



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



Transfer of Good Practices
& Reinforcement of
Internationalisation
Strategies in Kurdistan

Erasmus+ - Key Action 2
Capacity Building within the Field of Higher Education

TIGRIS Project

Evaluation report Raparin Workshop 2019

Draft Version 1.0

Date	February 28, 2019	Drafted By	GII
Version	1.0	In execution of	Working Package 4.1

Context

As part of the WP 2.1, the University of Raparin with the help of European partners provided a workshop for the Kurdish partners which served to provide insights into the Bologna Process and ECTS.

The workshop took place 04.-06.02.2019.

Results

Table 1 Please select your home institution:

Charmo University	1
Duhok Polytechnic University	2
Erbil Polytechnic University	2
Halabja University	2
Kurdistan Institution of Strategic Studies and Scientific Research (KISSR)	2
Salahaddin University – Erbil	1
Sulaimani Polytechnic University	1
University of Raparin	8
University of Sulaimani	2
MHESR	1
Total	22

In total, 22 individuals answered the survey and all except 2 answered all parts.

Table 2 How satisfied were you with the general organisation by Göttingen

	Very dissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied	Average	No. of answers
Organisation of the workshop as such	3		6	13	3.3	22
Information provided to prepare participation in the workshop	3	1	7	11	3.2	22
Timing & scheduling of the workshop	3	1	3	15	3.4	22
Overall	3		8	11	3.2	22

Overall, the respondents were somewhat satisfied with the workshop general organisation by Göttingen (3.2) and no part is really outstandingly negative or positive.

For this part, the workshop achieved the goal of a rating of at least 3.

Table 3 How satisfied were you with the general organisation by Raparin

	Very dissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied	Average	No. of answers
Organisation of the workshop as such	2	1	3	16	3.5	22
Information provided by the host in regard to the workshop (e.g. agenda, content, localities, etc.)	2	1	3	16	3.5	22
Support provided on-site by the host during the workshop	2	2	4	14	3.4	22
Overall	2	1.3	3.3	15.3	3.5	22.0

Overall, the respondents were quite satisfied with the general organisation by Raparin (3.5) and no part is really outstandingly negative or positive.

This part achieved the goal of a rating of at least 3. One comment was “Very bad accommodation!”

Table 4 How satisfied were you with the specific content of the workshop

	Very dissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied	Average	No. of answers
Introduction to Bologna principles and system	1	4	9	8	3.1	22
Understanding Learning Outcomes	2	2	8	10	3.2	22
Alignment of learning outcomes and competences	2	3	11	6	3.0	22
Use of ECTS	1	7	8	5	2.8	21
Competence-based approach curriculum. Use of qualification frameworks.	2	5	10	5	2.8	22
Comparison between Europe and Kurdistan						
From theory to practice. Learning Outcomes in selected course descriptors	3	4	9	6	2.8	22
Alignment of learning outcomes across curricula	2	3	13	4	2.9	22
Distribution of ECTS within selected programs. Modular approach	3	5	8	6	2.8	22
Group assignment	2	7	7	6	2.8	22
Presentations by Kurdish partner HEIs (UoR & ChU)	1	4	9	8	3.1	22
Wrap-up discussion and evaluation of status quo in Kurdistan	1	4	9	6	3.0	20
Project Management Meeting	2	3	8	9	3.1	22
Overall	1.5	4.5	8.3	7.3	3.0	21.5

The individual parts of the workshop were rated on average at 3.0. All aspects related to curricula and ECTS received ratings under 3 indicating a certain level of dissatisfaction and none was rated better than 3.1. The workshop content still **achieved the benchmark of at least a rating of 3 overall but not in all parts.**

Unfortunately, there were no specific comments by the participants that would explain the results.

Comparison of the different aspects

The overall result is satisfactory but not very good. The organisation from both Göttingen and Raparin appears to have been satisfying but the content was only partially satisfying and the gap between the satisfaction of organisation (3.2 and 3.5) and the content (3.0) is worth noting. Also no content managed to receive a very positive average, the best was 3.1.

Still, the workshop achieved an overall average of 3.2 (3.2, 3.5 and 3.0) and technically passed the benchmark of 3.0.



The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects 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.