In which role did you participate in the conference? (multiple answers)

- I gave a presentation and acted as ... (18)
- I acted as responsible of one ... (3)
- I acted as member of the staff (2)
- I chaired one or more sessions in ... (2)
- I acted as a speaker in one ... (2)
- I attended the conference but did ... (2)
- I acted as mentor of one or more ... (1)

How did you hear about the Neuchâtel Graduate Conference? (multiple answers)

- via members of the NCCR-on the ... (7)
- Other (please specify) (5)
- social media (Twitter) (5)
- E-News of the NCCR-on the move (5)
- past experience of participating in ... (3)
- mailing that the management of ... (2)
- at another conference on migration ... (0)

What did you most appreciate about the conference?

- very rich feedback and integration activities
- the fact that the conference was so well organised and well managed despite it being held in a hybrid model is really appreciable. Even though I could be present at the Conference physically, not once for a moment did I feel that I am missing out on any discussion.
- having a peer discussant as well as a mentor discussant
- What I liked most about the conference is that each paper received a considerable amount of feedback. Having extended feedback from the discussant as well as from the mentor was really helpful. The time allocated for questions also helped engage in dialogue and answer more punctual questions from the other presenters.
- Unusual long time space per paper, discussant and expert feedback, social events.

What did you least appreciate about the conference?

- would have loved more opportunities to meet/exchange with people from other working groups (more so than meeting senior academics)
- nothing.....everything was perfect
- nothing
- hard to say, everything was good
- The food at the cafeteria and VPN issues
### Timeliness of the information received before the conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeliness of the information received before the conference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Clarity of the information received before the conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of the information received before the conference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>13</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Responsiveness of the organizers to your queries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsiveness of the organizers to your queries</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>14</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Clarity of the information received during the conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of the information received during the conference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>15</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Approachability of the organizers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approachability of the organizers</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>18</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Do you have any recommendation on how we can improve the organization for next year?**

- the hybrid format did not work well
- no
- add a round of introduction in the working group time schedule

Thank you for the great job

Need for funding for academics in the Global South

---

### Quality of the infrastructure provided by Webex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of the infrastructure provided by Webex</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness and quality of the infrastructure provided by Webex</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity to be active and participate in the meeting</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Do you have any additional comment on the hybrid format you would like to share with us?

the hybrid format did not work well (but not your fault—the internet of the participants was not good enough, very unfortunate)

We had the chair online for one session. It did not work at all for this position.

No

Some chairs did not manage time well, giving some presenters/participants unlimited or uncontrolled time (unintentionally)

It was difficult at times to interact with the presenters online, but that is to be expected.

Please select the working group in which you participated

General structure of the working group sessions (4 sessions of 1h30, one discussant assigned and mentors providing additional feedback)
Your overall experience as presenter

- **Your overall experience as presenter**: 12
- **The preparatory emails/instructions by the organizers**: 12
- **The comments you received by the discussant**: 8
- **The comments you received by the mentor(s)**: 10
- **The quality of the discussion**: 8

---

Do you have any additional comment about your working group that you would like to share with us?

- Make sure Adobe is downloaded on the computers that are used to present; some people don’t use PowerPoint.
- I found it good to have 45 min per paper. However, after hearing the discussant’s and the expert’s feedback, we always had almost any time left for an open discussion. A shorter presentation and comments could be a solution.
- Shouldn’t be pressured to quickly round up our PowerPoint presentation. A bit of flexibility on the time of presentation will be greatly appreciated by the presenters in future.
- The time allocated is enough only if the chair is strict enough to call out those exceeding their given time.
- Not really the fault of the organizers, but I didn’t receive a paper draft (I got PPT slides) for my role as discussant. This made being a discussant quite challenging. I also didn’t receive these slides until a few days after the deadline, making it hard to prepare and make travel plans at the same time.
Public Lecture on "the Integration Nation"

- Public Lecture on "the Integration Nation"
  - 3: 2
  - 2: 10
  - 1: 6

- Speed Dating Session on Career...
  - 1: 3
  - 3: 3
  - 6: 9

- Panel on Ethics in Migration...
  - 1: 5
  - 1: 2
  - 7: 5

Do you have any additional comment on the plenary events you would like to share with us?

Non

I really enjoyed the lecture, it was engaging and fit the theme of the conference well. The speed dating was my favourite activity, I had the opportunity to speak to so many people from different backgrounds. One of the speed dating sessions had 3 professionals - one from IMO and two academics who did commissioned research for organisations like the UN and IMO. I found that very helpful rather than only having one individual per session, it worked like a mini-panel and answered questions about the differences between academic and non-academic careers very well. I liked the panel on ethics, but I think it felt superficial at times because it tried to cover too much. Perhaps a more specific ethical concern would have made it more engaging, e.g. emotions in research, getting access, working with vulnerable people, etc.

they were good. thanks

I took part in an impromptu panel in the seed dating sessions. We improvised and it seemed to work well.

If you only had one sentence, how would you describe our conference to your friends and colleagues?

A wonderful experience that will result in a lot of constructive feedback!

Interesting peer discussions, chats, and all this in a lovely setting at the lake.

Quiet an intellectually engaging conference for migration and development scholars with great diversity of participants.

An inspiring, mind-opening, international exchange on migration and mobility in a warm and friendly atmospheres at the shores of a beautiful lake.

It was Perfectly managed and the organisers put all their hearts in it. I really felt at home.