GOODFOOD Project

Good teaching practices in experiential learning for effective education in embedded food systems



Project No. 2020-1-PL01-KA203-082209

O3 - Syllabus of 2 Intensive Study Programmes 'Food systems embedded in territories':

3.8. The ISP Evaluation Questionnaire

Project timeframes: 1st November 2020 – 31st October 2023

Copyright CC BY-NC 4.0

GOODFOOD coordinating institution: Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW (Poland); Project Partners: FH Münster University of Applied Sciences (Germany), I.S.A.R.A (France), University of Gastronomic Sciences (Italy), Agricultural University - Plovdiv (Bulgaria), University of Oradea (Romania). Intellectual Output Leader: Prof. Paola Migliorini, University of Gastronomic Sciences (Italy). All GOODFOOD Partners contributed towards the development of this Intellectual Output of the project. The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.





Evaluation of the GOODFOOD Intensive Study Programme 'Food Systems Embedded in Territories'

Melle, Italy, 14th – 22nd July 2023

Thank you very much for your participation in our GOODFOOD course in Melle! We would appreciate your opinions, comments, and suggestions for improvements. Your feedback is very important to us.

Please rate the following statements about the course in Melle:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The course in Melle broadened my knowledge and skills in the area of embedded food systems.	۵		۵	۵	
The number of participating students was appropriate.					
The number of participating lecturers was appropriate.					
The course in Melle provided plenty of opportunities for building networks that might help further my career.	٥	٥			
The course in Melle provided plenty of opportunities to talk to senior researchers.					
The course in Melle and the preceding e-learning course complemented one another.					
Knowledge gained during the e-learning part of the programme helped me to work on the given subject in Melle.					
The quality of the educational activities undertaken during the course in Melle was good.				۵	
The educational methods/approaches applied during the course in Melle were good.				۵	
The lecturers' knowledge on the subjects was good.					
The balance between case study visits, workshops, reflection sessions (including group work), presentation sessions and other activities was optimal.					
The selection of Melle case studies was interesting and adequate for the studied topic.					
The objectives of the course in Melle were clear and clearly presented.			٥		
The delegated teaching materials provided during the e-learning part of the programme as well as all instructions and support provided during the course in Melle were relevant and covered well all aspects necessary for the elaboration of my ISP Case Study task.					
I was provided in the right time with all necessary information regarding the course in Melle.					
The teachers were sufficiently active and supportive during the course in Melle.					
I have obtained the following intended learning outcomes for this course: To develop basic understanding on what the embedded food system notion (EFS) is; To understand the multiple perspective of EFS; to know how to identify an EFS.					0



Overall, I think the course in Melle was profitable for me.					
The course in Melle met my expectations.					
Attending this course was worthwhile.					
Please rate the following statements regarding the group work on case studies in Melle:	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree noi disagree	_	Strongly agree
The ISP Melle group work task was clear (provided instructions were clear).					
The criteria of group work outcome's evaluation were clear.					
The size of working groups was good.					
The composition of working group was good.					
The selected case studies were interesting, especially from the perspective of studying their embeddedness in the Melle food system.					
There was enough time to prepare the group work presentations.					
The ISP Case Study sessions (when we were presenting our group task outcomes) were well planned & organized.		۵	۵		
How satisfied were you with the following aspects of the course in Melle?	Not satisfied at all	Not quite	Neither satisfied nor unsatisfi ed	Satisfied	Very satisfied
The overall organization of the course in Melle.					
The agenda of the course in Melle (including scheduled breaks, starting and finishing times).					
Keeping the timetable as planned in the agenda.					
The information via email provided before the course in Melle.					
The information (reg. organisational matters etc.) provided during the course in Melle.					
Necessary materials provided during the course in Melle.					
The ad hoc dealing by the organizers with unexpected difficulties you experienced during the course (or when planning your participation in the course) in Melle.					
The international character of the course (possibility of meeting and exchanging with colleagues and lecturers from other countries).					
The overall workload on the course.					
Professional level of the programme/course.					
The leisure activities in general.					
Amount of free time available.					
The ISP Case Studies in general.					
The ISP Case Study 1 (La MILPA Orto Collettivo).					



The ISP Case Study 2 (REIS Cibo Libero di Montagna).

The ISP Case Study 3 (LOCANDA ENVENTOOUR).					
The ISP Case Study 4 (Azienda Agricola Roggero).					
The ISP Case Study 5 (CRESCO CSA).					
The overall course location (Melle).					
The lecture halls and study facilities.					
The accommodation.					
The catering/food.					
Welcome session on Day 1.					
E-learning Case Study Sessions (presenting outcomes of the e-learning).					
Feedback received from the lecturers on your e-learning Case Study presentation.					
ISP Case Study Sessions (presenting outcomes of the course in Melle).					
Feedback received from the lecturers on your Melle Case Study presentation.					
ISP final reflection session (Programme harvest, Personal reflection).					
If you were not satisfied with any of the above aspects, pl improve these aspects in the future courses.	ease tell u	s why, so	that we d	ould try t	o
In my aninian the workload on the course in Malla was					

In my opinion, the workload on the course in Melle was:

Way too little / A bit too little / Appropriate / A bit too high / Way too high

In relation to my own prerequisites, I find the professional level of the course in Melle:

Way too low / A bit too low / Appropriate / A bit too high / Way too high

Please rate the overall quality of the course in Melle (1 – lowest, 5 – highest)

1/2/3/4/5

Would you recommend the course in Melle to your colleagues?

Yes / No / I'm not sure

If you could go back in time, would you have decided again to take part in this course in Melle?

Yes / No / I'm not sure



What worked well with this course? (positives)
What didn't work well? What challenges have you faced and why? (negatives)
What would you suggest to improve & how?
What was the main outcome of the course for you? the main learning? The main "take home message"? The main benefit?
The main benefit?

At which University do you study?

MUAS / ISARA / UNISG / WULS / AUP / UO

Thank you very much for taking part! ©

