



Case study reports: Greece CS₃



AgriDemo-F2F has received funding from
the European Union's Horizon 2020
Research and innovation program under
grant agreement No 728061

1. Background

Programme

The American Farm School (AFS), is a private, non-profit organisation which was founded in 1904 in the outskirts of Thessaloniki. It offers several agricultural training programmes to interested farmers, and it is active in formal agricultural education (secondary school). It runs a fully operational farm with both plant and animal production. AFS has a long tradition and experience in hands-on learning and has been engaged in demonstration activities since many decades. It hosts demos on its premises, while it also organises demo events on farmers' farms.

Funding and Governance

AFS organises demos either in the context of a signed agreement/project between AFS, a sponsor and some farmers/farmers' groups, or upon a direct contact/request between AFS and farmers.

AFS is fully responsible for planning and delivering demos. When sponsors are engaged the demo topics and the attendees/area of intervention may be defined by them.

Actors and networks

While AFS is a well-connected organisation, both nationally and internationally, the organised demos are not part of any other network or programme. AFS relies mainly to its own resources and only occasionally they reach out to additional experts/scientists in order to engage them into demo delivery.

Event Farm and location

The event was held on the AFS farm. It is a 140 h farm, which comprises livestock, horticulture and food processing operations that produce products sold on the open market.

Event Date: 13/11/2018

2. Method

In line with the Methodological Guidelines, three main data sources are used: a background document and interviews at Programme and Farm level to analyse structural and functional characteristics, and event tools and surveys to analyse event level participation and learning, as follows:

1. A background document for every case study was completed by the AgriDemo-F2F partner who carried out the case study.
2. Interviews with representatives of programme/networks (level 1) and farm level interviews with demonstrators/hosts (Level 1) to reveal how the functional and structural characteristics enable learning. Analysis of these interviews is reported in Sections 3 and 4. Data is sourced from 1 interview at the Programme Level. The analysis followed 5 themes: (1) Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants, (2) Developing and coordinating appropriate interaction approaches, (3) Planning, designing and conducting appropriate demonstration processes, (4) Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context, (5) Follow-up activities.
3. Event tools and surveys (level 3) to reveal peer to peer learning processes. Event details and analysis is reported in Section 5. This data is sourced from 7 pre and post-demonstration participant surveys, 1 pre-demonstration and 1 post-demonstration interview with the demonstrator and an event observation tool completed by an observing researcher. This data is mainly used for the analysis of learning processes and learning outcomes related to the specific event and overall comments on the effectiveness of the event.

Finally, partners reviewed the case study reports to prepare their workshops with different stakeholders related to the case studies. These workshops aimed at validating the data presented in the case study reports and to discuss on key characteristics related to effectiveness of demonstrations.

3. Structural Characteristics

T1: Programme/network level

1. The main organisations involved in the demonstration activities and their roles

American Farm school (AFS) specialists

AFS organises demos either in the context of a signed agreement/project between AFS, a sponsor and some farmers/farmers' groups, or upon a direct contact/request between AFS and a beneficiary. AFS is responsible for the project management, planning, design and delivery of the demos. The overall approach concerning demo planning has to do with a highly tailor-made topic selection and delivery. The design of the demo programme is tailored to meet the beneficiaries' needs. This is also achieved through meetings and thus the delivery method is adapted to current and future needs and capabilities. AFS monitors participants' post-demo engagement as well as the assessment of the extent of this engagement, provided that there is available funding for such activities. AFS systematically evaluates their demos and request feedback form participants in order to improve their future delivery. Finally sometimes AFS conduct a background research for demos (bibliography/experiments) in order to finalise specific solutions for beneficiaries. Thereafter, they organise demos to inform and train farmers on how to deal with specific problems.

Q: How is the programme/network managed? R: Each program is tailor made according to perspective cover needs of the beneficiaries. Project management is exclusively done by the source that provides the service via an agreement that contains all necessary analytical information in regards to organisation and execution within a certain time framework.

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: AFS certified and experienced specialists; External selected collaborators; Sponsors. Farmers (participant's) are rarely involved. Planning, design and delivery of the demos is in the hands of our organisation

Q: How do you identify/select relevant topics that will interest farmers? R: Meet and ask perspective beneficiaries first to identify current and future needs.

Q: How do the overarching goals/objectives of the programme translate down to individual demo activities? R: We got to see calf on the ground. Let me use an example: there was a case when farmers observed their crop was damaged by a new insect. We have done our background research (using both bibliography and experiments in our laboratories and farm plots) and we have come up with a way to treat this attack. Then we organised demos to inform and train farmers on how to deal with that problem and protect their produce.

Q: With reference to your programme, do you plan for the variation in learning capacities and learning styles of individual farmers and their diversity of knowledge and skills? R: Yes. As explained earlier we meet and talk to farmers before the event; this allow as us to work on a Delivery method adaptation.

Q: What are the funding arrangements for your demo activities? R: There are 2 general categories: a) There are signed agreements per project that contain time frameworks between AFS and sponsor organisations through CSR funding; There are demos which are Self-financed by the beneficiary (e.g.: farmer).

Q: Do you assess if participants have engaged with/acted on the lessons of the demonstrations? R: Yes. Check their presence in situ since programs are hands on; Programs are compulsory ever since they decide to participate; Continued observation of application methodologies via the provider and sponsor; Information dissemination provided by the provider to current and passed beneficiaries in electronic and hard copy forms.

2. The main actors involved in the demonstration activities and their roles (each at program / farm/event level).

Host Farmers / Beneficiaries farmers

Host farmers are sometimes involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities or the overall demonstration programme. The extent of their involvement depends on each project's and farmer's characteristic (e.g.: needs, social profile, leadership etc.). It should be noted though that most demos are hosted on the AFS farms.

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: AFS certified and experienced specialists; External selected collaborators; Sponsors. Farmers (participants) are rarely involved. Planning, design and delivery of the demos is in the hands of our organisation.

Q: Are host farmers involved in the development of the individual demonstration activities? R: Sometimes. Depending of the project, needs, resources and farmer's social profile (e.g.: leadership).

Q: Are host farmers involved in the development of the overall demonstration programme? R: Sometimes. Same as before (Depending of the project, needs, resources and farmer's social profile (e.g.: leadership).

Audience

The intended audience of the demonstrations organised by AFS are farmers, sponsor organisations and trainers in Thessaly/Central Greece, northern Greece and Thrace. Farmers' participants do not have any specific roles at demo development. An interesting process for attracting participants and advertising events relates to the Alumni concept developed by AFS: AFS graduates keep some kind of contacts and relations with AFS, which help AFS to recruit/attract additional participants for their events.

Q: In your experience, what is the most effective way of attracting participants and advertising events? R: Quality services provision directly to beneficiaries without involving intermediaries; b) The brand name of the service provider; c) The Alumni concept development by the service provider.

Q: Who is your intended audience? R: Farmers, sponsor organisations, individuals who work in this field (trainers) in Thessaly, northern Greece and Thrace.

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: AFS certified and experienced specialists; External selected collaborators; Sponsors. Farmers (participant's) are rarely involved. Planning, design and delivery of the demos is in the hands of our organisation.

Sponsors i.e. companies

Sponsors are one of the main actors involved in the demonstration activities. They are in close contact with AFS in the frame of signed agreements, and finance demos delivered by AFS. In most of the cases, sponsors have their own targeted beneficiaries, host farmers as well as participants, and request AFS's involvement concerning the extension part. Sponsors also observe and assess beneficiaries' actions' on the lessons of the demonstrations.

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: AFS certified and experienced specialists; External selected collaborators; Sponsors. Farmers are rarely involved. Planning, design and delivery of the demos is in the hands of our organisation.

Q: How do you target farmers to host demonstrations? R: Via promotion and sponsor's input.

Q: Are participants targeted in demo recruitment? R: Always. The sponsor is directly responsible for it, meaning that there is a direct relationship between the sponsor and us in our case.

Q: How effective are you in recruiting in 'the hard to reach' or those who have never attended a demonstration event before? R: It depends on the individual's thinking and level of education that affects next move and initiatives taken, and how much he/she is framed by contract with the sponsor. Overall though, the brand name and the reputation of the service provider count, plus, how much the outcome is taken seriously by result to previous generation, unless there is compensation involved per individual to attend, which does not fall in our philosophy of getting things done.

Q: Do you assess if participants have engaged with/acted on the lessons of the demonstrations? R: Yes. Check their presence in situ since programs are hands on; Programs are compulsory ever since they decide to participate; Continued observation of application methodologies via the provider and sponsor; Information dissemination provided by the provider to current and passed beneficiaries in electronic and hard copy forms.

External selected collaborators

Depending on each demo project needs and special issues AFS collaborate with external collaborators and expert to contribute to demo processes.

Q: Who are the main people involved in the demonstration activities and what are their roles? R: AFS certified and experienced specialists; External selected collaborators; Sponsors. Farmers are rarely involved. Planning, design and delivery of the demos is in the hands of our organisation.

3. Networks

AFS is a well-connected organisation, with both international and national collaborations with universities, research institutes, manufacturers and commercial companies. Nevertheless, the Programme interviewee underlined that their demo initiatives are not part of or connected with any programme nationally or internationally.

Q: To what extent is the network/programme connected to other networks/programmes in your country or even internationally? R: The programme is not connected to other programmes/networks in the country or internationally. (Programme interviewee)

4. Funding

Demo event are funded in two different ways: Either through signed agreements /projects - CSR funding, between AFS and sponsor organisations or they are self-financed by the beneficiary (e.g.: farmer to AFS). No financial incentives/compensation is offered to host farmers.

Q: What are the funding arrangements for your demo activities? R: There are two general categories: a) There are signed agreements per project that contain time frameworks between AFS and sponsor organisations through CSR funding; There are demos which are Self-financed by the beneficiary (e.g.: farmer).

Do you offer any incentives to farmers to host demonstration activities? Certification of knowledge and skills (in cases hosts turn to opinion leaders).

5. Human Resources

The event's demonstrator is an AFS employee. He owns a professional (formal) training in commercial cheese manufacture. The demonstrator is not typically trained in order to be a demonstrator. He learned his role on the job (Pre survey demonstrator). The demonstrator stated that he would not benefit from some extra training as a demonstrator (Post survey demonstrator).

6. Goals/ objectives

AFS's goals concerning demo activities fall in typical extension objectives. More specifically AFS intend to inform and train farmers and speed up changes of farmers' attitudes and problem solving towards specific beneficiaries.

Q: What are the overall goals/objectives of the demo farm? R: Change attitudes to bring farmers up to speed in regards to new tech applications for producing quality products with environmental concerns. This is done after developing the appropriate com channels with beneficiaries and sponsors.

T2: Farm (event) level

1. Event Farm location and layout

The specific event was organised on 13 November 2018, and took place at the local facilities of AFS in Thessaloniki.

2. Practice / technology demonstrated

The topic of the demonstration event, had to do with cheese production (yellow cheese) (Observation tool). The event was part of a series of 4 similar ones that focus on dairy products (Greek feta cheese, yellow cheese, other traditional Greek cheeses, and yogurt). Participants were exposed to the theoretical part on the topics of safe products and quality production in a previous meeting of the group with experts and scientists (vet, food processing expert and chemist). In this specific event, participants were engaged in the production of a Greek traditional semi-hard cheese. The demonstration was held in the farms creamery (Observation tool). The demonstrator has classified the specific event as a showcase of existing practices (Post survey demonstrator).

3. Actor's role

There was only one demonstrator who was employee of the farm and professional expert in cheese production. The demonstrator and the participants used all tools needed to prepare and process the farm's milk to produce semi-hard yellow cheese (Observation tool + Pre survey demonstrator). The demonstrator used a step by step approach starting from the safety measures which should be taken when handling machines/equipment/tools, then when handling raw material and then in the processing to produce milk. The demonstrator encouraged participants to share their own experiences with others and challenged/provoked them with questions (Observation tool).

Seven participants were present and interviewed at the specific demonstration event. Approximately 86 % of participants did not work in the area where the demonstration took place (Pre demonstration survey participant). The interviewed participants' occupations were farmers (50%) or other occupations not clarified (Pre survey participant). According to the event's demonstrator, participants were not involved in the overall development of the specific demonstration (Post survey demonstrator). Participants were free to ask any question on any different step of the process. All participants felt actively or very actively involved during the whole demonstration process (Post participant's survey). All participants were able to use available tools and equipment and all actually produced their own cheese as a team (Observation tool + Post survey demonstrator).

4. Duration

The event lasted for 4.5 hours (5 - 9.30 pm).

5. Frequency

AFS organises repeated as well as one-off events. This is an event which is held every year.

6. Farm's infrastructures or arrangements

The demonstration was held in the well-equipped creamery of AFS facilities.

7. Accessibility

The travel time of participants to reach the demo farm, ranged from 45 to 150 minutes, with an average time close to 87 minutes (Pre demonstration survey participant). Two out of seven participants (28%) rated their travel effort to participate as very little effort or little effort. Four out of seven participants (58%) rated their travel effort to participate as quite some effort or great effort. Finally one participant rated his travel effort to participate as greatest possible effort (Pre survey participant).

8. Fees for participation

All participants have to pay a fee in order to attend the demonstration. Moreover, none of the participants had received any financial compensation for its attendance (Post participant's survey).

4. Functional characteristics

T1: Coordinating effective recruitment of host farmers and participants

1. Incentives

With respect to funding the Programme interviewee identified 2 general categories as follows:

- 1) There are signed agreements per project that contain time frameworks between AFS and sponsor organisations through Sponsors (Corporate Social Responsibility) funding; (2) there are demos which are self-financed by the beneficiary (e.g. farmer/attendees). (Programme interviewee)

Host farmers do not receive financial incentives but they benefit from being considered opinion leaders.

2. Motivations for host farmers

The farmers' motivations for participating are the certification of knowledge and skills, provided by the American Farm School, to validate their knowledge. According to the interviewee "Both hosts and attendees react mainly to certification of knowledge and skills" (Programme Interviewee)

3. Motivations for participants

According to the interviewee, motivations for farmers participating in demos vary, he/she suggested that approximately 5% attend out of curiosity; 80% because they are entrepreneurs; 5% attend because of the social aspect; and 10% to improve their self-confidence.

4. Target audience/ Advertising and recruitment

The interview explained that the target audience includes: farmers, sponsor organisations, individuals who work in this field (trainers) in Thessaly, northern Greece and Thrace. Participants are targeted and typically the sponsor is directly responsible for this.

The interviewee felt that the most successful way of advertising/ attracting/ recruiting is through: "a) quality services provision directly to beneficiaries without involving intermediaries; b) using the brand name of the service provider; c) using the alumni concept development by the service provider (AFS). (Programme Interviewee)

T2: Appropriate demonstration and interaction approaches

1. The nature of interaction

The Programme Interviewee described the nature of interaction as Mostly bottom-up, taking account of farmers' different approaches, needs and capabilities. He/she explained that they:

Meet and ask perspective beneficiaries first to identify current and future needs. (Programme Interviewee)

2. Involving farmers in the learning process and the demonstration programme

With respect to host farmers' involvement in both individual demonstrations and the network programme, this does occur but will depend of the project, farmer needs, resources and farmer's social profile (for example whether they are leaders).

The content of the demo is not steered by the network. The demos are "highly tailor-made". According to the interviewee the following parameters are taken into consideration when deciding on the content: a) Needs; b) Resources; c) Availability; d) Conception; e) Budget.

3. Focus

The Programme Interviewee described the network approach as 'In between' 'Whole farm' and 'Single focussed'.

4. Design

The Programme Interviewee described the demo approach as 'Exemplary' rather than 'Experimental', he/she expressed a preference for 'Exemplary' as they considered that the benefits are long term.

5. Group size

Regarding the optimal size group for a demonstration, the interviewee observed that this:

Depends on the size of the group dealing with, and type of demo. The size is usually subjective against quality issues, cost effectiveness and management efficiency. (Programme Interviewee)

T3: Enabling learning appropriate to purpose, audience, context

1. Facilitating interaction and learning: structure, content and techniques

With respect to the best approach to demo activity (structure/method etc.) the interviewee said that farmers "Learn by doing". He/she judged that the most important outcome from a demo is that Participants ask questions & talk openly', this is because:

Those who participate need a certain feedback. Usually they would spend time with the provider to learn something new by doing in respect to their current experience. (Programme Interviewee)

2. Taking into account variation in learning

The Programme Interviewee said that they do take into account variation in learning:

We meet and talk to farmers before the event; this allows us to work on a Delivery method adaptation (Programme Interviewee)

T4: Effective follow-up activities

1. Follow-up activities and materials

According to the interviewee they try to engage with participants after the event. They have an "open line" to respond to specific requests as an after service activity. They also provide material.

Visits of both sides (AFS to attendees farms and farmers to AFS), plus, electronic and hard copy info on specific issues. (Programme Interviewee)

2. Assessing impact

The interviewee reported that they assess the impact of the events amongst participants with “continued observation of application methodologies via the provider and sponsor”. (Programme Interviewee).

They do not assess the impact of the event in the wider farming community.

5. Event analysis: effective peer learning characteristics

Event details

The group consisted of 7 participants all of which filled in the pre and the post survey.

Six out of 7 participants do not work in the local area.

	n° survey participants	cheese production	farmer	other	unknown
<i>occupations</i>	7	1	3	2	1
<i>gender</i>	7				
male	6	1	2	2	1
female	1		1		
<i>age</i>	7				
18-30	3	1		1	1
31-40	2		1	1	
41-50	2		2		
51-60					
60+					

T1: Learning processes

1. Communication initiation by participants

When in the whole group, more than 50% of the participants had no problem sharing their knowledge and/or experiences related to the topic. The demonstrator encouraged them to share with others and challenged/provoked them with questions. It was a quite informal meeting. There was only one small group of 7 participants. There was a lot of time for questions and a lot of them were asked. Questions were popping up throughout the event. There were a few participants trying to formulate their own points of view regarding the topic.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I had the feeling that I could share my own knowledge as relevant information.	1/7	0	4/7	2/7	0
I asked at least one question during the demonstration .	5/7 yes				
I shared my own point of view at least once during the demonstration.	4/7 yes				
I felt encouraged to ask questions during the demonstration.	0	1/7	3/7	3/7	0
When there were any discussions, I felt comfortable sharing my opinion.	0	1/7	5/7	1/7	0

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I asked participants to share some of their own background knowledge during the demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate their own point of view during the demonstration.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged the participants to formulate questions during the demonstration.	0	0	0	1	0

2. Interactive knowledge creation

Hands-on opportunities and other multisensorial experiences

More than one hands-on activity was demonstrated very clearly/ instructively. Participants could take part in multiple hands-on activities, and got some sort of feedback on their doing. They could engage in discussion: listening to each other and to the expert. They could use tools/equipment and machines. They could smell, taste and feel the temperature of milk/cheese/brine/etc. All participants used/engaged in all different phases and got feedback and asked questions on what is demonstrated and their own experience.

Discussion opportunities and negotiating conflicting points of view

Only the demonstrator was present. There was no specific time allocated to questions and discussion. Participants were free to ask any question on any different step of the process. The small size of the group and the duration of different steps (i.e., pasteurisation phase, brine, lactic acid producing bacteria, etc.) facilitated discussion in the group. Open discussions are stimulated and given a lot of time. Most participants are involved. Shared critical points of view were clarified/rephrased so more people could understand.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
In my opinion, there were interesting discussions during the demonstration.	1/7	0	3/7	3/7	0
If participants didn't agree with each other during discussions, somebody (demonstrator/other participant) tried to reach a consensus between them.	0	0	5/7	1/7	1/7

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
In my opinion, there were interesting discussions during the demonstration.	0	0	0	1	0
If participants didn't agree with each other during discussions , somebody (me or somebody else) tried to reach consensus between them.	0	0	1	0	0

3. Engagement during the event

Participants all seem to know each other well, but are not close friends. The demonstrator acts open and friendly, but not as close friends with the participants.

	participant answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I felt actively involved during the whole demonstration process.	0	0	4/7	3/7	0
I felt like the demonstration increased my ability to rely on myself as a farmer.	0	0	4/7	3/7	1/7
I could relate well to other participants (because they have an agricultural background similar to mine).	0	1/7	5/7	1/7	0
A lot of the other participants are part of the same farmer network as me.	1/7	1/7	4/7	1/7	0
I felt like I could trust the knowledge of (most of) the other participants.	0	1/7	6/7	0	0
The demonstration felt like an informal activity to me.	0	1/7	3/7	1/7	2/7
I thought the host farm was comparable enough to my own farm.					
I had the feeling the demonstrator was like one of us.	0	0	2/7	5/7	0
I had the feeling I could trust the demonstrators knowledge.	0	0	3/7	4/7	0
I got along very well with the demonstrator.	0	1/7	3/7	3/7	0

	demonstrator answers				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
Were participants (farmers, advisers, researchers etc.) involved in the overall development of this demonstration?	No.				
Most of the participants were well known to me.	1	0	0	0	0
A lot of the participants are part of the same network as me.	0	0	0	1	0
The demonstration felt like an informal activity to me.	0	0	0	1	0
I think the host farm was well suited for this demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I got along well with the participants.	0	0	0	1	0

T2: Learning outcomes

The explained knowledge was very clearly understandable. The demonstrator used different tools/machines during the demo so he had the opportunity to revisit and explain steps. Skills were very clearly addressed to foster maximum uptake by participants. All participants were able to use the tools and equipment. Especially in those phases were they felt they had less experience (PH measurement in different phases etc.). The demonstrators made subsequent rounds to allow them to become familiar with structures and steps. Common methods or ways of thinking on farming were questioned and alternatives were extensively elaborated on in group. There were extensive discussions of problems and solutions throughout the event.

	participant answers				
What would you ideally like to learn today?	How to produce better products; the maximum they could teach me (quality products, techniques, etc); the best approaches I can adopt; the right dairy/cheese production approaches and techniques especially with regard to safety and quality; to improve my knowledge on dairy/cheese production; experience and new techniques.				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
The demonstration met my expectations regarding what I wanted to learn.	0	1/7	2/7	4/7	0
The demonstration exceeded my expectations.	0	1/7	2/7	4/7	0
I felt surprised at some point(s) during the demonstration.	0	1/7	5/7	1/7	0
I obtained a clearer understanding of the topic(s) demonstrated.	0	0	5/7	1/7	1/7
I have the feeling I learned something new (knowledge, skill, practice, etc.).	1/7	0	1/7	5/7	0
I thought about how I could implement some of the ideas and practices on my own farm.	0	1/7	5/7	1/7	0
I reflected on my own point of view at some point during the demonstration.	1/7	0	4/7	2/7	0
I learnt about the principles underlying a practice.	1/7	1/7	2/7	3/7	0
I thought about how we learn something new on demonstrations (e.g.: teaching methods).	0	1/7	4/7	2/7	0
I thought about why I want to learn about the topic(s) of this demonstration.	0	1/7	6/7	0	0

	demonstrator answers				
what do you intend for the participants to learn today?	The dimensions of quality in dairy production and techniques to produce good quality products.				
	strongly disagreed	disagreed	agreed	strongly agreed	not applicable
I think participants have learnt what I intended them to learn.	0	0	1	0	0
I tried to surprise participants with uncommon/new knowledge/new skill.	0	0	0	1	0
I felt surprised at some point(s) myself during the demonstration (e.g. by a question or discussion).	0	0	1	0	0
I obtained a clearer understanding of the topic(s) myself.	0	0	0	1	0
I have the feeling I learned something new during this demo (from participants, discussion...).	0	0	1	0	0
I reflected on my own point of view myself at some point during the demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on their own point of view during this demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on their own situation sometime during this demo.	0	0	0	1	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on how we learn something new on demonstrations.	0	0	1	0	0
I encouraged participants to reflect on why we are trying to learn about the topic of this demonstration	0	0	0	1	0

T3: Overall comments on the effectiveness of the event

Participants:

With an average of 4,1 on 5, participants rated the event overall as very effective. 6/7 would recommend the demonstration. They stated as most effective characteristics of the event: how knowledgeable the demonstrator is and his ability to pass over new knowledge.

There were no suggestions for improvement.

Demonstrator:

The demonstrator reported on what made it effective: the active participation of participants. Regarding possible improvements he mentioned: each participant to prepare/work on his own cheese production (instead of one for all participants); and it could be good to have an automatic production line to compare with traditional practices.

Observed main strong points of the event:

It was led by a very knowledgeable and quite open and "approachable" demonstrator eager to simulate "real life" condition in cheese production. Different scenarios with mistakes, wrong handling and "savings" were presented (and appreciated by participants). There was a lot of time for questions and discussion throughout the event. Participants actually produced their own cheese as a team.

General conclusions:

IT was a well-structured event in a well-equipped creamery (which also gave a good idea on how participants can organise theirs without resorting to fancy solutions, but rather to practical ones).