



## Report with findings of the Peer Review Meeting (WP4.3)

The peer review meeting took place on **20.07.2020** from **11 am to 1 pm (CEST) / 12 noon to 2 pm (AST)**.

<b>Reviewed Institution</b>		
<i>KRG Partners</i>	<i>tick as appropriate (✓)</i>	<i>Represented in person of</i>
KISSR		
UOS		
SPU		
UOR		
UOH		
CHU		
DPU		
EPU		
SU	✓	Dr. Isam K. Abdullah Dr. Mohammed A. Saeed Mrs Bayan Faraidon Mr Haidi Jamal Abdullah Mr Yousif Ali Omer Dr. Dleen Mohammed Saleh

<b>Peer Reviewers</b>		
<i>EU Partners</i>	<i>tick as appropriate (✓)</i>	<i>Represented in person of</i>
UGOE	✓	Dr. Uwe Muuss, Jakob Hedderich
KUL	✓	Jef Schrooten
MU	✓	Violeta Osouchová
RUG		Maike Wagenaar

<b>I. General institutional setup for the internationalisation of the Higher Education Institution (HEI)</b>		<i>tick as appropriate (✓)</i>		
#	Item	Assessment		
		Yes	In part	No
1	An institutional setup conducive to the internationalisation of the university and implementation of the international strategy has been achieved.		✓	
2	The International Relations Office has been set up properly within the institutional framework of the HEI with reporting lines established.	✓		
3	Apart from the International Relations Office, other structural units of the university important for internationalisation have been identified and are included in the internationalisation process.	✓		
4	An appropriate (inclusive) process for the continued development of the international strategy and related policies is in place.		✓	
5	Monitoring of the internationalisation process and implementation of the international strategy is established.		✓	
6	Institutional arrangements for collaboration with the colleges (faculties) on internationalisation are in place.	✓		
7	A framework for the recognition of studies abroad is in place.	✓		
8	An institutional process for implementing Bologna Process reform elements (e.g. student-centred learning, ECTS, learning outcomes etc.) has been initiated.	✓		
<b>Written assessment / Comments:</b>				
<p><i>The International Relations Office is found to be properly set up within the structure of the university. In addition, other structural units of the university important for internationalisation are identified properly. Hence, key preconditions for internationalisation and the successful implementation of the strategy developed are met.</i></p> <p><i>However, areas for improvement of the institutional setup could be identified by European partners during the meeting:</i></p> <p><i>Although a committee for monitoring internationalisation and the implementation of the strategy is being set up, currently monitoring and reporting procedures seem not to be fully in place. The planned inclusion of the Head of IRO in the University Council is a very important step in this regard, since it directly links the IRO to the university's main deliberation and decision-making body, in which both university leadership and the colleges are represented.</i></p> <p><i>In part, this would also be a proper first step to address the second area of improvement identified, which concerns the development of the international strategy and related policies. So far, strategy development has been found to be a rather centralised and in part compartmentalised process involving only selected personnel and stakeholders. For the future and in order to conduct internationalisation successfully, a more inclusive and collaborative process should be developed that puts greater emphasis on the involvement of the colleges and departments, since this grass-root approach will render internationalisation an integral part of higher education at SU guaranteeing its long-term sustainability. For this, however, the support of the future university leadership and president will be key.</i></p> <p><i>It is important to note that links with the colleges to implement internationalisation are already established. Currently, collaboration with the colleges is done mainly through the deans and the deans' offices, which is found to be appropriate for the current state of internationalisation. However, SU plans to have a dedicated international officer at every college, which is highly supported by EU partners present.</i></p>				

	<p><i>Furthermore, a framework for the recognition of studies abroad is found to be in place with the partners from SU being able to portray recognition procedures during the meeting for both the recognition of degrees and periods of studies.</i></p> <p><i>An institutional process for the implementation of Bologna Process has been started and relevant committees have been formed at the institutional, college and department level. The College of Engineering is identified as piloting the implementation.</i></p>
	<p><b>Recommendations:</b></p>
	<p><i>European partners encourage SU to follow through with creating dedicated staff for internationalisation at the college level.</i></p> <p><i>Solidifying monitoring and reporting procedures is advised.</i></p> <p><i>Under the newly appointed president, SU should strive to develop a more inclusive and collaborative process when it comes to the development of international strategy and policies.</i></p>

<b>II. The organisation of and resources available at your International Relations Office</b>		<i>tick as appropriate (✓)</i>		
#	Item	Assessment		
		Yes	In part	No
1	The organisational structure of the International Relations Office is appropriate/functional and clear responsibilities are established.	✓		
2	Appropriate personnel resources are available at the International Relations Office.	✓		
3	Staff with English language proficiency is available at the International Relations Office.	✓		
4	Based on photo evidence, the International Relations Office and its premises are found to be suitable for the purpose and sufficiently equipped.	✓		
5	Equipment purchased with funds of the Erasmus+ TIGRIS Project is installed properly and marked according to Erasmus+ requirements.	✓		
<b>Written assessment / Comments:</b>				
<p><i>The organisational structure of the IRO as portrayed during the meeting is found adequate for the current state of internationalisation. However, with further progression the structure is likely due for revision in order to accommodate for increasing functional differentiation. As a side note, the structure and designations used are not immediately relatable for third parties (Protocol = incl. Welcome Services for intl. students and staff, delegations etc.) but this was clarified quickly during the meeting. Otherwise, sufficient resources are available at the IRO and equipment purchased with TIGRIS funds is found properly installed and marked accordingly.</i></p>				
<b>Recommendations:</b>				
<p><i>For the future, SU could consider revising the structure and designations of the IRO in order to make its organisation more relatable and accessible for outsiders who do not possess detailed knowledge on the office's organisation.</i></p>				

<b>III. The scope and mode of operation of the International Relations Office</b>		<i>tick as appropriate (✓)</i>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Assessment</b>		
		Yes	In part	No
1	Core services and tasks <sup>1</sup> of an International Relations Office are offered/performed by the local International Relation Office.	✓		
2	Core services and tasks not offered/performed by the local International Relations Office are offered/performed by another unit of the university ( <i>only if applicable</i> ).	✓		
3	The mode of operation of the International Relation Office as portrayed in the meeting is found to be appropriate for the related task(s).	✓		
<b>Written assessment / Comments:</b>				
<i>Core services and tasks of an IRO are found to be offered/performed. The management of academic mobility and incoming services offered were described in detail and are found to be appropriate.</i>				
<b>Recommendations:</b>				
<i>None.</i>				

---

<sup>1</sup> For this purpose, core services & tasks are defined as (1) coordination and management of **international relations** (with foreign university, networks, partnerships, etc.), (2) coordination and management of **international mobility** of students and staff, (3) conducting **intl. marketing/promotion** incl. recruitment of intl. students and staff, (4) offering **project support** (consultation incl. funding advice), (5) offering **support for incoming students and staff**.

<b>IV. Experience of students and staff with internationalisation at the university and services offered by the International Relations Office</b>		<i>tick as appropriate (✓)</i>		
#	Item	Assessment		
		Yes	In part	No
1	Students report to be well informed on internationalisation activities and opportunities offered by the university.	✓		
2	Students report on having received appropriate support before, during and after their international experience.	✓		
3	Students report to be satisfied with support received.	✓		
4	Students report that their studies abroad have been recognised by the home institution ( <i>only if applicable</i> ).	Not applicable		
5	Staff members report to be well informed on internationalisation activities and opportunities offered by the university.	✓		
6	Staff members report on having received appropriate support before, during and after their international experience.	✓		
7	Staff members report to be satisfied with support received.	✓		
<b>Written assessment / Comments:</b>				
<p><i>Both students and staff report to be well informed about opportunities to engage in internationalisation indicating the proper dissemination of information at SU when it comes to internationalisation.</i></p> <p><i>Both students and staff are aware of the ongoing internationalisation at SU and its general importance. Both students and staff see the need for increased internationalisation at SU including a wider range of activities but mainly perceive external factors outside the university to be the limiting factor (government support, funding, security conditions in KRI &amp; Iraq, visa regime &amp; restrictions).</i></p> <p><i>Both students and staff report to have received comprehensive support from the IRO and its staff and are highly appreciative of the IRO and the services offered by its staff. Especially, the Coordinator of Erasmus Plus is lauded for his dedication and level of support.</i></p> <p><i>Recognition of studies abroad (item 4) was not applicable in this case, since both PhD projects are still ongoing. From the experience of EU partners, however, recognition of studies is not known to be a problem at SU.</i></p>				
<b>Recommendations:</b>				
None.				



*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use, which may be made of the information contained therein.*