

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excel lent |
|--|------|----|------|--------------|---------------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excel lent |
|--|------|----|------|--------------|---------------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |


Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.



Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excel lent |
|--|------|----|------|--------------|---------------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excel lent |
|---|------|----|------|--------------|---------------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

No further comments

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

No further comments

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

No further comments

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| | Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|---------|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"

Venue: Middlesex University London (MUHEC), London, United Kingdom

Date: 20 March 2017

FIFTH QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING EVALUATION LIST

The general organisation of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|--|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Logistic preparation and organization of meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Content of the Agenda | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Arrangements of the meeting (venue, equipment, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

General working communication

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Communication before the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duration and timetable of the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of materials provided during the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of presentations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Communication between the coordinator of the project and the other partners | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Engagement of the participants in the activities and discussions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Objectives in the agenda regarding the NatRisk project are reached | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Overall success of the meeting

| Grading | Poor | OK | Good | Very Good | Excellent |
|---|------|----|------|-----------|-----------|
| Mode of reaching the decisions at the meeting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Opportunities to express your opinion and influence decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Achievement of the meeting and project goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Discussion of tasks for the upcoming activities and meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Assignment of follow-up tasks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Comment:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your comments are important to us and provide us with valuable feedback on the quality of the meeting, which will be taken into account when organising future events.

Project number: 573806-EPP-1-2016-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

"This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication 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"