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# Executive Summary

This document presents the analysis aimed to assess the quality of the first dissemination event (“IEOM”) with relevant stakeholders organised by Khon Kaen University.

The quality assessment questionnaire was filled by 5 participants at event. The analysis indicated that the participants were content about all the topics covered by the questionnaire.

# Introduction

According to the approved project application, dissemination events (workshops and info days) will be organised at each Thai university with two aims:

a) to disseminate project objectives, activities and results;

b) to promote the concepts of the new study program.

These dissemination events will start to be conducted after the completions of key activities for preparation and development phase and more often during the last six months of the project. Participants on these workshops will be academic staff, researchers, potential students, industry representatives.

This was the first such an event (“IEOM”) organised by Khon Kaen University. In order to ensure a proper quality for the next events, the event assessment questionnaire designed by project’s partners was used during this event.

# The Assessment Questionnaire Structure

The assessment questionnaire was designed to cover all the relevant aspects of the event, but also to be brief enough to avoid respondents’ boredom. The questionnaire had three sections: General information; Overall feedback; Strengths and limitations of the event.

The general information section had the following items:

1. Sex (please tick the appropriate option): □ Female □ Male
2. Your Age
3. Country
4. What is your present professional position?

The overall feedback section had following items (5-point Likert scale from 5 - “Most satisfied” to 1 - “Not at all satisfied”):

1. The event administration
2. The structure of the programme
3. The venue and facilities
4. The presentations
5. The discussions
6. The information I got will be of immediate use to me.
7. This event covered to a very high extent the topics I have expected.
8. I enjoyed the cooperation and interaction with the other participants.

The strengths and limitations of the event section had the following items:

1. Have you participated in similar events before? □ Yes □ No
2. Please illustrate any strengths of the event and contributions or activities you enjoyed:
3. Please indicate how you think the event could have been improved:
4. Any further comments?

# Analysis of Questionnaire Results

The questionnaire was filled by 5 participants. The gender structure was female (2) and male (3). The mean age of respondents was 32.6 years (youngest: 26; oldest: 40). The nationality of respondents was Thai. The professional structure of respondents was: lecturers (1), assistant professors (2), researchers (1) and students (1).

The statistical results for overall feedback are displayed in Table 1.

*Table 1*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Item* | *Mean**[max. 5]* |
| The event administration | 4.4 |
| The structure of the programme | 4.8 |
| The venue and facilities | 5 |
| The presentations | 4.8 |
| The discussions | 4.2 |
| The information I got will be of immediate use to me. | 4 |
| This event covered to a very high extent the topics I have expected. | 4 |
| I enjoyed the cooperation and interaction with the other participants. | 4.2 |

The variance of the results was between 0 – 0.3, which indicated that each mean expressed the results with a good accuracy.

Overall, the results were very good. The means were above 4. High marks were obtained at programme’s structure and venue and also at presentations. The coverage of topics and the utility of information were a little less appreciated.

80% of the respondents participated at a similar event before.

There were recorded several comments which were grouped according to their subject.

**Comments regarding the event’s strengths and enjoyed activities:**

* “The contents are very interesting.”
* “The presentations are excellent and good location for meeting”
* “Great event!!!”

**Comments regarding event improvement:**

* “It should fit the event period”
* “Food are not various”

# Conclusions

A questionnaire for assessment of MSIE 4.0 project’s events was designed and run for the first dissemination event organised by Khon Kaen University. 5 participants filled the questionnaire. The results indicated that the event was carried-out very good. The programme structure, the venue and the presentations were highly regarded.