

Nicole Nemecek, Julia Schmidt, Barbara Willsberger

Evaluation of the 1<sup>st</sup> IQ-Train/ing-Program



## IMPRESSUM

VerfasserInnen: Dieser Bericht wurde von L&R Sozialforschung im Auftrag des Amtes der Niederösterreichischen Landesregierung erstellt

MedieninhaberIn:

L&R Sozialforschung, Liniengasse 2A, 1060 Wien

Alle Rechte vorbehalten, Nachdruck – auch auszugsweise nur mit Quellenangabe gestattet

Wien, Oktober 2005



L&R SOZIALFORSCHUNG

Lechner, Reiter und Riesenfelder Sozialforschung OEG

A-1060 Wien, Liniengasse 2A/1

Tel: +43 (1) 595 40 40 - 0

Fax: +43 (1) 595 40 40 - 9

E-mail: [office@lrsocialresearch.at](mailto:office@lrsocialresearch.at)

<http://www.lrsocialresearch.at>

## Inhalt

<b>1</b>	<b>The Survey</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Information on Iq-Train</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The Motivation for participation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>The Second Phase of Iq-Train 2006/07</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Acquisition of potential participants</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Summary and Conclusion</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Tables</b>	<b>10</b>

# 1 The Survey

For the evaluation of the first Iq-Train programme, a web-based questionnaire was designed, the main emphasis of which focused on the general framework of the workshops, the evaluation of previous workshops and their effect on participants' work, and also on adaptation proposals for the second phase of Iq-Train. The link to this questionnaire was sent to nearly 300 people, including 117 Iq-Train participants, 14 members of the steering group and 163 potential Iq-Train-participants. Altogether 112 questionnaires were returned, equal to a return rate of 38%. The steering group had the highest rate of return – 11 of 14 questionnaires were sent back. The return rate for participants and potential participants was 36%.

## Structure of Respondents

53.6% of the respondents were male, while 45.5% were female. Slightly over half of the respondents were Austrians (51.8%). 27% of the responses came from Italy, one respondent was German. Questionnaires returned from members of the new EU states amounted to 15%, coming mostly from Slovenia and the Czech Republic.

**Tabelle 1: Country**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
<b>Austria</b>	6	54,5%	30	69,8%	22	37,9%	58	51,8%
<b>Italy/South Tyrol</b>	1	9,1%	4	9,3%	25	43,1%	30	26,8%
<b>Slovenia</b>	0	,0%	6	14,0%	3	5,2%	9	8,0%
<b>Czech Republik</b>	4	36,4%	2	4,7%	2	3,4%	8	7,1%
<b>Germany</b>	0	,0%	0	,0%	1	1,7%	1	,9%
<b>International</b>	0	,0%	0	,0%	5	8,6%	5	4,5%
<b>no comment</b>	0	,0%	1	2,3%	0	,0%	1	,9%
<b>Total</b>	11	100,0%	43	100,0%	58	100,0%	112	100,0%

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

The high proportion of potential participants from Italy (43%) and– especially from the Autonomous Province of Bolzano – South Tyrol is obvious. Also prominent among the group of potential participants are the regions Carinthia and Upper Austria.

The background of the interviewees is of interest in this context. The concept of the project includes a steering group. It was planned that most of its members should hold relevant positions in an intermediate body. The results of the questionnaire show that this aim has been realised: The majority (82%) of the steering group works in an intermediate body 44% of the participants work in the area of regional management and 26% are in financial controlling. In the group of the potential participants, less than one third works in regional management or development, about 12% work in financial controlling or as an intermediate body. 30% describe themselves as acting in other areas, mostly project management and monitoring. Thus the group of potential participants also includes people who are directly involved with project implementation with interests in Iq-Train varying from those of the actual target group.

When analysing attendance at the workshops provided, it is shown that members of the steering group participated more frequently than other Iq-Train participants. Over half of the steering group (54.6%) attended up to nine workshops, while a mere 28% of the Iq-train participants took part in two workshops – 44% attended one workshop only.

**Tabelle 2: Iq-Train participation (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Modules "Financials"	9	90,0%	13	37,1%	22	48,9%
Modules "Other Topics"	9	90,0%	9	25,7%	18	40,0%
Modules "Project Development"	9	90,0%	10	28,6%	19	42,2%
Modules "Regional Management"	6	60,0%	14	40,0%	20	44,4%
Modules "Steering Group"	9	90,0%	2	5,7%	11	24,4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

## 2 Information on Iq-Train

An important aspect in the successful acquisition of participants is sufficient information supply. Analysis of the questionnaires proves that it is mainly the members of the steering group who are supplied with information or inform themselves through different information channels. This was primarily information through the Iq-Train secretariat, the Iq-Train website and personal contacts (almost exclusively through Sabine Rosenberger). The sources of information named are also used predominantly by the other participants. Nearly all respondents were satisfied with their initial personal contact with Iq-train (88.9%) and of these – members of the steering group were more satisfied than the other participants. Interesting again is the fact that potential participants heard from Iq-train mainly through personal contacts and the Interact newsletter, while those sources of information were not important for the participants and the steering group.

**Tabelle 3: Information on Iq-Train (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Personal contacts	6	54,5%	18	42,9%	19	57,6%	43	50,0%
Interact newsletter / website	1	9,1%	5	11,9%	11	33,3%	17	19,8%
Iq-Train website	9	81,8%	15	35,7%	4	12,1%	28	32,6%
Iq-Train secretariat	10	90,9%	24	57,1%	7	21,2%	41	47,7%
Other sources	1	9,1%	3	7,1%	6	18,2%	10	11,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

The Iq-Train website is an important source of information for the members of the steering group in particular: Almost every member of the steering group (9 persons out of 11) visits the website weekly (56%) or monthly (44%). On the other hand, only 35% of the Iq-Train-Participants used the website at all and if they did so, this occurred monthly or even less often.

Differences were also found in the data regarding **satisfaction with the information** on Iq-Train. While all members of the Steering group felt well informed about Iq-Train activities, less than one third (30.2%) of the Iq-Train participants did so. Most of them felt moderately well informed (58.1%) and four participants felt they were not adequately informed. Asked for the reasons for not being well informed, only one person offered an explanation. This respondent would have wished for earlier notification of the Iq-Train dates. The high rate of satisfied steering group members can be explained by their function. They are steering the project and there is lot of contact between them and the Iq-train secretariat. They are also more active in informing themselves. Personal contacts and contacts through the Iq-train secretariat are more seldom in the case of participants than with the steering group. A slight increase in personal contact could contribute to a higher level of information amongst the participants.

**Tabelle 4: How well informed do you feel about Iq-Train?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
well informed	11	100,0%	13	30,2%	24	44,4%
rather well informed	0	,0%	25	58,1%	25	46,3%
rather not informed	0	,0%	4	9,3%	4	7,4%
not informed	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
no comment	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

### **Excursus: Steering group**

The members of the Steering group were also asked about specific aspects of the Iq-Train-Programme. All in all, most of the members of the Steering group (72.7%) were very satisfied with the organisation of Iq-Train. However, they see some requirement for improvement in communication and PR activities – only 45% were very satisfied, but 55% more or less satisfied with these.

It was also stated that the INTERREG are aware that improvement of the project partners was less satisfactory. Seven of the eleven members of the Steering group were only moderately satisfied with the improvement. Also most of them (72%) were only moderately satisfied with the strengthening of cooperation between the INTERREG actors. The absence of Slovenian partners was the explanation given by two of the moderately unsatisfied members of the Steering group.

## **3 The Motivation for participation**

All Steering group members stated that they expected to improve their knowledge on specific topics. Iq-train is an initiative of the steering group and 82% stated that participation was part of their job. Other motivation like improving knowledge on INTERREG programs generally (63.6%) and meeting other INTERREG actors/networking (72.7%) was mentioned. The view of the Iq-Train participants was quite different. Only one third (31.0%) were of the opinion that they needed to participate in the Iq-Train Workshops because it was part of their job.

Their chief motivations besides meeting certain experts (42.9%) were also improving knowledge on certain topics (71.4%) and meeting other INTERREG actors/networking (61.9%).

**Tabelle 5: Motivations and expectations (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Deepening my knowledge about this/those certain topic(s)	11	100,0%	30	71,4%	41	77,4%
Meet certain experts	6	54,5%	18	42,9%	24	45,3%
Deepening my knowledge about INTERREG programmes generally	7	63,6%	14	33,3%	21	39,6%
Positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region	5	45,5%	15	35,7%	20	37,7%
Part of the job	9	81,8%	13	31,0%	22	41,5%
Meet other INTERREG actors / networking	8	72,7%	26	61,9%	34	64,2%
Other expectations	0	,0%	2	4,8%	2	3,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005, One person didn't answer

The results of the survey demonstrate that not all expectations have been fulfilled. Generally it can be stated that the members of the steering group were more satisfied than other surveyed participants. Members of the steering group emphasized as a group that networks could be built up (100%) and knowledge on aspects of the INTERREG programme improved (91%). 82% opined that participating in Iq-Train Workshops has added value to their professional work and had positive impact on the INTERREG programme implementation in their region.

Other participants evaluated the workshops less positively. 79% stated that participating in Iq-Train workshops had added value to their professional work, 70% were satisfied as they could develop relations with relevant actors. 67% saw a positive influence on the INTERREG programme implementation in their region.

## 4 The Second Phase of Iq-Train 2006/07

The **favored topics** named for the second phase of Iq-Train 2006/07 were quite similar to those of the Workshops in the first phase of Iq-Train 2004/05. Most interest focuses particularly on future programming in Regional Management / Regional Development Agencies / Euregios, project development and cross border projects / partnerships. Here, too, differences in the surveyed groups can be detected. The members of the steering group have less interest in workshops about regional management (40%), though they are interested in topics like finance management (60%) or first level controlling (60%). The other participants, on the other hand, are less interested in project development (41%) but are additionally interested in workshops on small project funds. The group of potential participants is primarily interested in the main areas of interest described above, and of these project development is the topic which attracts most attention. This could well be explained by the fact that people involved with project execution are included in this group. Further topics named are EU-Programme/Enlarged EU after 2007, lead partner principle and practical first level control.

**Tabelle 6: Topics for the second Phase of Iq-Train 2006/07 (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Future programming period	9	90,0%	29	69,0%	21	48,8%	59	62,1%
Regional Management / Regional Development Agencies / Euregios	4	40,0%	25	59,5%	20	46,5%	49	51,6%
Project development	8	80,0%	17	40,5%	23	53,5%	48	50,5%
Cross-border projects / partnership	6	60,0%	23	54,8%	18	41,9%	47	49,5%
Financial management	6	60,0%	18	42,9%	15	34,9%	39	41,1%
First Level Control	6	60,0%	19	45,2%	10	23,3%	35	36,8%
Small project funds / Micro funds	5	50,0%	21	50,0%	8	18,6%	34	35,8%
Publicity / promotion of results	3	30,0%	13	31,0%	17	39,5%	33	34,7%
Evaluation	4	40,0%	10	23,8%	13	30,2%	27	28,4%
Changing of financial plans	1	10,0%	9	21,4%	7	16,3%	17	17,9%
Other topics	2	20,0%	9	21,4%	1	2,3%	12	12,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

In the context of comparative importance attached to topics, an evaluation conducted separately for older and newer EU member states could be of interest. With the exception of one topic - regional management - all persons surveyed in the newer EU states displayed more interest in all the other topics than people in the older member states. Interest in the future programming period (81%) as well as in cross border projects and financial management (63% respectively) is particularly high. Interest diverges on topics like first level control, evaluation and changing of financial plans. (See table 35).

In the first phase of Iq-Train, the **moderation of the workshops** was quite open, with only little structured input from experts. The focus was on communication and the transfer of know-how between the participants. Nearly all respondents (83.3%) would prefer no modification. Only six interviewees, two of whom were members of the Steering group, were not satisfied with this arrangement: They would prefer more talks given by external experts.

**Tabelle 7: Should this type of moderation be carried on in the second phase of Iq-Train?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	9	81,8%	36	83,7%	45	83,3%
no	2	18,2%	4	9,3%	6	11,1%
no comment	0	,0%	3	7,0%	3	5,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

Although there is a high degree of satisfaction with the design of the workshops some additional aspects are desired for the second phase. In general, over half of the interviewees (57.4%) would like to see a stronger involvement of experts – especially from the federal chancellery, ERP funds and EU officers – for instance in the form of talks. This applies to 46% of the steering group and 61% of the workshop participants. This wish applies to all modules, although there is a strong desire for talks by experts for the topic of finances. As subject areas, the future programming period, financial management und first level control are frequently mentioned, project development and cross border projects are also specified.

It is noteworthy that people from the old EU-member states (63%) tend to ask for this more often than people from the new EU-countries (42%). This could be explained by the fact that there are generally greater information deficits in the new EU-countries, while members of the old EU-countries already have quite a lot of experience in handling EU-projects. Hence people from the new EU-countries in particular hope to profit from the experience and knowledge of the old member states, while participants of the old EU-countries would like EU-experts to give talks.

The size of the **groups** in the Iq-Train Workshops was satisfactory for almost all respondents (92.6%), for the members of the Steering groups as well as for the Iq-Train participants. The experience and know-how of the participants were appropriate for almost all respondents (85%). However, respondents criticized that not all regions were represented among the participants. 82% of the steering group was of this opinion. The percentage among other participants is much lower at 28%. Both surveyed groups mention the absence of Czech and Slovenian partners.

In the first phase of Iq-Train, some modules were held separately and parallel for the **north and south** Iq-Train project regions. According to more than two thirds of the respondents (68.5%), this splitting should be carried on in the second phase of Iq-Train.

Regarding the **duration of the workshops**, differences exist between the members of the steering group interviewed and the participants. The steering group favours events lasting 1.5 days, while the other participants have a preference of one-day events. It is interesting that 46% of the steering group argue for the merging of several workshops into one, while only 23% of the participants approve of this. Possible merging applies to the topics finances and project development, regional management and the new programming period. With merged workshops, majority favours two-day events.

The Workshops in the first phase of Iq-Train were **documented** with a flipchart-photo protocol for the participants and with a summary of the main results/findings which was available to all via the Iq-Train homepage. Almost all respondents (81.5%) found this type of documentation satisfactory. (Participants from the new member states were particularly satisfied – 92%). Three of the six unsatisfied interviewees would prefer detailed protocols of the Workshops, another two favored summaries.

## **5 Acquisition of potential participants**

Over half of the interviewed potential Iq-Train participants (56.9%) had already heard of Iq-Train. The bulk of these people (82%) expressed interest in Iq-Train. Of those who had not yet heard about Iq-Train, half of these nevertheless expressed interest in the program.

The reasons given by potential participants who were not interested in attending Iq-Train Workshops were quite different. The primary reason for more than half of them is a lack of time (54.5%). Three were not interested in the topics discussed and two gave the long distance to the workshops as a reason for being not interested in the Iq-Train Workshops.

**Tabelle 8: Statements on no interest in Iq-Train Workshops (multiple choice)**

	Potential participants	
	Count	Perc.
long distance to workshop	2	18,2%
no budget	1	9,1%
no interest in the topics	3	27,3%
no time	6	54,5%
Other reasons	2	18,2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

According to this, the workplace setup in terms of existing time resources is the reason most frequently given as well as the scheduled topics and long journeys to the workshops, also seen as obstacles to participation in Iq-train. As to the expectations of potential participants, it is shown that improvement of personal knowledge about the INTERREG programme plays a prominent role. Meeting and networking with other INTERREG actors (57%) and experts (38%) are important. Some (especially from the old EU-countries) have a very pragmatic approach: for this group the Iq-train workshops are simply a part of their job.

**Tabelle 9: Motivations and expectations (multiple choice)**

	Potential participants	
	Count	Perc.
Interest in / Deepening my knowledge about certain topic(s).	8	19,0%
Meet certain experts	16	38,1%
Deepening my knowledge about INTERREG programmes generally	25	59,5%
Positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region	11	26,2%
Part of my job	19	45,2%
Meet other INTERREG actors / networking	24	57,1%
Others	6	14,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

In this context, evaluation according to old and new EU member states once more reveals interesting aspects. Participants from the new EU countries have a higher expectation of meeting and networking with INTERREG actors and experts than those from the old member states. Furthermore, it is more relevant for them to improve not only their INTERREG knowledge but also gain more insight into specific topics. This can be explained within the networking in some older EU-countries, where some institutions – like ÖROK in Austria – promote the exchange of experience and networking. Such institutions are not common in the newer member states.

## 6 Summary and Conclusion

Generally speaking, many more people from Austria than from neighbouring countries responded to the questionnaire. One reason for this is that there are more regional actors involved in INTERREG in Austria than in other countries; people from Slovenia and the Czech Republic are particularly poorly represented. This is also criticised partly by participants in

the workshops, as besides knowledge improvement, networking with different actors plays an important role for the people interviewed. The evaluation of the questionnaires shows that in the acquisition process, personal and telephone first contacts and information are especially successful. The results generally document a high degree of satisfaction with the workshops and thus very few changes are desired for the second phase of Iq-Train. The topics—as in the first phase – should primarily consist of the following items:

- Future programming period (62%)
- Regional Management / Regional Development Agencies / EUREGIOS (52%)
- Project Development (51%)
- Cross-border projects / Partnerships (50%)

People from the new EU- member states in particular, but also potential new participants, stated that they needed more general information about INTERREG.

Regarding the moderation of the workshops, no changes are needed. On the contrary, the open principle with little structure is appreciated by the people interviewed and should be continued in the next phase. For some topics, however, talks by experts should be included. Regarding the size of the groups, the division of some modules for the north and the south region, and also the documentation, there are no wishes for modification. The duration of the workshops should be between 1 and 2 days; with a clear preference for events lasting 1.5 days.

The results thus demonstrate that both in respect to content as well as framework, no adaptations are necessary. However, the acquisition strategy should be developed. The potential participants interviewed have a very high interest in the workshops, yet in this interview group almost no one from the new member states are represented, meaning that acquisition has to be intensified especially in this area. Besides the actual information through the website, the members of the steering group should be involved in PR activities. In the new member states in particular, initial information in the mother tongue is worth considering; older people in leading positions are not always skilled in the English language and thus relevant information might often not be forwarded to the people concerned. At the same time, it is shown that personal initial information is very important and that generally speaking, ongoing personal contacts lead to a higher degree of participant satisfaction. This means that personal contacts with potential participants should not be abandoned as an acquisition strategy.

## 7 Tables

**Tabelle 10: Gender**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
male	8	72,7%	19	44,2%	33	56,9%	60	53,6%
female	3	27,3%	23	53,5%	25	43,1%	51	45,5%
no comment	0	,0%	1	2,3%	0	,0%	1	,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 11: Country**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Austria	6	54,5%	30	69,8%	22	37,9%	58	51,8%
Italy/South Tyrol	1	9,1%	4	9,3%	25	43,1%	30	26,8%
Slovenia	0	,0%	6	14,0%	3	5,2%	9	8,0%
Czech Republik	4	36,4%	2	4,7%	2	3,4%	8	7,1%
Germany	0	,0%	0	,0%	1	1,7%	1	,9%
International	0	,0%	0	,0%	5	8,6%	5	4,5%
no comment	0	,0%	1	2,3%	0	,0%	1	,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 12: Region**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Austria - national level	0	,0%	6	14,0%	7	12,1%	13	11,6%
Autonomous Province of Bolzano - South Tyrol	1	9,1%	3	7,0%	23	39,7%	27	24,1%
Autonomous Region Friuli Venezia Giulia	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,7%	2	1,8%
Bavaria	0	,0%	0	,0%	1	1,7%	1	,9%
Burgenland	0	,0%	0	,0%	1	1,7%	1	,9%
Carinthia	1	9,1%	6	14,0%	6	10,3%	13	11,6%
Czech Republic - national level	0	,0%	2	4,7%	1	1,7%	3	2,7%
Italy - national level	0	,0%	0	,0%	1	1,7%	1	,9%
Lower Austria	1	9,1%	4	9,3%	4	6,9%	9	8,0%
Salzburg	0	,0%	2	4,7%	1	1,7%	3	2,7%
Slovenia	0	,0%	6	14,0%	3	5,2%	9	8,0%
South Bohemia	2	18,2%	0	,0%	1	1,7%	3	2,7%
South Moravia	2	18,2%	0	,0%	0	,0%	2	1,8%
Styria	3	27,3%	4	9,3%	2	3,4%	9	8,0%
Upper Austria	1	9,1%	8	18,6%	1	1,7%	10	8,9%
international	0	,0%	0	,0%	5	8,6%	5	4,5%
no comment	0	,0%	1	2,3%	0	,0%	1	,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 13: Fields of activities (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Regional Management / Regional Development Agency / Euregio	0	,0%	19	44,2%	18	31,6%	37	33,3%
Financial Control (First / Second Level Control)	2	18,2%	11	25,6%	7	12,3%	20	18,0%
Intermediate Body	9	81,8%	3	7,0%	7	12,3%	19	17,1%
Joint Technical Secretariat	0	,0%	4	9,3%	5	8,8%	9	8,1%
Programme Managing Authority	2	18,2%	5	11,6%	9	15,8%	16	14,4%
Other field of activity	0	,0%	4	9,3%	17	29,8%	21	18,9%
Paying Authority	1	9,1%	1	2,3%	8	14,0%	10	9,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 14: Other fields of activities**

	Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Project Management	2	50,0%	5	29,4%	7	33,3%
National Contact Point INTERREG IIB	2	50,0%	1	5,9%	3	14,3%
Others	0	,0%	6	35,3%	6	28,6%
Monitoring	0	,0%	3	17,6%	3	14,3%
No activities	0	,0%	2	11,8%	2	9,5%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 15: Fields of activities (multiple choice)**

	Modules "Steering Group"	Modules "Regional Management"	Modules "Financials"	Modules "Project Development"	Modules "Other Topics"	Total
	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.
Regional Management / Regional Development Agency / Euregio	18,2%	65,0%	,0%	15,8%	5,6%	33,3%
Financial Control (First / Second Level Control)	18,2%	5,0%	50,0%	21,1%	11,1%	26,7%
Intermediate Body	63,6%	25,0%	45,5%	47,4%	50,0%	24,4%
Joint Technical Secretariat	,0%	5,0%	9,1%	10,5%	16,7%	8,9%
Programme Managing Authority	18,2%	10,0%	4,5%	15,8%	22,2%	11,1%
Other field of activity	,0%	,0%	4,5%	5,3%	5,6%	4,4%
Paying Authority	9,1%	5,0%	9,1%	5,3%	11,1%	4,4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 16: Working experience**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
up to 1 year	0	,0%	6	14,0%	7	12,1%	13	11,6%
between 1 to 5 years	7	63,6%	20	46,5%	32	55,2%	59	52,7%
between 5 to 10 years	1	9,1%	15	34,9%	11	19,0%	27	24,1%
for more than 10 years	3	27,3%	1	2,3%	4	6,9%	8	7,1%
no comment	0	,0%	1	2,3%	4	6,9%	5	4,5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 17: Iq-Train participation (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Modules "Financials"	9	90,0%	13	37,1%	22	48,9%
Modules "Other Topics"	9	90,0%	9	25,7%	18	40,0%
Modules "Project Development"	9	90,0%	10	28,6%	19	42,2%
Modules "Regional Management"	6	60,0%	14	40,0%	20	44,4%
Modules "Steering Group"	9	90,0%	2	5,7%	11	24,4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 18: Workshops (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
None of the above	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
1st Iq-Train Open Space Conference, 29 June 04, Graz, AT	10	90,9%	20	46,5%	30	55,6%
"The role of Regional Managements, / Development Agencies / Euregios", Ws 2, Module 2, 10-11 May 05, Linz, AT	4	36,4%	7	16,3%	11	20,4%
"The role of Regional Managements / Development Agencies / Euregios", Ws 1b, Module 2, 12-13 January 05, Linz, AT	5	45,5%	5	11,6%	10	18,5%
"Changing of financial plans", Ws Module 7, 14 April 05, Klagenfurt, AT	4	36,4%	5	11,6%	9	16,7%
"Financing cross-border cooperation", Ws 2, Module 5, 15 April 05, Klagenfurt, AT	4	36,4%	6	14,0%	10	18,5%
"Finding the track", Ws 1 Module1, 16 November 04, Maribor, SI	8	72,7%	2	4,7%	10	18,5%
"The role of Regional Managements / Development Agencies / Euregios", WS 1a, Module 2, 17-18 November 04, Maribor, SI	5	45,5%	8	18,6%	13	24,1%
"Let's have a project", Ws 1b, Module 8, 2 March 05, Brno, CZ	2	18,2%	0	,0%	2	3,7%
"The new programming period", Ws 1, Module 4, 24-25 February 05, Bolzano, IT	9	81,8%	8	18,6%	17	31,5%
"Invoices, Receipts, Payment Confirmation – the world of first level control", Ws 1, Module 6, 25 January 05, Graz, AT	6	54,5%	7	16,3%	13	24,1%
"Let's have a project", Ws 1a, Module 8, 26 January 05, Graz, AT	6	54,5%	4	9,3%	10	18,5%
"Bridging the gap", Ws 1b, Module 9, 27 January 05, Graz, AT	6	54,5%	4	9,3%	10	18,5%
"Keeping the track – part 2", Ws 3, Module 1, 30 June 05, Graz, AT	5	45,5%	0	,0%	5	9,3%
"Bridging the gap", Ws 1a, Module 9, 6 December 04, Brno, CZ	6	54,5%	5	11,6%	11	20,4%
"Promotion – necessary tool for programmes and projects", Ws 1, Module 11, 7 March 05, Salzburg, AT	5	45,5%	2	4,7%	7	13,0%
"Get all the money you need", Ws 1, Module 5, 7 December 04, Brno, CZ	5	45,5%	4	9,3%	9	16,7%
"Keeping the track", Ws 2, Module 1, 8 March 05, Salzburg, AT	8	72,7%	0	,0%	8	14,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 19: Motivations and expectations by Target groups (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Deepening my knowledge about this/those certain topic(s)	11	100,0%	30	71,4%	41	77,4%
Meet certain experts	6	54,5%	18	42,9%	24	45,3%
Deepening my knowledge about INTERREG programmes generally	7	63,6%	14	33,3%	21	39,6%
Positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region	5	45,5%	15	35,7%	20	37,7%
Part of the job	9	81,8%	13	31,0%	22	41,5%
Meet other INTERREG actors / networking	8	72,7%	26	61,9%	34	64,2%
Other expectations	0	,0%	2	4,8%	2	3,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 20: Motivations and expectations (multiple choice)**

	Older EU-Countries		Newer EU-Countries		no comment		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Deepening my knowledge about this/those certain topic(s)	30	75,0%	11	91,7%	0	,0%	41	77,4%
Meet certain experts	20	50,0%	4	33,3%	0	,0%	24	45,3%
Deepening my knowledge about INTERREG programmes generally	15	37,5%	6	50,0%	0	,0%	21	39,6%
Positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region	14	35,0%	5	41,7%	1	100,0%	20	37,7%
Part of the job	15	37,5%	7	58,3%	0	,0%	22	41,5%
Meet other INTERREG actors / networking	26	65,0%	8	66,7%	0	,0%	34	64,2%
Other expectations	1	2,5%	1	8,3%	0	,0%	2	3,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 21: Other motivation and expectation**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Add value to the implementation of the work with INTERREG I	0	,0%	1	50,0%	1	50,0%
Help for beginners	0	,0%	1	50,0%	1	50,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>,0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 22: Participating in Iq-Train-Workshops has added value to my professional work.**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	7	63,6%	19	44,2%	26	48,1%
rather yes	2	18,2%	13	30,2%	15	27,8%
rather no	2	18,2%	8	18,6%	10	18,5%
no	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
no comment	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 23: Statement on "Participating in Iq-Train-Workshops has added value to my professional work."**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Transfer of experience on national level	0	,0%	1	12,5%	1	8,3%
First level control	0	,0%	1	12,5%	1	8,3%
Knowledge and information	4	100,0%	2	25,0%	6	50,0%
Exchange of experience	0	,0%	3	37,5%	3	25,0%
Overview	0	,0%	1	12,5%	1	8,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005, this table includes only participants who agreed the statements, 29 participants didn't answer

**Tabelle 24: By participating in Iq-Train-Workshops I was able to deepen my knowledge about INTERREG programme aspects.**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	8	72,7%	13	30,2%	21	38,9%
rather yes	2	18,2%	21	48,8%	23	42,6%
rather no	1	9,1%	6	14,0%	7	13,0%
no	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
no comment	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 25: Statement on „By participating in Iq-Train-Workshops I was able to deepen my knowledge about INTERREG programme aspects“**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Deepening knowledge and contacts generally	0	,0%	1	2,9%	1	2,3%
Organisational framework	0	,0%	1	2,9%	1	2,3%
Regional management	1	10,0%	0	,0%	1	2,3%
Financial management	1	10,0%	0	,0%	1	2,3%
Exchange of experience	0	,0%	4	11,8%	4	9,1%
Transparence	0	,0%	1	2,9%	1	2,3%
no comment	8	80,0%	27	79,4%	35	79,5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005, this table includes only participants who agreed the statements

**Tabelle 26: By participating in Iq-Train-Workshops I was able to establish new/intensify existing relationships important to my professional work.**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	5	45,5%	9	20,9%	14	25,9%
rather yes	6	54,5%	21	48,8%	27	50,0%
rather no	0	,0%	9	20,9%	9	16,7%
no	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
no comment	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 27: Statement on "By participating in Iq-Train-Workshops I was able to establish new/intensify existing relationships important to my professional work."**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Intensify contacts within the INTERREG community	1	9,0%	2	6,7%	3	7,3%
Intensify existing relationships	0	,0%	3	9,9%	3	7,3%
Important connections and important people	0	,0%	1	3,3%	1	2,4%
no comment	10	91,0%	24	79,9%	34	82,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005, this table includes only participants who agreed the statements

**Tabelle 28: Participating in Iq-Train-Workshops has positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region.**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	5	45,5%	12	27,9%	17	31,5%
rather yes	4	36,4%	17	39,5%	21	38,9%
rather no	2	18,2%	9	20,9%	11	20,4%
no	0	,0%	3	7,0%	3	5,6%
no comment	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 29: Statement on "Participating in Iq-Train-Workshops has positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region."**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Exchange of knowledge	0	,0%	2	6,9%	2	5,3%
Exchange of experience	0	,0%	1	3,4%	1	2,6%
Tools	1	11,1%	0	,0%	1	2,6%
New period	0	,0%	1	3,4%	1	2,6%
Networking	0	,0%	3	10,3%	3	7,9%
no comment	8	88,9%	22	75,9%	30	78,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005, this table includes only participants who agreed the statements

**Tabelle 30: Statements on Iq-Train by Modules and target groupes**

	Modules "Financial"		Modules "Project Development"		Modules "Regional Management"	
	Steering group	Iq-Train participants	Steering group	Iq-Train participants	Steering group	Iq-Train participants
	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.
Participating in Iq-Train-Workshops has added value to my professional work.	77.8%	61.5%	66.7%	50.0%	50.0%	64.3%
By participating in Iq-Train-Workshops I was able to deepen my knowledge about INTERREG programme aspects.	88.9%	46.2%	77.8%	20.0%	66.7%	42.9%
By participating in Iq-Train-Workshops I was able to establish new/intensify existing relationships important to my professional work.	55.6%	38.5%	55.6%	30.0%	33.3%	28.6%
Participating in Iq-Train-Workshops has positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region.	55.6%	46.2%	55.6%	30.0%	50.0%	35.7%
	(n=9)	(n=13)	(n=9)	(n=10)	(n=6)	(n=14)

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005, this table includes only participants who agreed the statements

**Tabelle 31: Statements by motivation and expectations**

	Deepening my knowledge about this/those certain topic(s)		Meet certain experts		Deepening my knowledge about INTERREG programmes generally		Part of the job		Meet other INTERREG actors / networking	
	Steering group	Iq-Train participants	Steering group	Iq-Train participants	Steering group	Iq-Train participants	Steering group	Iq-Train participants	Steering group	Iq-Train participants
	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.
By participating in Iq-Train-Workshops I was able to deepen my knowledge about INTERREG programme aspects	100,0%	52,6%	100,0%	70,0%	100,0%	76,9%	100,0%	44,4%	100,0%	50,0%
By participating in Iq-Train-Workshops I was able to establish new/intensify existing relationships important to my professional work	62,5%	31,6%	75,0%	50,0%	50,0%	30,8%	71,4%	11,1%	71,4%	37,5%
Participating in Iq-Train-Workshops has positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region.	62,5%	52,6%	75,0%	60,0%	50,0%	30,8%	71,4%	22,2%	57,1%	50,0%
Participating in Iq-Train-Workshops has added value to my professional work.	87,5%	84,2%	100,0%	90,0%	83,3%	92,3%	85,7%	88,9%	85,7%	93,8%
	(n=8)	(n=19)	(n=4)	(n=10)	(n=6)	(n=13)	(n=7)	(n=9)	(n=7)	(n=16)

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005, this table includes only participants who agreed the statements

**Tabelle 32: Statement on "Advantage of participating in an Iq-Train-Workshop**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Exchange of experience and knowledge	2	18,2%	3	7,0%	5	9,3%
Financial Flow and project work	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
Networking	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
PR	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
no comment	9	81,8%	36	83,7%	45	83,3%
Total	11	100,0%	43	100,0%	54	100,0%

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 33: Topics for the second Phase of Iq-Train 2006/07 (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Future programming period	9	90,0%	29	69,0%	21	48,8%	59	62,1%
Regional Management / Regional Development Agencies / Euregios	4	40,0%	25	59,5%	20	46,5%	49	51,6%
Project development	8	80,0%	17	40,5%	23	53,5%	48	50,5%
Cross-border projects / partnership	6	60,0%	23	54,8%	18	41,9%	47	49,5%
Financial management	6	60,0%	18	42,9%	15	34,9%	39	41,1%
First Level Control	6	60,0%	19	45,2%	10	23,3%	35	36,8%
Small project funds / Micro funds	5	50,0%	21	50,0%	8	18,6%	34	35,8%
Publicity / promotion of results	3	30,0%	13	31,0%	17	39,5%	33	34,7%
Evaluation	4	40,0%	10	23,8%	13	30,2%	27	28,4%
Changing of financial plans	1	10,0%	9	21,4%	7	16,3%	17	17,9%
Other topics	2	20,0%	9	21,4%	1	2,3%	12	12,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 34: Other topics**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Benchmarking for projects/regional development	0	,0%	1	11,1%	0	,0%	1	8,3%
Closure of the programmes	0	,0%	1	11,1%	0	,0%	1	8,3%
EU-Programme/Enlarged EU (new member states) after 2007	0	,0%	2	22,2%	1	100,0%	3	25,0%
INTERREG IIIB	0	,0%	1	11,1%	0	,0%	1	8,3%
Lead partner principle	2	100,0%	2	22,2%	0	,0%	4	33,3%
Practical First Level Control	0	,0%	2	22,2%	0	,0%	2	16,7%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 35: Topics for the second Phase of Iq-Train 2006/07 (multiple choice)**

	Older EU-Countries		Newer EU-Countries		no comment		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Future programming period	46	59,0%	13	81,3%	0	,0%	59	62,1%
Regional Management / Regional Development Agencies / Euregios	40	51,3%	8	50,0%	1	100,0%	49	51,6%
Project development	39	50,0%	9	56,3%	0	,0%	48	50,5%
Cross-border projects / partnership	36	46,2%	10	62,5%	1	100,0%	47	49,5%
Financial management	29	37,2%	10	62,5%	0	,0%	39	41,1%
First Level Control	27	34,6%	8	50,0%	0	,0%	35	36,8%
Small project funds / Micro funds	28	35,9%	6	37,5%	0	,0%	34	35,8%
Publicity / promotion of results	27	34,6%	6	37,5%	0	,0%	33	34,7%
Evaluation	19	24,4%	8	50,0%	0	,0%	27	28,4%
Changing of financial plans	9	11,5%	8	50,0%	0	,0%	17	17,9%
Other topics	9	11,5%	3	18,8%	0	,0%	12	12,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 36: Up to now the moderation of the workshops was quite open with only little structured input from experts. The focus was on communication and the transfer of know-how between the participants. Should this type of moderation be carried on in the second phase of Iq-Train?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	9	81,8%	36	83,7%	45	83,3%
no	2	18,2%	4	9,3%	6	11,1%
no comment	0	,0%	3	7,0%	3	5,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 37: Proposals for the modification of the Workshops**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
External experts	0	,0%	2	50,0%	2	33,3%
External experts/general points	1	50,0%	1	25,0%	2	33,3%
Participants	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
no comment	1	50,0%	1	25,0%	2	33,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 38: Would you prefer more lectures from experts in the Iq-Train-Workshops?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	5	45,5%	26	60,5%	31	57,4%
no	5	45,5%	11	25,6%	16	29,6%
no comment	1	9,1%	6	14,0%	7	13,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 39: Would you prefer more lectures from experts in the Iq-Train-Workshops?**

	Older EU-Countries		Newer EU-Countries		no comment		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	26	63,4%	5	41,7%	0	,0%	31	57,4%
no	9	22,0%	7	58,3%	0	,0%	16	29,6%
no comment	6	14,6%	0	,0%	1	100,0%	7	13,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 40: Would you prefer more lectures from experts in the Iq-Train-Workshops?**

	Modul "Steering Group"	Modul "Regional Management"	Modul "Financials"	Modul "Project Development"	Modules "Other Topics"	Total
	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.	Perc.
yes	45,5%	55,0%	68,2%	57,9%	55,6%	60,0%
no	45,5%	45,0%	22,7%	31,6%	22,2%	28,9%
no comment	9,1%	,0%	9,1%	10,5%	22,2%	11,1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,0% (n=11)</b>	<b>100,0% (n=20)</b>	<b>100,0% (n=22)</b>	<b>100,0% (n=19)</b>	<b>100,0% (n=18)</b>	<b>100,0% (n=45)</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 41: More lectures to following topics for the second Phase of Iq-Train 2006/07 (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
all topics mentioned above	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
Changing of financial plans	0	,0%	3	10,7%	3	9,1%
Cross-border projects / partnership	3	60,0%	8	28,6%	11	33,3%
Regional Management / Regional Development Agencies / Euregios	0	,0%	9	32,1%	9	27,3%
Evaluation	0	,0%	4	14,3%	4	12,1%
Financial management	3	60,0%	13	46,4%	16	48,5%
First Level Control	2	40,0%	13	46,4%	15	45,5%
Future programming period	5	100,0%	14	50,0%	19	57,6%
Other topics	1	20,0%	1	3,6%	2	6,1%
Project development	2	40,0%	10	35,7%	12	36,4%
Publicity / promotion of results	0	,0%	8	28,6%	8	24,2%
Small project funds / Micro funds	1	20,0%	6	21,4%	7	21,2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 42: More lectures to ther topics**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Lead partner principle	1	100,0%	0	,0%	1	50,0%
Multiprojects and financing	0	,0%	1	100,0%	1	50,0%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 43: Are there any experts you would like to meet at the Iq-Train-Workshops?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
BKA	0	,0%	3	7,0%	3	5,6%
DG Regio	1	9,1%	0	,0%	1	1,9%
ERP	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
EU	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
Space for participants	1	9,1%	0	,0%	1	1,9%
no comment	9	81,8%	36	83,7%	45	83,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 44: Are you satisfied with the size of the group?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	10	90,9%	40	93,0%	50	92,6%
no	1	9,1%	1	2,3%	2	3,7%
no comment	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 45: If not, why were you not satisfied with the size of the group?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Often too small	0	,0%	1	100,0%	1	50,0%
Only little input from slovenian partners	1	100,0%	0	,0%	1	50,0%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 46: Did enough participants from all addressed regions attend the Iq-Train-Workshops?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	2	18,2%	27	62,8%	29	53,7%
no	9	81,8%	12	27,9%	21	38,9%
no comment	0	,0%	4	9,3%	4	7,4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 47: If no, who was missing?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Czech partners	4	44,4%	3	25,0%	7	33,3%
Slovenian partners	5	55,6%	5	41,7%	10	47,6%
The South	0	,0%	1	8,3%	1	4,8%
no comment	0	,0%	3	25,0%	3	14,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 48: Was the experience/know-how of the participants appropriate?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	9	81,8%	37	86,0%	46	85,2%
no	2	18,2%	2	4,7%	4	7,4%
no comment	0	,0%	4	9,3%	4	7,4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 49: In the first phase of Iq-Train some topics/modules were held separately and parallel for the north and south Iq-Train project regions. Should this splitting be carried on in the second phase of Iq-Train?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	8	72,7%	29	67,4%	37	68,5%
no	2	18,2%	7	16,3%	9	16,7%
no comment	1	9,1%	7	16,3%	8	14,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 50:** In the first phase of Iq-Train some topics/modules were held separately and parallel for the north and south Iq-Train project regions. Should this splitting be carried on in the second phase of Iq-Train?

	Older EU-Countries		Newer EU-Countries		no comment		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	29	70,7%	7	58,3%	1	100,0%	37	68,5%
no	6	14,6%	3	25,0%	0	,0%	9	16,7%
no comment	6	14,6%	2	16,7%	0	,0%	8	14,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 51:** In the second phase of Iq-Train there should be more/less 1-day workshops held.

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
more	2	18,2%	12	27,9%	14	25,9%
less	4	36,4%	3	7,0%	7	13,0%
no modification	5	45,5%	25	58,1%	30	55,6%
no comment	0	,0%	3	7,0%	3	5,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 52:** In the second phase of Iq-Train there should be more/less 1.5-day workshops held.

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
more	2	18,2%	7	16,3%	9	16,7%
less	2	18,2%	6	14,0%	8	14,8%
no modification	7	63,6%	22	51,2%	29	53,7%
no comment	0	,0%	8	18,6%	8	14,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 53:** In the second phase of Iq-Train several workshops should be put together to one workshop.

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	5	45,5%	10	23,3%	15	27,8%
no	5	45,5%	26	60,5%	31	57,4%
no comment	1	9,1%	7	16,3%	8	14,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 54:** Which?

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Depending on topic	1	20,0%	1	10,0%	2	13,3%
Financial issues, project development	2	40,0%	1	10,0%	3	20,0%
Regional management and new period	0	,0%	2	20,0%	2	13,3%
no comment	2	40,0%	6	60,0%	8	53,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 55: If yes, the duration of the workshops should last**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
2 days	4	80,0%	8	80,0%	12	80,0%
3 days	1	20,0%	1	10,0%	2	13,3%
4 days	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
5 days	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
no comment	0	,0%	1	10,0%	1	6,7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 56: In the first phase of Iq-Train the workshops were documented in two ways: with a flipchart-photoprotocol for the participants and with a summary of the main results/findings which are available to all via the Iq-Train homepage. Are you satisfied with this type of documentation?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	7	63,6%	37	86,0%	44	81,5%
no	3	27,3%	4	9,3%	7	13,0%
no comment	1	9,1%	2	4,7%	3	5,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 57: In the first phase of Iq-Train the workshops were documented in two ways: with a flipchart-photoprotocol for the participants and with a summary of the main results/findings which are available to all via the Iq-Train homepage. Are you satisfied with this type of documentation?**

	Older EU-Countries		Newer EU-Countries		no comment		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	32	78,0%	11	91,7%	1	100,0%	44	81,5%
no	7	17,1%	0	,0%	0	,0%	7	13,0%
no comment	2	4,9%	1	8,3%	0	,0%	3	5,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 58: If not, which proposals for modification do you have concerning the documentation?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Detailed protocolls	1	33,3%	2	50,0%	3	42,9%
Summaries of the workshops	0	,0%	2	50,0%	2	28,6%
Tools based on workshops	1	33,3%	0	,0%	1	14,3%
no comment	1	33,3%	0	,0%	1	14,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 59: Information about Iq-Train (multiple choice)**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Personal contacts	6	54,5%	18	42,9%	19	57,6%	43	50,0%
Interact newsletter / website	1	9,1%	5	11,9%	11	33,3%	17	19,8%
Iq-Train website	9	81,8%	15	35,7%	4	12,1%	28	32,6%
Iq-Train secretariat	10	90,9%	24	57,1%	7	21,2%	41	47,7%
Other sources	1	9,1%	3	7,1%	6	18,2%	10	11,6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 60: Other sources**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Colleagues	0	,0%	2	66,7%	0	,0%	2	20,0%
E-mail	0	,0%	0	,0%	2	33,3%	2	20,0%
INTERACT secretariat	0	,0%	0	,0%	1	16,7%	1	10,0%
Participants	0	,0%	0	,0%	1	16,7%	1	10,0%
Project partner	1	100,0%	0	,0%	2	33,3%	3	30,0%
Supervisor	0	,0%	1	33,3%	0	,0%	1	10,0%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 61: Primary personal contact**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Agencija za regionalni razvoj, (ARR) Slovenija	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
Armin Schabus	0	,0%	5	11,6%	5	9,3%
Buro of european affairs	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
Danube	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
Klug Johann	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
Martin Kavalek, Hannes Klug, Sabine Rosenberger	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
Robert Schrötter	0	,0%	2	4,7%	2	3,7%
Sabine Rosenberger	8	72,7%	14	32,6%	22	40,7%
Sabine Rosenberger, Robert Schrötter	1	9,1%	3	7,0%	4	7,4%
Samantha Illmer	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
Upper Austria and JTS Interreg Austria-Bavaria	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
none	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
no comment	2	18,2%	10	23,3%	12	22,2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 62: How satisfied are you with this contact?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
very satisfied	9	81,8%	24	55,8%	33	61,1%
satisfied	1	9,1%	14	32,6%	15	27,8%
rather satisfied	1	9,1%	0	,0%	1	1,9%
not satisfied	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
no comment	0	,0%	4	9,3%	4	7,4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 63: Positive statement on „How satisfied are you with this contact?“**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Teamwork	0	,0%	1	2,6%	1	2,1%
no comment	10	100,0%	37	97,4%	47	97,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 64: Negative statement on „How satisfied are you with this contact?“**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
no comment	1	100,0%	1	100,0%	2	100,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 65: How well informed do you feel about Iq-Train?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
well informed	11	100,0%	13	30,2%	24	44,4%
rather well informed	0	,0%	25	58,1%	25	46,3%
rather not informed	0	,0%	4	9,3%	4	7,4%
not informed	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
no comment	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 66: Statement on „How well informed do you feel about Iq-Train?“**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Earlier announcement of dates	0	,0%	1	2,3%	1	1,9%
no comment	11	100,0%	42	97,7%	53	98,1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 67: How often do you visit the Iq-Train Website (www.iq-train.net)?**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
never	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
less than once a month	0	,0%	7	46,7%	7	29,2%
monthly	4	44,4%	7	46,7%	11	45,8%
weekly	5	55,6%	1	6,7%	6	25,0%
several times a week	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
more than 5 times a week	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005 Only participants who used the Iq-Train Website as a source for information

**Tabelle 68: How satisfied are you with the project organisation of Iq-Train?**

	Steering group		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
very satisfied	8	72,7%	8	72,7%
satisfied	0	,0%	0	,0%
rather satisfied	3	27,3%	3	27,3%
not satisfied	0	,0%	0	,0%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 69: Statement on „How satisfied are you with the project organisation of Iq-Train?“**

	Steering group		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
The secretariat workes quite well	1	9,1%	1	9,1%
no comment	10	90,9%	10	90,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 70: How satisfied are you with the communication and PR activities of Iq-Train?**

	Steering group		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
very satisfied	5	45,5%	5	45,5%
satisfied	0	,0%	0	,0%
rather satisfied	6	54,5%	6	54,5%
not satisfied	0	,0%	0	,0%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 71: Statement on „How satisfied are you with the communication and PR activities of Iq-Train?“**

	Steering group		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
nix	11	100,0%	11	100,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 72: How satisfied are you with the INTERREG know-how improvement of the project partners?**

	Steering group		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
very satisfied	4	36,4%	4	36,4%
satisfied	0	,0%	0	,0%
rather satisfied	7	63,6%	7	63,6%
not satisfied	0	,0%	0	,0%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 73: Statement on „How satisfied are you with the INTERREG know-how improvement of the project partners?**

	Steering group		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Missing slovenian partner	1	9,1%	1	9,1%
no comment	10	90,9%	10	90,9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 74: How satisfied are you with the strengthening of the cooperation between the INTERREG actors?**

	Steering group		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
very satisfied	3	27,3%	3	27,3%
satisfied	0	,0%	0	,0%
rather satisfied	8	72,7%	8	72,7%
not satisfied	0	,0%	0	,0%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 75: Statement on „How satisfied are you with the strengthening of the cooperation between the INTERREG actors?**

	Steering group		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Missing slovenian partner	2	18,2%	2	18,2%
no comment	9	81,8%	9	81,8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 76: Suggestions**

	Steering group		Iq-Train participants		Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Helpful for beginners	0	,0%	1	2,4%	0	,0%	1	1,9%
More participation from and information about Czech partner	1	9,1%	0	,0%	0	,0%	1	1,9%
News about other seminars organised at national/regional level	0	,0%	1	2,4%	0	,0%	1	1,9%
More PR	0	,0%	1	2,4%	0	,0%	1	1,9%
no comment	10	90,9%	39	92,9%	0	,0%	49	92,5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>,0%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 77: Have you ever heard about Iq-Train?**

	Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	33	56,9%	33	56,9%
no	25	43,1%	25	43,1%
no comment	0	,0%	0	,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 78: Interest in Iq-Train**

	Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	27	81,8%	27	81,8%
no	5	15,2%	5	15,2%
no comment	1	3,0%	1	3,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005 Potential participants who had already heard from Iq-Train

**Tabelle 79: Interest in Iq-Train**

	Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
yes	12	48,0%	12	48,0%
no	12	48,0%	12	48,0%
no comment	1	4,0%	1	4,0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005 Potential participants who had not already heard from Iq-Train

**Tabelle 80: Statement on „No interest in Iq-Train“ (multiple choice)**

	Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
long distance to workshop	2	18,2%	2	18,2%
no budget	1	9,1%	1	9,1%
no interest in the topics	3	27,3%	3	27,3%
no time	6	54,5%	6	54,5%
Other reasons	2	18,2%	2	18,2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005, one person didn't answer

**Tabelle 81: Motivations and expectations (multiple choice)**

	Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Interest in / Deepening my knowledge about certain topic(s).	8	19,0%	8	19,0%
Meet certain experts	16	38,1%	16	38,1%
Deepening my knowledge about INTERREG programmes generally	25	59,5%	25	59,5%
Positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region	11	26,2%	11	26,2%
Part of my job	19	45,2%	19	45,2%
Meet other INTERREG actors / networking	24	57,1%	24	57,1%
Others	6	14,3%	6	14,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 82: Motivations and expectations of potential participants (multiple choice)**

	Older EU-Countries		Newer EU-Countries		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
Interest in / Deepening my knowledge about certain topic(s).	6	16,2%	2	40,0%	8	19,0%
Meet certain experts	13	35,1%	3	60,0%	16	38,1%
Deepening my knowledge about INTERREG programmes generally	23	62,2%	2	40,0%	25	59,5%
Positive impacts on the INTERREG programme implementation in my region	11	29,7%	0	,0%	11	26,2%
Part of my job	18	48,6%	1	20,0%	19	45,2%
Meet other INTERREG actors / networking	20	54,1%	4	80,0%	24	57,1%
Others	5	13,5%	1	20,0%	6	14,3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

**Tabelle 83: Other Motivations and expectations**

	Potential participants		Total	
	Count	Perc.	Count	Perc.
New and innovative approaches - not only the closed partners	1	16,7%	1	16,7%
Contribute with practical experience	1	16,7%	1	16,7%
Cross-border public health issues	1	16,7%	1	16,7%
Current challenges faced by cross-border programmes	1	16,7%	1	16,7%
First level control	1	16,7%	1	16,7%
Monitoring	1	16,7%	1	16,7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100,0%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

Source: L&R Datafile 'Iq-Train evaluation', 2005

