



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Helmy Sayed</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>HU</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.				X	
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.				X	
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....



<b>Project Name</b>	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course review meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24-25 July 2017, 9:00AM
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST, Alexandria, Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Dr. Karim Hassan Youssef</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>Alexandria University</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	<b>7/10/2017</b>

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.				X	
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.			X		
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making			X		
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.			X		
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.			X		
There was a person assigned to document minutes.			X		
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.			X		
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.				X	
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.			X		
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?				X	
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.			X		



## SGT-MEF(v0.2) Meeting Evaluation Form

Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



---

**Comments (Constructive Suggestions):**

.....  
.....  
.....



<b>Project Name</b>	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course review meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24-25 July 2017, 9:00AM-5:00PM
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST, Alexandria, Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Nabil Abbasy</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>Alexandria University</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	<b>6-10-2017</b>

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making				X	
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.				X	
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.			X		
There was a person assigned to document minutes.			X		
The meeting started on time.				X	
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.			X		
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.				X	
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.				X	
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?			X		
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.				X	



---

**Comments (Constructive Suggestions):**

- A chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track and a person assigned to document minutes need to be clearly declared at the beginning of meeting.
- A methodology (ground rules) for running the meeting was partially defined at the beginning of the meeting. However, the preparation of more specific ground rules for reviewing the courses; e.g. benchmarks, standard curricula, could have been more useful.



<b>Project Name</b>	Smart Grid Technology - A Master Program (SGT-MAP)
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course review meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24-25 July 2017, 9:00AM
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST, Alexandria, Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Dr. Ragi A R Hamdy</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>Alexandria University</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	<b>7/10/2017</b>

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.				X	
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.			X		
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making				X	
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.			X		
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.				X	
There was a person assigned to document minutes.				X	
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.			X		
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.				X	
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.				X	
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?				X	
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.			X		



## SGT-MEF(v0.2) Meeting Evaluation Form

Funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



---

**Comments (Constructive Suggestions):**

.....  
.....  
.....



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	Sherif Mohamed abdalla tawfik
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>AAST</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....





<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Ahmed Anaselwogoud Helal</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>AAST</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.				X	
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Mohamed Ismeil</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>Aswan University</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	30 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?				X	
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.				X	
There was a person assigned to document minutes.				X	
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?				X	
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Mohamed Orabi</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>Aswan University</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	30 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.				X	
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.				X	
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24- 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Amr Kassem</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>HU</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.				X	
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.				X	
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AASTMT - Alexandria - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Mahmoud Mohamed Elmesalawy</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>HU</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	26 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.				X	
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.				X	
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.				X	
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.				X	
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24- 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Mostafa Abdelgeliel</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>AAST</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Mostafa Abdallah Ammar</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>AAST</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making			X		
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.				X	
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.				X	
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

- 1- Notify and send the meeting agenda to participants for a bigger period before meetings.

.....

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Mostafa Saad Hamad</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>AAST</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....





<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24- 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Mahmoud Shaban</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>HU</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.			X		
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.					X
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Yehia Mohamed Youssef</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>AAST</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.					X
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.				X	
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.					X

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....



<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Smart Grid Technology - A Master Programme (SGT-MAP)</b>
<b>Meeting Name</b>	Course Review Meeting
<b>Date and Time</b>	24 - 25 July 2017
<b>Place of Meeting</b>	AAST - Egypt
<b>Your Name (Optional)</b>	<b>Eman Youssef Hamdan</b>
<b>Your Organization (Optional)</b>	<b>AAST</b>
<b>Date of Assessment</b>	25 July 2017

Please mark with X the appropriate column for each item according to your selected evaluation rate from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).

Evaluation Item	Evaluation Rate				
	1	2	3	4	5
The meeting objective was clear.					X
There was a published agenda with clear objectives for each item and allowed time.				X	
What is your opinion of the presenters/facilitators?					X
The participants' contribution to the discussion and decision making					X
I was notified in advance of the topic, my role in the meeting, and what I may be asked.					X
There was a chairperson appointed to keep the meeting on track.					X
There was a person assigned to document minutes.					X
The meeting started on time.					X
There was a process (ground rules) defined for how the meeting was to run.					X
The meeting kept to the agenda and the allowed time for each item, and the ground rules were followed.					X
Action items were assigned where appropriate.				X	
There was a general agreement for raised points.					X
To what extent have the meeting objectives been achieved?					X
Minutes were provided within a reasonable period and adequately documented the meeting.				X	

**Comments (Constructive suggestions):**

.....  
 .....  
 .....