Survey: Chairs, Board, Staff Meeting Chile 2016

Report: Default Report

Survey Status		Respondent Statistics		Points Summary
Status:	Live	Total Responses:	24	No Points Questions used in this survey.
Deploy Date:	10/24/2016	Completes:	24	
Closed Date:		Partials:	0	

1.
Outcome of last meeting. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not at Meeting	Total
The summary presented by Brian accurately reflected the outcome of the last meeting.:	6(26.09%)	12(52.17%)	2(8.7%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	3(13.04%)	23
I am confident that the Board acted on the priorities identified at the last meeting.:	7(30.43%)	12(52.17%)	2(8.7%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(8.7%)	23

Total Responded to this question:	23	95.83%
Total who skipped this question:	1	4.17%
Total:	24	100%

2.
Do you have any comments in relation to the outcome of the last meeting?

	Responses	Percent
Responses:	2	100%
Total Responded to this question:	2	8.33%
Total who skipped this question:	22	91.67%
Total:	24	100%

Graph/Chart function not relevant for this question type.

2.
Do you have any comments in relation to the outcome of the last meeting?

Response	Response Text
1	Due to overlap only the first part of the Meeting could be attended
2	Good approach followed to involve all and include views on priorities

3.
Chief Executives Update. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not at Meeting	Total
I agree with the priorities indicated in Martin Burke's presentation.:	8(34.78%)	12(52.17%)	1(4.35%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(8.7%)	23
Martin's presentation provided me with information I did not already know.:	2(9.09%)	6(27.27%)	7(31.82%)	2(9.09%)	2(9.09%)	3(13.64%)	22
Martin's presentation demonstrated that ICAR is now on a good path.:	7(30.43%)	13(56.52%)	1(4.35%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(8.7%)	23

Total Responded to this question:	23	95.83%
Total who skipped this question:	1	4.17%
Total:	24	100%

4.
Do you have any comments in relation to Martin's presentation?

	Responses	Percent
Responses:	2	100%
Total Responded to this question:	2	8.33%
Total who skipped this question:	22	91.67%
Total:	24	100%

Graph/Chart function not relevant for this question type.

4.
Do you have any comments in relation to Martin's presentation?

Response	Response Text
1	As board member i'm uptodate of many subjects.
2	Open approach and informative

5.
Group Reports. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with these statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not applicable	Total
I found the Group reports most informative.:	7(30.43%)	13(56.52%)	2(8.7%)	1(4.35%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	23
There is no need for the Group reports.:	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(8.7%)	6(26.09%)	14(60.87%)	1(4.35%)	23
Not enough time was devoted to discussing the Group reports.:	1(4.35%)	8(34.78%)	9(39.13%)	4(17.39%)	1(4.35%)	0(0%)	23
I think the Reports of the Groups to the meeting should be made public.:	2(8.7%)	11(47.83%)	4(17.39%)	5(21.74%)	1(4.35%)	0(0%)	23
Consideration be given to having Group reports presented to the Board during the year by video conference.:	2(8.7%)	5(21.74%)	12(52.17%)	4(17.39%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	23

Total Responded to this question:	23	95.83%
Total who skipped this question:	1	4.17%
Total:	24	100%

6.
Do you have any comments in relation to the Group reports?

	Responses	Percent
Responses:	9	100%
Total Responded to this question:	9	37.5%
Total who skipped this question:	15	62.5%
Total:	24	100%

Graph/Chart function not relevant for this question type.

6.
Do you have any comments in relation to the Group reports?

Response	Response Text
1	Board should act in cases, where the goal and/or priorities of the group are not clear enough.
2	Providing the group reports to a public forum could be useful. However there maybe sensitive information on occasion that may be not appropriate to pass on. The group reports are also summaries of group activities which in some cases do not have much context. To give context potentially makes producing these reports much more time consuming. So see some benefit but not sure that this is outweighed by the disadvantages.
3	DCMR report needs to be more concise.
4	I understand the issue of time during the ICAR meetings but I think that the (even more comprehensive) feedback of chairs is vital to keep the Board, Staff and other chairs informed about what's happening in ICAR. The interaction during such feedback (questions etc.) can be vital, but I see the need for saving time. Video conference? Maybe, but full participation is necessary. I feel a 'mutually informed' ICAR is a strong ICAR - it will lead to less duplication of efforts, more focus on core issues and easier identification / prioritisation of focus areas for the groups and others.
5	Brain, The solution adopted in Chili and 2 years ago to have a synthesis in general assembly and a meeting chair + board just before general assembly seems to me the best organisation.
6	There are too many groups, with still considerable overlap. The most obvious example is "electronic" data recording (in-line meters, heat-time devices, pedometers, feed intake etc....). Progress in this area is crucial for many of the groups. A bit like the DNA working group, there is merit for potentially consolidating a number of the data recording aspects of groups into one group. For example, within Interbeef, we currently have no focus on performance recording. Where should it sit, as dairy recording doesn't sit within Interbull, which is the dairy genetic evaluation equivalent.
7	The way the Meeting was held it reflects what the group coordinatior thinks about it and not what the chair or the group thinks. Discussion time was heavily occupied by individual chairs. If this continues there is little gain in listening to the Group coordinator or individual chairs. In this case the whole meeting could be canceled or (better) the previous format could be considered (having a clear timeline for each chair) to present the main outcome and direction of its Group and listen to questions of others and discuss these (on focus, overlap etc.). It should also be considered to come back to the presentation of all Groups to all members. This was one of the most informative sessions that one could attend at ICAR Meetings.
8	I would be in favour if every chair would present his/her own summary of working groups/sub committees. Strategic views and challanges in the groups were not discussed. It would be helpful to have this kind of discussion.
9	The groups are an important part of the ICAR activities. Providing a summary or update on their activities and actions in a public fashion would be appropriate, but the messaging and presentation needs to be managed and focused by the ICAR team to ensure consistency of message and avoid individual bias of groups/chairs.

7.
Guidelines Workshop. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
The pre-meeting survey on the Guidelines provide information that helped inform the meeting.:	3(13.64%)	14(63.64%)	4(18.18%)	1(4.55%)	0(0%)	22
Reforming the guidelines is a major priority for ICAR.:	14(63.64%)	6(27.27%)	2(9.09%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	22
The workshop identified the main priorities for improving the ICAR guidelines.:	9(40.91%)	10(45.45%)	3(13.64%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	22
I am confident that ICAR will implement the improvements to the guidelines identified during the workshop.:	6(27.27%)	12(54.55%)	4(18.18%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	22

Total Responded to this question:	22	91.67%
Total who skipped this question:	2	8.33%
Total:	24	100%

8.
Value of the meeting. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I found the meeting very valuable.:	10(45.45%)	12(54.55%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	22
ICAR should give more time to these sorts of meetings.:	7(31.82%)	6(27.27%)	9(40.91%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	22
Something similar should be organised for next year.:	10(47.62%)	8(38.1%)	3(14.29%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	21
The meeting was too long.:	0(0%)	0(0%)	5(22.73%)	14(63.64%)	3(13.64%)	22
The breakout session was most helpful.:	5(22.73%)	12(54.55%)	5(22.73%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	22
Finishing with dinner was an important part of the meeting.:	10(45.45%)	9(40.91%)	3(13.64%)	0(0%)	0(0%)	22

Total Responded to this question:	22	91.67%
Total who skipped this question:	2	8.33%
Total:	24	100%

9.

Any other comment? Is there anything else you would have liked to see discussed at our meeting in Chile?

	Responses	Percent
Responses:	5	100%
Total Responded to this question:	5	20.83%
Total who skipped this question:	19	79.17%
Total:	24	100%

Graph/Chart function not relevant for this question type.

9.

Any other comment? Is there anything else you would have liked to see discussed at our meeting in Chile?

Response	Response Text
1	The room as too hold and not enough fresh air.
2	I like the fact that ICAR identified priorities around objectives and branding last year and acted upon them. That give confidence that they will now approach the guidelines with the same commitment. This is critical as the guidelines are a crucial aspect of ICAR's existence. Further consolidation of group activities would also greatly facilitate this.
3	Is this the Overall Meeting in Chile or the guidelines Workshop from item 7 or the Meeting of chairs and board? Answers given in 8 are for board and chairs.
4	I think that one such meeting at the ICAR yearly conference is sufficient
5	I could not join the meeting as it coincided with the Technical Committee meeting of Interbll

10.
What role(s) do you have in ICAR?

	Responses	Percent
Member of ICAR Staff team:	7	29.17%
ICAR Board member:	5	20.83%
Service ICAR Board member:	1	4.17%
Chair of ICAR Group (Sub Committee, Working Group, Task Force):	11	45.83%
If other, please specify:	2	8%
Total Responded to this question:	24	100%
Total who skipped this question:	0	0%
Total:	24	100%

10.
What role(s) do you have in ICAR?

Response	Comments
1	was chair of WG when this meeting took place
2	Inspector