



Enhancing Teaching, Learning and Graduate Employability
through University-Enterprise Cooperation

Evaluation Report

Artificial Intelligence



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

1. Resume

The aim of this workshop is to share best practices in the field of Artificial intelligence and the agenda was the following:

- UNIVPM AI Teaching & Research team introduction
- UNIVPM AI courses
- Introducing an AI course (a practical example)
- AI by examples
 - o AI & Health
 - o AI & Inspection & Maintenance
 - o AI & Human Behavior Analysis
 - o AI & Industry 4.0
 - o AI & Precision Agriculture
- AI Tools & Practical Exercises
- Deep Dive in the Computer Vision & Deep Learning Course
- Discussion and Suggestions on the Lebanese and Jordanian AI Syllabi

2. Results

5 participants answer the evaluation form, where each question with a grade between 1-5, where 1 is Poor and 5 is Excellent. and the feedback was the following:

Questions	Mean
The training was well planned and organized.	4,8
The training facilities were adequate and comfortable.	4,8
The technical resources used were satisfactory.	4,6
Materials provided were helpful.	4,6
The objectives of the training were clearly defined and met.	4,8
The training content was well organized.	4,8
The topics of the training were clear and easy to follow.	4,8
Length of training was sufficient.	4,6
The training enhanced my understanding on the subject.	4,8
Training was relevant to my needs.	4,8
The training will be useful to my work and my professional growth	4,8
Training met my expectations.	4,8



The trainer was knowledgeable about the training topic.	5,0
The trainer had the ability to explain and illustrate concepts	4,8
The topics were presented in a clear and understandable manner.	5,0
The trainer encouraged participation, interaction and answered questions clearly.	4,8
The trainer's communication style kept me focused and interested.	4,8

The general organization of the event was good as we can see from the average results presented above. The average of the evaluations was 4,8 in general. All participants considered that the training was appropriate for their level of experience.

