



STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP (KEY ACTION 2)

RUR'up Project: *“Innovative education for sustainable development in peripheral rural areas
RUR'UP”*

under the Agreement n° **2020-1-EL01-KA203-079121**

Intellectual Output 6

“Reflective report on the approach and methodology adopted”

Final report

31/10/2022

Authors:

Lead partner: Gaki D, Vlahos G, Felekis S, University of Thessaly Greece

Participants:

- ⇒ Herzon I, Helsingin YLIOPISTO, Finland
- ⇒ Puig de Morales M, Berchoux T, Kessari M., Centre international des Hautes Etudes Agronomiques Méditerranéennes - Institut Agronomique Méditerranéen de Montpellier, France
- ⇒ Moran J, BennettCoady R, Atlantic Technological University, Ireland
- ⇒ Kazakova Y, University of National and World Economy, Bulgaria
- ⇒ Jitea IM, Mihai V., Universitatea de Stiinte Agricole si Medicina Veterinara CLUJ NAPOCA, Romania
- ⇒ Tolić S, Klepač O, Roglic M., University Josip Juraj Strossmayer Osijek, Croatia



1. The approach for evaluation

1.1. *Introduction*

Experience and research indicates that peripheral rural areas present specificities that have to do with the different structural characteristics of farming and rural enterprises prevailing in each area and the varying environmental conditions, and therefore, viability issues. Furthermore, the approach selected by RUR'UP partners to combine distance learning with the intensive learning activity at the local level called for the implementation and adaptation of novel approaches in highly variable contexts of peripheral rural areas. Implementation of some innovative educational tools, methods and techniques, so far rarely in use, in training professionals in rural development and agricultural sciences in the partner countries also support the deployment of systematic reflective process.

The RUR'UP consortium has strategically selected the use of innovative educational tools and novel methods in the learning process developed for high-quality and outcome-based education for peripheral areas. The partnership has deliberately made this choice, based on their experience, both as individual educational institutions and collectively in the HNV-Link project, in participatory research and development in remote, less accessible rural areas.

The current document has, therefore the following objectives:

- To reflect upon the suitability and adaptability of novel tools and techniques to differing circumstances
- To assess the effectiveness of the project approach in achieving educational goals initially set by the participants, also in relation to their experience with more conventional teaching methods,
- To evaluate the participatory process adopted for the implementation of the project and
- to develop a post-project strategy (e.g., planning for Erasmus mobility).

The process

Every activity, national and transnational, included an evaluation process, under the supervision of an assigned member of the project. Feedback from the participants in all activities was collected. For both online learning course and Summer School, a digital survey with the participating students was run. The feedback was collected post-activity, digitally. All interactive activities with actors and/or stakeholders (i.e. consultations and multiplier events) included also an evaluation process mainly by a digital survey in English. Furthermore, during the Summer School a reflective session of all project participants has been conducted.

A series of digital and paper questionnaires have been proposed by the leader of IO6, consulted with partners, agreed and used for each of the different interactions. These are provided in the Appendix of the present report.

2. Transnational meetings

The evaluation process has been conducted through an evaluation sheet provided to all participants in the Transnational meeting (See Appendix). The evaluation sheets were filled after each meeting by the participants. Participants were asked to state their degree of agreement in a series of statements that had to do with the preparation and the technicalities of the meeting, the way the meeting was run as well as the outcomes and the effectiveness of the meeting.

The process has been applied in for Transnational Project meetings and 39 persons participating in the meetings responded to the inquiry (See Table 1)

Table 1 Number of respondents per Transnational Project Meeting

Meeting Date	Participants	%
November 6 th 2020	12	30.8
January 28 th 2021	9	23.1
July 22 nd 2022	9	23.1
March 14 th and 15 th 2022	9	23.1
Total	39	100.0

The answers of the respondents, participants in the TPM has been in their vast majority positive (See Table 2) but with certain variations which could be interesting to refer to briefly. As far as the preparation of the meeting per se is concerned it seems that the preparation was in a really satisfactory level (see answers in q 1,3,4). But as far as what was expected by the participants there was a small differentiation (see answers in q2,5,6) since it seems that for some of the respondents it was not clear what their role would be in the meeting.

As far as the way the meeting was conducted, keeping the time schedule seems to be the weak point of the whole process (see q 8 and 10) while in terms of content it seems not to have raised concerns. (See q 7 and 9). As far as participation is concerned, although the meetings seemed to gather the appropriate participants, the balance of the meetings was something that was not equally strongly supported by respondents (see q 11 and 12). However, these two caveats did not seem to deter participants from feeling respected (see q 13 and 14), resulting thus to a high degree of engagement in the process (see q 15).

The picture is somewhat different when effectiveness of the meeting is concerned. In that respect, it seems that the degree of agreement is considerably less unanimous (see q 16-18). It seems that respondents had a rather strong impression that decisions have been taken, this certainty was not equally shared by all participants when asked whether the decisions have been turned into actions and even less when asked about the actual assignment of these actions to persons. However, the overall impact of the meetings for the project process seemed to be positive and not a waste of time (See q 19 and 20).

Table 2 Participants's reactions after the Transnational Project Meetings

Question	Stongly disagree	Mostly disagree	Mostly agree	Strongly agree	Total
1. The meeting had a clear purpose.	-	-	2	37	39
	-	-	5%	95%	
2. We had specific objectives to complete.	-	-	5	34	39
	-	-	13%	87%	
3. I understand why I was invited.	-	-	1	38	39
	-	-	3%	97%	
4. There was an agenda/plan.	-	-	1	38	39
	-	-	3%	97%	
5. I knew what I needed to prepare for the meeting.	-	2	4	33	39
	-	5%	10%	85%	
6. I came prepared.	-	1	5	33	39
	-	3%	13%	85%	
7. The meeting had a leader.	-	-	12	27	39
	-	-	31%	69%	
8. We started on time.	-	1	3	35	39
	-	3%	8%	90%	
9. We stayed on task.	-	-	7	32	39
	-	-	18%	82%	
10. We ended on or before the scheduled end time.	1	6	13	19	39
	3%	15%	33%	49%	
11. The right people were at this meeting.	-	-	2	37	39
	-	-	5%	95%	
12. Participation was balanced.	-	-	11	28	39
	-	-	28%	72%	
13. I felt my voice was heard.	-	-	4	35	39
	-	-	10%	90%	
14. I felt respected.	-	-	3	36	39
	-	-	8%	92%	
15. I felt engaged.	-	1	3	35	39
	-	3%	8%	90%	
16. We effectively made decisions.	-	-	9	30	39
	-	-	23%	77%	
17. We converted those decisions into actions.	-	-	18	21	39
	-	-	46%	54%	
18. The actions were assigned.	-	-	22	17	39
	-	-	56%	44%	
19. We completed what we came to do.	-	-	7	32	39
	-	-	18%	82%	
20. This meeting was a good use of my time.	-	-	1	38	39
	-	-	3%	97%	

As far as the individual meetings are concerned certain interesting results can be drawn from an analysis of the answers classified by meeting. Thus the effectiveness of the meetings in terms of

decisions taken, seemed to be increasing with the progress of time. This outcome is more worth noting since according to the responses, the role of leadership in the last meeting was not as important as in the previous ones. A more detailed analysis revealed that previous preparation and clear objectives have been determinant for the success of the meetings, while leadership's importance was mentioned when keeping of time was concerned. The degree of satisfaction of the participants in the sense of feeling engaged, heard, respected and, at the end of the day, concluding that they constructively spend their time in the meetings seem to be dependent more on their prior preparation for the meeting as well as the balanced synthesis of the participants (See Statistical Annex1)..

3. Multiplier events

In the case of the multiplier events evaluation was made through an evaluation sheet (See Appendix) provided to all participants after the event.

Quantitative analysis

Some information on the respondents is provided in tables 3 to 5. Thus, female respondents consisted 60.8% of the total (See Table 3) while the majority of the respondents (See Table 4) belonged to academia (Research Institutes and Universities) with a considerable participation of NGOs and rural development actors as well as representatives of various levels of government (Local/regional/National).

Table 3 Gender of respondents

Gender	Respondents	%
Female	45	60.8
Male	29	39.2
Total	74	100.0

Table 4 Professional background of respondents

Professional background	Respondents	%
Academia /education	20	31.7
NGOs	10	15.9
Rural Development	9	14.3
Local government	8	12.7
Technical advisory	6	9.5
Farming	5	7.9
Others	5	7.9
Total	63	100.0
Missing	11	
Total	74	

Finally, there was a wide variety of origins of the respondents amounting to 10 different nationalities (See Table 5)

Table 5 Origin of Respondents

	Respondents	%
Croatian	28	40.0
Irish	15	21.4
Bulgarian	14	20.0
Greek	5	7.1
Italian	2	2.9
British	2	2.9
Portuguese	1	1.4
Belgian	1	1.4
Dutch	1	1.4
Lithuanian	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0
Missing	4	
Total	74	

As far as the statements of respondents are concerned (See Table 6), it seems that the general assessment was positive. If one would make a distinction, this could be related to the preparatory phase of the multiplier events as well as the relevance of the subject to the respondents interests. A more detailed analysis of the responses reveals that the opinions over the adequacy of meeting preparation differ significantly among the genders with female respondents being more positively oriented, while professional background did not seem to influence the respondents views regarding the meetings. The fact main problem seem to rely in the fact that some of the participants felt that the information given to them prior to the event was not adequate to help them clarify at a satisfactory level neither the objectives nor the issues at stake resulting thus to a certain feeling of disengagement among some of the participants. A detailed analysis also revealed that during the meetings a certain level of trust was achieved, among participants and with the effective facilitation a sincere dialogue was developed, where participants felt comfortable to freely express their opinions and felt respected by their colleagues (See Statistical Annex1).

Table 6 Overall evaluation of Multiplier events

Question	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neither-nor		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The information that was provided in advance...1. helped me clarify the objective(s) of the meeting;	2	2.7	1	1.4	6	8.1	19	25.7	46	62.2
The information that was provided in advance... 2. helped me understand the issues at stake	2	2.9	0	0.0	4	5.7	17	24.3	47	67.1
3. The content of the meeting was relevant and consistent to my needs and interests	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	12.2	19	25.7	46	62.2
4. I think that all participants had a fair chance to express their opinion	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	13	17.6	60	81.1
5. There was enough time allowed to express our views and pose questions	0	0.0	1	1.4	2	2.8	15	20.8	54	75.0
6. The facilitator(s) were active in ensuring a good and fair flow of the discussion	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	12	16.2	61	82.4
7. I felt that I could trust the team members with whom I collaborated	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.1	6	15.4	31	79.5
8. I felt comfortable in sharing my views	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	16	22.5	54	76.1
9. I had always the opportunity to express my opinion	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4	12	16.2	61	82.4
10. I felt that all workshop participants were open to constructive criticism	0	0.0	1	2.5	1	2.5	10	25.0	28	70.0
11. I felt being manipulated by powerful participants to accept their views	32	78.0	3	7.3	3	7.3	0	0.0	3	7.3

Comments by participants

The comments were in general positive concerning the organisation as well as the performance of the presenters.

“The information before the conference made me interested in participating in the conference, and during the conference I was introduced to the way of work and the field of research, where students have the opportunity to penetrate into the life of rural areas and actively contribute to its improvement.”

“The organizer was accommodating and available for all questions”

“Everything was thoroughly explained”

Although they were cases when participants stated that they had no information on the subject of the meeting and they felt that the issues dealt with were not relevant to them.

“There was some content that was related to my interests”

“I think that it is not directly related to me, but to the students themselves”

“I had no information before the conference”

The most positive answers have been the ones given by people related to training

“It was an opportunity to learn by about new tools. There are needed to our work”

“At my high school, I deal with topics related to ecological agriculture, nature and environment protection”

“This is really the area of my work that connects the issues of education and rural development, and it is always good to hear what is happening”

4. The digital learning tool

The digital learning tools has been evaluated by the students – participants in the digital course through answering an online questionnaire (See Appendix).

Quantitative analysis

The level most represented among the course participants (See Table 7) has been MSc students (40,0 %) followed by PhD candidates (36.7%).

Table 7 Course participants by educational level

Level of studies	N	%
Bachelors	6	20,0
MSc	12	40,0
PhD	11	36,7
Professional	1	3,3
Total	30	100,0

While in terms of origin $\frac{1}{3}$ of the participants have been studying in Greece while another third was coming from Bulgaria and Ireland. All MS represented in the consortium have been represented by students in the course. (see Table 8)

Table 8 Course participants by origin

Country of Origin	N	%
Bulgaria	5	16,7
Ireland	5	16,7
Greece	10	33,3
Finland	2	6,7
Croatia	3	10,0
Romania	3	10,0
France	2	6,7
Total	30	100,0

A set of questions had to do with the opinions of the participants for the course as a whole (See Table 9). The overall impression was that the overview was clear and easy to follow with a good balance between online resources and students' activities. Although the latter with considerably less certainty on the part of the respondents. The majority of the respondents found that the course was challenging (24 out of the 29 that answered). Nevertheless, only 42% considered that the workload of the course was demanding and only 2 of them considered it very demanding in terms of workload.

As far as the overall satisfaction expressed by participants it seems that although the majority (62,1%) was very satisfied, there was a considerable part that has been just somewhat satisfied while 3 out of 29 respondents stated that they have not been satisfied at all.

Moving to the structure of the course, it seems that this has been well accepted by the students (See table 10). The material provided by the course seems to have been proven useful for most of the participants and the objectives of the modules were clear to most of the participants. The impression when the evaluation process was concerned, has been somewhat different. For a significant part of the participants neither the criteria used for their assessment nor its linkages with the content of the modules have been clear (7 and 8 out of 29 respondents respectively).

Finally, a distinct set of questions had to do with the badge that was provided to all participants who successfully completed all the parts of the course (Table 11). It seems that the badge has been of considerable importance for half of the respondents. However, most of them are planning to use it as a recognition for their achievements in the particular course.

Table 9 Participants' views on the course as a whole

Question	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neither agree nor disagree		Agree		Strongly agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The overview of online course was clear and easy to follow	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	2	6,9%	10	34,5%	17	58,6%
There was a good balance between online resources and student activities	0	0,0%	0	0,0%	2	6,9%	20	69,0%	7	24,1%
This online course challenged me	0	0,0%	2	6,9%	3	10,3%	16	55,2%	8	27,6%

Table 9a Participants' views on the course as a whole

<i>How would you describe the level of workload expected on this online course (time spent on presentation, online resources, case studies, activities and private study)</i>	N	%
Very manageable-Undemanding	3	10,3
Manageable	14	48,3
Demanding	10	34,5
Very demanding	2	6,9
Total	29	100,0
<i>Which of the following indicates your overall level of satisfaction with the online platform - CPDlearnonline</i>		
Very dissatisfied	3	10,3
Somewhat satisfied	8	27,6
very satisfied	18	62,1
Total	29	100,0

Table 10 Participants' views on the structure

Question	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neither agree nor disagree		Agree		Strongly agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The objective(s) of the modules were clear to me	1	3,4%	0	0,0%	2	6,9%	16	55,2%	10	34,5%
The structure of the modules was clear to me	1	3,4%	1	3,4%	2	6,9%	13	44,8%	12	41,4%
The material provided helped me understand the issues at stake	1	3,4%	0	0,0%	2	6,9%	9	31,0%	17	58,6%
The content of the modules were relevant and consistent with my expectations and interests.	1	3,4%	0	0,0%	4	13,8%	12	41,4%	12	41,4%
The assessment methods/criteria were clear to me	1	3,4%	2	6,9%	4	13,8%	15	51,7%	7	24,1%
The assessment reflected the module content	0	0,0%	1	3,4%	7	24,1%	12	41,4%	9	31,0%

Table 11 Course participants' views on the digital badge

	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neither agree nor disagree		Agree		Strongly agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The digital badge created an additional motivation for me to work towards the next badge	2	7,1	3	10,7	8	28,6	9	32,1	6	21,4
The digital badge certificate provides sufficient detail to acknowledge the work required to achieve the badge	1	3,6	0	0,0	12	42,9	11	39,3	4	14,
Digital badges are a useful recognition of my achievements on this course	2	7,1	0	0,0	10	35,7	11	39,3	5	17,9

Table 11a Course participants' views on the digital badge

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
Have digital badges been used previously on course/modules that you have participated in?	7	24,1	22	75,9
Do you plan to use the digital badges as a recognition of your learning/achievement on this module?	22	75,9	7	24,1

Further analysis of the responses of the course participants suggests that the factor that played an important role in the success of the course was clarity. Clarity of the overall aims and structure of the course seem to have helped participants in understanding the issues and interpret the material but also enabled them to participate actively in the interactive process and further enjoy the interaction with their peers (See Statistical Annex2).

Comments by participants

As far as the overall design and presentation of the course a series of specific technical suggestions (e.g. improve scrolling, uploading files etc) concerning the on line platform was provided. As far as the overall content is concerned an introductory meeting was considered as useful by a considerable number of participants.

Moving to the specific modules although their informational value and their clarity was rather widely accepted, difficulties seem to have arisen when the assessment process was concerned. Some participants found it difficult to link the assessment with the content of the modules, while for others the criteria used for the assessment have not been clear enough.

Interacting with peers was one of the most interesting part for most of the participants, although the difficulties of communication due to different rhythms of engagement with the course have been a problem for a lot of the participants.

As far as the participants' opinions related to each one of the particular modules it seems that the most challenging one has been module 4 "Creating and Implementing solutions" especially innovation types and how these innovations work together. Here the challenges seemed to be that it was demanding in terms of time and work. The other module that seemed to be challenging for participants has been the next one "Moving forward" dealing with innovation brokering. In the case of Module 5 the main problems reported had to do more with the clarity of the objectives. The less challenging one has been, according to the majority of the participants the first "introductory" module.

5. Debriefings by the project teams

A debriefing sheet was proposed to project participants in order to be filled after each participatory event. This debriefing sheet would be useful for the meeting organisers in order to give a structured report on the proceedings and the outcomes of the meetings, in order to use it, on the one hand for the improvement of the procedures to be followed in the future, and on the other, for use in the reduction of the IO6 report.

The results suggest that the synthesis of the actors participating in the meetings was good since all participants have been useful during the meeting, while even in the cases when they were not active during the core meeting they took advantage of the informal parts to express their views.

'Some participants were not participating actively in the group discussions but did communicate on the issues discussed during the breaks in smaller groups.'

In all cases there was a facilitator and in one case translation was provided. The question concerning the issues were directed towards all participants and the organisers considered that they got answers in their questions, hence the meetings met their objectives.

Meeting time was kept in general except in one case when the meeting was online and internal of a participant institution.

"The partnership group discussions were richer than expected. Participants worked deeply on the topic providing new points of view, working on new suggestions, and methods."

As far as the quality of the discussions and the interactive part of the meetings were concerned it seems that the meetings ran smoothly without conflicts and when different opinions arose, both sides had the opportunity to fully expose their arguments.

"Speakers of different opinions had time to present them, even if not in a pre-defined turn but as they arose."

It seems that, even despite the moderators efforts, the most vociferous of the groups, were more active, without though dominating the discussions.

"It was expected that participants with more experience and expertise in the topic took the lead in some concrete points and aspects of the discussions, contributing easily to the overall dialogue."

Finally, when breakout groups were formed, the experience seemed to be fruitful

"Working groups with a reduced number of participants successfully enabled to work deeply on concrete aspects related to the topic."

6. Lessons learnt

The reflection process has a considerable value added for the partnership because it allows us to ensure the sustainability of the process and transferability of the outcomes to the institutional level. Throughout the whole project there have been several target groups that the partnership was trying to reach higher education students, peers in academia, stakeholders and local actors. However, IO6 was particularly targeted to educational personnel. The partnership decided to put a special effort into a systematic assessment process covering the whole project, which is rarely done but can be of great value for educators attempting to work in transdisciplinary and highly interdisciplinary manner, as well as developing personal skills and competences in modern learner-centered pedagogy and in flexible learning.

A general conclusion that applies to all types of interactive meetings has to do with the importance of a good preparation of the meeting. Preparation not only on the technical level, but also in the sense of give to participants a clear idea on what the meeting is about, what are the issues at stake and what their expected role and contribution in the process are. This makes possible for participants to be more prepared and helps them to participate more actively and finally engage with the process.

The second lesson learnt from the process has to do with the interactive/participative part of the process. All participants seemed to have enjoyed these parts of the process and did not feel that it was taking time from the informative part of the meetings.

Specific lessons learnt from the different procedures

As far as the transnational meetings are concerned it seems that clarity of meeting objectives was the most important factor. It also seems that, due to the fact that they were internal of a project group with previous experience of working together, the role of leadership in the meetings seemed to be limited to a better keeping of time. It also seemed that during the course of the time, meetings were becoming more effective, in the sense of resulting to concrete decisions actually implemented.

The assessment of Multiplier events both by the participants (digital questionnaire) and the organisers (debriefing sheets) stressed the importance of the prior information and clarity on the objectives of the meetings for the success of the meetings. It also points out to the willingness of actors to participate in well-organized discussions.

Another conclusion that could be drawn was the enhancing role of forming smaller discussion groups, since even in the cases when these were not created by the organisers, informal discussions during coffee breaks and after the meeting, acted as breakout groups and provided the chance less vociferous actors to communicate their views.

Finally, as far as the learning platform and its functioning is concerned, one could say that what the participant enjoyed most have been the interactive parts of the process. They identified certain problems in this process, that inhibited better communication and interaction with colleagues, which seems also an open question for the improvement of the platform.

Appendix

1. Meeting Check Evaluation
 [workshop theme]– [date] ,[LOcation]

Name: Organisation:

Strongly Agree	Mostly Agree	Mostly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	<p>Instructions: Circle /bold the number in the column that best matches your impressions of this meeting. Total each column, and then total the four column scores to generate a rating. Use the back side to provide any specific suggestions you have for the leader.</p> <p>Characteristics of an Effective Meeting</p>
3	2	1	0	1. The meeting had a clear purpose.
3	2	1	0	2. We had specific objectives to complete.
3	2	1	0	3. I understand why I was invited.
3	2	1	0	4. There was an agenda/plan.
3	2	1	0	5. I knew what I needed to prepare for the meeting.
3	2	1	0	6. I came prepared.
3	2	1	0	7. The meeting had a leader.
3	2	1	0	8. We started on time.
3	2	1	0	9. We stayed on task.
3	2	1	0	10. We ended on or before the scheduled end time.
3	2	1	0	11. The right people were at this meeting.
3	2	1	0	12. Participation was balanced.
3	2	1	0	13. I felt my voice was heard.
3	2	1	0	14. I felt respected.
3	2	1	0	15. I felt engaged.
3	2	1	0	16. We effectively made decisions.
3	2	1	0	17. We converted those decisions into actions.
3	2	1	0	18. The actions were assigned.
3	2	1	0	19. We completed what we came to do.
3	2	1	0	20. This meeting was a good use of my time.
				Multiply number of circles in each column by the rating (e.g. 8 x 3 = 24)
				Add the 4 column totals to get your overall rating (60 points max)

Note: I agree in using the meeting's personal data concerning project's management.

2. Multiplier event evaluation sheet

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither-nor	Agree	Strongly Agree
The information that was provided in advance... 1. helped me clarify the objective(s) of the meeting;					
The information that was provided in advance... 2. helped me understand the issues at stake					
Comments and recommendations regarding the information prior to the meeting:					
3. The content of the meeting was relevant and consistent to my needs and interests					
4. I think that all participants had a fair chance to express their opinion.					
5. There was enough time allowed to express our views and pose questions.					
6. The facilitator(s) were active in ensuring a good and fair flow of the discussion					
7. I felt that I could trust the team members with whom I collaborated					
8. I felt comfortable in sharing my views.					
9. I had always the opportunity to express my opinion.					
10. I felt that all workshop participants were open to constructive criticism					
11. I felt being manipulated by powerful participants to accept their views					
What new I learned that I will find useful:					
Other comments, issues you would like to mention:					



3. Learning tool evaluation sheet

Please indicate which learner category best describes your current programme of study					
Please indicate which country you are currently studying in					
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The digital badge created an additional motivation for me to work towards the next badge	1	2	3	4	5
The digital badge certificate provides sufficient detail to acknowledge the work required to achieve the badge	1	2	3	4	5
Digital badges are a useful recognition of my achievements on this course	1	2	3	4	5
	Very dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied		
Which of the following indicates your overall level of satisfaction with the online platform - CPDlearnonline	1	2	3		
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The overview of online course was clear and easy to follow	1	2	3	4	5
There was a good balance between online resources and student activities	1	2	3	4	5
Have you any suggestions to improve the overall design and presentation of the course on the CPDlearnonline platform					



	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
This online course challenged me	1	2	3	4	5
	Very manageable-Undemanding Manageable Demanding Very demanding				
How would you describe the level of workload expected on this online course (time spent on presentation, online resources, case studies, activities and private study)					
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The objective(s) of the modules were clear to me	1	2	3	4	5
Please provide some explanatory text of your response to the statements in the previous question					
The structure of the modules were clear to me	1	2	3	4	5
Please provide some explanatory text of your response to the statements in the previous question					
The material provided helped me understand the issues at stake	1	2	3	4	5
The content of the modules were relevant and consistent with my expectations and interests.	1	2	3	4	5
The assessment methods/criteria were clear to me	1	2	3	4	5
The assessment reflected the module content	1	2	3	4	5



Which module(s) challenged you the most?					
Which module(s) challenged you the least?					
What did you enjoy most about this online course in relation to programme content and delivery?					
What did you enjoy least about this online course in relation to programme content and delivery?					
Are there any suggestions you would like to make towards improving this online course?					
Have digital badges been used previously on course/modules that you have participated in?	Yes	No			
Do you plan to use the digital badges as a recognition of your learning/achievement on this module?	Yes	No			
	Include them in my curriculum vitae (CV)	Share them with current or potential future employer	On personal webpage or social media (e.g. LinkedIn)	All of the above	
If you answered yes to the previous, indicate which of the following ways you plan to use the digital badges as recognition of your learning/achievement	1	2	3	4	
Have you any suggestions/comments on the use of digital badges within this course (usefulness of digital badges, overall number of badges, criteria for awarding badges, timing of use of digital b...					
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I was motivated to participate to the interactive part of this course	1	2	3	4	5
My required contribution to the interactive part of	1	2	3	4	5



the course was clear to me					
I am satisfied with the level of interaction with my peers in the module	1	2	3	4	5
I felt comfortable in sharing my views	1	2	3	4	5



RUR'UP DEBRIEFING / REPORTING SHEET

WORKSHOP:

Filled out by the organiser,, after the end of the project activity

Partner organiser	
Activity	
Purpose/objective	
Date and location	

Participants' profile

1. Total number of participants involved in the activity
- 2.
3. By gender

Female	Male	Non-binary

4. By age category (#, %)
- 5.

<29	30-39	40-49	50-59	>60

6. By participants' types (based on their professional background) (#, %)

Students	Team members	Farmers	Authorities	Advisors	Others

Design of the process

7. Stakeholders' identification/selection

Were all stakeholders useful for the process? Yes No

Please clarify if some stakeholders were not helpful in the process-

8. **Was the team prepared properly?** Yes No

Issues to be tackled:

- a. Was the activity properly Structured? (Schedule, grouping etc.)
- b. Were the questions formulated?
- c. Were they attributed to one person?
- d. Were they relevant to the issues raised?
- e. Were they directed to specific persons?
- f. Did you get answers?

9. **Did the meeting exceed its planned duration?** Yes No

If so, please explain why this happened.

.

Was there a facilitator who coordinated the discussion/activity? Yes No

If so, please specify who was.

10. Other issues that need to be considered/reported

Group dynamics.

Please indicate to what extent...

(1. Not at all / 2. To a small extent / 3. To a moderate extent / 4. To a great extent)

	①	②	③	④	Comments
were all views well taken into account by others?					
did participants respect opposed opinions?					
did conflict/opposition occur during the activity?					
did participants talk over each other?					
did all participants have the opportunity to communicate their opinions? (facilitator made a roundtable)					
were participants open to communicate and share their views with the RUR'UP team (asking questions, providing feedback)?					
did participants collaboratively and constructively work?					
did participants start an open dialogue and discussion between them?					
were some voices more dominant than others?					
did certain individuals have more influence over the decision-making process than others?					