



“Towards a European Qualification Prototype for Adults Trainers”

PARTNERS MEETING

BERLIN - 28^h/29th June 2010

**Evaluation
Results of Feedback**



Hochschule für
Wirtschaft und Recht Berlin
Berlin School of Economics and Law

Birgit Achterberg/Prof. Erwin Seyfried



Legal notice: The content of this document does not necessarily reflect the view or legislation of the European Commission. Neither the European Commission nor the project partners or any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use that might be made of the information in this document.

Questionnaire


How do you assess the following aspects of the meeting?

	I strongly agree	I mostly agree	I partly agree	I don't agree
1. The preparation in the run-up to the meeting was good.				
2. The period between the last and the current meeting was used according to the project schedule.				
3. The organisation of the workshop was good.				
4. Partners' contributions (e.g. presentations, draft papers) were relevant for the project.				
5. Relevant material (e.g. texts, articles, partners' contributions) were provided in due time.				
6. Project tasks were done as scheduled.				
7. The moderation was an appropriate guidance in terms of goal orientation.				
8. Tasks were allocated adequately to the partners.				
9. Discussions brought the project work forward.				
10. Administrative issues were handled in an effective way.				
11. I am satisfied with the process of the meeting.				
12. I am satisfied with the results of the meeting.				
13. My suggestions for improvement:				


Results

The following results are based on the feedback of 8 respondents. The feedback questionnaire was filled in by the partners at the end of the meeting.


1. The preparation in the run-up to the meeting was good.




2. The period between the last and the current meeting was used according to the project schedule.




3. The organisation of the workshop was good.




4. Partners' contributions (e.g. presentations, draft papers) were relevant for the project.




5. Relevant material (e.g. texts, articles, partners' contributions) were provided in due time.




6. Project tasks were done as scheduled.




7. The moderation was an appropriate guidance in terms of goal orientation.




8. Tasks were allocated adequately to the partners.




9. Discussions brought the project work forward.




10. Administrative issues were handled in an effective way.




11. I am satisfied with the process of the meeting.



I am satisfied with the results of the meeting.



overview: results of all questions



The diagramm shows the strong agreement for all twelve questions. This means that the partners meeting was evaluated positively. On average the agreement lies between “strongly agree” and “mostly agree”. The best feedback was given for the preparation in the run-up to the meeting, the relatively weakest agreement was given on “the satisfaction with the process of the meeting”.

Suggestions for improvement

Very efficient meeting, except for inefficient discussion on IPR
Stick to the agenda

Birgit Achterberg/Erwin Seyfried
28.08.2010