Soran University Policy Development and Governance

Institutional narrative report for official review

September 2026

Establishing a coordinated policy framework

At Soran University, we have developed a policy framework to connect institutional governance with the quality of teaching, research, student support and administration. We have established core policies and committee responsibilities, documented the review of specific policy proposals and set out a programme for further development. Our updated register has brought together 65 policies and instructions, recording their purpose, status, responsible body, approval authority, relationship to the strategic plan, proposed timeline and expected outcomes. This register has provided a basis for distinguishing the policies already approved from those still under development. (E.01).

We have placed the Policy for the Preparation and Development of Policies at the centre of this framework. Its provisions established a common process for identifying a policy need, preparing a draft, obtaining comments, reviewing the text through the Steering Committee for the Strategic Plan (SCSP), and submitting it to the University Council for final approval. The framework also required a record of policy history and version changes, communication to relevant parties, and subsequent review. These arrangements have linked policy development with identifiable responsibilities and institutional oversight. (E.02).

Assigning responsibility and documenting decisions

Our policy arrangements have drawn on academic, administrative and stakeholder expertise. At its meeting of 28 October 2025, the SCSP discussed its responsibility for overseeing strategic objectives and developing and reviewing institutional policies. Members agreed on a regular meeting schedule and were instructed to study the Committee's policy and propose duties appropriate to their expertise. At the meeting of 19 November 2025, these responsibilities were assigned to named members and reporting arrangements were specified. (E.03).

The assigned responsibilities connected policy review with the University's operating functions. Faculty deans represented academic needs and alignment with institutional strategy. Quality assurance examined consistency with standards and performance measures; finance considered resources; legal affairs reviewed compliance and legal risks; and information technology supported digital infrastructure and archiving. Student, alumni and external representatives contributed their respective perspectives. The SCSP Office, managed by Shahla Yasin Mohammad Salih, was assigned coordination of drafting, review, approval records and archiving. These assignments have provided a documented basis for participation and accountability. (E.04).

The correspondence accompanying the minutes has also demonstrated a route for institutional oversight. Letters dated 9 January 2026 recorded approval of the minutes of the October and November 2025 meetings by the Chair of the University's Committee for Institutional Effectiveness. We have treated these letters as evidence of approval of the meeting records. Final approval of individual policies has remained a separate step under the policy-development framework. (E.05).

Building the approved policy foundation

The updated register classified eight policies as approved and established. These covered policy preparation and development; departmental advisory councils for academic programmes; student dormitories; awarding postgraduate degrees; conducting postgraduate thesis defences; the Institutional Accreditation Committee; the Steering Committee for Quality Assurance; and the Steering Committee for the Strategic Plan. Together, these policies have defined the core framework for governance, academic standards, student accommodation and institutional review. The register identified the University Council as their approval authority. (E.06).

Through the Departmental Advisory Council Policy for Academic Programs, we have defined a structured role for stakeholder advice in programme development. The policy provided for internal academic members and external participation, including employers and alumni. It required consideration of programme educational objectives, labour-market relevance and programme improvement, together with meeting records and a log for tracking recommendations and departmental responses. It also required at least one meeting each semester. These provisions established a means of connecting academic planning with external experience and documenting the consideration of advice. (E.07).

We have also defined complementary controls for postgraduate education. The register described the Awarding Postgraduate Degrees policy as a means of verifying academic, research, examination and administrative requirements before authorising and recording an award. The policy for Conducting Postgraduate Thesis Defences addressed qualified examiners, assessment criteria, documented decisions and verification of corrections. The compilation contained the corresponding policy texts and submission sheets. At the SCSP meeting of 19 November 2025, members were instructed to study postgraduate submission procedures and provide comments before subsequent consideration for approval, documenting an earlier stage of scrutiny. (E.08).

Reviewing a policy through operational consultation

The Student Dormitory Policy has provided a specific example of how we reviewed a policy with the service responsible for applying it. On 24 February 2026, SCSP members examined the policy and identified provisions requiring clarification. They decided to invite Abdullah Sherko Mohammad, Director of Dormitories, to explain those provisions before submission to the University Council for final approval. The Committee also supported a proposal to change the Directorate’s designation to Student Accommodation. The minutes recorded this as a committee proposal; they did not, by themselves, establish completion of the institutional renaming process. (E.09).

At the meeting of 5 May 2026, the Director attended and explained key provisions and administrative procedures. Members then reviewed the text in light of his explanations. This sequence has documented consultation with the responsible service and further examination before final approval. The updated register subsequently listed the Student Dormitory Policy as approved and described its purpose as establishing a healthy and organised residential environment, with defined student rights, duties and oversight arrangements. (E.10).

Connecting quality assurance and accreditation with strategic planning

We have established distinct responsibilities for accreditation, quality assurance and strategic planning through the three committee policies. The Institutional Accreditation Committee policy defined arrangements for coordinating accreditation work, institutional self-evaluation, evidence preparation and reporting. The Steering Committee for Quality Assurance policy provided for oversight of academic and administrative quality, monitoring, stakeholder participation and improvement. The SCSP policy connected

strategic planning with policy development, implementation, review and reporting. Their inclusion in the approved-policy register has documented their place within the University's governance framework. (E.11).

The meeting records have shown how performance monitoring entered this work. On 30 June 2026, a framework of 53 indicators across five strategic goals was presented to the SCSP. Members decided to review the indicators and submit comments. At the same meeting, they discussed the Policy for Developing Strategic Planning and the Student Complaints Policy, and asked members to send observations to Shahla Yasin Mohammad Salih for amendment of the texts. These decisions demonstrated active policy review and preparation for monitoring; they did not establish that the proposed indicators or the two policy texts had received final approval at that meeting. (E.12).

Managing policies under development

Our updated register identified nine policies as in process. They covered the Student Information System (SIS), alumni engagement, grievances and complaints, laboratories, memoranda of understanding, auditing and oversight, information management and data security, email retention, and events and activities. It assigned the SCSP as the responsible committee and the University Council as approval authority. The proposed schedule placed the SIS policy in October 2026, alumni and complaint policies in November, laboratory and partnership policies in December, and several governance and information policies in January 2027. These entries have recorded planned development milestones rather than completed approvals. (E.13).

The SIS draft illustrated the detail being developed for academic administration. It specified responsibilities for departments, teaching staff and students in module registration, attendance, grades, examination registration and ECTS-based workloads. However, its issue and approval-date fields were blank, and one credit requirement was incomplete. We have therefore described it in accordance with the updated register as a policy in process. The same register separately classified the Bologna System Study Instructions as active and in use, preserving the distinction between existing academic instructions and the SIS policy under development. (E.14).

The records also connected emerging policies with needs identified during review. On 28 January 2026, the SCSP assigned Dr. Ali Yousif Aziz, in coordination with Committee members, to prepare a professional ethics policy for teaching staff and students. The updated register later included an Ethics and Professional Conduct Code among planned policies. We have treated the meeting decision as evidence of a drafting assignment, while retaining the register's planned status for the listed code. (E.15).

Extending the policy programme through 2028

Beyond the approved and developing policies, the register listed 47 planned items. We have organised the proposed coverage around academic quality, research integrity, fair treatment, student welfare, reliable information and responsible resource management. Academic priorities included programme evaluation, learning outcomes assessment, faculty performance and workload, academic honesty and the use of generative AI. Research priorities included animal research ethics, instrumentation standards and publication ethics. These entries described the proposed scope of future policies and the outcomes sought from their development. (E.16).

The planned programme also addressed anti-discrimination, equal opportunity, student rights, harassment prevention, mental wellbeing and student organisations. Administrative and operational priorities included procurement, financial audits, asset management, privacy, access to academic records, IT auditing, library services, campus safety and visitor access. Many entries set out staged planning, implementation and

evaluation over a 24-month period. Through this register, we have made the intended breadth and sequence of policy development visible, while preserving the distinction between planned safeguards and policies already in force. (E.17).

Reviewing effectiveness and maintaining the evidence

The policy-development framework required periodic assessment, including a review every two years, and provided for revisions informed by feedback and changing needs. It also required documentation of versions and amendments and communication of approved policies to relevant parties. The SCSP minutes have supplied examples of these review practices through named assignments, consultation with responsible officers, discussion of comments and requests for amended texts. Together, the framework and minutes have demonstrated both the prescribed process and specific instances of its use. (E.18).

Our evidence has established a core set of approved policies and an organised programme of further development. The expected outcomes in the register have included more consistent decisions, reliable records, fairer processes and better coordination, but the register has not itself measured those improvements. We have therefore distinguished documentary progress from demonstrated effectiveness. The next stage has required completion of outstanding drafts and approval details, followed by implementation records and evaluation of results. This distinction has allowed us to present an accurate account of the University's progress and continuing responsibilities to the reviewing organisation. (E.19).

Status recorded in the updated policy register

The counts below were calculated from the 65 numbered entries. "Planned" has normalised the register's wording "In planned". Approval status has been reported as recorded in that register; the title of the approval compilation has not been treated as proof that every included draft was approved.

Recorded status	Number	Entry numbers	PDF pages
Approved	8	1–8	2–3
Active / In Use	1	10	3
In Process	9	9 and 11–18	3–4
Planned	47	19–65	4–10

Evidence (E.20). The 56 entries in process or planned were separate from the eight approved policies and the one active instruction.

Evidence register

Source note: References have used the supplied document filenames and PDF page numbers, counting the first page as page 1. In the bilingual SCSP file, references have pointed to the English section; its printed references to an earlier source PDF have not been used as page numbers for this report. The filename “206-2028” has been retained as supplied; the register itself identified the timeline as 2026–2028.

Evidence (E.01): Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, pp. 1–10.

Evidence (E.02): All approval policies - with briefly explanation.pdf, pp. 2–6 and 8.

Evidence (E.03): Approval minutes of SCSP - Kurdish and English.pdf, pp. 4 and 7–9.

Evidence (E.04): Approval minutes of SCSP - Kurdish and English.pdf, pp. 7–9.

Evidence (E.05): Approval minutes of SCSP - Kurdish and English.pdf, pp. 2–6; All approval policies - with briefly explanation.pdf, p. 6.

Evidence (E.06): Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, pp. 2–3.

Evidence (E.07): All approval policies - with briefly explanation.pdf, pp. 20, 22, 26 and 28.

Evidence (E.08): Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, p. 2; All approval policies - with briefly explanation.pdf, pp. 30–36 and 66–75; Approval minutes of SCSP - Kurdish and English.pdf, p. 9.

Evidence (E.09): Approval minutes of SCSP - Kurdish and English.pdf, p. 23.

Evidence (E.10): Approval minutes of SCSP - Kurdish and English.pdf, p. 27; Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, p. 2; All approval policies - with briefly explanation.pdf, pp. 37–48.

Evidence (E.11): All approval policies - with briefly explanation.pdf, pp. 49–51, 76–78 and 91–94; Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, pp. 2–3.

Evidence (E.12): Approval minutes of SCSP - Kurdish and English.pdf, pp. 33–34.

Evidence (E.13): Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, pp. 3–4.

Evidence (E.14): All approval policies - with briefly explanation.pdf, pp. 10–15; Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, p. 3.

Evidence (E.15): Approval minutes of SCSP - Kurdish and English.pdf, p. 19; Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, p. 6.

Evidence (E.16): Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, pp. 4–7 and 9–10.

Evidence (E.17): Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, pp. 4–10.

Evidence (E.18): All approval policies - with briefly explanation.pdf, pp. 5–6; Approval minutes of SCSP - Kurdish and English.pdf, pp. 19, 23, 27 and 34.

Evidence (E.19): pdated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, pp. 2–10; All approval policies - with briefly explanation.pdf, pp. 4–6 and 10–15.

Evidence (E.20): Updated-Policies for Soran University (206-2028).pdf, pp. 2–10.