



Georg-August-Universität Göttingen
Stiftung Öffentlichen Rechts



Global Impact Institute

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 2nd annual dissemination conference 2019

Draft Version 1.0

Date	Dec 09, 2019	Drafted By	GII
Version	1.0	In execution of	Working Package 4.1

Context

As part of the WP 5.3, KISSR with the help of European partners provided a 2nd annual dissemination conference which took place on October 6th, 2019, at the Ramada Hotel in Sulaymaniyah.

Results

Table 1 Please select your home institution:

Charmo University	1
Duhok Polytechnic University	1
Erbil Polytechnic University	1
Halabja University	1
Kurdistan Institution of Strategic Studies and Scientific Research (KISSR)	1
Salahaddin University – Erbil	1
Sulaimani Polytechnic University	2
University of Raparin	1
University of Sulaimani	1
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MHESR)	2
Total	12

In total, 12 individuals answered the survey and all answered all parts.

Table 2 How satisfied were you with the general organisation and concept of the conference (responsible KISSR & UGOE)

	Very dissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied	Average	No. of answers
General concept of the conference	2	1	1	8	3.2	12
Information provided to prepare participation in the conference (preliminary information via email, agenda, etc.)	2	1	2	7	3.2	12
Overall timing & scheduling of the conference	2	1	3	6	3.1	12
Overall	2	1	2	7	3.2	12

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

For this part, the 2nd annual dissemination conference achieved the goal of a rating of at least 3. Four comments were made, two which were recommendations: “I actually preferred to have a longer conference with covering more details and more relevant topics” and “The agenda for events very late and changed the date for events“. The other 2 were positive feedbacks: “The conference was very good and was useful. The avenue and the accommodation were excellent” and “It was timely and well fitted with the general goals of the project”;

Table 3 How satisfied were you with the organisation of the conference by the host (responsible KISSR)

	Very dissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied	Average	No. of answers
Organisation of the conference as such	0	1	0	11	3.8	12
Venue of the conference (e.g. accessibility, appropriateness, technical infrastructure)	0	1	1	10	3.8	12
Visual identity of the event (e.g. interior decoration & promotion material, etc.)	1	0	0	11	3.8	12
Information provided by the host in regard to the conference (e.g. localities/venues, accommodation etc.)	1	0	3	8	3.5	12
Support provided on-site by the host during the conference (incl. translation service)	0	2	2	8	3.5	12
Overall	0.4	0.8	1.2	9.6	3.7	12

Overall, the respondents were very satisfied with the general organisation by KISSR (3.7) and no part is really outstandingly negative, however one person was very dissatisfied with the visual identity and the information provided and another was somewhat dissatisfied with organisation and venue.

This part achieved the goal of a rating of at least 3. One comment was “UoH participants didn't use translation service during the conference but I ticked (very satisfied) because I noticed host institution organized the service very well.”.

Table 4 How satisfied were you with the specific content of the conference?

	Very dissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied	Average	No. of answers
On-stage presentations by selected partners	0	1	4	7	3.5	12
Poster Walk	1	0	4	7	3.4	12
Roundtable discussion	1	1	2	8	3.4	12
Overall	0.7	0.7	3.3	7.3	3.4	12

The individual parts of the conference were rated quite high with an average of 3.4. No activity was rated exceptionally high or low. The conference content thus easily **achieved the benchmark of at least a rating of 3 in all parts.**

Table 5 How would you rate the dissemination and impact factor of the conference?

	Very low	somewhat low	somewhat high	very high	Average	No. of answers
Coverage by and involvement of media	0	3	5	4	3.1	12
Overall outreach to and impact of the conference on key target groups	0	1	6	5	3.3	12
Outreach to and impact on Kurdish HEIs	0	1	4	7	3.5	12
Outreach to and impact on Kurdish policy and decision makers in Higher Education (e.g. members of the Council of the MHESR, government representative, etc.)	0	1	5	6	3.4	12
Outreach to and impact on Kurdish internationalisation practitioners and experts	0	1	6	5	3.3	12
Outreach to and impact on the Kurdish public and society at large	0	4	4	4	3.0	12
Outreach to and impact on key target groups outside of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq	0	4	3	5	3.1	12
Overall	0.0	2.1	4.7	5.1	3.3	12

The individual parts of the dissemination were all rated quite well with an overall average of 3.3. No aspect was rated under 3.0 and none exceptionally high. The conference content thus easily **achieved the benchmark of at least a rating of 3 in all parts.**

Comments were: “One of the aims of the conference was to give seminar about Institutions’ Internationalization Strategies. Writing Internationalization Strategy under supervision and assistance of TIGRIS was something that we are always proud of and we need more assistance regarding implementation of the strategy because UoH is lack [sic!] of professionals in this process” and “We could have had more representatives from the CGs [Consulate Generals] and Embassys [sic!]”.

Comparison of the different aspects

The overall result is really good. The organisation from both Göttingen and KISSR appears to have been better than e.g. in the workshop in Raparin and the content as well as impact was considered very satisfying.

The conference achieved an overall average of 3.4 (3.2, 3.7, 3.4, and 3.3) and easily 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.