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# Event evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess delivery and impact of the event regarding the capitalization of the project results and outputs as well as their dissemination to attract peers and widen the basis of project results’ recipients for better exploitation.

### Participants

The event was organized by INAT and there were seven (7) participants: members from INAT organization and other partner organizations.

### Results Presentation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The assessment is presented below, in %, (1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good) | **1****Poor** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5****Very Good** |
| 1. What is your opinion of the general organization and facilities of the event?
 |  |  |  | 14 | 86 |
| 1. To which extent did the event live up to your expectations?
 |  |  |  | 14,00 | 86,00 |
| 1. What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?
 |  |  |  | 14,00 | 86,00 |
| 1. How do you evaluate the information and the material that was distributed before and during the event?
 |  |  |  | 57,00 | 43,00 |
| 1. How do you evaluate the agenda of the event?
 |  |  |  | 14,00 | 86,00 |
| 1. How do you evaluate the technical resources used?
 |  |  |  | 86,00 | 14,00 |
| 1. How effective do you think was the methodologies used?
 |  |  |  | 71,00 | 29,00 |
| 1. How useful was the event?
 |  |  |  |  | 100,00 |
| 1. How valuable was the event for your professional growth?
 |  |  |  | 28,00 | 72,00 |
| 1. How satisfied are you from the level of participation to the event proceedings?
 |  | 14,00 |  | 28,00 | 57,00 |
| 1. Do you feel that the targets of the event have been fulfilled?
 |  |  | 14,00 |  | 86,00 |
| 1. How do you evaluate the accommodation and catering of the event?
 |  |  |  |  | 100,00 |

### Conclusions and Recommendations

The assessment was very positive in all indices, since more than 85% of the participants gave scores between 4 and 5 on a 5-point Likert scale,where 1 is Poor and 5 is Very Good.