

Name of PP: **Vaslui County School Inspectorate**
 Name of P1: **Galati County School Inspectorate**
 Project code: **PN2018**
 Financing contract number and date : **1/30.10.2020/N**
 Project implementation period : **30.10.2020-30.04.2023**

QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this anonymous questionnaire is to make an assessment of the effectiveness of the course. Circle or tick the number/box corresponding to your answer. The figure 5 corresponds to the excellent level and the figure 1 corresponds to the poor level. The information contained in this questionnaire is confidential.

A. Identification data

- a) Pilot school.....
- b) Discipline taught.....
- c) Gender
 - M
 - F
- d) Teaching grade:
 - Indefinite
 - Grade II
 - Grade I
 - Masters
 - Doctoral
- e) Age:
 - Under 35 years
 - 36 – 50 years
 - Over 50 years
- f) Length of service in education.....

B. Course management

1. Evaluate the overall organisation of the course:

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

2. Assess the extent to which your expectations have been met:

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

3. Evaluate the teamwork:

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

4. Evaluate the general atmosphere of the course:

Tense/oppressive 1 2 3 4 5 Relaxed

5. Evaluate the course conditions (environmental conditions regarding the room, sound, visibility, alternation between lecture and break):

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

6. Evaluate the course duration:

Short 1 2 3 4 5 Excessive

C) Curricula

1. For you, the information provided by this course was:





Norway grants



- Known
- Partially new
- Completely new
- Far too concentrated (too few hours allocated to this course)
- Too much information (too detailed for our specialization, very busy schedule)
- In a suitable volume
- Far too vague (too many hours allocated to this course)
- Too little information (too vague in relation to our specialisation)
- Highly applicable in practice
- Not practical

2. The course support was:

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Easy to understand | | | | | |
| Clear and well structured | | | | | |
| The issues addressed were well selected | | | | | |

D) Evaluation of activities/trainers

1. How do you rate the trainer's professional training?

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Taught with professional confidence | | | | | |
| Conveyed the content intelligibly | | | | | |
| He had an open attitude towards the trainers | | | | | |
| Encouraged dialogue with the formable | | | | | |
| He was always prepared for the course | | | | | |
| Provided support for group activities and discussions | | | | | |

2. The learning activities were:

Inefficient 1 2 3 4 5 **Efficiente**

Boring 1 2 3 4 5 **Attractive**

3. The time allocated to learning tasks was:

Insufficient 1 2 3 4 5 **Sufficient**

4. The methods used were:

Classic 1 2 3 4 5 **Interactive**

5. Compared to other courses taken, the difficulty of the assignments and tasks was:

Very low 1 2 3 4 5 **Very high**

6. This course was as an experience:

- Very interesting
- Boring
- Useful
- Pleasant
- Useless
- Unpleasant/Traumatising

E) Suggestions and recommendations:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you for your support



INSPECTORATUL ȘCOLAR JUDEȚEAN VASLUI