



The Project:

## **Modernizing geodesy education in Western Balkan with focus on competences and learning outcomes - GEOWEB**

### **Activities 2.1, 2.3 and 5.2**

#### **Curricular development workshop with IAB and WBGF meetings**

Belgrade, October, 24th

Participants of the workshop provided their feedback on the event. They were given an opportunity to evaluate event by giving grades (1-5, 5 is the best) according to the following questions:

1. Are the objectives and tasks of the event clearly defined?
2. Have you received sufficient background documents before the event?
3. Is the time allocated for the event sufficient and appropriate?
4. Is the technical equipment incl. internet functioning satisfactorily?
5. Has the event achieved the stated objectives?
6. Has the event achieved the stated objectives?
7. Are you satisfied with social activities during the event?

Also, participants were given an opportunity to give their remarks and suggestions as the answers to the following questions:

1. What in this event is not good and needs improvement?
2. Your specific suggestion for changes and improvement in future event:

All participants expressed their general satisfaction with the implementation of all activities and tasks. Average grade for the whole event is 4.55. Minor dissatisfaction can be noticed regarding functioning of the equipment (probably Internet), grade 4.22. Also, participants expressed their opinion that the time allocated for certain events is not properly allocated, grade 4.33. Some participants expressed their opinion that allocated time could be used in a better way, such as focusing on more specific issues, allocating more time for complex and important issues, instead of some less relevant issues and also by better preparation for the discussion - by solving some issues before hand. There were also some remarks regarding the relevance of some presentations given during the meetings and the quality of coffee breaks and the quality of lunch.

Detailed results are given in Table 1.

Local coordinator  
Branko Bozic, PhD

Question	Participant																		Average	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18		
1 Are the objectives and tasks of the event clearly defined ?	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4.78
2 Have you received sufficient background documents before the event ?	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	3	4	5	4	5	4	5	4.61
3 Is the time allocated for the event sufficient and appropriate ?	5	3	5	2	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	4.33
4 Is the technical equipment incl. internet functioning satisfactorily ?	5	5	4	4	4	3	5	5	2	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	4	4	4	4.22
5 Has the event achieved the stated objectives ?	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	4.67
6 Have you got sufficient information and support on travel & accomodation	5	5	4	5	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4.56
7 Are you satisfied with social activities during the event ?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	3	4	4	4.67
8 What in this event is not good and needs improvement ?					Time for curricular workshop is too short.	Probably the time, we seemed not to be so much on schedule according to our agenda.		None	None	There was no coffee breaks during the event. Very long sections without breaks and often not very productive.	Probably we were using too much time for issues that could be discussed in less time. Breaks during the day & maybe coffee would have been nice.									N/A
9 Your specific sugestion for changes and improvement in future event:				Reserve more time for discussions of complicated issues.	Not having anything in mind yet. ;)			None	The lunch could be of better quality.	Be more efficient in shorter time. Try to discuss some issues before hand. Some of the presentations were out of scope and wasting time.							I suggest to focus a lot more on concrete and specific improvements regarding BSc and MSc studies on each faculty, so it doesn't stay only on cosmetic changes.			N/A
<b>Average</b>	5.00	4.29	4.71	4.43	4.43	4.71	5.00	4.86	3.71	4.29	5.00	4.14	4.86	4.86	4.14	5.00	4.00	4.43	4.53	4.53

Table 1.Feedback on the event by participants

This report reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.