (G).
- I appreciated the interaction between the participants and guests both during lunch but also during the poster session (S)
- The round-table discussion was really good and well-prepared. However, we should try to set-up actual collaboration-projects as a result from the round-table discussion and workshop in general. I think collaboration-projects are essential to develop the research school further (S).

3. Do you think it is a good idea to continue the tradition of the Research School Open Seminars and plan for the 3rd Open Seminar in 2014?

Yes -100%

No

4. If you just answered “yes”, what do you think we all can do better in the next Open Seminar (and at the Research School in the future)? Some of the answers:

- I am looking forward for future activities such as this (Seminar). I am also looking forward for more opportunities for cross-sectional collaboration and perhaps brainstorming activities (S).
- Invite new guests (S, G, E)
- Maybe have even more focus on potential interdisciplinary research topics in the round table discussion (S).
- To possibly drive some interdisciplinary projects for the three research areas together with some external partners; maybe this could be a niche strategy for Halmstad University to carry out interdisciplinary research within health, entrepreneurship and innovation in some specialized areas. However, there is a tradeoff for PhD students since the time is limited and focus has to be on thesis work, but maybe this could be a career opportunity for newly graduated researchers and for more experienced researchers (S).
- I think the Research School also can discuss issues as business models that came up but also questions related to finance, management and corporate governance in the health care sector (E).
- More people from the industry and probably international participants shall be a great boost to the Research School (S).
- Perhaps, have a round table discussion in smaller groups (S).
- It will be great to work with other PhD students on an interdisciplinary research project (S).
- See if there could be a form to engage all participants in the discussion. We need to continue to develop the balance between PhD-students, seniors and guests for dynamic discussions (G).
- Even though the participants not are the same over time, I think it’s time for “us” to think more in entrepreneurship and present how our research can be used on a “market” as well as the guest can talk and speculate around what kind of services/products they might need in the future or in what sense we might be useful for them and contribute (S).
- I think the Research School is important for HH and holds a central position as the “only” PhD organization between the different research environments (E).
- Setting up collaboration projects across schools within the university and with external partners. I think that the group who is supposed to work with external contacts (at the university in general) should spread the message of the Research School activities and to extend the list of external guests. (S).
- We should work more with collaboration projects between schools within the university to strengthen research and education. Such examples of collaboration projects could be PhD courses, applications for research funds, research projects, articles, writing a book, methodology sessions/workshops such as experimental designs etc. It is also interesting to know more about the research activities that the seniors are conducting. One reason for this is to integrate juniors and seniors more and to try to build collaboration bridges between the schools are represented in the Research School (S).

Abbreviations: (S) – PhD student, (E) – HH employee, (G) – External guest.

Summarized by: Natalia Stambulova, 2013-11-27.