

Annex 1: EVALUATION OF THE ROSTOV FEEDBACK FORMS (SEPT 30 – OCT 02, 2015)

Aspects of the workshop were rated by the participants on a 1 to 5 scale, whereby "1 = "strongly disagree"; 2 = "disagree"; 3 = "neither agree nor disagree"; 4 = "agree; "5 = "strongly agree"

1. TRAINING ORGANIZATION	Ø _{n=23}
1.1. The venue information received before the training was useful.	4,48
1.2. The duration of the training was right for me.	4,7
1.3. The catering was of good quality.	4,87
1.4. The training was well organized.	4,74
Written comments of participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Thank you" • "More info for bus. Education" • "the materials have to be shorter" • "Russian language for distributed materials" 	

2. TRAINING MODULE 1 - UoC	Ø
2.1. The handouts distributed during the training were useful. Ø _{n=23}	4,74
2.2. The training content was relevant to me. Ø _{n=23}	4,74
2.3. The balance between different types of activities was right. Ø _{n=22}	4,48
2.4. The training fulfilled the established objectives. Ø _{n=23}	4,61
2.5. The workload was appropriate. Ø _{n=23}	4,61
2.6. The content was presented in a well-structured manner. Ø _{n=22}	4,91

2.7. The presenter engaged the audience. $\emptyset_{n=22}$	4,82
Written comments of participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “not all the presenters engaged” • “it was all great” • “Thank you” 	

3. TRAINING MODULE 2 - DUW $\emptyset_{n=23}$	
3.1. The handouts distributed during the training were useful.	5
3.2. The presentation-slides were well-structured.	4,91
3.3. The training content was relevant to me.	4,74
3.4. The balance between different types of activities was right.	4,87
3.5. The training fulfilled the established objectives.	4,87
3.6. The workload was appropriate.	4,74
3.7. The content was presented in a well-structured manner.	4,96
3.8. The presenter engaged the audience.	4,91
Written comments of participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The workshops were fantastic and very useful!” • “They were great!” 	

4. TRAINING MODULE 3 - DUK $\emptyset_{n=23}$	
4.1. The handouts distributed during the training were useful.	4,96
4.2. The presentation-slides were well-structured.	4,83
4.3. The training content was relevant to me.	4,87
4.4. The balance between different types of activities was right.	4,96

4.5. The training fulfilled the established objectives.	4,96
The workload was appropriate.	4,87
The content was presented in a well-structured manner.	4,91
The presenter engaged the audience.	4,96
Written comments of participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “thank you” • “I like it so much. The best energy!” • “The work was very fruitful.” 	

Other comments on the evaluation form:

- “We are so grateful to you, for your facilitation in the learning process”
- “Each of the tutors was great and interesting! I found out a lot of important and up-to-date things. I am delighted with the lectures. It would be great if you organize the programme about validation of non-formal/informal education for some months. Thank you very much again!”
- “Perfect! Thank you very much!”
- “Thank u very much, lots of useful information”
- “Thank u!”

Absolute Frequency of the Rating

Item	1	2	3	4	5	Sum
1.1.	0	0	1	10	12	23
1.2.	0	0	1	5	17	23
1.3.	0	0	0	3	20	23
1.4.	0	0	2	2	19	23
2.1.	0	0	0	6	17	23
2.2.	0	0	0	6	17	23
2.3.	0	0	0	7	15	22
2.4.	0	0	2	5	16	23
2.5.	0	0	1	7	15	23
2.6.	0	0	0	2	20	22
2.7.	0	0	0	4	18	22

3.1.	0	0	0	0	23	23
3.2.	0	0	0	2	21	23
3.3.	0	0	1	4	18	23
3.4.	0	0	0	3	20	23
3.5.	0	0	0	3	20	23
3.6.	0	0	1	4	18	23
3.7.	0	0	0	1	22	23
3.8.	0	0	0	2	21	23
4.1.	0	0	0	1	22	23
4.2.	0	0	0	4	19	23
4.3.	0	0	0	3	20	23
4.4.	0	0	0	1	22	23
4.5.	0	0	0	1	22	23
4.6.	0	0	0	3	20	23
4.7.	0	0	0	2	21	23
4.8.	0	0	0	1	22	23