



Training Workshops: Outcomes and Feedback Report (WP3A1)

Authors: Rasa Seliuginienė, Marjan Monshi, Dr. Gintarė Tautkevičienė

Date: January 2026








Co-funded by
the European Union

Deliverable Factsheet

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Project Number: | 2024-1-EE01-KA220-HED-000243324 |
| Project Acronym: | CAELUM |
| Project Title: | Open science supporting vulnerable communities: empowering university libraries in crisis response |
| Title of Document: | Training Workshop Outcomes and Feedback Report: WP3A |
| Output: | Report |
| Due date according to contact: | 01/02/2026 |
| Editor(s): | Liisi Lembinen (UT), Svea Kaseorg (UT), Korina Defteraiou (W2L), Damla Bal (SKS), Tetiana Kolesnykova (USUST) |
| Contributor(s): | All project partners [University of Tartu, Web2Learn, Kaunas University of Technology, Ukrainian State University of Science and Technologies, SKS Knowledge Services |
| Reviewer(s): | 14/02/2026 |
| Approved by: | All Partners |
| Abstract: | This report includes the pre- and post-assessment and feedback reports of five training workshops conducted under Activity WP3A1. It evaluates the effectiveness of the CAELUM methodology in upskilling library staff for crisis response through open science and interdisciplinary collaboration. |
| Keyword list: | Open Science, Capacity Building, Crisis Response, University Libraries, Mental Well-being, Disinformation, Employability |
| Copyright | Creative Commons License 4.0 International |
| Please cite as | Seliuginienė, R., Monshi, M., Tautkevičienė, G., (2026). Training Workshops: Outcomes and Feedback Report. CAELUM consortium. |

Partnership

| Name | | Logo |
|------|--|---|
| 1 | University of Tartu |  |
| 2 | Web2Learn |  |
| 3 | Kaunas University of Technology |  |
| 4 | Ukrainian State University of Science and Technologies |  |
| 5 | SKS Knowledge Services |  |

Revision History

| Version | Date | Revised by | Reason |
|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|
| V0.1 | 4/2/2026 | Liisi Lembinen, Svea Kaseorg (UT) | Partner review |
| | 5/02/2026 | Korina Defteraïou (W2L) | Partner review |
| | 12/02/2026 | Damla Bal (SKS) | Partner review |
| | 14/02/2026 | Tetiana Kolesnykova (USUST) | Partner review |

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

Disclaimer:



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Deliverable Factsheet | 2 |
| Partnership | 3 |
| Revision History | 4 |
| Table of Contents | 5 |
| Executive Summary | 6 |
| Introduction | 7 |
| Methodology and Implementation | 7 |
| 4.1 CAELUM Training Framework | 7 |
| 4.2 Workshops Design | 7 |
| 4.3 Evaluation Approach | 9 |
| Workshop Assessment Results (Quality and Quantity Metrics) | 10 |
| Kaunas University of Technology (KTU): Employability | 10 |
| SKS Knowledge Services: Information Overload | 10 |
| University of Tartu (UT): Student Well-Being | 11 |
| Ukrainian State University of Science and Technologies (USUST): Counter-Disinformation 11 | |
| Web2Learn (W2L): Accessibility and Inclusion | 11 |
| Participant Feedback | 12 |
| Challenges and Areas for Improvement | 12 |
| Outcomes and Impact | 13 |
| Behavioral and Institutional Shifts | 13 |
| Conclusions and Future Roadmap | 14 |
| Annex 1: Pre-Workshop Assessment Template | 16 |
| Annex 2: Post-workshop Assessment Template | 18 |
| Annex 3: Post-Workshop Participants' Feedback Template | 20 |

Executive Summary

The CAELUM project is driven by a mission to empower university libraries to serve as resilient hubs for vulnerable communities during times of crisis. This report provides a strategic synthesis of the WP3A1 activities, which focused on operationalizing the CAELUM methodology to upskill university library staff across Europe. By repositioning libraries as "resilience hubs," the project addresses critical gaps in European crisis response, aligning directly with the European Education Area's goals regarding social inclusion and digital resilience. Between December 2025 and January 2026, the partnership executed five distinct workshop series addressing varied crises: employment of international students, wartime disinformation, student mental health, information overload, and accessibility for the print-disabled.

Work Package 3 (WP3) bridges the gap between theoretical research (WP2) and the practical implementation of resilience strategies. Focusing on "Upskilling," WP3 ensures that library staff possess the innovative and interdisciplinary tools required to manage modern crises, effectively operationalizing the concept of the "Library as a Resilience Hub."

The workshops achieved a collective reach of 157 participants across five diverse institutional contexts (KTU: 15, SKS: 12, UT: 60, USUST: 35, W2L: 35). The overall success of these initiatives is evidenced by satisfaction scores that consistently exceeded 85% across the partnership. These workshops successfully addressed topics on employability (focusing on the integration of international students, and supporting youth employment), mental well-being and accessibility (addressing student mental health through physical support mechanisms and digital accessibility for print-disabled users), and information integrity (equipping staff to counter disinformation and manage information overload in high-stress and wartime environments).

The following sections provide a detailed methodology and analysis of the specific institutional implementations that secured these results, highlighting the adaptability of the CAELUM framework to varied socio-political landscapes.

Introduction

The CAELUM project envisions university libraries as the central architecture for community resilience during systemic shocks. The WP3A1 activity was designed to convert this vision into institutional reality by equipping library staff with the interdisciplinary tools required for modern crisis management. By focusing on these various crisis WP3A1 aimed to upskill staff in collaborative practices and innovative pedagogical tools. This approach transforms librarians from traditional information curators into proactive crisis managers capable of supporting vulnerable communities through Open Science principles.

This report provides a comprehensive review of the five training workshops organized under activity WP3A1. It encompasses the pre-workshop strategic objectives, the diverse delivery methodologies (onsite, online, and hybrid) and a rigorous synthesis of post-workshop participant feedback and learning goal achievement.

The audience of this document is mainly public and private libraries who need evidence-based insights for integrating these proactive practices into permanent institutional policy and infrastructure.

Methodology and Implementation

4.1 CAELUM Training Framework

The pedagogical foundation of WP3A1 relies on a "hands-on" engagement model that prioritizes active co-creation. A cornerstone of this framework is the "Didactic Game," defined as a low-stakes simulation environment that allows librarians to practice complex decision-making under pressure, a core tenet of the CAELUM methodology. This aligns with Open Science principles by fostering transparency and community-sourced solutions, ensuring that participants are not merely recipients of data but active architects of crisis-management strategies.

4.2 Workshops Design

The methodology and implementation for each partner are summarized below:

Kaunas University of Technology (KTU): The workshop was implemented as a face-to-face session designed to foster collaborative problem-solving among librarians from diverse

academic and public institutions. The methodology combined theoretical instruction with practical application; after introductions to the project goals and desktop research, the session focused on a specific case study regarding youth unemployment and international student integration. To facilitate active engagement, participants were divided into small groups equipped with markers and paper to review the KTU action plan, exchange professional perspectives, and propose concrete improvements. This hands-on format encouraged visualization and collective reflection, concluding with group representatives presenting their key conclusions to a wider audience.

SKS Knowledge Services (SKS): SKS adopted a hybrid learning methodology, combining a synchronous 90-minute online Zoom session with asynchronous engagement via a dedicated Learning Management System and collaborative whiteboard. The implementation focused on "Information Overload," utilizing historical perspectives ("Science in Motion") and expert contributions on research integrity to frame the discussion around observation and neutrality rather than immediate crisis definition. While the session included live Q&A and moderated discussion, time constraints necessitated shifting the planned co-creation activity to an asynchronous format, where participants were invited to contribute reflections and input on survey design via the integrated online whiteboard after the live event.

University of Tartu (UT): The University of Tartu implemented a two-stage face-to-face workshop series to ensure a comprehensive approach to capacity building regarding student mental well-being. The first workshop utilized a co-creative methodology with a small group of stakeholders, including library staff, counseling professionals, and students to collaboratively design the vision for a "Well-Being Room," while the second workshop focused on broader dissemination of research findings and practical implementation strategies to a larger audience of library staff. Both sessions integrated short presentations with open discussion, and a key implementation strategy involved guided physical visits to the proposed well-being spaces, allowing participants to connect theoretical concepts directly with the practical environment.

Ukrainian State University of Science and Technologies (USUST): Despite the constraints of wartime conditions, USUST implemented a robust online workshop focused on countering disinformation, utilizing a mix of live lectures, individual assignments, and group discussions. The core methodological tool was a "Didactic Game," where participants applied the CAELUM methodology to a specific crisis scenario to develop response plans. This process was structured to include pre- and post-workshop surveys to measure readiness, and it culminated in the collaborative creation of a mental map titled "University Libraries Against Disinformation," effectively visualizing the participants' collective strategies and innovative roles.

Web2Learn (W2L): Web2Learn implemented a hybrid workshop in collaboration with the Academic Library of Panteion University, connecting onsite participants in Athens with online

attendees to address accessibility and inclusion. The methodology relied on peer learning through concise presentations of case examples from various Greek academic libraries, followed by a hands-on activity based on the CAELUM methodology. Participants were divided into mixed small groups and breakout rooms to brainstorm solutions for specific crisis scenarios based on assigned roles, promoting adaptive thinking, and drawing on local resources. The session concluded with a planning segment for the future case study on creating audiobooks, thereby linking the training directly to upcoming project actions.

4.3 Evaluation Approach

To support effective planning, implementation, and evaluation of the workshop, all project partners prior to organizing workshops filled in pre-workshop and after a workshop was implemented post-workshop assessment templates.

The pre-workshop assessment captured essential background information, including the participant profile (target audience and their existing level of knowledge), a planned overview of the workshop (key topics and themes, planned materials, methods, and tools), expected learning outcomes, and anticipated challenges, along with indicators for measuring success. This information informed the design and delivery approach, ensuring relevance and alignment with participants' needs.

The post-workshop assessment templates were used to document key implementation details, such as the number of participants, how the workshop was delivered compared to the original plan, and the level of participant engagement. The post-workshop assessment also evaluated outcomes and impact by examining the extent to which learning objectives were achieved, the knowledge, skills, or attitudes gained by participants, and the expected changes in participants' work or organizations. In addition, reflections on delivery captured what worked well, challenges encountered, and the overall satisfaction of the organizers, providing valuable insights for future improvements.

A rigorous "Pre-" and "Post-" assessment design was employed to track professional evolution. This data allows for a granular comparison of professional confidence, measuring the transition from baseline familiarity to high-level skill acquisition. Pre- and post-hop templates are accessible in Annex 1 and Annex 2 of this document.

Workshop Assessment Results (Quality and Quantity Metrics)

After each event, every project partner distributed a feedback survey to the participants. The aim of the survey was to collect participants' feedback and assess their overall experience of the event. Respondents were asked whether the event met their expectations, to rate the seminar on a ten-point scale, and to provide comments or suggestions for improvement. In addition, participants were asked to evaluate several statements using a Likert scale, including: *I improved knowledge in international students support in searching job and integration; I increased capacities to support and engage with underprivileged communities; This event helped me understand strategies I can use when dealing with a crisis situation.* Pre- and post-workshop templates are accessible in Annex 1 and Annex 2 of this document.

The strategic objective of these assessments was to measure competency growth using quantitative indicators. The following metrics represent the immediate "before-and-after" data collected via participant surveys.

Kaunas University of Technology (KTU): Employability

- **Satisfaction Data:** The workshop achieved a high satisfaction rating, with 88% of the 15 participants stating the event met their expectations. Notably, 50% of participants gave the workshop a perfect 10/10 rating.
- **Learning Proficiency:** Post-workshop surveys indicated a strong acquisition of specific skills. 87.5% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that they deepened their knowledge regarding the integration of international students, while 75% confirmed they now understand strategies to use in a crisis situation.

SKS Knowledge Services: Information Overload

- **Satisfaction Data:** Satisfaction scores were consistently high (all ratings 7–10/10), but 28.6% of respondents selected "Maybe" regarding whether the workshop met their expectations. Qualitative comments suggest this was driven by the 90-minute live session being perceived as too short for the topic's complexity, with deeper co-creation shifted to post-session asynchronous participation.

- **Learning Proficiency:** The assessment data shows that 71.4% of participants improved their knowledge on supporting individuals experiencing information overload. Additionally, 71.4% reported a better understanding of strategies for responding to information abundance.

University of Tartu (UT): Student Well-Being

- **Satisfaction Data:** Across the workshop series (totaling 60 participants), the average satisfaction score was 8.68 out of 10. In the post-workshop evaluation, 95.4% of respondents (21 out of 22 surveyed) confirmed the workshop met their expectations.
- **Learning Proficiency:** The data reflects a universal increase in awareness: 100% of respondents reported a positive impact on their understanding of the library's role in mental well-being. However, confidence levels varied, with approximately 54.6% agreeing or strongly agreeing they felt confident directing students to resources such as university counselling services and library well-being initiatives, highlighting the need for the supplementary e-courses.

Ukrainian State University of Science and Technologies (USUST): Counter-Disinformation

Satisfaction Data: The workshop recorded the highest engagement relative to conditions, with a satisfaction score of 93/100. 87% of the 35 participants confirmed that the workshop met their expectations. This is particularly valuable because the participants represented 17 university research and academic libraries from different regions of Ukraine.

- **Learning Proficiency:** Survey results were exceptionally high for skill acquisition: 91% of participants agreed they improved their knowledge of the library's role in countering disinformation, and 87% confirmed they now understand specific strategies to overcome crisis situations. Furthermore, 58% expressed a direct willingness to participate in the next "Case Study" phase.

Web2Learn (W2L): Accessibility and Inclusion

- **Satisfaction Data:** The hybrid format was highly successful, with 95% of the 35 participants reporting that the workshop met their expectations. 90% of participants rated their overall satisfaction between 8 and 10.
- **Learning Proficiency:** Most participants agreed or strongly agreed that the session improved their knowledge on how libraries can embrace disability and helped them understand strategies for dealing with crisis situations.

A summary of Quantitative Satisfaction Metrics is shown in Table 1.

| Partner | Participants | Overall Satisfaction (Avg/Scale) | Expectations Met (%) |
|------------|--------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| KTU | 15 | 9.1 / 10 | 88% |

| | | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------|-------|
| SKS | 12 | 8.1 / 10 | 71.4% |
| UT | 60 | 8.68 / 10 | 95.4% |
| USUST | 35 | 9.3 / 100 | 87.5% |
| W2L | 35 | 9.0 / 10 | 95% |
| TOTAL | 157 | - | - |

Table 1. Quantitative Satisfaction Metrics

Participant Feedback

Qualitative analysis of open-ended responses reveals three primary drivers of participant satisfaction:

- **Interactive and gamified learning:** participants consistently rated "hands-on" activities highest. USUST participants highlighted the "Didactic Game" and mental mapping as the most effective components for understanding disinformation. Similarly, KTU participants valued the visualization activities using markers and paper to suggest improvement on action plan.
- **Hybrid and Flexible Delivery:** W2L received positive feedback for the hybrid format, with participants noting it was "particularly well-received for its flexibility and accessibility," allowing diverse attendance without technical difficulties.
- **Relevance to Current Events:** Participants across all partners expressed appreciation for the timeliness of the topics. USUST participants emphasized the "relevance of the event right now" given the wartime context, while Tartu participants valued the clarification of the library's specific role in mental health support.

Challenges and Areas for Improvement

- **Time Constraints:** The most frequently cited challenge was the duration of the workshops. SKS participants (online) noted that 90 minutes was "not sufficient for a topic of this complexity," which limited live co-creation.
- **External Environmental Factors:** USUST faced significant delivery risks due to "complex risks of war," including blackouts and shelling, which complicated logistics but did not prevent successful delivery.
- **Confidence Gaps:** While awareness increased, some Tartu participants (approx. 36%) remained neutral regarding their confidence to support students, suggesting a need for continued practical training beyond the introductory workshop.

Outcomes and Impact

The workshops moved beyond theory to produce concrete assets for community resilience:

- **Counter-Disinformation Strategy:** USUST participants collaboratively created a mental map titled "University Libraries Against Disinformation," which visualizes the library's role in detecting manipulation and supporting community security.
- **Physical Infrastructure:** The UT workshop facilitated the immediate operationalization of the "Well-Being Room." The sessions transformed a theoretical concept into a functional space, with staff now trained on specific referral protocols for students in distress.
- **Accessibility Resources:** Among the participants of the W2L workshop, there were five participants with disabilities contributing valuable first-hand perspectives on how libraries can become more welcoming and usable spaces for all. W2L secured a commitment to the co-creation of audiobooks for print-disabled users, directly linking the training to the production of accessible educational materials in the next project phase.
- **Workshop Handout (SKS):** SKS produced a workshop handout on information overload, consolidating key concepts and case examples from the session. Archived on Zenodo (DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18324129>), the resource can be used by libraries and research support services to inform internal discussions and training activities on managing information-rich research environments.

Behavioral and Institutional Shifts

- From "Crisis Definition" to "Observation": A critical intellectual shift occurred within the SKS workshop. Participants moved away from immediately labeling information overload as a crisis, adopting a mindset of "careful observation and neutrality," a crucial skill for research integrity.
- Professional Boundaries: At Tartu, the workshop clarified the distinction between support and treatment. By directing staff to the "Psychological First Aid" e-course, the library established a sustainable model where librarians support well-being without overstepping into clinical roles.
- Interdisciplinary Collaboration: KTU's workshop broke down silos by bringing together librarians from academic and public institutions (e.g., Oak Grove Library) to co-design employability strategies, fostering a cross-sectoral support network.

The USUST webinar noted that the pattern of service transformation (in wartime) is becoming a key element of the proactive model of "building information resilience and community security." In the context of information warfare, the library has become a space for building resilience to manipulative narratives.

Conclusions and Future Roadmap

The WP3A1 training workshops have successfully met the project's aim to upskill university library staff in innovative crisis responses. By engaging 157 professionals across five European nations, the partnership has demonstrated that libraries can function as adaptive "Resilience Hubs." The high satisfaction rates (averaging over 85% across partners) and the successful deployment of the CAELUM methodology, ranging from didactic games in wartime Ukraine to well-being spaces in Estonia, prove that Open Science principles can be effectively operationalized to support vulnerable communities.

The insights gathered from these training sessions will directly inform the implementation of the upcoming Case Studies:

- SKS (Information Overload): Will utilize the whiteboard feedback to refine survey instruments and interview guidelines for the study of information abundance.
- USUST (Disinformation): Will mobilize the 58% of workshop participants who expressed interest in joining the "Case Study" working group to develop new inclusive services for countering wartime disinformation.

- W2L (Inclusion): Will activate the network formed during the workshop to begin the collaborative production of audiobooks for the print-disabled.
- UT (Mental Health): Will focus on monitoring the usage of the newly opened Well-Being Room and ensuring staff complete the recommended psychological first aid e-training.
- KTU (Employability): Will proceed with the "Action Plan" to support international student integration, utilizing the improvements proposed by workshop groups.

Annex 1: Pre-Workshop Assessment Template

PRE-WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT FORM

Project Acronym: CAELUM

Grant Agreement Number: 2024-1-EE01-KA220-HED-000243324

Project Title: Open science supporting vulnerable communities: empowering university libraries in crisis response

Project Website: <https://caelum.ut.ee/>

| Information about the workshop | |
|--|--|
| Workshop title: | |
| Date: | |
| Location: | |
| Duration and format of the workshop: | |
| Partner organization: | |
| Name and role of person filling this form: | |

| Participants profile | Describe |
|---|----------|
| Who is the target audience of this workshop (educators, students, librarians etc.): | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Estimated number of participants: | |
| How knowledgeable are participants of the topic in hand (in your opinion): | |

| Workshop overview: | |
|--|----------|
| Topic | Describe |
| What is the main purpose of this workshop? | |
| What are the key topics or themes to be addressed? | |
| What materials, methods, or tools do you plan to use? (e.g., presentations, group work, case studies, etc.) | |
| What outcomes or learning goals do you expect participants to achieve? | |
| Any other comments: | |

| Impact and indicators: | |
|---|--|
| What challenges do you anticipate in preparing or delivering this workshop? | |
| How will you know the workshop has been successful? (e.g., participant engagement, feedback, observable skills, networking outcomes) | |
| Any other comments: | |

Annex 2: Post-workshop Assessment Template

POST-WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT FORM

Project Acronym: CAELUM

Grant Agreement Number: 2024-1-EE01-KA220-HED-000243324

Project Title: Open science supporting vulnerable communities: empowering university libraries in crisis response

Project Website: <https://caelum.ut.ee/>

| Information about the workshop | |
|--|--|
| Workshop title: | |
| Date: | |
| Location: | |
| Duration and format of the workshop: | |
| Partner organization: | |
| Name and role of person filling this form: | |

| Workshop implementation | Describe |
|---|----------|
| Describe the audience who participated in the workshop (participants profile) | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Number of participants: | |
| Was the workshop delivered as planned? | |
| How well did the participants engage with the content and activities? | |

| Outcomes and impact | |
|---|----------|
| Topic | Describe |
| To what extent do you think participants met the intended learning objectives? | |
| What specific knowledge, skills, or attitudes do you think participants gained? | |
| Did the workshop achieve its intended outcomes? | |
| What changes do you expect to see in participants' work or organizations as a result? | |
| What follow-up actions or support do you plan to provide (if any)? | |
| Any other comments: | |

| Reflection on delivery | |
|--|--|
| What worked well during the workshop? | |
| What challenges or difficulties did you encounter? | |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with how the workshop went? | |
| Any other comments: | |

Annex 3: Post-Workshop Participants' Feedback Template

Thank you for participating at the "ADD TITLE OF YOUR ACTION" organised by NAME OF YOUR INSTITUTION on DATE, YEAR.

We hope you enjoyed participating in this learning experience.

This short surveys aims to monitor your awareness and learning journey in the aftermath of the workshop, as well as for our team to learn and improve for our next actions. This questionnaire does not have any right or wrong answers, your answers will help us evaluate your participation in the workshop. It should take no more than 5 minutes to finish.

Thank you for your time!

The CAELUM team <https://caelum.ut.ee/>

This project has been funded with support from European Commission. This survey and its content reflect views only of the authors. The Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of information contained therein. [Project number: 2024-1-EE01-KA220-HED-000243324]

1. Your professional background
 - Librarian
 - Higher education student
 - Higher education staff
 - Researcher
 - Business
 - Other
2. Has the workshop met your expectations?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Maybe
3. Evaluate the following statements

| | Strongly dissagree | Dissagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Agree | Strongly agree |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|-------|-------------------|
| I improved knowledge in international students support in searching job and integration | | | | | |
| I increased capacities to support and engage with underprivileged communities | | | | | |
| This event helped me understand strategies I can use when dealing with a crisis situation | | | | | |

4. On the scale from 1 to 10, please rate your satisfaction from attending the event

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|

Not at all satisfied

Very satisfied

5. Comments, suggestions

(Type your answer)