



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*  
*TIGRIS Training on Bologna and ECTS 2020*

*Draft Version 1.0*

<b>Date</b>	May 21, 2020	<b>Drafted By</b>	GII
<b>Version</b>	1.0	<b>In execution of</b>	Working Package 4.1

### Context

As part of the WP 3.4, RUG provided a workshop for the Kurdish partners on “TIGRIS Training on Bologna and ECTS”. The workshop took place 02.-06.03.2020.

## Results

Table 1 Please select your home institution:

Charmo University	0
Duhok Polytechnic University	1
Erbil Polytechnic University	0
Halabja University	1
Kurdistan Institution of Strategic Studies and Scientific Research (KISSR)	0
Salahaddin University – Erbil	0
Sulaimani Polytechnic University	0
University of Raparin	1
University of Sulaimani	2
MHESR	1
Total	6

In total, 6 individuals answered the survey.

Table 2 How satisfied were you with the general organisation and concept of the training workshop? (responsible RUG)

	Very dissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied	Average	No. of answers
General organisation and concept of the training workshop	2	0	0	4	3.0	6
Information provided to prepare participation in the training workshop (preliminary information via email, agenda, etc.)	2	0	0	4	3.0	6
Overall timing & scheduling of the training workshop	2	0	2	2	2.7	6
Overall	6	0	2	10	2.9	18

Overall, the respondents were not very satisfied with the workshop general organisation by RUG (overall average 2.9) and no part is really outstandingly good. There is a remarkable schism within the group since 66% are usually very satisfied or satisfied but 2 participants were unhappy with everything. Seems to indicate more a personal issue of these individuals.

Table 3 How satisfied were you with the organisation of the training by the host? (responsible RUG)

	Very dissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied	Average	No. of answers
Organisation of the training as such	2	0	0	4	3.0	6
Venue of the training (e.g. accessibility, appropriateness, technical infrastructure)	2	0	1	3	2.8	6
Information provided by the host in regard to the training (e.g. localities/venues, accommodation etc.)	1	1	0	4	3.2	6
Support provided on-site by the host during the training	2	0	1	3	2.8	6
Overall	7	1	2	14	3.0	24

The result for the general organisation is very similar and it is again the same 2 individuals who were unhappy with practically all organisational aspects. However, they did not leave any comments here or at any other point of the survey. The overall result for this 3.0, so this part just achieved the required minimum.

Table 4 How satisfied were you with the specific content of the training programme? (responsible RUG)

	Very dissatisfied	somewhat dissatisfied	somewhat satisfied	very satisfied	Average	No. of answers
Achievements and Challenges (1) - Participants' Presentations. Part 1	1	0	1	3	3.2	5
Achievements and Challenges (1) - Open discussion about the common and institution-particular challenges	1	0	1	3	3.2	5
Site visit to the main university building, university library and Faculties of Arts and Law, Tuning office	1	0	2	2	3.0	5
Achievements and Challenges (2) - Bologna process-related reform and challenges in the region – Presentation by the Ministry Representative	1	0	0	4	3.4	5
Achievements and Challenges (2) - Participants' Presentations. Part 2	1	0	1	3	3.2	5
Key principles of Bologna & ECTS - Key principles of Bologna	1	0	0	4	3.4	5
Key principles of Bologna & ECTS - Key principles of ECTS	1	0	0	4	3.4	5
Learning Outcomes and ECTS-based programmes	1	0	1	3	3.2	5
Student workload: Key principles, institutional experience, Tuning tools	0	0	1	3	3.8	4
Current level of compliance with ECTS implementation indicators based on one's own programme analysis & institutional policies and application [Institutional self-assessment exercise in small groups with sharing experience]	0	1	1	3	3.4	5
Key Supporting Documents (Course Catalogue, Learning Agreement, Transcript of Records, & Diploma Supplement)	1	0	1	3	3.2	5
Assessment and grading scales	1	0	2	2	3.0	5
Q&A sessions 1 + 2	1	0	0	4	3.4	5
Tour of the city of Groningen, history & relation between city / community and the university	1	0	0	4	3.4	5
Work on institutional and joint action plan for after the seminar	1	0	0	4	3.4	5
Presentation of the jointly agreed course of action, followed by an open discussion	1	0	0	4	3.4	5
Discussion of issues which required clarification in order to successfully implement the jointly agreed course of action	1	0	0	4	3.4	5
Overall	15	1	11	57	3.3	84

Regarding the content, The overall result is 3.3, and no part scores under 3.0. Again, one individual was unhappy with absolutely everything. The workshop content thus ***achieved the benchmark of at least a rating of 3 in all parts.***

### Comparison of the different aspects

The overall result is acceptable. The workshop achieved an overall average of 3.1 and therefore just passed the benchmark of 3.0.

Note: Due to the small number of cases, the one generally unhappy individual and the second which was very dissatisfied with the organisational aspects skewed the overall averages far below what seems justified by the majority of votes. We suggest to not take the averages for this workshop too seriously.



*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.*