Republic of Iraq

Ministry of Higher Education & Scientific Research

Supervision and Scientific Evaluation Directorate

Quality Assurance and Academic Accreditation

International Accreditation Dept.

Academic Program Specification Form For The Academic Year 2015-2016

Universitiy:University of Baghdad

College : College of Veterinary Medicine

Number Of Departments In The College :Internal Medicine

Date Of Form Completion :

# 

Dean ’s Name

Date : / / 2016

Signature

Dean ’s Assistant For Scientific Affairs

Date : / / 2016

Signature

The College Quality Assurance And University Performance Manager

Date : / / 2016

Signature

Quality Assurance And University Performance Manager

Date : / / 2016

Signature

**TEMPLATE FOR PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION**

|  |
| --- |
| HIGHER EDUCATION PERFORMANCE REVIEW: PROGRAMME REVIEW |

**PROGRAMME SPECIFICATION**

|  |
| --- |
| This Programme Specification provides a concise summary of the main features of the programme and the learning outcomes that a typical student might reasonably be expected to achieve and demonstrate if he/she takes full advantage of the learning opportunities that are provided. It is supported by a specification for each course that contributes to the programme. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| University of Baghdad \ College of Veterinary Medicine | 1. Teaching Institution |
| College of Veterinary Medicine | 2. University Department/Centre |
| Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine and Surgery | 3. Programme Title |
| Bachelor | 4. Title of Final Award |
| Quarterly | 5. Modes of Attendance offered |
|  | 6. Accreditation |
|  | 7. Other external influences |
|  | 8. Date of production/revision of this specification |
| 9. Aims of the Programme | |
| Internal and preventive medicine which I find the programs offered by the college and therefore, the vision, mission and goals are consistent with the vision section goals the college and university and excellence to produce a generation capable to serve the country. | |
|  | |
|  | |
|  | |
|  | |
|  | |

|  |
| --- |
| 10. Learning Outcomes, Teaching, Learning and Assessment Methods |
| 1. Knowledge and Understanding   A1. Identify the basic concepts of internal diseases    Identify the basic concepts of infectious diseases  Identify the basic concepts of epidemiology diseases  Identify the basic concepts the treatment of diseases  Identify the basic concepts of clinical pathology  Identify the basic concepts of clinical diagnosis of disease |
| B. Subject-specific skills  B1. Gain knowledge of skill in the basics of Internal Medicine  Gain knowledge of skill in the basics of infectious Medicine  Gain knowledge of skill in the basics of preventive Medicine |
| Teaching and Learning Methods |
| Examinations short  Conduct scientific research and follow each new  Quarterly exams  Duties and discussions within the lecture |
| Assessment methods |
| Quizzes  Duties  Researches |
| C. Thinking Skills  Thinking and the use of problem-solving |
| Teaching and Learning Methods |
| Examination Duties Internal discussions lectures |
| Assessment methods |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D. General and Transferable Skills (other skills relevant to employability and personal development)  Oral and written exams and discuss  Stay away from self and teamwork  Ability to solve problems  Ability to realize the conditions and link them | | | | |
| Teaching and Learning Methods | | | | |
| Discussions  Seminars  Lectures  Exercises  Duties | | | | |
| Assessment Methods | | | | |
| Examinations | | | | |
| 12. Awards and Credits | 11. Programme Structure | | | |
| Credit  rating | Course or Module Title | Course or  Module  Code | Level/Year |
| Bachelor Degree  Requires ( x ) credits |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| 13. Personal Development Planning |
|  |
| 14. Admission criteria . |
|  |
| 15. Key sources of information about the programme |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Curriculum Skills Map** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **please tick in the relevant boxes where individual Programme Learning Outcomes are being assessed** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Programme Learning Outcomes** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | | |
| General and Transferable Skills (or) Other skills relevant to employability and personal development | | | | Thinking Skills | | | | Subject-specific skills | | | | Knowledge and  understanding | | | | Core (C)  Title or Option  (O**)** | | Course Title | Course  Code | Year / Level |
| **D4** | **D3** | **D2** | **D1** | **C4** | **C3** | **C2** | **C1** | **B4** | **B3** | **B2** | **B1** | **A4** | **A3** | **A2** | **A1** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |

**TEMPLATE FOR COURSE SPECIFICATION**

|  |
| --- |
| HIGHER EDUCATION PERFORMANCE REVIEW: PROGRAMME REVIEW |

**COURSE SPECIFICATION**

|  |
| --- |
| This Course Specification provides a concise summary of the main features of the course and the learning outcomes that a typical student might reasonably be expected to achieve and demonstrate if he/she takes full advantage of the learning opportunities that are provided. It should be cross-referenced with the programme specification. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | 1. Teaching Institution |
|  | 2. University Department/Centre |
|  | 3. Course title/code |
|  | 4. Programme(s) to which it contributes |
|  | 5. Modes of Attendance offered |
|  | 6. Semester/Year |
|  | 7. Number of hours tuition (total) |
|  | 8. Date of production/revision of this specification |
| 9. Aims of the Course | |
| Prepare the student for the basic information of Internal and preventive Medicine | |
| Know the student on infectious diseases | |
| Know the student on internal medicine diseases | |
| Know the student on epidimiology of diseases | |
| Prepare the student for the basic information of infectious diseases | |
|  | |

|  |
| --- |
| 10· Learning Outcomes, Teaching ,Learning and Assessment Methode |
| 1. Knowledge and Understanding   A1. Topics or areas of knowledge that students should know and understand about the subjects |
| B. Subject-specific skills  B1. Explain strategies and skills used in order to write the students thread |
| Teaching and Learning Methods |
| Lectures, tutorials and assignments used |
| Assessment methods |
| Examinations |
| C. Thinking Skills  . Thinking skills and problem-solving course that seeks designation may be useful words that starts its ability. |
| Teaching and Learning Methods |
|  |
| Assessment methods |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| D. General and Transferable Skills (other skills relevant to employability and personal development)  D1. Examinations  Final semester examination |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11. Course Structure  Skills that should be developed with the student in the field of relationships that benefit others  Self-reliance  Responsibility towards society | | | | | | |
| Assessment Method | Teaching  Method | Unit/Module or Topic Title | ILOs | Hours | Week | |
|  |  | Introduction |  | 1 | 1 | |
|  |  | Rinder pest |  | 1 | 2 | |
|  |  | PPR |  | 1 | 3 | |
|  |  | FMD |  | 2 | 4 | |
|  |  | VESICULAR STOMATITIS |  | 1 | 5 | |
|  |  | BLUE TONGUE |  | 2 | 6 | |
|  |  | MD & BVD |  | 2 | 7 | |
|  |  | MCF |  | 2 | 8 | |
|  |  | VIRAL DIARHEA /SMAL RUMINANT AND FOALS |  | 2 | 9 | |
|  |  | H,S |  | 1 | 10 | |
|  |  | BLACK LEG |  | 1 | 11 | |
|  |  | BLACK DISEASE |  | 1 | 12 | |
|  |  | TETANUS |  | 1 | 13 | |
|  |  | ENTEROTOXEMIA |  | 2 | 14 | |
|  |  | BOTULISM |  | 1 | 15 | |
|  |  | BACILLARU HB UREA |  | 1 | 16 | |
|  |  | BRAXY |  | 1 | 17 | |
|  |  | T.B & JOHNS DISEASE |  | 2 | 18 | |
|  |  | ACTINOMYCOSIS &ACTINOBACILLOSIS |  | 2 | 19 | |
|  |  | ORAL AND LARYNGEAL NECROBACILLOSIS |  | 1 | 20 | |
|  |  | WINTER DYSENTARY OF CATTLE |  | 1 | 21 | |
|  |  | DISEASE OF MOREXELLA &HEMOPHYLUS |  | 2 | 22 | |
|  |  | EIA |  | 1 | 23 | |
|  |  | A.H.S |  | 1 | 24 | |
|  |  | EQUINE RHINO PNEMONITIS |  | 1 | 25 | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| Assessment Method | Teaching  Method | Unit/Module or Topic Title | ILOs | Hours | Week | |
|  |  | EQUINE VIRAL ARTHRITIS |  | 1 | 1 | |
|  |  | EQUINE INFLUENZA |  | 2 | 2 | |
|  |  | VIRAL ENCEPHALOMYLITIS IN HORSE |  | 3 | 3 | |
|  |  | ANAPLASMOSIS |  | 4 | 4 | |
|  |  | THEILERIOSIS |  | 5 | 5 | |
|  |  | BABESIOSI |  | 6 | 6 | |
|  |  | MASTITIS |  | 7 | 7 | |
|  |  | BRUCELLOSIS |  | 8 | 8 | |
|  |  | LEPTOSPIROSIS |  | 9 | 9 | |
|  |  | LISTERIOSIS |  | 10 | 10 | |
|  |  | ANTHRAX |  | 11 | 11 | |
|  |  | COLIBACILLOSIS |  | 12 | 12 | |
|  |  | SALMONELLOSIS |  | 13 | 13 | |
|  |  | FOOT ROT |  | 14 | 14 | |
|  |  | CCPP&CBPP |  | 15 | 15 | |
|  |  | TOXOPLASMOSI |  | 16 | 16 | |
|  |  | ORF |  | 17 | 17 | |
|  |  | PAPLOMATOSIS |  | 18 | 18 | |
|  |  | LUMPY SKIN DISEASE |  | 19 | 19 | |
|  |  | BOVINE ULCERATIVE MAMMALITIS |  | 20 | 20 | |
|  |  | BOVINE EPHEMERAL DISEASE |  | 21 | 21 | |
|  |  | RFT VALLEY FEVER |  | 22 | 22 | |
|  |  | AKABANI VIRAL DISEASE |  | 23 | 23 | |
|  |  | BOVINE VIRAL LEUKOSIS |  | 24 | 24 | |
|  |  | RABIES |  | 25 | 25 | |
|  |  | PSEUDO RABIES |  | 26 | 26 | |
|  |  | LOUPING ILL |  | 27 | 27 | |
|  |  | SCRAPIES |  | 28 | 28 | |
|  |  | ENZOATIC ABORTION IN SHEEP |  | 29 | 29 | |
|  |  | GLANDER |  | 30 | 30 | |
|  |  | STRANGLES |  | 31 | 31 | |
|  |  | EPIZOATIC LYMPHANGITIS |  | 32 | 32 | |
|  |  | CONTAGIOUS BOVINE PYELONEPHRITIS |  | 33 | 33 | |
|  |  | CASEOUS LYMPH ADENITIS OF SHEEP |  | 34 | 34 | |
|  |  | ULCERATIVE LYMPHANGITIS |  | 35 | 35 | |
|  |  | DISEASE CAUSED BY PARASITE |  | 36 | 36 | |
|  |  | MANGE AND PARASITE |  | 37 | 37 | |
| Assessment Method | Teaching  Method | Unit/Module or Topic Title | ILOs | Hours | Week | |
|  |  | Introduction |  | 3 | 1 | |
|  |  | MILK FEVER |  | 3 | 2 | |
|  |  | DOWNER COW SYNDROM |  | 3 | 3 | |
|  |  | HYPOMAGNESEMIA |  | 3 | 4, | |
|  |  | PREGNANCY TOXEMIA |  | 3 | 5,6 | |
|  |  | KETOSIS |  | 3 | 7 | |
|  |  | POST PARTURENT HB UREA |  | 3 | 9.10 | |
|  |  | AZOTUREA |  | 3 | 12 | |
|  |  | CARDIOVASCULAR SYSTEM |  | 10 | 13 | |
|  |  | VIT. D DEFICIENCY |  | 3 | 14 | |
|  |  | CA.DEFICIENCY |  | 3 | 15 | |
|  |  | P DEFICIENCY |  | 3 | 16 | |
|  |  | OSTEOMALASIA |  | 2 | 17 | |
|  |  | VIT A DEFICIENCY |  | 2 | 18 | |
|  |  | VIT. E DEFIVIENCY |  | 2 | 19 | |
|  |  | VIT.K DEFIVIENCY |  | 2 | 20 | |
|  |  | CUPPER DEFICIENCY |  | 2 | 21 | |
|  |  | IODINE DEFICIENCY |  | 2 | 22 | |
|  |  | MN DEFICIENCY |  | 2 | 23 | |
|  |  | ZN DEFICIENCY |  | 2 | 24 | |
|  |  | CO DEFICIENCY |  | 2 | 25 | |
|  |  | VIT C DEFICIENCY,THIAMINE,RIBOFLAVIN DEFICIENCY |  | 2 | 26 | |
| Assessment Method | Teaching  Method | Unit/Module or Topic Title | ILOs | Hours | Week | |
|  |  | Laboratory apparatus |  | 3 | 1 | |
|  |  | Samples collection |  | 3 | 2 | |
|  |  | PCV&Hb measurement |  | 3 | 3 | |
|  |  | WBCs count |  | 3 | 4 | |
|  |  | RBCs count |  | 3 | 5 | |
|  |  | Blood smear staining |  | 3 | 6 | |
|  |  | Differential WBCs count |  | 3 | 7 | |
|  |  | Bacteriological culture |  | 3 | 8 | |
|  |  | Bacteriological smear staining |  | 3 | 9 | |
|  |  | Clinical chemistry |  | 3 | 10 | |
|  |  | Blood parasites |  | 3 | 11 | |
|  |  | Revision |  | 3 | 12 | |
|  |  | Examination |  | 3 | 13 | |
|  |  | Fecal examination |  | 3 | 14 | |
|  |  | Identification & count of egg parasites |  | 3 | 15 | |
|  |  | Milk test |  | 3 | 16 | |
|  |  | Urine test |  | 3 | 17 | |
|  |  | Skin scraping and external parasites identification |  | 3 | 18 | |
|  |  | Antibiotic sensitivity test |  | 3 | 19 | |
|  |  | Revision |  | 3 | 20 | |
|  |  | Examination |  | 3 | 21 | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 12. Infrastructure | |
|  | Required reading:  · CORE TEXTS  · COURSE MATERIALS  · OTHER |
|  | Special requirements (include for example workshops, periodicals, IT software, websites) |
|  | Community-based facilities  (include for example, guest  Lectures , internship , field studies) |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 13. Admissions | |
|  | Pre-requisites |
|  | Minimum number of students |
|  | Maximum number of students |

**TEMPLATE FOR TYPICAL SITE VISIT CHEDULE**

1. The typical site visit schedule is designed for two or three days. It includes pre-arranged meetings. The responsibility for arranging these meetings and fitting the template to the circumstances rests with the Universities Quality Assurance and University Performance departments

2. Site visits will normally commence at 09:00 on day 1. Start times of pre-arranged meetings are indicated. Pre-arranged meetings should not normally last more than one hour. The schedule should not completely fill all times with meetings, but leave space for additional activities by peer reviewers including preparing for meetings, updating notes and records and drafting paragraphs for the draft Programme Review report

Table (1)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Time** | **Session** | |
|  | **Day** **1** | | |
| Welcome and introductions; brief introduction to the review (purposes, intended outcomes, use of evidence and self-evaluation report) – Programme Team | 09:00 | | 1 |
| Curriculum; discussion with faculty members | 09:30 | | 2 |
| Meeting with a group of students | 11:00 | | 3 |
| Efficiency: tour of resources | 12:30 | | 4 |
| Review panel meeting: scrutiny of additional documentation including sample of students’ assessed work | 14:00 | | 5 |
| Efficiency: meeting with faculty members | 15:00 | | 6 |
| Review panel meeting: review of the evidence and any gaps or matters to follow-up | 16:00 | | 7 |
| Meeting with external stakeholders (sample of graduates, employers, other partners) | 17:00 | | 8 |
|  | **Day** **2** | | |
| Review meeting with review chairperson, review coordinator, programme leader: summary of day 1 findings, addressing any gaps, adjust the schedule for day 2 if required | 08:45 | | 9 |
| Academic standards: meeting with faculty members | 09:00 | | 10 |
| Effectiveness of quality management and assurance: meeting with faculty members | 10:30 | | 11 |
| Review panel meeting: review of evidence and any matters still to be addressed | 12:00 | | 12 |
| Flexible time to pursue any matters arising | 14:00 | | 13 |
| Review panel final meeting: decisions on outcomes and drafting oral feedback | 14:30 | | 14 |
| Oral feedback by review chairperson to review coordinator and faculty members | 16:30 | | 15 |
| Close | 17:00 | |  |

**TEMPLATE FOR THE FOLLOW-UP PROCESS**

**AND REPORT, AND OUTLINE OF TYPICAL SITE VISIT SCHED-**

**ULE FOR FOLLOW-UP**

**TEMPLATE FOR FOLLOW-UP REPORT**

Quality Assurance and Academic Accreditation Directorate / International Accreditation Department.

Institution:

Faculty:

Programme:

Follow-up Report

1. This report presents the findings of the follow-up visit, which took place on / /20\_\_. This is part of the Universities Quality Assurance and University Performance departments arrangements to provide continuing support for the development of internal quality assurance processes and continuing improvement

2. The purposes of the follow-up review are to assess the progress made in the programme since the Programme Review report, and to provide further information and support for the continuing improvement of academic standards and quality of higher education in Iraq.

3. The evidence base used in this follow-up review and report includes:

1. Self-Evaluation Report for the programme together with supporting information
2. Improvement plan prepared and implemented since the Programme Review report
3. Programme Review Report
4. Higher Education Quality Review Report and institutional strategic plan (if any)
5. Additional evidence presented during the follow-up visit.

4. The overall conclusions reached as the outcome of the follow-up review are as follows:

1. The programme (give title) at (give name of institution) has/has not successfully

implemented an improvement plan.

1. Good practice in the indicators demonstrated since the Programme Review site visit includes: (insert)
2. Matters of particular importance that should be addressed by the institution in its

continuing improvement of the programme are: (insert and indicate if they are, or as yet are not, addressed by the improvement plan).

5. The detailed report is provided in Annexure A below.

Annexure A

Name of Institution\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date of initial Programme Review site visit\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date visited in follow-up \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date of follow-up report \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Names of follow-up reviewers Position/title Signed

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 1: The Internal Quality Assurance System in operation** | | | | |
| **Further action required?** | **Comment** | **Yes?**  **(√)** | **Questions** |  |
|  |  |  | Is the programme Self- Evaluation  Report complete? | 1 |
|  |  |  | Do the most recent self-evaluation  reports indicate the extent to which the criteria in the Framework for Evaluation are met and/or are being addressed? | 2 |
|  |  |  | Is there an improvement plan in place, informed by external and internal review? | 3 |
|  |  |  | Are there any major gaps that appear not to be addressed? | 4 |
|  |  |  | Is progress with the improvement plan monitored? | 5 |
|  |  |  | Are there any major obstacles to the expected achievementof the improvement plan? | 6 |
|  |  |  | What is the institution’s estimate of the time needed to complete improvements to the programme? | 7 |
|  |  |  | What is the reviewers’ assessment of the time needed to complete improvements to the programme that would demonstrate the indicators? | 8 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part 2: Progress demonstrated with the indicators** | | | |
| Overall  conclusion | New information from  follow-up site visit | Improvement plan  points (comment  on match with  the Programme  Review report’s  recommendations) | Indicators (refer to  Framework of Evaluation) |
|  |  |  | Curriculum  Aims and ILOs  Syllabus (content)  Progression year on year  Teaching and Learning  Student assessment |
|  |  |  | Efficiency  Profile of admitted  students  Human resources  Physical resources  Uses made of available  resources  Student support  Ratios of graduation to  admitted students |
|  |  |  | Academic Standards  Clearly articulated  standards  Use of appropriate  benchmarks  Achievement of graduates  Standards of students’  assessed work |
|  |  |  | Programme management  and Assurance  Arrangements for  programme management  Policies and procedures  applied  Structured comments  collected and used  Staff development needs  identified and addressed  Improvement planning  processes working |

**CRITERIA FOR A SUCCESSFUL REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE PROCESS**

**CRITERIA FOR A SUCCESSFUL REVIEW**

1. The criteria for a successful review that informs the arrangements for Programme Review and its evaluation are as follows:

1. The programme being reviewed is supported by existing or developing internal systems including specifications and review with a culture of self-evaluation and continuing improvement. These features of internal review provide a sound basis for the external review.
2. The timing of the external review is appropriate.
3. The profile of the visiting peer review panel matches in broad terms the profile of the academic activities in the institution.
4. There is due attention to detail in planning and preparation, by -
   1. The Quality Assurance and Academic Accreditation Directorate applies consistently its procedures for working with the institution and the reviewers and provides appropriate support for the external review as required
   2. The review coordinator: ensures that the evidence base generated by internal review and reporting systems is available on time to the visiting peer reviewers, and any requirements for clarification and supplementary information are satisfied
   3. The institution: provides a self-evaluation report for the programme to be externally reviewed
   4. The peer reviewers: undertake their preparation for the visit including reading the advance documentation and preparing initial commentaries that inform the conduct of the visit
5. There is consistency in the application of the published review method and the protocols by all participants in a way that respects and supports the mission and philosophy of the overall process for continuing review and continuing improvement.
6. Reviewers and representatives of the institution conduct an open dialogue throughout the review that shows mutual respect.
7. The judgements reached by the reviewers are clear, based on the evidence available and systematically recorded.
8. The review report is produced on time in line with the standard report structure and is confirmed by the institution to be factually accurate.
9. The set of conclusions arising from the review are constructive, offering a fair and balanced view of the programme.
10. The institution is able to benefit from the external review by giving due reflection and consideration to the findings and preparing where appropriate a realistic improvement plan

**EVALUATION**

2. The Quality Assurance and Academic Accreditation Directorate wishes to establish and implement procedures for the systematic evaluation of all external Programme Reviews arranged by it. The institution, the review chairperson and the peer reviewers will all routinely be asked to evaluate each external review by completing a short questionnaire. The structured comments will be analysed by the Quality Assurance and Academic Accreditation Directorate and where necessary the Quality Assurance and Academic Accreditation Directorate will take action to follow-up any difficulties highlighted. In addition, the Quality Assurance and Academic Accreditation Directorate will collate the structured comments to compile regular summary reports indicating the main features of the review process in practice, including the overall levels of satisfaction expressed by the participants, together with examples of good practice and opportunities for continuing improvement.

**GLOSSARY OF TERMS IN PROGRAMME RE-**

**VIEW**

**DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED IN THE PROGRAMME REVIEW HANDBOOK**

Some of the terms used in the Handbook and/or used in internal and external review and reporting may have different meanings according to the context in which they are used. To remove possible ambiguities, the following working definitions of the terms are offered.

**ADEMIC FIELDS/SUBJECT AREAS/DISCIPLINES**

Academic fields categorise recognisable and coherent domains or the scope of study such as Mathematics, Medicine, Engineering and Philosophy. Fields that have a wide scope are often subdivided; for example, Humanities include subjects like History and Literature and Arts may include separate disciplines of Fine Arts and Photography. The curriculum of some programmes may combine academic fields, or may include different subjects and disciplines such as Mathematics in Engineering or Accountancy in Business Administration.

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS**

Specific standards decided by the institution, and informed by external reference points. They include the minimum or threshold level of knowledge and skills to be gained by the graduates from the programme, and can be used in evaluation and review.

**ACCREDITATION**

The recognition accorded by an agency or other organisation to either an education programme or to an institution to confirm that it can demonstrate that the programme(s) meet acceptable standards and that the institution has effective systems to ensure the quality and continuing improvement of its academic activities, according to published criteria.

**ACTION OR IMPROVEMENT PLANS**

Realistic plans for improvement derived from the consideration of available evidence and evaluations; they may be implemented for more than one year, but should be prepared and reviewed annually at each level of courses, programmes and the institution.

**ADMITTED STUDENTS**

Students registered on a programme, including those accepted holding prior credits for admission after year 1.

**BENCHMARK/REFERENCE POINTS**

Benchmark statements represent general expectations about the standards of achievement and general attributes to be expected of a graduate in a given academic field or subject. Reference standards may be external or internal. External reference points allow comparison of the academic standards and quality of a programme with equivalent programmes in Iraq and internationally. Internal reference points may be used to compare one academic field with another, or to identify trends over a given time period.

**COMMUNITY**

A defined segment of wider society served by the institution, as determined in its mission and bylaws. It may be defined geographically or in terms of the range of organizations, groups and individuals engaged in its activities.

**COURSE AIMS**

Overall course aims should be expressed as the outcomes to be achieved by students completing the course as significant and assessable qualities. They should contribute to the achievement of defined aims within one or more education programmes.

**CURRICULUM OR (IN THE PLURAL) CURRICULA**

The complete organised learning as designed and managed by an institution for an admitted student, determined by the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) and comprising the content, the arrangements for teaching and learning and assessments of students’ achievements together with the access to the range of facilities available within the University and, by arrangement, outside it, including libraries, computers studies, social, sports, internships and field studies.

**DIRECTED SELF-LEARNING/INDEPENDENT LEARNING**

The active promotion of personal skills included in the curriculum that support the student and graduate to seek, assimilate and learn from a range of structured and unstructured experiences. Methods of promotion include e-learning, personal and autonomous learning and fieldwork, assignments, internships, and reflexive learning. Devices commonly used that support directed self-learning beyond formal teaching lectures include logbooks, self-assessment reports, interactive learning tools or the equivalent.

**E-LEARNING**

Electronic-based learning using information technology may be the primary or secondary element in material associated with a programme or a course. It may be stand-alone or integrated with other teaching and learning approaches. It may include self-determination

of aims, ILOs and materials using self-selection and will usually include self-assessment. It generally increases the levels of autonomy in, and responsibility for, learning. Converting existing texts or lecture notes to a website or pre-recorded media alone is generally not considered to be e-learning.

**EXTERNAL EVALUATOR/EVALUATION**

An appointment to a specific programme, part of a programme or course(s) by the institution to establish an independent and external professional opinion on the academic standards set and achieved in the examinations for the award of the degree.

**FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION**

The framework for evaluation provides a standard structure for evaluation of programmes. It will form the basis for self-evaluation, the site visit by external peer reviewers and the Programme Review report. It is designed to operate in all academic fields and institutions, and to apply to internal and external reviews.

**GENERAL PRECEPTS/BY-LAWS**

Principles, by-laws and regulations, which the educational institution must have as part of the policies covering its operations.

**HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTE (HEI)/INSTITUTION**

A Faculty, College or University providing higher education programmes leading to a first university degree (B.Sc. or B.A.) or a higher degree.

**INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES (ILOS)**

The ILOs are the outcome-related definition of knowledge, understanding and skills which

the institution intends for its programmes. They should be mission-related, capable of measurement (assessable) and reflect the use of external reference standards at appropriate

level.

**INTERNAL SYSTEM FOR QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND ASSURANCE**

The system adopted by the institution to ensure that its education programmes and contributing elements meet specified needs and are continually reviewed and improved. An outcomes-related system of quality management involves precise specifications for quality from design to delivery; evaluation; the identification of good practice as well as of learning deficiencies and obstacles; performance follow-up; suggestions for development and enhancement; and the systematic review and development of processes for establishing effective policies, strategies and priorities to support continuing improvement.

**JOB/LABOUR MARKET**

The availability of professional, commercial, research-oriented or other fields of employment that a graduate is qualified to join upon graduation.

**MISSION STATEMENT**

A brief statement clearly identifying the educational institution’s duty and its role in the development of the community; a mission statement may also offer brief supporting statements on the vision, values and strategic objectives of the institution.

**PEER REVIEWER**

A person who is professionally equal in calibre and with management and/or subject expertise to those delivering the provision, but not from the same institution and without any conflict of interest, who can contribute to the review of an education programme for internal and external quality assurance or for accreditation purposes.

**PROGRAMME**

For the purpose of Programme Review an education programme is defined as one which admits students who, on successful completion, receive an academic award.

**PROGRAMME AIMS**

The broad purposes for providing the programme which in turn guide the development and

implementation of strategic objectives (to ensure that the aims are met) and ILOs (to ensure that the students work towards attaining the specified outcomes).

**PROGRAMME REVIEW**

Programme Review applies to all education programmes in all higher education institutions.

Where the programme is studied in more than one institution, the whole programme is included in Programme Review. Programme Review in Iraq has three objectives:

1. To provide decision-makers (in the higher education institutions, Quality Assurance and Academic Accreditation Directorate , parents, students, and other stakeholders) with evidence-based judgements on the quality of learning programmes
2. To support the development of internal quality assurance processes with information on emerging good practice and challenges, evaluative comment and continuing improvement
3. To enhance the reputation of Iraq’s higher education internationally.

**QUALITY ASSURANCE**

The institution has the means of assuring that for each education programme, academic standards are defined and achieved in line with equivalent national and international standards, that the quality of the curriculum and related infrastructure are appropriate and fulfil the expectations of the range of stakeholders, that its graduates represent the range of attributes specified and that the organisation is capable of sustained, continuing improvement.

**REVIEW COORDINATOR**

The nominee of an institution to coordinate a Programme Review to assist in the gathering and interpretation of information and to support the application of published methods of review.

**REPORT**

The regular reports prepared on the basis of Programme Reviews and evaluations of its education programme.

**SELF-EVALUATION**

n institution’s process of evaluating a programme as part of Programme Review and within an internal system of quality management and assurance.

**SITE VISIT**

A scheduled visit by external peer reviewers as part of Programme Review. Normally the site visit will be for two or three days. A typical outline timetable is provided in Appendix(1).

**SPECIFICATION**

The detailed description of the aims, construction and intended outcomes of a programme, and any courses, specific facilities or resources that contribute to it. The specification provides information to design, manage, deliver and review the programme.

**STAKEHOLDER**

Those organisations, groups or individuals which have a legitimate interest in the educational activities of the institution both in respect of the quality and standards of the education and also in respect of the effectiveness of the systems and processes for assuring the quality. An effective strategic review process will include the key stakeholder groups. The precise range of stakeholder groups and their differentiated interests depend upon the mission of the institution, its range of educational activities and local circumstances. The range is usually defined by a scoping study. Examples of groups with a legitimate interest include current students, graduates, intending students and their parents or family, staff in the institution, the employing community, the relevant Government ministries, the sponsors and other funding organisations and, where appropriate, professional organisations or syndicates.

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES/PLANS**

A collection of institution-specific objectives that are derived from its mission and developed into a realistic plan based on evidence-based evaluations. Objectives concentrate on the means by which an institution seeks to deliver its mission. The plan sets out the matters to be addressed, timeframe, person responsible and estimate of costs, and is accompanied by an implementation plan with arrangements for monitoring the progress and evaluating impact.

**STUDENTS’ASSESSMENT**

A set of processes, including examinations and other activities conducted by the institution to measure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of a programme and its courses. Assessments also provide the means by which students are ranked according to their achievement. Diagnostic assessment seeks to determine the existing range of knowledge and skills of a student with a view to constructing an appropriate curriculum. Formative assessment provides information on the student’s performance and progress to support further learning, without necessarily counting a grade towards graduation. Summative assessment determines the final level of attainment of the student on the programme or at the end of a course that contributes credits to the programme.

**STUDENTS’ EVALUATIONS**

The systematic gathering of students’opinions on the quality of their programme in a standardized structure together with the analysis and outcomes. Surveys using questionnaires are the most frequently used methods to collect opinions; other mechanisms include websites conferences, panels or focus groups, and representation on councils or other committees.

**TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS**

The range of methods used by teachers to help students to achieve the ILOs for the course.

Examples include: lectures, small group teaching such as tutorials, seminars and syndicate groups; a case study to teach students how to analyse information and reach a decision; assignments such as writing a review paper for the students to gain the skills of self-learning and presentation; field trips; practical sessions for the students to gain practical skills; and carrying out experiments to train the students to analyse the results, reach specific conclusions and prepare a report, presentation or poster.