****

حكومةتا هةريَما كوردستانىَ - عيَراق

وةزارةتا خويَندنا بالاَ وتويَذينةوةيا زانستى

سةروكاتيا زانكوَيا دهوَك

ريظةبةريا دلَنيايى جوَرى

**Students Feedback on the Course**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Course Title: | | |
| Lecturer in charge:  Academic Year:  Date:  Semester: | | |
| Faculty : | School: | Department: |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | **Questions of the feedback** | **Level (1-5)** | **More Remarks – Objectively** |
| 1 | The objectives and the outcomes of the course were clear? |  |  |
| 2 | The subject content was beneficial and related to the main objectives of the course? |  |  |
| 3 | Did the lecturer make an effort in preparing the course book? |  |  |
| 4 | The lecturer tried to apply the principles and the contents stated in the course book and well analyzed the related points? |  |  |
| 5 | Did the lecturer attend the lectures on time and end them on time as well? |  |  |
| 6 | Did the lecturer give the lectures in a nice, transparent and respectful manner? |  |  |
| 7 | The power point slides the lecturer presented were clear, attractive and useful? |  |  |
| 8 | Did the lecturer allocate a time for the students questions and answer them clearly? |  |  |
| 9 | Did the lecturer give significance to the notes, inquiries and opinions raised by the students? |  |  |
| 10 | Did the lecturer give clear information about the exams questions? |  |  |
| 11 | Were the exams questions variable and reflected the variety of contents in the course book? |  |  |
| 12 | Were the scientific resources suggested by the lecturer updated and convenient with the subject? |  |  |
|  | **Total** |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Measuring Tool** | | | |
| 1 – 2Weak | 2.1 – 3 Average | 3.1 – 4 Good | 4.1 – 5 Very Good |
|  |  |  |  |

**Table of the results and merits for student feedback**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results and Merits** | **Grade** | **Points** | **Degree** |
| A letter of appreciation from the Ministry of Higher Education provided that he/she get no less than (A\*) or (A) in CAD. | very good | more than 4.50 | A\* |
| His/her rights are preserved and he/she is excused from questioning | good | 2.50 - 4.49 | A |
| **B1**- If the teacher gets (A\*) or (A) in CAD, His/her rights are preserved and he/she is excused from questioning.  **B2**- If the teacher gets (B) or less in CAD:   * he/she will be given a letter of notification for more efforts in the coming years. * he/she will have to attend three lectures for other teachers with high points at TQA to benefit from their experience. | average | 2.00 - 2.49 | B |
| **C1-** If the teacher gets (A\*) or (A) in CAD, he/she will be submitted to item (B2).  **C2-** If the teacher gets (B) or less in CAD, he/she is will be considered weak in quality assurance program, consequently:  - his/her performance will be assessed by the director of quality assurance and two other assessors from outside the department.  - he/she will have to attend six lectures for other teachers with high points at TQA to benefit from their experience, then he/she is reassessed.  - If he/she gets less than the required points a second year, he/she will be submitted to item (D2). | below average | 1.50 - 1.99 | C |
| **D1-** If the teacher gets (A\*) or (A) in CAD, he/she will be submitted to item (C2).  **D2-** If the teacher gets (B) or less in CAD, he/she is will be considered weak in quality assurance program and will be denied the right to teach for three months and during this period:  - the university full-time allocations would be cut from his/her salary and he/she will be given other assignments in the university.  - He/she will be required to participate in a training course on methods of teaching and his/her performance will be assessed.  - If he/she gets less than the required points a second year, he/she will be deprived from teaching permanently and will be given other assignments in the university. | weak | 1.00 - 1.49 | D |