



*ASSET Project number 585587-EPP-1-2017-1-IL-EPPKA2-
CBHE-JP*

CM#2 Assessment report

Note: regarding the open-ended questions – General comments from which the consortium can benefit are presented. Personal comments were forwarded directly to the respective WP leaders and are not included in this report.

Section 1 - BEFORE THE MEETING - Meeting preparation

Scale :


1 = totally disagree

2 = disagree

3 = agree

4 = totally agree

	Average
1. In general, I am satisfied with the information provided prior to the meeting for its preparation	3.711
2. The meeting schedule was provided on time	3.763
3. I knew in advance what I was expected to deliver to the meeting (e.g., presentations).	3.500
4. I had enough time to prepare for the meeting	3.605
5. I could get help and additional clarifications regarding my tasks for the meeting	3.676
6. The structure of the meeting was clear and sensible	3.632
7. The website was helpful in preparing for the meeting	3.632
TOTAL	3.645



Suggestions:

1. Everything was clear and well organized

QA team comments: No comments

Section 2 - DURING THE Meeting

Scale :

1 = totally disagree


2 = disagree

3 = agree

4 = totally agree

	Average
1. the meeting objectives where clearly stated	3.737
2. The meeting followed an agreed agenda circulated beforehand	3.632
3. The length of the meeting sessions was adequate and reasonable	3.711
4. The meeting encouraged open and clear communication	3.737
5. The meeting encouraged everyone to contribute to discussion	3.526
6. The objectives of the meeting achieved (in terms of stated deliverables)?	3.579
7. The development stages of the project were stated clearly (I know what comes next)	3.632
8. the dissemination stages of the project were stated clearly	3.632
9. (For coordinators) I understand how to use the ASSET website for financial procedures.	3.840

10. (For coordinators) I understand how to use the ASSET website for administrative procedures.	3.875
11. I understand how to use the ASSET website for the group work and development of new/renewed assessment methodologies	3.378
12. Each HEI had participated the activities	3.500
13. The website was helpful during the meeting	3.395
14. In general, this meeting was effective and achieved its goals	3.658
TOTAL	3.631



Suggestions:

1. Everything was very good.
2. Everything was very organized and clear
3. More practical work would have been good.
4. It was an amazingly well organized CM
5. Everything was organized so well that I don't have any comments or suggestions.
6. I think we need to focus more directly on assessment issues on Day 1 of each meeting - it is important to theorise formative assessment and to have some theoretical perspectives in each presentation. It is also important for the hosting institution to provide name tags for all participants as the project is still in its initial phase and people don't know each other. There were new people at this meeting. We should build time into the schedule for welcoming newcomers and letting them introduce themselves. However, there was a very good atmosphere at the meetings and people did have the opportunity to integrate at workshop level.

QA team comments: A special area for theory was created on the portal – gathering useful material from the participants. Although not planned – a slot has been allotted for a theoretical presentation during the meeting (also available on the portal).

Section 3 - Management aspects

Scale :

1 = totally disagree

2 = disagree

3 = agree

4 = totally agree


	Average
1. The clarifications on the financial management aspects were clear to me	3.750
2. The next steps are clear to me in terms of overall workplan, individual task, schedule for next events, etc	3.861
3. The coordinator communicates clearly and effectively	3.889
4. The website is structured effectively	3.750
5. Generally, I am quite satisfied with the project management	3.833
TOTAL	3.817

Suggestions:

1. Thank you to our Austrian hosts for their hospitality and generosity!
There are cultural differences among the group which can be difficult to navigate at times and perhaps could be addressed more clearly at the beginning of each meeting. For example, the refusal of many group members to pay attention to the presenters and their continual talking over them makes the sessions much more difficult than they need be. I find this very disrespectful, and it makes me feel like there is little point trying to contribute to the group. Too much time was spent on day 3 discussing minor logistical details about the sessions in Israel and Georgia. It would be beneficial to have spent more time discussing assessment more generally, perhaps on day 1. no suggestions. everything was ok.
2. excellent organizing
3. No suggestions/remarks

Any other comments that you have regarding ASSET?

1. the ASSET project is very important for me personally and for my institution in General, as I learn more about the alternative assessment tools , namely, FA tools, that can be applied to our existing or future courses.
2. You are doing a wonderful job coordinating the project, Dorit. We appreciate your leadership.
3. Thanks for organizers and the host university for hospitality and warmth they showed
4. Thanks!
5. Participants need to stop talking during the sessions! it is annoying and distracting and means they are not listening to the main business in hand. However, it is clear to me that people are working hard.



QA team comments: more attention should be payed to members while talking. Logistic seems at times to be tedious and minor - however has a tremendous importance and cannot be avoided.