

# Tehran Management Meeting

## July 02, 2017

### Quality Assurance Report & Evaluation

On July 2, 2017, Dr. Arabkheradmad, TUMS Vice-Chancellor for Global Strategies and International Affairs, had a meeting with Dr. Riyadh Qashi, representative of Leipzig University as the European coordinator of OPATEL Project. Other attendees of the meeting were included Dr. Mohammad Hossein Nekoofar, Dr. Sina Marashi, Dr. Enayat Shabani, as the main managers of the project as well as Ali sayyadi and Tannaz Azadi, OPATEL project officers.



Dr. Qashi had a brief introduction to the OPATEL project and stated that Online Platform for Academic Teaching and Learning in Iran and Iraq (OPATEL), is an Erasmus Plus project established by the European Union, in which 13 universities based in Iran, Iraq, Portugal, Greece, and Germany have collaborations in different areas of education and online learning. He also added that in the framework of this project, the

European Union provides funding for the defined activities such as the purchase of equipment for online education to the members. General information regarding equipment purchase and also dissemination were given to the audience by him as well. Steps required to ask for the offers for purchase of equipment we completely explained and questions were answered by the project coordinator from Leipzig University.

More details regarding budget allocation for OPETAL's activities were presented at this meeting. OPETAL aims at establishing an online platform for enhancement of education for students and staffs of universities. TUMS officials emphasized the importance of OPATEL and stated that the outcome of this project will benefit a grand number of educational institute.

Evaluation of the meeting where conducted by gathering information through a questionnaire. The results are as below:

What is your opinion of the general organization and facilities of the meeting/event?												Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total		
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6	4.5	90 %
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
To which extent did the meeting/event live up to your expectations?													
	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	00.00%	0	81.70%	5	18.30%	1	6		
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?													
	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	00.00%	0	33.33%	2	66.67%	4	6		
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
What is your opinion of the material that was distributed before or during the meeting/event?													

Abbreviation of document(version):  
Full name of form



	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6	4.5	90%
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
How do you evaluate the agenda of the meeting/event?													
	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	00.00%	0	00.00%	0	100.00%	6	6	5	100%
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
How do you evaluate the technical resources used?													
	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6	4.5	90 %
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
How effective do you think was the methodologies used?													
	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	00.00%	0	66.67%	4	33.33%	2	6	4.33	86.6 %
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
How useful was the meeting/event?													
	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	50.00%	3	50.00%	3	6	4.5	90 %
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
How valuable was the event for your professional growth? (only applicable for events)													
	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	00.00%	0	66.67%	4	33.33%	2	6	4.33	86.6 %
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
How satisfied are you from the level of participation to the event proceedings? (only applicable for events)													

	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	00.00%	0	00.00%	0	0	—	—
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>0</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	
Do you feel that the targets of the meeting/event have been fulfilled?													
	1 Poor		2		3		4		5 Very Good		Total	Weighted Average	Satisfaction rate
1	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	00.00%	0	100.00%	6	6	5	<b>100 %</b>
											<b>Answered</b>	<b>6</b>	
											<b>Skipped</b>	<b>0</b>	

The questionnaire was designed in 5 Likert scale and the results shows overall satisfaction of the different aspects of the meeting since all of the answers were in 4 and 5 point.

It is worth mentioning that the survey was commissioned by the Directorate of International Relations, Accreditation and Ranking of Tehran University of Medical Sciences. This report is going to be presented to the Leipzig University of Applied Sciences (HTWK), the European coordinator of Online Platform for Academic Teaching and Learning in Iraq and Iran (OPATEL).