



---

## Results

### Survey 536354

---

Number of records in this query:	19
Total records in survey:	19
Percentage of total:	100.00%



---

## Field summary for A1

Your institution:


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
"Dzemal Bijedic" University of Mostar (A1)	2	10.53%
University of Banja Luka (A2)	2	10.53%
University of Bihac (A3)	0	0.00%
University of East Sarajevo (A4)	3	15.79%
University of Mostar (A5)	3	15.79%
University of Sarajevo (A6)	1	5.26%
University of Tuzla (A7)	3	15.79%
University of Zenica (A8)	2	10.53%
Centre for Information and Recognition of Qualifications in Higher Education (A9)	1	5.26%
Agency for Development of Higher Education and Quality Assurance B&H (10)	0	0.00%
Higher Education Accreditation Agency of Republika Srpska (11)	1	5.26%
Federal Ministry of Education and Science (12)	0	0.00%
Ministry of Education and Culture of Republika Srpska (13)	1	5.26%
KU Leuven (14)	0	0.00%
Instituto Politecnico do Porto (15)	0	0.00%
Buckinghamshire New University (16)	0	0.00%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



## Field summary for A1

Your institution:





## Field summary for A2

Name and surname (optional):

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	15	78.95%
No answer	4	21.05%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%

ID	Response
1	Nenad Markovic
2	Monija Maleševi?
3	Duska Radmanovic
5	Jelena Rozic
7	Dejan Petrovi?
8	Alim Abazovic
9	Dejan Bokonjic
10	Milica Mari?
11	Amel Dizdarevic
12	Ana Dujmovic
13	Adnan Rahimi?
16	Alma Tanovic
19	Maja Kazazic
20	Malik Cabaravdic
22	Dženan Omanovi?



---

## Field summary for A3

Gender:


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
Female (F)	9	47.37%
Male (M)	10	52.63%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



### Field summary for A3

Gender:





---

## Field summary for A4(SQ001)

[with the quality of planning and organization of meeting?]


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very satisfied (A1)	12	63.16%
Satisfied (A2)	4	21.05%
Neutral (A3)	1	5.26%
Dissatisfied (A4)	1	5.26%
Very dissatisfied (A5)	1	5.26%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



### Field summary for A4(SQ001)

[with the quality of planning and organization of meeting?]







---

### Field summary for A4(SQ002)

[with the scope of information presented?]


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very satisfied (A1)	13	68.42%
Satisfied (A2)	4	21.05%
Neutral (A3)	1	5.26%
Dissatisfied (A4)	0	0.00%
Very dissatisfied (A5)	1	5.26%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



### Field summary for A4(SQ002)

[with the scope of information presented?]





---

### Field summary for A4(SQ003)

[with the usefulness of the information?]


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very satisfied (A1)	10	52.63%
Satisfied (A2)	6	31.58%
Neutral (A3)	2	10.53%
Dissatisfied (A4)	0	0.00%
Very dissatisfied (A5)	1	5.26%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



### Field summary for A4(SQ003)

[with the usefulness of the information?]





---

### Field summary for A4(SQ004)

[with the quality of the presentations in the general sessions?]


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very satisfied (A1)	11	57.89%
Satisfied (A2)	6	31.58%
Neutral (A3)	1	5.26%
Dissatisfied (A4)	0	0.00%
Very dissatisfied (A5)	1	5.26%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



### Field summary for A4(SQ004)

[with the quality of the presentations in the general sessions?]





---

### Field summary for A4(SQ005)

[with the overall meeting format's emphasis on event?]


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very satisfied (A1)	9	47.37%
Satisfied (A2)	5	26.32%
Neutral (A3)	4	21.05%
Dissatisfied (A4)	0	0.00%
Very dissatisfied (A5)	1	5.26%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



### Field summary for A4(SQ005)

[with the overall meeting format's emphasis on event?]







---

### Field summary for A4(SQ006)

[that you had sufficient time to network and share ideas with you colleagues and experts?]


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very satisfied (A1)	7	36.84%
Satisfied (A2)	7	36.84%
Neutral (A3)	3	15.79%
Dissatisfied (A4)	1	5.26%
Very dissatisfied (A5)	1	5.26%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



### Field summary for A4(SQ006)

[that you had sufficient time to network and share ideas with you colleagues and experts?]





---

### Field summary for A4(SQ007)

[with the events' overall value in helping you improve your professional effectiveness?]


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very satisfied (A1)	7	36.84%
Satisfied (A2)	8	42.11%
Neutral (A3)	3	15.79%
Dissatisfied (A4)	0	0.00%
Very dissatisfied (A5)	1	5.26%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



### Field summary for A4(SQ007)

[with the events' overall value in helping you improve your professional effectiveness?]





---

## Field summary for A4(SQ008)

[with your institution's role in the project?]


---

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very satisfied (A1)	9	47.37%
Satisfied (A2)	8	42.11%
Neutral (A3)	1	5.26%
Dissatisfied (A4)	0	0.00%
Very dissatisfied (A5)	1	5.26%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%



### Field summary for A4(SQ008)

[with your institution's role in the project?]





### Field summary for A5

Please provide comments supporting your answers in the previous questions. Are there any additional comments or suggestions you would like to make regarding the project in general? Anything missing or that could have been removed? Any suggestions on how to better drive the project further?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	11	57.89%
No answer	8	42.11%
Not completed or Not displayed	0	0.00%

ID	Response
1	All praise to organizer mr Geert De Lepeleer and his colleagues for hospitalization and invested effort on ensuring very good lecturers.
2	students should be more actively included into the programe
3	In order to achieve the goals of the meeting it should be considered to have a three instead of two days event. It would assure more involvement of the students representatives (work in groups, more interactive approach for students etc) and enough time for consortium meeting.
5	When organizing training I would recommend work in groups, interactive activities and concrete tasks to overcome.
9	To provide at least one more day for networking if it possible during next meetings
10	The training was very well organised for the academic staff, but the students' presence didn't play significant role for the project.
11	Maybe implementing students bit more into whole project.
13	As mentioned at the meeting, activity of BH students was expected in high level than it was. Students left without showing their abilities how to contribute to the project's implementation, especially since the students were part of mobility programs before.
16	I think it would be more efficient if the consortium meetings took place at the end of the first of the two days, since it would provide participants with more time for more detailed discussions on project issues. All presentations were excellent.
20	Everything was perfect
22	Items concerning recognition procedures were very helpful for me