At the PDT meeting, 12 participants completed the evaluation survey with 5-point rating scale: 1 means “strongly disagree”, and 5 means “strongly agree.”

As a result, the participants thought that the PDT meeting was very informative (mean=4.50, st.d. = .674); that the content of the meeting would be very useful in their own professional life (mean=4.50, st.d. = .674); and that the results of the meeting would be well integrated into project activities (mean= 4.67, st.d. = .492). This time, the participants became clear about the expectations for their involvement in the PDT meeting. They especially liked collaborating and brainstorming ideas with colleagues and found the information shared in the meeting useful for their own professional activities, colleagues, and students.

Yet, the participants’ familiarity with the contents delivered in the meeting varied (min= 1, max=5, mean= 3.17, st.d. = 1.337). The contents were very new to 33.3% of the participants while 33.3% of the participants already knew the contents. In addition, they were more likely to share the information from the meeting with their colleagues (mean= 4.58, st.d. = .669) than their students (mean= 3.92, st.d. = 1.084).

They were looking forward to the next PDT meeting (mean= 4.50, st.d..= .674). For the improvement of the PDT meeting, they suggested (1) having more participants at the meeting, (2) disseminating the project information ahead of time, (3) presenting a longer and more concise overview of the project at the meeting, and (4) providing activities to get to know the participants and door prizes for those who stay at the meeting through the entire time.