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ABSTRACT
The present study was aimed to evaluate performance in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Service Center based on the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation. The present research was practical in terms of objective; and in terms of data collection method, it was descriptive-survey. The statistical population consisted of 2000 students from Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Service Center, from whom 322 individuals were selected as sample size, using Morgan Table and a stratified random sampling method. In order to collect data, a standard organizational excellence questionnaire (EFQM) (2010) with 55 items was used. Using Cronbach’s alpha, the reliability of the questionnaire was calculated to be 0.82; in addition, in order to calculate the validity of the questionnaire, content validity was used; then the questionnaire was approved by experts. Data analysis was done using SPSS software in two sections: Inferential and descriptive (single-sample t-test). Findings showed that organizational excellence in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Service Center was in a favorable level (higher than a medium level) for components such as leadership, strategies, employees, partnership, resources, processes, employee results, society results, key results, and customer results.

Keywords: Customer Results, Organizational Excellence, Organizational Excellence Model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation, Performance Evaluation

JEL Classifications: C32, O13, O47

1. INTRODUCTION
The world is very complex, with two important features: Limited resources and unlimited resources. These two factors have made humans pay increasing attention to productivity (Bolboli and Reiche, 2015). Productivity or improvement in organizational performance can support the provision and development of opportunities for organizational excellence. Without doing research and gathering information on the level of realizing goals in organizations, without identifying organizational challenges, without gathering information on the level of applying defined policies, and without identifying areas which require serious improvement, there will be no favorable change in organizational performance. Hence, evaluation of performance for the purpose of realizing goals is a requirement in every organization (Milani and Kheirgoo, 2016). In line with this, organizational excellence model has been considerably successful as a strong model or tool for responding to organizational needs, being able to help organizations identify problems and reach excellence in human resources. Using such models, organizations can not only increase and evaluate their capability of implementing plans in different points of time, but they can also compare their level of performance with that of other organizations, especially the best ones. Organizational excellence models are increasingly used as a framework for evaluating performance and level of success in new management systems and inclusive quality management (Gómez-López et al., 2015).
Today, we are witness to organizations changing from supportive environments to competitive ones. In such environments, organizations are in need for wise management of resources in order to survive and achieve sustainable growth. In line with this, organizational excellence models have been able to provide an appropriate framework for organizational management in a competitive environment, by learning from successful firms. One of these models is the model proposed from Europe’s Quality Management Foundation, which is used by many firms throughout the world, especially in Europe, as a proper pattern for success in businesses. Organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation has been chosen as a model for the national prize of productivity and organizational excellence; and Iranian organizations have come up with it well (Adab and Golavar, 2013).

Davies (2008) examines the factors related to the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation in two sections areas: (1) Enablers, including five criteria which express the elements of an organization and the way they interact, (2) results, including four criteria which form achievements through organizational performance (Table 1).

Organizational excellence can be referred to as growth and development in an organization in different dimensions, in a way that long-term success is achieved through making all beneficiaries satisfied, and through balancing beneficiaries (Santos and Alvarez, 2007). In addition, the last version of organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation, related to the year 2010, has been given in the following Figure 1.

For evaluation of performance, different reasons have been expressed. Parker expresses the reasons for performance evaluation as follows:

1. Performance evaluation identifies problems and recognizes where improvements are needed.
2. Performance evaluation helps organizations to be well aware of their processes, and to know what they know and what they do not know.
3. Performance evaluation helps ensure decisions are based realities not assumptions and speculations (Parker, 2000).

Organizational excellence model has acted as a successful tool for responding to this need in organizations. Organizational excellence models have been designed in way that they are used both as a proper tool for competition and as a tool from pathology and designing plans for organizational development (Abdolshah et al., 2016).

On the other hand, loss of a control and evaluation system in an organization means that there is no contact with internal and external environments, which results in senility and death in organizations. Today, many top managers in profit and non-profit organizations allocate considerable quantities of time and financial resources to basic strategies; however, most of them report improper implementation of the strategies. A prospect that these managers imagine for their organizations is completely bright. However, their employees do not have enough awareness of prospects; therefore, they do not show much empathy or sense of cooperation for realizing common goals. Thus, top managers constantly seek solutions to make sure that strategies are implemented; hence, they have performance evaluation methods as a tool for controlling the implementation of strategies. However, the features of the age of economy, based on knowledge and information, have questioned the efficiency of classic performance evaluation methods, which organizations consider to be proper for the age of industrial economy (Tabari and Arasteh, 2008).

In such conditions, excellence models and novel performance evaluation methods are well accepted as tools which help apply

---

**Table 1: Factors affecting organizational excellence model of Europe’s quality management foundation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enablers</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Employee results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Customer results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and strategy</td>
<td>Society results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships and resources</td>
<td>Key performance results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Davies, 2008

---

**Figure 1:** The last version of organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation, related to the year 2010 (Adab and Golavar, 2013)
strategies, or in other words, as a system for managing strategies. Studies show that excellence models in different countries converge; and to use these models, we do not need to make basic and structural changes (Moridani et al., 2016). In other words, the language of business is an international language which leading Iranian organizations must test in order to be able to use it; and here, it is very important to become familiar with excellence models. Among excellence models of business, the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation is, for many reasons (like the following reasons), of greater importance for leading industries and organizations in our country.

1. Studies show that this model, more than other models, has been selected as a reference model for national prizes.
2. Since this model has been selected as a reference model in most European countries, it is possible to learn from a wide range of organizations in European countries with different conditions and features; and there is more possibility for our country’s experts to visit excellent organizations (or organizations which have made efforts to become excellent) in some of the European countries such as Turkey.
3. Our country has had good relationships with European countries, which makes it possible for our organizations to transfer knowledge and directly use experts of the model.
4. A strong systematic attitude, careful attention to management based on organizational processes and goal-orientation of the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation are highly informative and easy to implement for Iranian organizations facing serious problems in such fields.
5. The model which is the basis for evaluation and presentation of the national prize for productivity and organizational excellence in Iran’s industries and mines (Ministry of Industries and Mines is going to give prizes to eligible organizations) is based on the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation (Adab and Golavar, 2013).

The present study is trying to evaluate the performance of Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Service Center, using the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation. In addition, it is aiming to provide information on the level of success in implementing plans and realizing goals in different criteria in this organization, because universities, more than any other service-giving organization, deal with people; and to perform their duties, they are equipped with certain tools and resources, which are to the benefit of the society if they are healthy.

One of the strategic plans in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University is: Providing distance services based on e-government, quantitative and qualitative enhancement of giving services, improving the level of the society’s public health culture, internalizing practical studies in health systems, increasing the share of non-governmental sector, cooperation and charity foundations for health services and reducing the tenure of the government, increasing employees, motivation by exploiting new opportunities, having access to new financial resources required for universities (using provincial capabilities), decreasing system costs, providing the ground for increasing the involvement of the society in decision-making, implementing and evaluating health services, reinforcing inter-sector cooperation with an emphasis on environmental fields, nutrition, lifestyles and life quality, decreasing contagious and non-contagious diseases, prioritizing health plans, classifying health services (www.bpums.ac.ir). With a look at strategic plans in universities such as distance services based on e-government, internalizing practical studies in health systems, increasing employees’ motivation by exploiting available opportunities, decreasing system costs, providing the ground for increasing the involvement of the society in decision-making, and so forth, we understand the importance of performance evaluation in universities.

Therefore, considering its role in meeting the society’s needs, this organization must be examined in order to identify weaknesses and strengths as well as the distance between status quo and a favorable status, in a way that necessary measures are taken to dominate weaknesses, leading to better organizational performance.

The present study aims to examine and evaluate the organization performance of Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center, using the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation, considering its nine-fold dimensions. In fact, in the present research, organizational performance, considering the indexes of the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation and the style of scoring in it, is evaluated; and weaknesses and strengths are identified, leading to introduction of performance enhancement methods.

Hence, considering the fact that the managers and the other people working in health ministry seek information on the performance of universities, and the fact that one of their goals is to achieve organizational excellence, the present study is trying to answer the question, “How is organizational performance of Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center, based on the components of the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation?”

Therefore, considering the abovementioned, the hypotheses and conceptual model of the present study (Figure 1) are as follows:

- Organizational excellence of Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Service Centers is in a favorable condition.
- Leadership in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center is in a favorable condition.
- Strategies in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition.
- Employees in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition.
- Partnerships and resources in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition.
- Processes in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition.
- Employee results in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition.
2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study was practical in terms of objective; and in terms of data collection method, it was descriptive-survey. Narjes Midwifery College (1983) started midwifery trainings in Bushehr; in 1988, Nursing and Midwifery College and Paramedics College admitted students; in 1991, for the first time, they admitted PhD students for medical sciences; in 1995, Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center started its activities; and in 2011, Dentistry College was added to Bushehr’s university. Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University had five faculties: Medical sciences, dentistry, nursing and midwifery, health, paramedics, and three research centers for Infectious and Tropical Diseases in the Persian Gulf, Nuclear Medicine in the Persian Gulf, Sea Biotechnology in the Persian Gulf, and 158 faculty members. Currently, more than 2000 individuals are studying in 22 majors for associate degrees, three majors for BA degrees, four majors for MA degrees and PhD degrees, and three majors for residency (Medical Expertise).

Considering the aforementioned, the statistical population of the study consisted of 2000 students from Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center, from whom 322 individuals were selected as sample size, using Morgan Table and a stratified random sampling method. It must be noted that categories included five faculties of medical sciences, dentistry, nursing and midwifery, health, paramedics, and three research centers for Infectious and Tropical Diseases in the Persian Gulf, Nuclear Medicine in the Persian Gulf, Sea Biotechnology in the Persian Gulf; according to each category, students were selected randomly.

In the present study, in order to collect data connected to factors, a standard questionnaire for the organizational excellence model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation (2010) was used. This questionnaire had 50 items, whose responses were scored based on a five-point Likert scale, including nine dimensions: Leadership (5 items), policy and strategy (4 items), employees (5 items), partnerships and resources (5 items), processes (7 items), customer results (9 items), employee results (5 items), society results (3 items), key performance results (7 items). The scale for responding to items was a five-point Likert scale (very much, much, to some extent, little, very little). In the present study, in order to calculate the validity of the questionnaires, content validity was used; hence, the questionnaires were approved by supervisors and experts of this field. And necessary modifications were applied. In order to calculate the reliability of the questionnaires, Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was used; the reliability of all questionnaires was calculated to be > 0.7, which shows that the measurement tool is reliable.

The analysis of the data obtained from the implementation of the questionnaires was done using SPSS software in two sections: Descriptive (mean) and inferential (single-sample t-test).

3. RESEARCH FINDINGS

As mentioned, the statistical sample included 322 university students. In this section, in order to test research hypotheses, SPSS software and single-sample t-test were used. It must be noted that before choosing the desired test, the normality of data distribution was examined using Smirnov-Kolmogorov test. Findings show that data distribution for all variables was normal; hence, it can be said that using parametric tests such as single-sample t-test is allowed.

3.1. Main Hypothesis

Examination of the status of organizational excellence in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center.

Table 2 presents mean and standard deviation of the main variable of the Mean of three medium results has a minimum score of 1 and a maximum score of 5, based on a Likert scale. The following Table 3 presents the results of the single-sample t-test for examining the main hypothesis of the research.

Table 3 shows that significance (0.000) is lower than 0.05, which is enough for disapproving of H1 hypothesis. Since, in connection to the organizational excellence of Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center, both upper bound and lower bound are positive, the mean value of it, according to the society, is greater than the tested value (3). In other words, it can be stated that organizational excellence of Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center is in a favorable condition.

Table 4, the subsidiary hypotheses of the research (all nine dimensions of EFQM excellence model for Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services) are examined.

As it can be seen from the Table 4, standard mean value of leadership in the studied sample was 3.585, and standard deviation was 0.4144; standard mean value of strategy in the studied sample was 3.784, and standard deviation was 0.57096; standard mean value of employees in the studied sample was 3.6776, and standard deviation was 0.47050; standard mean value of partnerships and resources in the studied sample was 3.4944, and standard deviation was 0.44938; standard mean value of processes in the studied sample was 3.5955, and standard deviation was 0.51694; standard mean value of key results in the studied sample was 3.8972, and standard deviation was 0.55648; standard mean value of customer results in the studied sample was 3.7972, and standard deviation was 0.55648; standard mean value of key results in the studied sample was 3.5955, and standard deviation was 0.51694; standard mean value of society results in the studied sample was 3.9792, and standard deviation was 0.55648; standard mean value of society results in the studied sample was 3.8972, and standard deviation was 0.55648; standard mean value of key results in the studied sample was 3.36642, and standard deviation was 0.55648; standard mean value of customer results in the studied sample was 3.0547, and standard deviation was 0.55648.

The results of single-sample t-test for all research hypotheses have been given in the following Table 5.

As it can be seen from Table 5: Considering significance level (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05, and considering the value of t-student for leadership ([20.64] > 1.96), null hypothesis is disapproved and H1 hypothesis is approved. In other words, the assumption that leadership in
Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center is in a favorable condition is approved.

Considering significance level (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05, and considering the value of t-student for strategy (|19.186|) > 1.96), null hypothesis is disapproved and $H_1$ hypothesis is approved. In other words, the assumption that strategy in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center is in a favorable condition is approved.

Considering significance level (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05, and considering the value of t-student for employees (|21.067|) > 1.96), null hypothesis is disapproved and $H_1$ hypothesis is approved. In other words, the assumption that employees in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition is approved.

Considering significance level (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05, and considering the value of t-student for partnerships and resources (|16.094|) > 1.96), null hypothesis is disapproved and $H_1$ hypothesis is approved. In other words, the assumption that partnerships and resources in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition is approved.

Considering significance level (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05, and considering the value of t-student for processes (|17.554|) > 1.96), null hypothesis is disapproved and $H_1$ hypothesis is approved. In other words, the assumption that processes in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition is approved.

Considering significance level (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05, and considering the value of t-student for employee results (|22.560|) > 1.96), null hypothesis is disapproved and $H_1$ hypothesis is approved. In other words, the assumption that employee results in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition is approved.

Considering significance level (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05, and considering the value of t-student for society results (|23.585|) > 1.96), null hypothesis is disapproved and $H_1$ hypothesis is approved. In other words, the assumption that society results in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition is approved.

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation of the main variables of the research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean±SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.03039±0.60633</td>
<td>3.4165</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>Organizational excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD: Standard deviation

Table 3: Results obtained from single-sample t test for the main hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper bound</th>
<th>Lower bound</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Freedom degree</th>
<th>Value of t</th>
<th>Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.4772</td>
<td>0.3557</td>
<td>0.1648</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>13.478</td>
<td>Organizational excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Results of mean and standard deviations of research variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard mean error</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.02833</td>
<td>0.4144</td>
<td>3.585</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03903</td>
<td>0.57096</td>
<td>3.748</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03216</td>
<td>0.47050</td>
<td>3.677</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03072</td>
<td>0.44938</td>
<td>3.494</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Partnerships and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03392</td>
<td>0.49622</td>
<td>3.595</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03534</td>
<td>0.51649</td>
<td>3.797</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Employee results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03804</td>
<td>0.55648</td>
<td>3.897</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Society results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3012</td>
<td>0.44066</td>
<td>3.664</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Key results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04046</td>
<td>0.79393</td>
<td>3.054</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>Customer results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Results obtained from single-sample t-test for research hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper bound</th>
<th>Lower bound</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Degree of freedom</th>
<th>Value of t</th>
<th>Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6409</td>
<td>0.5292</td>
<td>0.5850</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8258</td>
<td>0.6719</td>
<td>0.74883</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>19.186</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7410</td>
<td>0.6142</td>
<td>0.67757</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>21.067</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5549</td>
<td>0.4338</td>
<td>0.49439</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>16.094</td>
<td>Partnerships and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6623</td>
<td>0.5286</td>
<td>0.59546</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>17.554</td>
<td>Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8669</td>
<td>0.7275</td>
<td>0.7972</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>22.560</td>
<td>Employee results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9722</td>
<td>0.8222</td>
<td>0.8972</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>23.585</td>
<td>Society results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7236</td>
<td>0.6048</td>
<td>0.66422</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>22.050</td>
<td>Key results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2342</td>
<td>0.0751</td>
<td>0.05469</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>3.823</td>
<td>Customer results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considering significance level (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05, and considering the value of t-student for key results (|22.050| > 1.96), null hypothesis is disapproved and H1 hypothesis is approved. In other words, the assumption that key results in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition is approved.

Considering significance level (0.000) which is smaller than 0.05, and considering the value of t-student for customer results (3.823 > 1.96), null hypothesis is disapproved and H1 hypothesis is approved. In other words, the assumption that customer results in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center are in a favorable condition is approved.

**4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Comprehensive and reliable evaluation of organizational performance has always been a concern for beneficiaries and managers, because performance evaluation can increase awareness of the level of advancement in improving performance in every organization, especially service units, leading to motives and opportunities for improving the quality of performance in service or production-based structures (Hakkak and Ghodsi, 2015). The presentation of national prizes for quality and excellence opportunities for improving the quality of performance in service organization, especially service units, leading to motives and possibilities for improving the performance in every organization, especially service units, leading to motives and opportunities for improving the quality of performance in service or production-based structures (Hakkak and Ghodsi, 2015).

Organizational excellence model (EFQM), as an inclusive tool helps managers to learn more about their organizations. The present study was aimed to evaluate Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center based on enablers and the results of EFQM model in order to identify areas which need improvement (Ezzabadi et al., 2015). In the following, obtained results are discussed, and in the end, certain propositions are presented.

The results of testing the nine hypotheses of this research, and the analyses conducted through a single-group t-student test showed that organizational excellence in Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center was greater than a medium level for all components: Leadership, strategy, employees, partnerships and resources, processes, products and services, customer results, employee results, society results, and key results. This means that in the society from which the sample was selected, respondents consider the performance of Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center to be favorable in terms of each of the nine mentioned components.

In such organizations, leadership is a motive for all employee activities intended for realization of organizational excellence. Leadership provides the ground for innovation and creativity in employees who voluntarily participate in the process of continually improving performance. Managers strictly protect organizational values, and play roles in integrating the organization on the inside and on the outside. Leaders are aware of organizational capacities and try to develop them. Missions, prospects, values, and ethics of managers are developed, leading to defining, monitoring, and revising the mechanisms of Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center in order to enhance performance. Managers encourage a culture of excellence with the help of employees, ensure the university’s flexibility, and effectively manage evolutions.

In excellent organizations, policies and strategies, which are based on beneficiaries’ current and future needs, are provided and continually improved through IT. In Bushehr’s Medical Sciences University and Health Services Center, top organizations were compared in terms of performance in order to understand strengths and improvement areas. An effective mechanism had been used for understanding future conditions and managing strategic risks. Certain objectives for inventing and refining strategies have been planned, which help to increase creativity. Strategies are based on understanding the needs and expectations of beneficiaries and external environments, and they are also based on understanding universities’ internal performance and capabilities. Strategies and policies are supported, developed, revised, and updated; and through plans, processes and goals are informed and implemented; in addition, strategies are based on understanding the needs and expectations of beneficiaries and external environments.

In excellent organizations, there is an intimate relationship between managers and employees. Excellent managers are involved in organizational affairs, and their ideas are turned into novel methods through creativity and innovation. Universities provide a culture based on which personal and organizational goals as well as mutual benefits are realized; justice and equality are encouraged; employees are engaged in the process of developing and revising strategies, policies, and plans; employees’ skills, talents, and creativity are developed; human resources plans support universities’ strategies; employees’ knowledge and capabilities are developed; capable employees are engaged in organizational activities; employees communicate effectively; and employees are appreciated, encouraged, and supported.

Organizational excellence is rooted in proper communications with providers, partners, and contractors. In excellent organizations, contractors are not considered to be organizational slaves intended for doing work and receiving pre-defined amounts of money, but all providers, partners, and contractors are considered to be integral parts of excellence. In fact, excellent organizations organize and manage their external business cooperation, providers, and internal resources in order to support policies and strategies, and to effectively implement processes.

Excellent organizations design and do all their activities, using a process-based approach. Such organizations analyze the output of their processes and use beneficiaries’ comments and expectations in order to make their activities effective. Results which are obtained by universities in different fields refer to
achievements from appropriate implementation of enablers; and considering the fact that the university is in a favorable condition in terms of enablers, it is also in a favorable condition in terms of results. Processes are designed and managed in order to optimize values for beneficiaries. In order to create optimized value for students, services are developed and effectively popularized; and communications with students are managed and enhanced.

Excellent organizations inclusively measure the results related to their employees and achieve them. If an organization is excellent, it does a variety of activities in connection to empowering its employees. The effect of these activities on employees must be shown using certain indicators. In order to have access to these indicators, excellent organizations give employees a questionnaire, define certain indexes for each of them, and examine and analyze the organizations by comparing the indexes of the indicators.

Excellent organizations inclusively measure the important results connected to the society and achieve them. An excellent organization is one which has valuable impacts on the society and considers itself as a member of the society; such an organization also identifies social expectations and takes necessary actions to meet expectations in order to prove its citizenship role.

Key results of universities’ performance are achievements which health ministry expects from the organizations. These achievements can be financial achievements such as profit, cost-benefit, and so forth; or non-financial achievements such as level of education quality and so forth.

In excellence culture, organizations cannot exist without customers. Even in the most exclusive organizations, customers are always present. This is more obvious in organizations like universities. Students are a key element of survival in universities. In excellent organizations, customers determine the level of excellence. Novel managerial evolutions show that there will be two types of organization in future: (1) Organizations which target customers, act based on customers’ needs and expectations, and continually improve themselves; and (2) organizations which have to close due to not paying attention to customers’ needs and expectations. Excellent organizations identify their customers’ perceptions of the organization and try to satisfy them through certain indicators.

The results of the present study for this criterion are in congruence with those obtained from studies conducted by Bou-Llusar et al. (2009), Sharma and Talvar (2007), Aghataher and Khadem (2015), and Husseini et al. (2015).

In the following, some propositions from the findings are outlined:
1. Motivating employees of other provinces’ Medical Sciences Universities to compete with one another.
2. Planning and implementing policies and strategies based on the information obtained from measuring performance, studies, learning, and external relevant activities.
3. Using talents and capacities of employees in university plans.
4. Paying attention to new ideas in designing processes in order to increase students’ satisfaction.
5. Offering holidays in order to heighten employees’ morale and help them regain their power.
6. Getting students’ comments on performance and applying them in plans and interactions.
7. Using different statements in order to better meet students’ different demands.

REFERENCES


Aghataher, B., Khadem, M. (2015), Evaluation of Performance in Student Assistance Section of Science and Culture University, Based on the Organizational Model of Europe’s Quality Management Foundation, the Fourth National Gathering for New Management Sciences, Professional and Scientific Association of Managers and Accountants, Golestan, Gorgan.


Apodaca, E., Maxwell, L. (2016), Applying the EFQM Excellence Model for Practice Improvement at Salem Free Clinics.