

## Geophysical Exploration Course 1.2 Participants Evaluation

Question 1 Score				Question 2 Score				Question 3 Score				Question 4 Score			
Question 1: Did the training course meet your expectations? 1=Completely, 2=Partially, 3= Not at all				Question 2: What do you think about the overall relevance of training course? Considering the limits on your time and the topics discussed? 1=Very relevant, 2 = Somewhat relevant, 3 = Not relevant				Question 3: How the relevant was the training workshop to your organization or project's need?? 1= Too Long, 2= Just right, 3 = Too short				Question 4: What is your recommendation for further improvement and follow up?			
No.	1	2	3	1	2	3		1	2	3					
1			complete			Very relevant				Too short		The time of this course was short, but the content of the lesson was much, I request you to exceed the time of the workshop and translate the lessons through professionals.			
2			The training course was good, but it was short, it's better to extend the time of these courses.			I'm a hydrogeologist, therefore this course was totally relevant to my major and my work.				Too short					
3			The training course was good, but it must durable.			The content of this course was base on my work, so it exceed my knowledge.				These courses must be durable that should learn more.		My only suggestion is an expert and professional translator for these type of courses.			
4			This training course was good for all Hydrogeologists.			I'm working in the field of Hydrogeology, and this course was totally relevant to my work and profession, so it was useful for me.				This training course was useful, but the time was too short, it would be more useful, if the time of these courses to be exceed.		It would be great if these courses be durable and held continuously to learn what we need.			
5			Partially			Parcially				The time of this training course was too short for using GIS tools to develop Hydrogeological maps, so for this handout we really need more time.		Generally the focuse of this training course was introduction with the basic contents of Hydrogeology, but we need more practical work to achieve our profession goals.			
6			I thought we have less data, and we were not aware from our abilities, that we are able to develop Hydrogeological maps, but I understood we have the copabilities to develop these maps.			Any Hydrogeologist who wants to start Hydrogeological survey, he need to use the Hydrogeological maps.				The topic of this training course was completely new for me, but the time was too short to learn more.		We need long term time training courses with more details.			
7			The focus of this training course was most on theory, whereas we need more practical lessons.			Very relevant				Such technical traning courses, must be for at least 10 days.		I found training the lithological log was not considered for Faryab, a potential parameter.			

## Geophysical Exploration Course 1.2 Participants Evaluation

8		We fulfilled the gap of our knowledge, this was a interesting training course and we learned a lot.		We learned what we need for survey, it was really important.		Just right	The implication of this training course was good, we need to move such courses with long period.
9		We need more time to fulfill all our expectation.		Completely relevant to Hydrogeological issues, it must be implicated in the field.		The time was too short, but the topics were a lot.	This training course was good, but followed to fast, some of the participant were not able to understand well, specially Faryab members.
10		The training course was instructive if exceed the time and hired a expert translator.		The training course was very relevant and useful to us, and in general it covered the most part of our project activities.		The time of this training course was too short, so the all topics were shortly explained.	We need long term time training courses with more details.
11		What we learned it was helpful and could fulfill all our gaps and shortages.		This training course was mostly in theory, it should have been followed by practic.		Since the Hydrogeology is a big subject, so we need more time for train.	
12		Complete		Very relevant		Too shor	We need more explanation in term of trasfering of data and creation of Hydrogeological maps, from all cross section
13		Complete		Very relevant		Just right	Generally we learned from this training course, and during this work we fulfilled some of our gaps for field survey.
14		complete		Very relevant		Just right	The training course was useful, I hope would follow such courses in up coming future.
15		complete		Very relevant		Too short	The subject of this training course needed more explanation.
16		Thanks a lot from Dr. David with his good explanation.		The subject was totally relevant to our work.		The time was too short, it must be longer.	for such courses to be instructive, the participant must be Hydrogeologist.
17		This training course was very close to my background and my profession.		This training course was totally relevant to my profession, because I'm working on water section.		Because we have another responsibility in our organization.	This training course was good, and I would like to continue to learn better, how to make good Hydrogeological maps
18		Training of this course was great, cause we learned the occurrence of Ground Water in field and where to drill a water points.		Very relevant		Too short	In future we need the training of GIS and MIS too.
19		Partially		Parcially relevant		Just right	

Geophysical Exploration Course 1.2 Participants Evaluation

20		Partially		Partially relevant		Just right	In upcoming courses, the focus of the course must be on practical portion, and the toolkits that we are going to use in Hydrogeological survey must show to us practically
21		complete		Very relevant		Too short	The training course was effective and useful, so it raise up our capacity, but the term of training was too short.