

Feedback for Group 1A

1. Clarity, communicability (use of documentation, visualisations, storytelling...)

13:11 » Text on slides is rather small +2

13:14 » Relevant information is shown but often there is too much information per slide and too little time for reading all of it.

13:14 » Nicely structured and very clear +1

13:14 » That table showing whether each rules are written or not was so nice +2

13:15 » Break of visual language between speakers - so as a reader one has to re-adjust every few slides. Therefore less attention paid to content.

13:15 » well prepared your illustration, incredible +3

13:15 » Nice visualisation of your journey! & overall very communicative and creative use of visualisations. You engage the audience! +1

13:16 » Excellent and clear visualisations. But due to short time, the presentation was too fast.

13:18 » The question to the audience was really good and helped to understand the problem better! +1

13:19 » Nice timeline of process. Good use of photographic documentation.

13:19 » Good visuals!

13:20 » It's very clear! And nice visualization!

13:20 » The slides is well presented and structure is good

13:20 » Easy to understand, the narrative was clear. Maybe the interactive part of the presentation did not work that well, though the example was great

13:21 » Nice visuals and easy to follow:)

13:21 » - Creative way to engage with the audience through a question.

- Impactful last slide with main insights leading to the core issue.

13:21 » A lot of information, nice visualization, +1

13:26 » AMAZING visuals!!

13:28 » Great visuals and story. Could empathise with the actors.

2. Relevance and quality of research (sources, research methods, sample...):

13:14 » Lesser emphasis on research methods and it's significance compared to other findings, perhaps this is intentional owing to the time constraints +3

13:20 » Difficult to evaluate, the focus of the presentation was more on outcomes. +2

13:21 » A bit all over the place. Could focus more on the method

13:23 » The visit to the site seemed a crucial step of the process! Maybe it could be a test site for some later part of the process and testing ideas.

13:23 » Would have appreciated an overview or more direction up front on a high level to guide me through the research

13:24 » Spot on, there is a lot of information in here +1

13:25 » Based on the presentation, you have done research with multiple methods.

3. The usefulness of research analysis and framing of identified problem areas (understanding of the topic, insights framing, systemic analysis...):

13:15 » Nice way of explaining your insights & their relevance, you manage to make the issues feel pressing.

13:18 » Existing knowledge nicely broken down, good attempt of highlighting hidden behaviour. A coherent walkthrough of one scenario would have been nice:) nice problem space breakdown

13:19 » Really nicely visualized

13:19 » I clearly got your central discussion=lack of communication. +1

13:20 » Nice critical approach to the topic! +2

13:22 » It's useful! The research results really help and audience can understand

13:23 » Would like to know more about too which extent may the guidelines affect the biodiversity +1

13:23 » Well done! Useful and rich results. +3

13:23 » The criteria to exam the physical sign is too vague for me +1

Feedback for Group 1B

1. Clarity, communicability (use of documentation, visualisations, storytelling...)

13:28 » Simple, clearly visualised. nice! +1

13:28 » I like the illustration +1

13:28 » I love story-driven narratives and this is a great example of the same. +2

13:29 » user journey with a persona/character! nice, easy to follow +1

13:29 » Very clear, good personalization +1

13:30 » Visually very clear materials with nice unified style

13:30 » Clear slides, nice visualization

13:30 » human centered approach is well communicated with the visuals +3

13:34 » I like the narration so much! ! Very clear and well-structure of the presentation, I enjoy it!

13:34 » nice matrix about activities! +1

13:35 » Lovely presentation and way of telling the story +3

13:35 » love the presentation, very easy to understand :)

13:35 » The presentation itself feels humane, nice! +1

13:35 » Clear and lovely storytelling! +1

13:36 » The presentation is neat and clear. I can easily understand the context of your problem and your problem space. Good job! +1

13:43 » Who should we interview? I think it would be important to include different groups: those who are newcomers, those who do not/have a car, those arriving with small kids etc.

2. Relevance and quality of research (sources, research methods, sample...)

13:29 » nice finding, numbers of links in luontoon.fi

13:31 » Good insights :)

13:34 » interesting insights

13:34 » Very nice way of using the journey to introduce the insights. Makes it tangible and relatable +3

13:35 » Have you made interviews on visitors? +5

13:35 » I like the open approach of sharing the insights and asking the feedback from people. Good idea and inclusive!

13:35 » informative and interesting!

13:37 » Research methods are well used and clearly showed, if more details and workload can be shown will be better!

13:40 » very relevant insights but we could mostly saw the outcomes of the methods, not what were all the methods -> but the outcomes were super and the time constrained

3. The usefulness of research analysis and framing of identified problem areas (understanding of the topic, insights framing, systemic analysis...):

13:34 » Well identified and communicated findings +1

13:35 » It seems that you really understood the topic. +1

13:36 » The insights are spot-on. Curious to see how these might be prioritized +1

13:36 » Cool way of ending the presentation, with such a discussion question +7

13:36 » Segmenting the people into experience with nature and in terms of connection is an extremely well thought out way of analysing the project. Kudos :D

13:37 » Love the academic connections to the different kinds of world views and their affect on nature +1

13:38 » The analysis seems very interesting especially for the last insight!

13:38 » The problem space dose help us generate more idea toward finding new solution

13:42 » Really appreciate having four deep insights and there may be a chance to integrate some of the insights in the next stage

13:44 » What are the touchpoints motivating people to look any information before visiting? Do people assume they are lacking information, and what would that be? +1

13:44 » You've found four useful insights. Maybe now delve deeper e.g. to the last one.

Feedback for Group 1C

1. Clarity, communicability (use of documentation, visualisations, storytelling...)

13:45 » Lot of text on slides, unable to read it all. +3

13:46 » Clear communication.

13:47 » Text vs time. Lots of text for little time:) +1

13:47 » the process slide was nice but went by quite fast +1

13:47 » Lots of text, but it's gonna be useful to keep for the report!

13:47 » Nice visualization of the process!

13:48 » stakeholder map is neatly put but could be bigger

13:52 » Pretty systems map!!

13:52 » Great systems analysis! But a bit too much text on some slides.

13:52 » A lot of text on the slides, a lot of info

13:54 » Too much information shown simultaneously on one slide. But appreciate the effort to put it there.

13:55 » Nice and clear, but a little bit too much words at the same time sometimes

13:56 » The layout is nice! but maybe darker colors should be avoided for bigger screens in public presentation

13:58 » The diagrams/mappings are nice but the text is a bit small and hard to read

13:59 » <https://forms.gle/1iznqLBGgj2rSjYW8> this is our ongoing online survey!

14:04 » More focus on what the work is about in the beginning. I didn't understand what the work is focusing on (except in the end, where you managed to put everything together)

2. Relevance and quality of research (sources, research methods, sample...):

13:47 » Good way of illustrating how you did fieldwork

13:48 » It was easy to understand how you did your research

13:48 » Stakeholder map is cool. Good way to show the inter-connections

13:50 » You have lots of support for your insights which is great!

13:51 » Clear research and also research methods!

13:54 » comprehensive research, clear that you analyzed much data!

13:54 » Well documented field work and references.

13:55 » you qualitative and quantitative data is really supportive for your research.

13:55 » Wöw impressive

13:55 » You have clearly researched your topic well also by looking into written material but with some findings I was left wondering if they are relevant to national parks or forests in general (also economical forests)

13:58 » In relation to Susannes comment, sitras new release on biodiversity and especially on luontosuhde is a good resource for answering the question of what nature education should be, or start to be

13:58 » questionnaire wow! Great! +1

13:59 » Great data analysis !

3. The usefulness of research analysis and framing of identified problem areas (understanding of the topic, insights framing, systemic analysis...):

13:49 » Good way to contextualise your research using statistics +2

13:51 » Great findings, but there's quite a lot of text for the audience to follow in the research analysis

13:52 » Show the map, but highlight the relationships better somehow and why you did the map +1

13:53 » Very data-driven approach +1

13:54 » It seems you have fully used of the research data! Good work! +1

13:55 » The data helps to support your arguments really well! +1

13:55 » Great research approach. +2

13:55 » Problem areas and data behind them presented in clear way :)

13:55 » The elaboration on the understanding of locality was a very fresh look.

13:55 » These findings seem relevant also beyond nuuksio as a case

13:55 » There are many times mentioned "letting dog run freely", this seems to be the only thing harming biodiversity, what are the other commonly done actions harming it? +1

13:56 » Nice that you have "locals" and "localness" as a thread through the presentation & the insights, makes it focused +3

13:57 » Your topic was very nicely narrowed down to localness, but the term local could have been clearer +1