



Co-funded by the
Tempus Programme
of the European Union

**«ALIGN: Achieving and checking the alignment between academic
programmes and qualification frameworks»**

(543901-TEMPUS-1-2013-1-AM-TEMPUS-JPGR)

**NATIONAL REPORT ON ALIGNING ACADEMIC
PROGRAMMES AND QUALITY ASSURANCE WITH
EU STANDARDS**

ALIGN
ACHIEVING AND CHECKING THE ALIGNMENT BETWEEN
ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES AND QUALIFICATION FRAMEWORKS

2017

Authors:

Paul Hyland – European and Postgraduate Development, Bath Spa University (England);

David Quin – Faculty of Film, Art and Creative Technologies, Institute of Art Design and Technology (Ireland);

Konstantin Kyrychenko – International Affairs Department, Sumy State University (Ukraine);

Olena Krykliy – Teaching and Learning Department, Sumy State University (Ukraine);

Volodymyr Zaslavskiy – Faculty of Computer Science and Cybernetics, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine);

Olga Yamkova – Scientific and Methodological Center, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine);

Svitlana Grygoruk – Department of Applied Mathematics and Social Informatics, Khmelnytsky National University (Ukraine);

Pavlo Grygoruk – Department of Automated Systems and Modelling in Economic, Khmelnytsky National University (Ukraine).

ALIGN (ACHIEVING AND CHECKING THE ALIGNMENT BETWEEN ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES AND QUALIFICATION FRAMEWORKS) is a three-year multi-country project, under the Governance Reform, EACEA N° 35/2012, 6th call National Priorities for Joint Projects action.

The present edition constitutes of two major parts – National Report on work and findings of the project with the main focus at site-visits to Ukrainian HEIs to pilot 6 academic programmes and National Guidelines for introducing tools for HEIs to achieve alignment of academic programmes with National Qualifications Frameworks (NQFs) and for QA agencies to check such alignment.

© Sumy publishing house, 2017

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein

Content

Preamble from EU experts	4
Preface.....	5
Introduction	6
PART 1 ALIGNING ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES AND QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS WITH EUROPEAN AND NATIONAL QUALITY FRAMEWORKS.....	8
1.1 Purpose of the Report.....	8
1.2 The Aims of Alignment	8
1.3 The Benefits of Alignment.....	8
1.4 The Key Challenges of Alignment.....	10
1.5 Recommendations for Strategic Development	11
1.6 Key Resources.....	14
1.7 Key Contacts	18
PART 2 NATIONAL REPORT ON THE WORK AND FINDINGS OF THE ALIGN PROJECT	20
2.1 Introduction.....	20
2.2 The Peer Review Process.....	20
2.3 The Documentation for Peer Review of Alignment.....	26
2.4 The Measurement of Alignment	28
2.5 The Findings of Peer Review.....	29
2.6 Impact Statements	43
Annexes.....	45
Annex 1 List of Abbreviations.....	45
Annex 2 The Module “Decision Making in Financial Mathematics” Descriptors	46
Annex 3 Master Programme in Social Informatics	49
Annex 4 Action Plan Sumy State University	52

Preamble from EU experts

The Ukrainian Tempus ALIGN National working group are to be highly commended on the National report, especially on the instances of Ukrainian best practice (page 10) and most importantly on the development of firm Recommendations for Strategic Development (from page 11). These recommendations have been carefully developed to work at National Level, at Institutional Level and at Programme Team level and are specific to the current context of Ukraine.

The Tempus ALIGN National Report also includes a comprehensive list of Key Resources and a contact list of Key Ukrainian academics who are anxious now to continue the work of Tempus ALIGN and to broaden the process of alignment (with National Frameworks and with the European Qualifications Framework and the ESG) across the Ukrainian higher education sector. We have learned that this alignment process involves ongoing development of student-centred learning, the modernisation and refinement of learning, teaching and assessment practices, an alignment of Quality Assurance processes and procedures to more internationally accepted norms and the development of a National system of regular peer review for programmes and for Higher Education Institutes.

This National Report should be widely disseminated and used in Ukraine, and the process of alignment which the Tempus ALIGN project has assisted should, over the next few years, allow Ukrainian Higher Education students, programmes, Institutions and Universities to move confidently and with enhanced success into the future.

Preface

ALIGN (ACHIEVING AND CHECKING THE ALIGNMENT BETWEEN ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES AND QUALIFICATION FRAMEWORKS) is a three-year multi-country project, under the Governance Reform, EACEA N° 35/2012, 6th call National Priorities for Joint Projects action.

The wider objective of the project is to enhance the intelligibility, consistency and transferability of qualifications through establishment of mechanisms for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to achieve alignment with Qualifications Frameworks (QFs) and for external quality assurance agencies (EQAAs) to check such alignment.

The targeted beneficiaries of the project – universities and national external evaluation bodies from Eastern Neighbouring Area (Ukraine, Armenia and Russia) have successfully carried-out pilot activities for internal and external evaluation of academic programmes according to European standards and guidelines. During the project life-time.

The present edition constitutes of two major parts – National Report on work and findings of the project with the main focus at site-visits to Ukrainian HEIs to pilot 6 academic programmes and National Guidelines for introducing tools for HEIs to achieve alignment of academic programmes with National Qualifications Frameworks (NQFs) and for QA agencies to check such alignment.

Introduction

Curricula modernization and linking academic programmes (APs) with learning outcomes (LOs) and assessing achievement of those LOs are necessary elements for QF alignment to facilitate student mobility, provisions of joint qualifications and benchmarking. LOs are the basic building blocks of the Bologna process and self-certification verification criteria (particularly criteria 2, 3 and 5) require evidence of their use. Thus, the methodology of the project was specifically designed to ensure there is capacity for the HEIs to achieve alignment with the NQFs and for the EQAAs to check that alignment.

The aims of ALIGN project target at:

- promoting a better understanding of HEIs and EQAAs of the role of QFs, their structure, the differences between the different kinds and levels of student achievement;
- building on the capacity of HEIs to write and assess LOs that define the various types of student achievement;
- building on the capacity of the HEIs to use the QF alignment to facilitate student transfer, joint qualifications and benchmarking;
- enabling the EQAAs to check whether proposed LOs and their assessment mechanisms match the QF descriptors at each level by establishing mechanisms for ensuring consistency of judgments across institutions.

The main activities are:

- capacity building of HEIs and EQAAs to ensure achievement and checking alignment with NQFs;
- development of mechanisms ensuring achievement of alignment with national qualifications frameworks (for HEIs);
- development of mechanisms for checking alignment (for EQAAs);
- revision of two study programmes at each HEI and pilot evaluation of the developed mechanisms;
- adoption of the alignment tools at HEIs, EQAAs and governmental levels.

The key results are:

- two selected study programmes at each HEI revised in terms of correspondence to European standards and requirements of QFs;
- staff of HEIs retrained to assess learning outcomes and promote student-centred teaching and learning;
- mechanisms ensuring achievement of alignment with NQFs developed as well as mechanisms for checking alignment developed;
- two selected programs at each HEI evaluated by means of the developed mechanisms;
- alignment tools adopted at HEIs, tools for checking alignment recommended to national bodies responsible for external evaluation and accreditation (Ministry of Education and Science Ukraine, EQAAs, Accreditation Committee etc.).

To ensure dovetailing and complementary capacities, ALIGN has brought together a strong, well-balanced consortium assembled around its specific objectives: aligning the academic programmes with NQFs; and checking such an alignment – the property of EQAAs. To make the

picture complete, the building blocks of the consortium are also assembled with the key stakeholders in the process – students, employers and the Ministries– the direct consumers of the product whose satisfaction is crucial for the success of the educational process. With the joint efforts, it was expected to fully achieve the project objectives and turn the results into a good practice for further dissemination and multiplier effect.

Partners from Ukraine:

- Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (TSNUK);
- Khmelnytsky National University (KhNU);
- Sumy State University (SSU);
- Ukrainian Association of Student Self- government;
- Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs of Khmelnytsky region;
- Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MESU).

Partners from European Union:

- Central and Eastern European Network of QA Agencies, **Germany**;
- Bath Spa University , **United Kingdom**;
- Institute of Art, Design and Technology, **Ireland**;
- Katholieke Hogeschool Sint-Lieven, **Belgium**;
- Adam Mickiewicz University, **Poland**;
- Koblenz-Landau University, **Germany**.

Partners from other countries:

Armenia:

- Armenian National Students' Association;
- Ministry of Education and Science;
- National Centre for Professional Education Quality Assurance;
- Republican Union of Employers of Armenia;
- Yerevan State Academy of Fine Arts;
- Yerevan State Medical University.

Russia:

- Moscow State Humanitarian University;
- Northern (Arctic) Federal University;
- Volga State University of Technology;
- The National Centre of Public Professional Accreditation;
- Russian Student Union;
- Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs;
- Ministry of Education and Science in Russia.

PART 1

ALIGNING ACADEMIC PROGRAMMES AND QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEMS WITH EUROPEAN AND NATIONAL QUALITY FRAMEWORKS

1.1 Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this Report is to provide a summary account of the work and findings of the ALIGN project in Ukraine in order to support the development of its higher education sector. The Report is therefore written to inform and advise a variety of stakeholders. These include senior managers, academic leaders, professional services (notably quality assurance staff) and student unions within the country's universities, and the relevant ministries, quality assurance agencies, student and employer organisations and other public bodies that have national responsibilities within the sector.

1.2 The Aims of Alignment

Within the ALIGN project, the aim of «Alignment» has been to support selected universities in the development of their academic programmes and quality assurance procedures so that these can be seen to meet European and national standards (European and National Qualifications Frameworks: EQF and NQF). This means that academic programmes are designed, delivered and developed within a university in ways that conform to the European and national frameworks, and that each university has clear and effective quality assurance systems to ensure that the design, approval, monitoring, support and development of its academic programmes complies with national and European requirements.

The key elements of Alignment (based upon the use of appropriate qualifications for awards at various levels, student-centred education, learning outcomes, credit accumulation and mobility, institutional responsibilities for quality assurance, etc.) are relatively straightforward. However, the processes of Alignment are often challenging for any university; involving both technical changes (as the use of common nomenclature for awards) conceptual changes (as in understanding student-centred learning) and cultural changes (as in the developing a university community in which everyone has a role and responsibility for maintaining and improving the quality of courses). Even so, as Alignment is achieved it brings many benefits.

1.3 The Benefits of Alignment

For students:

- Introducing student-oriented approach to training and teaching based on achievement of learning outcomes;
- a stronger focus throughout the university on increasing student learning opportunities, enriching student learning experiences, and raising the value of learning outcomes;
- a greater understanding and international recognition of achievements (in academia, professions and employers);
- transparency and fairness of assessment of learning outcomes;
- enforcement of students' role in the development and evaluation of their courses and learning environment;
- greater opportunities for national / international exchange and mobility;

- providing information support to students and increase of the level of transparency of academic programmes through the development of handbooks;
- acquiring qualification that will allow graduates to continue their studies or confidently enter the labor market and start to build a successful career;
- facilitating the transition from education to life-long learning.

For staff:

- active participation in development and monitoring of academic programmes;
- focus on student learning outcomes, more opportunities to introduce innovation teaching methods;
- a clear understanding that each element of an AP should provide for achievement of its objectives and intended LOs;
- possibility to select an effective teaching strategy focused at intended LOs, define methods and forms of training, pick supportive technologies necessary for development of agreed competences;
- greater support for continuous professional development, recognition of professionalism and opportunities to innovate in teaching and learning;
- the possibility of forming interdisciplinary educational programs and new courses;
- for non-academic staff – development of professional competences in the field of quality assurance system using modern methods and tools, best European standards;
- understanding of the priority and importance of learning outcomes in organization of educational activity;
- large-scale involvement of staff to the procedures of internal quality assurance.

For universities:

- ability to ‘internationalise’ the university community; through staff and student recruitment, internationalisation of the curriculum, dual degrees, joint research projects, etc.;
- increased efficiency and effectiveness (educationally and economically) in the management and delivery of educational services of the university;
- greater ethical security in all teaching learning and student assessment processes, based upon transparency and collegiate responsibility for quality;
- enforcement of interaction between HEIs and labour market by means of involving employers in the processes of design, monitoring and review of academic programmes;
- harmonization of the interests of external and internal stakeholders while designing the academic programme;
- facilitating development of the internal quality assurance system;
- promotion recognition of competencies acquired as a result of the non-formal/informal education;
- driving up the demand for educational services of certain academic programmes in a certain HEI.

For the sector:

- establishing correspondence and relevance of the national education qualification system to other foreign counterparts and, above all, the European Qualification Frameworks;
- stylization of educational and professional standards regarding the level, quality and scope of knowledge, skills and abilities of students that will allow them get employed according to the acquired professional qualification recognized by the competent authority;
- higher international esteem for the quality of the country's universities;
- increased public and employer confidence in the work and value of the higher education sector;
- promotion of European culture of quality assurance and enhancement in the national higher educational system;
- increasing the level of internationalization of national higher education system on the base of effective and sustainable partnership between Ukrainian and foreign HEIs;
- strengthening connections between key national stakeholders of higher education on different levels of the system both in academic environment and also with the Ministry of Education and Science, student environment and labour market;
- facilitating development of proper and clear criteria for the procedures of external evaluation and accreditation and licensing.

For applicants:

- providing information support to students and increase of the level of transparency of academic programmes through the development of handbooks;
- a more clear picture on the possibilities for employment according to the developed competences;
- providing information on the possibilities of academic mobility in frames of a particular academic programme.

1.4 The Key Challenges of Alignment

Throughout its work, the ALIGN project has identified and addressed many of the opportunities for Alignment, both within academic programmes and faculties, and at institutional level, particularly with regard to the development of sound institutional policies and practices in quality assurance. From this work, it is possible to identify a number of key challenges that need to be tackled at institutional and national levels if Alignment and its benefits are to be fully realised.

At institutional level, the key challenges are:

- absence of the legal and regulatory support at the level of HEIs regarding the involvement of stakeholders to the procedures of design and review of academic programmes;
- conservative approaches to design of academic programmes based on available human resources;
- passive attitude of students towards university internal quality assurance system in general and the procedures of APs review in particular;
- low level of the development of the internal quality assurance system, partial introduction of mechanisms of cooperation with external stakeholders;

- absence of experience on the design of APs according to the requirements and recommendations of European Standards and Guidelines (ESG 2015).

At national level, the key challenges are:

- incompleteness of the formation of the new legislation in educational sphere in general and in higher education in particular, which leads to increase of uncertainty of the educational environment;
- absence of the approved procedure of the external evaluation of the quality assurance system of the higher education;
- frequent review of the criteria and indicators of the licensing of the educational activity, their orientation towards the quantitative standards;
- mainly, declarative nature of the NQF, the absence of the convergent tools for the National Classification of the Occupations and the training fields, a number of terms and concepts are used in other interpretation in the EQF;
- absence of the clear external guidelines for the programme design (sectoral qualifications framework, higher education standards, professional standards, etc.);
- absence of the procedures, recommendations and principles of the academic programmes' accreditation coherent with international standards;
- absence of the clear recommendations concerning the creation, development and the improvement of the internal system of the universities' educational activities quality ensuring;
- insufficient understanding by the employers their part in ensuring the quality of the educational activity of the universities and academic programmes;
- low level of the employers' ability to formulate clear requirements concerning the alumni's competencies;
- lack of the awareness and low activity of the students organizations and units concerning the possibility of participation in quality assurance;
- insufficient development of the feedback mechanisms with stakeholders.

1.5 Recommendations for Strategic Development

From the work and findings of the ALIGN project, the main recommendations for the strategic development of Alignment:

at national level:

REC 1: Given the massification and internationalisation of higher education and the increasing competition, the European dimension of quality assurance should be further promoted in Ukraine. This will be enhancing the performance and attractiveness of Ukrainian HEIs. Instruments such as the ESG 2015, the European Quality Assurance Register (EQAR), EQF and the Dublin Descriptors, the coordinated collaboration at the European level (ENQA and the E4 group) and the related international and national projects will be of utmost importance to create transparency and advance quality in Ukrainian higher education. The outreach and publicity of these instruments should be strengthened, including all levels of quality assurance, i.e. MESU, national QA agency, universities (especially quality assurance units), faculties and study programmes.

REC 2: Support the creation of a quality culture in HEIs. The proper emergence of a quality culture at university level may become the key for quality and competitiveness of the Ukrainian higher education sector. Quality in Ukrainian higher education will only become sustainable if appropriate organisational structures are set up within the institutions responsible for education provision.

REC 3: Facilitate quality assurance approaches responding to the rapidly changing higher education landscape. The Ukrainian quality assurance frameworks and systems need to react to the challenges and trends in higher education, such as life-long learning, massive open online courses, e-learning, the increasing focus on LOs, and cross-border education, to name a few. To respond to those changes, it is advisable to further include representatives of HEIs in the political dialogue on quality assurance.

REC 4: Intensification of work on the formation of a national system of QA. In this regard, we recommend the national authorities involved in the formation of QA systems:

- enforce full implementation of the NQF according to internally adopted work plan;
- to conduct information work on the basis of which to make certain that all stakeholders involved understand why the NQF is needed and what its particular benefits are;
- focus on communication with and involvement of all relevant stakeholders (HEIs, students, employers, QA experts and alumni etc.);
- prepare all documents in both the national language and a widely understood foreign language (English);
- ensure that national quality assurance mechanisms are in line with European Standards and Guidelines and that they form part of the NQF.

REC 5: To review of the official titles of awards to match the standard international nomenclature for such awards at various levels. Particularly, to regulate formal / regulatory differentiation between Bachelor of Arts (BA) and Bachelor of Science (BSc), Master of Arts (MA) and Master of Science (MSc) awards in Ukraine. From a European perspective, the national-level Bachelors and Masters Award titles will need to be clarified. The differentiation between BA and BSc, MA and MSc is generally a useful and conventional one in most EC countries, taking Arts, Humanities and some Social Sciences away from Scientific Councils, Commissions and government advisory bodies.

REC 6: To facilitate mobility and to meet the needs and recognise the achievements of some students who may be unable to complete the full Bachelors or Master's degree, should consider providing students with the opportunity to exit the programme with a Certificate of Education or a Diploma, based on their attainment of the necessary number of ECTS (European Community Course Credit Transfer System) at Bachelors or Masters Level.

at institutional level:

REC 1: HEIs should ensure that teaching and learning has to be integrated into the European policies, strategies and recommendations for the modernisation of teaching and learning.

REC 2: HEIs should ensure the use of terminology in accordance with European standards in all internal documents.

REC 3: HEIs, academic and administrative staff should be actively involved in the development of NQF and subject specific frameworks (benchmarks/standards).

REC 4: HEIs should be actively looking for involvement of educational standards; otherwise, somebody else will prepare standards for them.

REC 5: HEIs good and bad practices, experience of national and international partner universities should be taken into consideration, using benchmarking.

REC 6: HEIs should provide that key principles of alignment, programme development and QA feed into their new strategic plans.

REC 7: HEIs should develop a policy on Staff Training and Development. Staff training and development (especially ongoing and continuous pedagogical development) needs to be prioritised in Strategic Plan. Experts recommend more professional training, especially structured pedagogical training in modern Learning, Teaching and Assessment methods. Universities should organize special trainings, informational seminars, workshops to the academic staff for better understanding and right use of NQF, modern curricula development principles and new accreditation / external evaluation criteria.

REC 8: HEIs should create unit responsible for implementation of NQF and subject specific frameworks (benchmarks, standards) for all academic programs should be identified (QA Department / Team, Programme team, Department of Academic Affairs, Faculty administration etc.).

REC 9: HEIs should continue development of the Internal QA and Enhancement systems (at university and programme / faculty levels), to establish clear principles, regulations and processes to ensure and promote the Alignment of its academic programmes. The quality systems shall not be too much «top-down». There is too much focus on quality control and management, rather than quality improvement

REC 10: HEIs should provide that all stakeholders, academic staff, students, international experts, social partners and employers, business and industry representatives involved in redesigning academic programme and curricula according to NQF and subject specific frameworks (benchmarks / standards).

REC 11: HEIs should create networks in which they can co-operate on aims of the programmes, programmes and module learning outcomes, module descriptor with employers, national authorities, QA experts, students, and alumni.

REC 12: HEIs should provide that linkages with stakeholders would need to be clearly explained in documentation. Clear university policies, procedures and regulations would need to be shown to demonstrate how employers might inform assessment procedures, how and when employers would suggest amendments to university programmes, and how the University and the programme teams would respond to such employer advice. It will also be helpful to evidence examples of formal contractual agreements (or memorandum of understanding) with employers and industry.

REC 13: HEIs should create mechanisms and procedures for feedback on the programme. This system needs to be clarified, so that each lecturer and each student clearly understands what needs to be done to improve the students' academic performance and so that feedback, especially on formative tasks, is distributed back to all students in a regular, routine, clear and timely fashion.

REC 14: The HEIs should provide the development of more student choice and flexibility of study / modules, at least within academic programmes and fields of study, and possibly more

widely. At the current time, elective courses are not really elective; this should be improved at the university level with generic skills courses (e.g., entrepreneurship). Additional foreign languages should exist as electives.

REC 15: HEIs should the enrichment of the educational experience of students (and their academic and career opportunities) primarily through greater internationalisation of the student cohorts. The students clearly, strongly and unanimously advocated this. In connection with this, universities need to develop a strategic plan for the internationalisation of teaching and learning, create incentives for and provide support to academics to internationalise curricula and their practices of teaching and learning.

at programme team level:

REC 1: The programme team must work to map the programme to the EQF and the Dublin Descriptors.

REC 2: The programme team in programme design and approval should pay attention to the following points:

- the titles of the programme must be better connected with the programme content and mission;
- simplifying the program aims and LOs is recommended. Programmes could enhance its internationalization through clear articulation of its programme aims;
- students assessment system should be adjusted to LOs indicated in APs. A major review of the University's assessment system has to ensure that all summative assignments / tasks are clearly identified (distinguished from formative exercises / tasks) and testing students' attainment of LOs at module level within the academic programmes. The assessment and testing system need to be adapted to the real LOs assessment;
- students and stakeholders are to be really involved in programme design and approval;
- students, including part-time students, should be better informed of results of surveys, as well as the use of the findings;
- credits are properly connected to courses but there is no real determination of student workloads. Whilst some aspects of ECTS are well understood, recommend future student study load measurement.

REC 3: The programme team should provide information transparency of the APs. The Programme Handbook (owned by the programme team) should be a central component in the distribution of accurate, transparent programme information. Programme Handbooks be developed and published as soon as possible, and clear QA policies should guide the updating, development and regular (perhaps annual) re-publication of such Handbooks.

REC 4: Programme information is also should provide through the University website, which should be updated and improved, the information about academic programme and curricula must to be up-to-date.

1.6 Key Resources

1) A Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area. Bologna Working Group on Qualifications Frameworks. – Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation. –

February 2005 [Electronic resource]. – URL: www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/050218_QF_EHEA.pdf.

2) Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region. – Lisbon, 11 June 1997. [Electronic resource] – URL: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13522&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

3) International Standard Classification of Education. ISCED 2011 / UNESCO. [Electronic resource] – URL : <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/isced-2011-en.pdf>.

4) International Standard Classification of Education: Fields of Education and Training 2013. ISCED-F 2013 / UNESCO. [Electronic resource] – URL: <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/isced-37c-fosreview-222729e.pdf>.

5) The European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (EQF). – European Communities, 2008. [Electronic resource]. – URL: www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/news/EQF_EN.pdf.

6) Dublin descriptors for short cycle, first cycle, second cycle and third cycle awards [Electronic resource]. – URL: www.nvao.com/system/files/pdf/Dublin%20Descriptors_1.pdf.

7) Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2015). [Electronic resource]. – URL: http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf.

8) ECTS Users' Guide [Electronic resource] – URL: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/library/publications/2015/ects-users-guide_en.pdf.

9) Tuning educational structures in Europe, TUNING [Electronic resource] – URL: www.unideusto.org/tuningeu. (for familiarization with special (professional) competencies and examples of standards).

10) Guidelines for Quality Enhancement in European Joint Master Programme [Electronic resource] – URL: www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/EMNEM_report.1147364824803.pdf.

11) European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes. October 2014 (endorsed by the BFUG, subject to approval by EHEA ministers) [Electronic resource] – URL: www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/European_Approach_QA_of_Joint_Programmes_endorsedByBFUG.pdf

12) The UK Quality Code for Higher Education [Electronic resource] – URL: www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code.

13) Quality Assurance Agency in Higher Education (QAA). [Electronic resource] – URL: <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en>. (for familiarization with the standards of forming an internal quality system for HEIs and UK Quality Assurance Agency's subject benchmark) // <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/information-and-guidance/publication?PubID=2958#.V5IZVNKU3cs>

14) Довідник користувача 2015 р. (переклад українською мовою) [Електронний ресурс] – URL: <https://naps.gov.ua/ua/press/announcements/860/>.

15) Стандарти і рекомендації щодо забезпечення якості в Європейському просторі вищої освіти (неофіційний переклад українською мовою) [Електронний ресурс] – URL:

http://www.enqa.eu/indirme/esg/ESG%20in%20Ukrainian_by%20the%20British%20Council.pdf.

16) Розроблення освітніх програм. Методичні рекомендації / Авт. В.М.Захарченко, В.І.Луговий, Ю.М.Рашкевич, Ж.В.Таланова. – К., 2014. – 120 с.

17) Електронний ресурс доступний за посиланням: https://ihed.org.ua/images/biblioteka/rozroblennya_osv_program_2014_tempus-office.pdf.

18) Методичні рекомендації для розроблення профілів ступеневих програм, включаючи програмні компетентності та програмні результати навчання. – К., 2016. – 80 с.

Електронний ресурс доступний за посиланням: <http://erasmusplus.org.ua/korysna-informatsiia/korysni-materialy/category/3-materialy-natsionalnoi-komandy-ekspertiv-shchodo-zaprovadzhennia-instrumentiv-bolonskoho-protseesu.html>.

19) Рашкевич Ю.М. Методичні рекомендації щодо опису освітньої програми в контексті нових стандартів вищої освіти [Електронний ресурс] – URL:erasmusplus.org.ua/korysna-informatsiia/korysni-materialy/category/3-materialy-natsionalnoi-komandy-ekspertiv-shchodo-zaprovadzhennia-instrumentiv-bolonskoho-protseesu.html.

20) Рашкевич Ю.М. Методичні рекомендації щодо опису освітньої програми в контексті нових стандартів вищої освіти: принципи та механізми забезпечення вибору навчальних дисциплін [Електронний ресурс] – URL:erasmusplus.org.ua/korysna-informatsiia/korysni-materialy/category/3-materialy-natsionalnoi-komandy-ekspertiv-shchodo-zaprovadzhennia-instrumentiv-bolonskoho-protseesu.html.

21) Луговий І.В. Розроблення та імплементація освітніх програм у рамках системи забезпечення якості [Електронний ресурс] – URL:erasmusplus.org.ua/korysna-informatsiia/korysni-materialy/category/3-materialy-natsionalnoi-komandy-ekspertiv-shchodo-zaprovadzhennia-instrumentiv-bolonskoho-protseesu.html.

22) Захарченко В.М. Розроблення освітніх програм на основі стандартів вищої освіти: досвід та проблемні питання [Електронний ресурс] – URL:erasmusplus.org.ua/korysna-informatsiia/korysni-materialy/category/3-materialy-natsionalnoi-komandy-ekspertiv-shchodo-zaprovadzhennia-instrumentiv-bolonskoho-protseesu.html.

23) Національний освітній глосарій: вища освіта / 2-е вид., перероб. і доп. / авт.-уклад. : В. М. Захарченко, С. А. Калашнікова, В. І. Луговий, А. В. Ставицький, Ю. М. Рашкевич, Ж. В. Таланова / За ред. В. Г. Кременя. – К. : ТОВ «Видавничий дім «Плеяди», 2014. – 100 с.

Internal regulatory framework of the TSNUK:

24) Program of activities on higher education quality assurance at TSNUK (adopted by the Academic Council of the University on 07.10.2011) [Electronic resource] – URL: nmc.univ.kiev.ua/doc.htm (Documents for 2011/2012 study year, №7)

25) Development program of TSNUK for 2012-2020. [Electronic resource] – URL: science.univ.kiev.ua/documents/rozvytok/Progran_Univ_2020.pdf

26) The concept of educational activity of TSNUK (adopted by the Academic Council of the University on 06.10.2014) [Electronic resource] – URL:nmc.univ.kiev.ua/docs/Kontseptsia.pdf

27) Temporary provisions "On the procedure for implementing students of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv under right to the free selection of academic disciplines" (01.03.2016) [Electronic resource] – URL: nmc.univ.kiev.ua/docs/Poloz_viln_vub_224-32.pdf

28) Order of the Rector of the of TSNUK "On introducing educational and informational process of describing the educational-professional (educational-scientific) program, structural requirements for the information package, forms of the curriculum of the discipline and forms of presentation of information on qualifications Scientific and pedagogical worker " (August 11, 2017, No. 729-32) APPENDICES 1-7 (Documents for 2016/2017 study year, №1) [Electronic resource] – URL:nmc.univ.kiev.ua/docs/Nakaz_Form_Doc-729-32_11-08-2017.pdf

Internal regulatory framework of the KhNU:

29) Положення про індивідуальний навчальний план студента (adopted by the Academic Council of the University on 29.09.2015) [Electronic resource] – URL: www.khnu.km.ua/root/res/700-100-49-8.pdf.

30) Положення про відрахування, переривання навчання, поновлення і переведення здобувачів вищої освіти (adopted by the Academic Council of the University on 26.03.2015) [Electronic resource] – URL: www.khnu.km.ua/root/res/700-100-49-1.pdf.

31) Положення про участь здобувачів вищої освіти у процедурах забезпечення якості освітньої діяльності та вищої освіти у Хмельницькому національному університеті (adopted by the Academic Council of the University on 29.09.2016) [Electronic resource] – URL: khnu.km.ua/root/res/pol11.pdf.

32) Положення про систему внутрішнього забезпечення якості освітньої діяльності та вищої освіти у Хмельницькому національному університеті (adopted by the Academic Council of the University on 29.09.2016) [Electronic resource] – URL: www.khnu.km.ua/root/res/pol22.pdf.

33) Положення про порядок вільного вибору навчальних дисциплін студентами Хмельницького національного університету (adopted by the Academic Council of the University on 26.06.2017) [Electronic resource] – URL: khnu.km.ua/root/res/509.pdf.

Internal regulatory framework of the SSU:

34) Regulation on the organization of the educational process at Sumy State University"(Rector's order № 0452-I from June 22, 2016) [Electronic resource] – URL:<http://sumdu.edu.ua/ukr/general/normative-base.html?task=kind=3>.

35) The quality assurance system of education and quality of higher education SSU» (Rector Edict № 0452 from June 22, 2016) [Electronic resource] – URL: [URL:http://sumdu.edu.ua/ukr/general/normative-base.html?task=kind=3](http://sumdu.edu.ua/ukr/general/normative-base.html?task=kind=3).

36) SSU Guidelines «Aligning academic programmes with European and national quality frameworks» [Electronic resource] – URL: [URL:http://sumdu.edu.ua/ukr/general/normative-base.html?task=kind=3](http://sumdu.edu.ua/ukr/general/normative-base.html?task=kind=3).

37) Guidelines «General requirements to structure, content and profiling of study programmes» [Electronic resource] – URL: [URL:http://sumdu.edu.ua/ukr/general/normative-base.html?task=kind=3](http://sumdu.edu.ua/ukr/general/normative-base.html?task=kind=3).

38) Guidelines «General requirements to structure, content and design of handbooks of study programmes» [Electronic resource] – URL: [URL:http://sumdu.edu.ua/ukr/general/normative-base.html?task=kind=3](http://sumdu.edu.ua/ukr/general/normative-base.html?task=kind=3).

1.7 Key Contacts

№	HEIs	List of persons	E mail addresses	Field of expertise
1	TSNUK	<p>Volodymyr Zaslavskiy, Professor, Doctor of Science, Professor Faculty of Computer Science and Cybernetics</p>	<p>zas@unicyb.kiev.ua</p>	<p>System analysis of the problems of higher education, development of APs, informatization of educational processes and APs in the TSNUK</p>
		<p>Andrii Gorbachyk, Associate Professor, Dean of the Faculty of Sociology</p>	<p>a.gorbachyk@ gmail.com</p>	<p>Development of APs, monitoring and analysis of the QA of APs in TSNUK.</p>
		<p>Andrii Gozhyk, Director of Scientific Educational and Methodological Center at the TSNUK, PhD in Geology, Associate Professor, Department of Mineralogy, Geochemistry and Petrography</p>	<p>andriy.gozhyk@ gmail.com</p>	<p>Development and implementation of the NQF, a competent approach, internal and external QA system in TSNUK and Ukraine, analyses of APs</p>
		<p>Anatoliy Garmash, Department of labor potential and corporate social responsibility of the Federation of Employers of Ukraine (FEU)</p>	<p>garmash@fru.org.ua</p>	<p>Implementation of a system of independent socio- professional accreditation in HEI, the organization of the participation of stakeholders: employers, students, the educational community and the state in the design, revision and accreditation of Aps in the FEU</p>
		<p>Olga Yamkova, Scientific and Methodological Center TSNUK</p>	<p>olgayamkova@ gmail.com</p>	<p>Monitoring the quality of APs, harmonization of APs based on the standards of the EU and Ukraine in TSNUK</p>
2	KhNU	<p>Svitlana Grygoruk, Candidate of Sciences in Pedagogics, Associate Professor of the Department of Applied Mathematics and Social Informatics</p>	<p>grygoruk.svitlana@ gmail.com</p>	<p>Development of Educational Programmes Internal Quality Assurance systems procedures Developing Questionnaires for Student</p>
		<p>Serhii Matiukh, Candidate of Sciences in Economics, Vice- rector for educational and pedagogical work</p>	<p>matuh@meta.ua</p>	<p>Internal Quality Assurance system procedures</p>
		<p>Oleh Savenko, Candidate of technical sciences, Dean of the faculty of programming, computer and telecommunication systems</p>	<p>savenko_oleg_st@uk r.net</p>	<p>Establishing cooperation with stakeholders. Developing information technology to support student centred learning</p>
		<p>Pavlo Grygoruk, Doctor of Sciences in Economics, Head of the Department of Automated Systems and modelling in</p>	<p>violete@ukr.net</p>	<p>Development of Educational Programmes Internal Quality Assurance system procedures</p>

№	HEIs	List of persons	E mail addresses	Field of expertise
		economic		
		Larysa Liubokhynets , Candidate of Sciences in Economics Head of Learning and Methodical Department, KhNU	lubohinets@ukr.net	Monitoring of Educational Programmes. Internal Quality Assurance procedures
3	SSU	Volodymyr Yuskaiev , Candidate of technical sciences, Head of the organization-methodic Department	v.yuskaiev@gmail.com	Development of the quality assurance system of educational activity and higher education at SSU. Controlling the process of design, monitoring and review of Aps. Accreditation of Aps.
		Kostyantyn Kyrychenko , Head of the International Affairs Office	info@dir.sumdu.edu.ua	Internationalization of APs and curricula. Organization of academic degree and credit mobility
		Iryna Skliar , Candidate of Sciences in Economics, Head of the Educational Department	i.skliar@finance.sumdu.edu.ua	Procedures and documentation management ensuring processes of design, approval, monitoring a review of APs.
		Olena Kryklii , Candidate of Sciences in Economics, Deputy Head of the Educational Department	o.kryklii@uabs.sumdu.edu.ua	Documentation management of APs. Securing information transparency of APs.
		Olha Liuta , Candidate of Sciences in Economics, Head of the Bureau for quality assurance of educational activity and quality of higher education	o.liuta@uabs.sumdu.edu.ua	Development of the quality assurance system of educational activity and quality of higher education at SSU. Monitoring of the quality of educational activity and higher education. Conduction of student surveys

PART 2
NATIONAL REPORT ON THE WORK AND FINDINGS OF THE ALIGN PROJECT

2.1 Introduction

List of universities and other partners in Ukraine:

- Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv;
- Khmelnytsky National University;
- Sumy State University;
- Ukrainian Association of Student Self- government;
- Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs of Khmelnytsky region;
- Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine.

List of academic programmes undertaking Alignment:

HEIs	Pilot APs	Level
TSNUK	Social Informatics (Business Informatics)	Master
	Methods of Empirical Sociological Research	Master
KhNU	Economic cybernetics	Master
	Applied mathematics	Bachelor
SSU	Management of Organizations and Administration	Master
	Computer mechanics	Master

2.2 The Peer Review Process

In frames of the corresponding workpackage of the project, an operational plan for all activities related to external evaluation of APs according to European standard procedures was designed and implemented.

Summary of the aims and processes

Processes	Aims and short description	Dates of activities
1.Documentation (Selection of APs, their revision to align with European and national frameworks).	To ensure that evaluation panels have the documentation that they need to conduct their review each HEI had to provide the following set of four documents: Programme Descriptors The Self Evaluation Document (SED) Information about Quality Assurance The National Qualifications Framework A more detailed description is given in 2.6 of this document	15.02.-30.04. 2016
2.Desk review (This involves	The panels had to undertake desk-reviews of the two APs and the	01.05-01.06.16

<p>setting up peer-review panels of EU and local experts to evaluate the achievement of alignment).</p>	<p>relevant (i.e., programme approval and review) quality assurance principles and processes in each HEI. Panels conducted their work in a professional manner, in accordance with European conventions for peer review of academic programmes. Each panel was chaired by one of the EU expert members: he/she will be responsible for the work of the panel and the production of the HEI report following desk review and site visit. Panels shared the review documents and (through their chair) agree, if they so choose, on any particular responsibilities that they would like any individual members to undertake.</p>			
<p>3.Site visit (a panel had to conduct its meetings during a site visit within one or two days)</p>	<p>During site-visits panels aimed to advise HEIs (through discussion and written report) on the nature and extent to which (a) the two selected academic programmes have been aligned with European (EHEA) standards and national qualification frameworks; (b) how far the HEI's quality assurance processes are aligned with European and national requirements and expectations; and (c) any recommendations that may help the HCI to further the alignment of its academic programmes and quality assurance processes with European and national standards. The time was expected to be allocated for (a) private meetings of the panel; (b) meeting with the leaders of each of the two academic programmes (and maybe their Heads of Department/Faculty); (c) meeting with all or various other members of the APC; (d) meeting with some current students or recent graduates from the two academic programmes; maybe a group of 3-6 students from different year-groups and demographics; (e) short meeting with some key staff responsible for quality assurance and enhancement at institutional and/or faculty levels.</p>	<p><u>SSU</u> 05- 07.06.16</p>	<p><u>KhNU</u> 08- 10.06.16</p>	<p><u>TSNUK</u> 12- 15.06.16</p>
<p>4.Report (The panel's report for each HEI (HEI Report) on its two APs and QA processes had to</p>	<p>For each piloted AP the panel developed a peer-review report with evaluations and recommendations for improvement. Besides, the three 'HEI Reports' were foreseen for each country to create a broader but</p>	<p>01.07-31.08.16</p>		

contain commendations and recommendations).	summary 'national overview' that could be used to help other universities, agencies and stakeholders in that country to see what has been achieved and what might be done to keep enhancing the design, delivery and quality assurance for academic programmes.			
5.Action plan	When the two APs and quality assurance processes have been peer reviewed at HEI, and the HEI has received its written report (HEI report), the HEI will be able to 'fine tune' its academic programmes and quality assurance processes, and plan the best way of supporting the wider implementation of Alignment within the institution.	<u>SSU</u> 01.09-01.10.2016 with further ammendments (Annex 4)	<u>KhNU</u> 19.09.2016	<u>TSNUK</u> 27.04.2017



Composition of Panels.

- Academic Programme Committees at Ukrainian Universities:

HEIs	APs	Members
TSNUK	Social Informatics (Business Informatics)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anatoly Anisimov, Dean Faculty of Cybernetics. • Elena Kashpur, Associate Prof., Vice Dean Faculty of Cybernetics. • Ludmila Omelchuk, Associate Prof., Deputy Head of Methodological Commission of the Faculty of Cybernetics. • Volodymyr Zaslavskiy, Head of Working Group ALIGN project at TSNUK, Professor of Department Mathematical Informatics. • Irina Rozora, Associate Professor Faculty of cybernetics. • Faculty of Cybernetics students: Maxim Dmitrov – PhD, Volodymyr Matviichenko – PhD, Vladislav Kolomiichenko – Master’s student, 2nd year, Natalia Tarasova – Master student of the Faculty of Cybernetics. • Pochebut Maxym, coordinator of education projects in EPAM Systems, stakeholders.
	Methods of Empirical Sociological Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrii Gorbachik, Dean Faculty of Sociology. • Tetyana Kuzmenko, Assoc. Prof., vice-Dean of the Faculty of Sociology responsible for education. • Alla Marchenko, Assoc. Prof., member of the working group of this Master's Program. • Faculty of Sociology students: Anastasya Mazurok - postgraduate student, former student of the Faculty of Sociology, graduated this master's program in 2014. • Tatiana Nikitina, PhD, stakeholders.
KhNU	Economic cybernetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mykola Skyba, Rector– Chairman. • Hanna Krasylnikova, Head Department of Internal Quality Assurance on Higher Education – Vice Chairman. • Iryna Romanets, Vice-chairman of the Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs of Khmelnytsky region, Chairman of the Association of employers of Khmelnytsky region. • Hanna Biliavska, graduate. • Anastasiia Petrychenko, current student. • Valentina Lukyanova, Head of Department of Economics and Business Enterprise.
	Applied mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mykola Skyba, Rector– Chairmen. • Hanna Krasylnikova, Head Department of Internal Quality Assurance on Higher Education – Vice Chairman. • Iryna Romanets, Vice-chairman of the Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs of Khmelnytsky region, Chairman of the Association of employers of Khmelnytsky region. • Roman Rusych, graduate. • Zagrab Avetyasian, current student. • Tatyana Govoruschenko, Associate Professor of Department of System Programming

HEIs	APs	Members
SSU	Management of Organizations and Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oleksandr Telizhenko, Head of the Department of management. • Vadym Lukianikhin, Ass. Prof. of the Department of Management, Head of the Department of practice and integration affairs with employers. • Olha Dreval, Deputy Head the Department of Management. • Olena Pavlenko, Ass. Prof. of the Department of Management. • Kostyantyn Kyrychenko, Assistant of the Department of Management. • Anastasiya Niesheva, Master student. • Maryna Shkurat, Graduate of the master programme «Management of organizations and administration» in 2015. • Andriy Antonenko, Head of the Department of organization-personnel work of Sumy city council.
	Computer mechanics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andriy Zahorulko, Ass. Prof. of the Department of General Mechanics and Dynamics of Machines. • Sergiy Gudkov, senior lecturer, Deputy Head of the Department. • Yevgen Savchenko, Ass. Prof. of the Department of General Mechanics and Dynamics of Machines. • Ivan Masalytyn, 1st year student of the master course in computer mechanics. • Alyona Khalyzeva, 2nd year student of the specialty "Dynamics and strength of machines". • Oleksandr Maksymenko, The Public Joint Stock Company "NASOENERGOMASH Pump & Power Engineering Works Sumy", Head of the calculation-experimental office.

- Peer-review panels (one for each HEI) included 3 EU experts, 2 locals experts, 1 student and 1 employer.

HEIs	Role	Members
TSNUK	EU experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Hyland (chair), Prof., Head of European and Postgraduate Development, Bath Spa University, Bath, England. • David Quin, Lecturer in the Faculty of Film, Art and Creative Technologies, Institute of Art Design and Technology, Dublin, Ireland. • Stefanie Lochbaum, Project Manager, Central and Eastern European Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (CEENQA), Dusseldorf, Germany.
	Locals experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrii Gozhik, PhD, Associate Professor, Director of the Scientific-Methodical Center of Educational process TSNUK. • Alexander Chernyak, Prof., Head of the Department of Economic Cybernetics, Faculty of Economics of the TSNUK.
	Student	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maksim Schedrolosev, Head of the Student Parliament of the Physics Department of the TSNUK.

HEIs	Role	Members
	Employer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anatoly Garmash, the Federation of Employers of Ukraine. The Department of Labor building, coordination and social responsibility.
KhNU	EU experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Hyland (chair), Prof., Head of European and Postgraduate Development, Bath Spa University, Bath, England. • David Quin, Lecturer in the Faculty of Film, Art and Creative Technologies, Institute of Art Design and Technology, Dublin, Ireland. • Stefanie Lochbaum, Project Manager, Central and Eastern European Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (CEENQA), Dusseldorf, Germany.
	Locals experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liubokhynets Larysa, Head of Learning and Methodical Department. • Yokhna Mykola, Vice-rector for International Relations.
	Student	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Khurkova Karyna, current student, Head of Student Board of Faculty of Programming, Computer and Telecommunication Systems.
	Employer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ivan Dunets, Chairman of the Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs of Khmelnytsky region, Chairman of the Association of employers of Khmelnytsky region.
SSU	EU experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul Hyland (chair), Prof., Head of European and Postgraduate Development, Bath Spa University, Bath, England. • David Quin, Lecturer in the Faculty of Film, Art and Creative Technologies, Institute of Art Design and Technology, Dublin, Ireland. • Stefanie Lochbaum, Project Manager, Central and Eastern European Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (CEENQA), Dusseldorf, Germany.
	Locals experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iryna Skliar, Head of the Educational Department. • Yuliia Shkodkina, Deputy Director of Training-Methodic Work, Oleg Balatsky Academic and Research Institute of Finance, Economics and Management.
	Student	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Darya Kolesnichenko, Student Rector, student of the Oleg Balatsky Academic and Research Institute of Finance, Economics and Management.
	Employer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Drozdenko, Employer Representative, Institute of Applied Physics of National Academy of sciences.

2.3 The Documentation for Peer Review of Alignment

Each HEI provided the following set of four documents (A-D).

A. Two «Aligned» Programme Descriptors. They contained:

- brief description of the programme; its history and place within the academic strategies and structure of the university, its students, staff, resources, etc.;
- a statement of the aims / goals of the programme: explain its academic / educational rationale, and its value to students in terms of their needs and aspirations and employability/careers;
- an outline of the structure of the programme; including the list of modules at each level, what is mandatory (required) and optional (elective), the mode of delivery (e.g., full / part time, online), the sequence of delivery, ECTS values, etc.;
- a matrix showing the alignment of module learning outcomes with the Programme Aims
- the Module Descriptors. These contained information about each module's level, LOs, teaching and learning activities, class contact hours, student assessment tasks (and their relationship to the module learning outcomes), ECTS awarded;
- programme-level QA Procedures: the key processes for monitoring (during course delivery: e.g., student consultations), evaluating (after the delivery of the course: e.g., end-of module questionnaires), and enhancing (acting upon data collected from monitoring and evaluation, and from the programme team's reflections: e.g., on student performance, new learning facilities, employment data, or professional association advice) to make changes that will enhance the quality of students' learning opportunities, experiences and outcomes in the future.

B. The Self Evaluation Document (SED).

The SED is central to the review process and should provide an evidence-based evaluation of the two academic programmes being reviewed. The SED contained:

1. *National, Institutional and Professional Contexts:*

- the National Context. An account of how the APs has addressed the main requirements of its NQF. Attention was be given here to elements of the NQF that do not appear to be consistent with European standards, or that have posed particular difficulties for the APs;
- the Institutional Context. An account of any additional academic requirements that the university demands for the approval / validation /re-approval of its programmes. (For example, if the university regulations state that all students must undertake a module in a foreign language, or that all students must undertake traditional unseen examinations, these things was be noted);
- the Professional Context. APs may be in subjects / fields that are governed by national professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (e.g., for the professional accreditation of Medicine, Engineering, Accountancy degrees). If this is the case, briefly summarise the requirements of that organisation and how the requirement is met in the relevant academic programme.

2. *Development of the Academic Programmes.* This should be an information of how the two APs have been developed within the HEI. It should include information about:

- how / why the two programmes were selected;
- a list of the main people (APC) who have been involved, their university roles, and their roles in the alignment process;
- a summary of how the APC has undertaken its work, and the key stages of development in aligning the academic programmes;
- a statement of the main challenges that have been faced within the HEI, and how (if possible) these have been addressed;
- a statement about the nature and impact of any actual changes that have been made to the delivery / operation of one or both of the programmes in the light of the ALIGN project;
- a statement about the nature and impact of any actual changes that have been made to the HEIs 'course approval and review' quality assurance processes in the light of the ALIGN project. (It may be that no changes have been made to date. But if changes have been made, please tell us about these and what you think the impact has been or might be);
- a short statement about any activities that have been undertaken by the APC to promote the wider implementation of alignment within the university.

3. Information about Students studying the programme, this should include:

- quantitative data on the two academic programmes: e.g., current student numbers, demographic data (ethnicity, gender, disability, age), entry standards, enrolments, course / study choices, progression rates, mobility, academic performance, post-award employment, international students;
- qualitative data, in the form of short statements that would help panel members to understand how the two academic programmes have been revised / aligned to provide learning opportunities, experiences and outcomes that address the nature and variety of future students' needs and aspirations.

4. Evidence of Academic Programme Alignment.

In this section provided evidence under each of the «ten indicators» of how the two academic programmes meet the «expectation» for programme alignment.

5. Evidence of Quality Assurance Alignment.

In this section provided evidence under each of the «ten indicators» of how the university meets the «expectation» for quality assurance alignment.

6. Advice for University Implementation of Alignment (optional).

A key aim of ALIGN is to develop the local knowledge and expertise needed to implement the alignment of academic programmes and quality assurance processes within each of the partner universities. It would help panel members to know what members of the APC think are the most practical and constructive steps that can be taken to advance the general progress of alignment in their own institution. Any advice included in this section of the SED will not form part of the panel's assessment of the alignment of the university's two academic programmes.

C. Information about Quality Assurance.

All of partner universities will have some documentation concerning the QA principles and processes that are applied for the approval and periodic review of the institution's APs. These documents may be in various stages of development, be in the form of a set of guidelines or regulations, or form part of a long-established QA system at the university.

D. The National Qualifications Framework.

This should be the official document, in the home language and with English translation of those sections which are relevant to the work of the panel.

2.4 The Measurement of Alignment

The following Indicators of good practice: Alignment of Academic Programmes were applied:

1. the AP are properly titled and lead to awards at the appropriate level, consistent with European and NQF for higher education qualifications, and the Dublin Descriptors;
2. the AP are informed by and consistent with professional / industry standards / requirements, where appropriate;
3. the aims of the AP are appropriate for the student intake, and can be realised through students' attainment of the programme / module LOs;
4. all LOs at module level are at the appropriate level, and are assessed through fair, valid and reliable student assignments / tests;
5. throughout their course of study, students are able to monitor their academic progress and development, and receive advice on how they can improve and enhance their work;
6. the teaching and learning activities employed within the modules are informed by reflection on professional practices, and designed to enable students to develop the knowledge, skills, abilities and professional competencies that will enable them to achieve the modules' LOs;
7. the structure of the programme ensures the progression of students' learning, and provides appropriate opportunities for student choice;
8. the credits ratings (national and ECTS) for modules are properly aligned with the designated student workloads for the modules;
9. students are provided with clear and current information about the learning opportunities and support available to them;
10. the design, delivery and monitoring of the APs is «student centred», engaging students collectively and individually as partners in the development, assurance and enhancement of their educational experiences (e.g., through effective representation of the student voice, discussions about opportunities for course enhancement, involvement in QA processes, and the monitoring and evaluation of student experiences).

Indicators of Good Practice: Alignment of Quality Assurance Processes.

1. there are clear criteria against which APs are assessed in the programme approval, monitoring and review processes;
2. the roles and responsibilities for programme design, development, approval and monitoring are clearly articulated;
3. students are involved in programme design and in the processes of programme development, approval, monitoring and review;
4. there are effective policies which ensure that the academic standards for credits and awards are rigorously maintained at the appropriate level, and that student performance is judged against these standards;
5. there are clear and effective policies and processes for assessing the recognition of prior learning and supporting student mobility between courses of study and institutions;

6. knowledge of professional standards / requirements and external expertise (e.g., from subject experts, employers and professional associations) is used to inform the design, development, approval and monitoring of APs;
7. there are appropriate arrangements to train and support academic and professional / administrative staff who are involved in the design, delivery, approval and monitoring of APs;
8. there are clear policies and processes in place to ensure the integrity of student assessment (e.g., through marking schemes, moderation processes, examination board regulations), and the effectiveness of these policies is regularly reviewed;
9. the policies and processes of programme design, development, approval and monitoring are regularly reviewed in order to ensure the effectiveness and continuous enhancement of current practices;
10. there are effective policies in place to ensure that staff appointed to teach and support student learning on APs are appropriately qualified, and that delivery of the programmes is supported by the appropriate learning resources.

2.5 The Findings of Peer Review

From the rigorous peer review of six academic programmes at three selected Ukrainian universities, it is evident that there are many commendable elements of Alignment that have been achieved. These may be used to support even greater Alignment within the selected universities, and to help guide and inspire other universities to work toward Alignment. The ALIGN project particularly commends:

TSNUK:

- the self-assessment report of TSNUK contains a good example of a module descriptor (course «Decision Making in Financial Mathematics») that could (with some small changes) be used as an excellent model by the programme team. During the discussion with the panel, it was agreed that there were too many (17) learning outcomes for this 3-credit module, but the key principles of module design were sound, and the panel was pleased to see that this module was designed and described in a way that conformed to European requirements (Annexe 2);
- in TSNUK students are provided with clear and current information about the learning opportunities and support available to them: 1) students have good access to the information that they need (e.g., through the University website, the electronic cabinet system, and meetings with teachers); it was also noted that there is special support for international motilities and internships within the Faculties; 3) information about the academic programme is clearly, accurately and attractively presented for variety of prospective students, international partners and external stakeholders;
- the way chosen by the university to show the possible relationships between Programme Aims (LOs), Suggested Teaching Strategies, and Possible Assessment Strategies, and these relationships ('constructive alignment') are central to a LOs approach to course design, delivery and assessment (as required in the European Qualifications Framework) (Annex 3).

KhNU:

- throughout their course of study, students of KhNU are able to monitor their academic progress and development, using the electronic system Moodle in the university. Furthermore, the students receive feedback on their examinations and how they can be improved;
- the electronic system as learning resource to showcase good practices and innovations is very commendable. For the enrolled students there are good ways to receive information about the study programmes, modules, assessment criteria and exam results.

SSU:

- the University's clear determination (as in its use of surveys of student opinion and experiences) to involve students and alumni as key partners in the development of its academic programmes and its quality assurance and enhancement activities;
- the development of the University's five-year scheme for staff review and development, particularly focusing on pedagogical innovation and the sharing of good practices.
- Introduction of councils of employers at the level of an academic programme or field of study to facilitate more effective interaction aimed at improvement of the AP quality.

Common to all universities:

- the constructive and friendly nature of the staff-student relationships in the academic programmes that have been reviewed;
- the quality of the HEIs engagement with industry and external employer stakeholders.

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation		
			quantitative	quality	
TSNUK	Master Programme in 'Social Informatics'	Set 1	Indicator 1	partly achieved	
			Indicator 2	largely achieved	Although, at present, there do not appear to be any nationally approved professional standards, the panel was pleased to see from the self-evaluation report and from discussions in several meetings during the site visit that there are well-established and effective links with industry, professional associations and the labour market for the SI programme, and that these appear to work well for students.
			Indicator 3	partly achieved	1. The record of student performance in terms of standards achieved and completion-rates for awards appears strong, and student employment <i>post</i> graduation also appears strong. 2. SI programme is in transition, having been substantially revised for the September 2016 student intake. The revised aims of the programme are clear, strong and appropriate for Masters students. The aims rightly include generic and applied skills and competencies as well as subject-specific knowledge and abilities. They also refer explicitly the importance of teamwork and creativity (innovation), and this is commendable. 3. Possible relationships were shown between Programme Aims, and these relationships ('constructive alignment') are central to a Learning Outcomes approach to course design, delivery and assessment (as required in the European Qualifications Framework).
			Indicator 4	not achieved	A good example ('Decision Making in Financial Mathematics') of a module descriptor that could (with some small changes) be used as an excellent model by the programme team.
			Indicator 5	largely achieved	Generally, the students were satisfied that they knew what they were expected to do for assessments, could monitor their own progress, and that most staff were often available to help them.
			Indicator 6	largely achieved	From discussions with staff and students the panel came to realise that students are offered a rich and varied range of learning activities and experiences (from many kind of teacher-led classes, to group-project work, internships, industry assignments, class presentations, seminars and tutorials, and even opportunities to work with staff and external partners on international projects, and events). Students clearly appreciate the variety of activities offered, and it appears that some experiences and activities can be tailored to meet students' individual needs and interests: this is wholly appropriate at Masters level and is commendable.
			Indicator 7	partly achieved	The SI programme is highly structured.
			Indicator 8	largely achieved	All modules within the SI programme have been allocated NQF and ECTS credit ratings, and these amount to 120 ECTS for completion of the Masters degree.
			Indicator 9	fully achieved	1. Students have good access to the information that they need (e.g., through the University website, the electronic cabinet system, and meetings with teachers). 2. It was also noted that there is special support for international motilities and internships within the Faculties. 3. Information about the educational programme is clearly, accurately and attractively presented for variety of prospective students, international partners and external stakeholders.
			Indicator 10	partly achieved	1. The quality of the relationships between staff and students on the programme: these appear to be cheerful, professional, friendly and constructive. Students appreciate the care that staff normally take not only in their teaching duties but in trying to help and support individual students both during and beyond their academic studies. 2. The students are being enabled to prepare presentations, lead classes on their own, suggest ideas for activities and improvements, and are involved in many kinds of group work. Informally, student opinion and experiences are taken in to account during course/module monitoring and evaluation processes, and there are formal systems (such the student parliament) through which the views and advice of students can expressed, and feedback on how this advice has been used to deliver enhancements is provided to the students. Students feel that they are consulted and listened to.
		Master Programme in Economic Cybernetics	Set 1	Indicator 1	partly achieved
			Indicator 2	partly achieved	During the site visit it emerged that there were working relations with industry/employers, and the internships were real and valued by students.

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation			
			quantitative	quality		
		Indicator 3	partly achieved	<p>1. The record of student performance in terms of standards achieved and completion-rates for awards appears strong, and student employment <i>post</i> graduation also appears strong.</p> <p>2. The aims of the programme are clear and appropriate for Masters students. The aims rightly include generic and applied skills and competencies as well as subject-specific knowledge and abilities. They also refer explicitly the importance of teamwork and creativity (innovation), and this is commendable.</p> <p>3. Some very helpful thinking has been done to show the possible relationships between Programme Aims (Programme Learning Outcomes), Suggested Teaching Strategies, and Possible Assessment Strategies, and these relationships ('constructive alignment') are central to a Learning Outcomes approach to course design, delivery and assessment (as required in the European Qualifications Framework).</p>		
		Indicator 4	not achieved			
		Indicator 5	largely achieved			
		Indicator 6	partly achieved	Students are offered a rich and varied range of learning activities and experiences (from many kind of teacher-led classes, to group-project work, internships, industry assignments, class presentations, seminars and tutorials. Students clearly appreciate the variety of activities offered, and it appears that some experiences and activities can be tailored to meet students' individual needs and interests: this is wholly appropriate at Masters level and is commendable.		
		Indicator 7	partly achieved			
		Indicator 8	largely achieved	All modules within the Sociology programme have been allocated NQF and ECTS credit ratings, and these amount to 120 ECTS for completion of the Masters degree. The ECTS credits are formally related to student workloads, though it should be noted that the class-contact time (teaching time) on most modules is significantly higher than for similar programmes in some EU countries.		
		Indicator 9	fully achieved	Students have good access to the information that they need (e.g., through the University website, the electronic cabinet system, and meetings with teachers), though the panel did not ask broader questions about information and support (e.g., for students with disabilities, or special learning needs) outside the context of the programme. It was also noted that there is special support for international nobilities and internships within the Faculties.		
		Indicator 10	partly achieved	The 'student survey' that has been developed within the Sociology Department. This a sophisticated and impressive survey of student opinion and experiences which may produce findings that can be used not only to assure academic and professional standards, but also to identify key topics and areas for improvement. The panel was impressed by this work and would strongly recommend its continued development and strategic use within the University.		
		For both APs	Set 2	Indicator 1	partly achieved	<p>1. TSNUK has regulations and a system of quality assurance for programme approval, monitoring, modification and review.</p> <p>2. Overall, the panel recommends that the key remits and criteria, stages, processes, decisions and responsibilities of various individuals and groups (and their membership) for the quality assurance of programmes should be presented in a summary flow chart</p>
				Indicator 2	partly achieved	There are a range of people and groups who have particular roles and responsibilities for programmes, and the panel appreciates that changes are currently being made. These changes appear to include more formal processes for informing and consulting with students, particularly about changes and improvements to programmes. This is to be commended, and it is recommended that the collection and analysis of useful data about students' learning opportunities, experiences, performance, needs and ideas for improvement should form a vital part of the process, alongside student representation on working groups and committees.
Indicator 3	partly achieved			The panel learned that there are plans to involve students and student opinion (e.g., as gathered through the 'student survey') more formally and actively in the programme quality assurance processes. The University may stipulate the requirements for this at faculty, department and programme levels.		
Indicator 4	partly achieved			From its meeting with students and alumni, the panel is pleased to report that students are confident that their work is assessed fairly, and they can gain advice about how to improve their work and grades. The procedures in place in cases of individual students' assessment failures, re-submissions/re-takes, and mitigating circumstances appear to work well (though the panel did not have time to test these procedures through a particular case).		
Indicator 5	partly achieved			The University/faculties have systems in place to promote and support student mobility within and outside Ukraine, and these appear to be working well and are greatly appreciated by students on the academic programmes.		
Indicator 6	largely achieved			<p>Programme teams and their departments have clearly developed and sustained strong relationships with employers and external professional groups over many years, and consulted with them about the design and delivery of courses.</p> <p>Good external industry/employer engagement is a genuine strength of the programmes (particularly of SI) and that there are some 'obligatory requirements' for such engagement at University or faculty levels.</p>		

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation	
			quantitative	quality
		Indicator 7	largely achieved	The University operates a five-year appraisal scheme (which may recognise an individual's international or external activities and courses) for all of its teachers, and a training programme for new/inexperienced teachers. Staff development is also supported by seminars organised by the University's scientific council, and about 75% of staff have evidently attended these seminars. Academic staff are able to apply for the 'Best Teacher of the Year' award, in recognition of their work and achievements. The award is granted by the Teaching Council which, we assume, includes student representatives and is informed by and researches student views
		Indicator 8	partly achieved	There are many University regulations and policies in place concerning the assessment of students and the determination of their final awards. Within the academic programmes, there are also 'work-plans' developed by each teacher at module level to record each student's progress and performance (in points for work completed) on the module, a system for checking/monitoring the grades awarded, and a 'hotline' that students can use if they wish to complain or appeal against particular grades that have been awarded.
		Indicator 9	partly achieved	1. There are many policies and processes at national, University and faculty levels are currently being developed, reviewed and revised. 2. Each Faculty has an administrative team that oversees (with programme curators) the quality assurance of programmes, and that these teams liaise with staff at University level.
		Indicator 10	largely achieved	University has policies and programmes in place that ensure the mandatory training of new teachers and the professional development of more experienced ones (e.g., for Masters teaching).

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation		
			quantitative	quality	
KhNU	Applied Mathematics for Bachelors Level	Set 1	Indicator 1	largely achieved	<p>This 'Applied Mathematics' programme is described in the documentation as a four-year Bachelors programme and conforms to Level 6 on the current Ukrainian NQF.</p> <p>The peer review panel would be confident that the programme is functioning at Bachelors level, with strong outcomes for graduates (although such outcomes need to be more clearly evidenced and explained in the SER documentation). More recently, the Applied Mathematics programme team have worked to map the programme to the European Qualifications Framework and the Dublin Descriptors, although this mapping would need to be explained in the SER documentation.</p> <p>Internationally, it is common to specify academic programme awards at 'Bachelor' level as Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Engineering, Bachelor of Arts, etc. However, these specifications are not mandatory in the European context. Generally, the degree programme award and title reflects its aims, learning outcomes and standards</p>
			Indicator 2	largely achieved	<p>Though there currently there are no nationally approved professional standards in Ukraine, the programme team took the requirements of educational and qualification characteristics of relevant professions and the classifier of occupations OC 003:2010 into account. Such mapping needs to be clearly evidenced and explained in the SER documentation.</p> <p>During the site visits it was stated that a complex employer-survey was carried out within the project. The findings as well as the processing and implementation of the survey need to be documented clearly. Nevertheless, the panel recognizes that a lot of work has been done in the engagement with industry and employers, which the students also confirmed.</p>
			Indicator 3	largely achieved	<p>In the self-report the aims for the academic programme are described. The panel found the programme aims not as attractive as they could be for the student intake, and it recommends simplifying them. Applicants should be encouraged to feel excited about the potentials and opportunities of participation on this programme, and its value to them in their lives and careers after graduation.</p> <p>The Programme Learning Outcomes are very detailed and represent a good start. The panel also recommends simplifying them for easier and more attractive presentation to current and prospective students.</p>
			Indicator 4	not achieved	<p>The Learning Outcomes-module matrix articulates the knowledge, skills and competencies that students can acquire in each module. However, this is not consistent with the module descriptors. Each module descriptor should show what the learning outcomes are, how these learning outcomes are assessed and what criteria for assessment are being used. Furthermore, there should be a clear differentiation between summative and formative assessments. The percentage statements of the summative assessments are missing.</p> <p>Learning Outcomes are the fundamental component of the western model of programme or course design. Programme documentation must clearly show the pedagogical link between the learning outcomes and the summative assessment tasks. The programme team needs to show in the pedagogy of the module, in the teaching and learning activities, what the student and the lecturer do in order to achieve the learning outcomes.</p> <p>During the site visit the panel also advised to align the terminology of the module descriptors closer to the European context (please relate to Annex 4). In the European context it is required to state which modules should be finished/achieved before progressing to the next module level.</p>
			Indicator 5	fully achieved	<p>During the site visit the panel learned that all students are able to monitor their academic progress using the electronic system Moodle in the university. Furthermore, the students receive feedback about their examinations and how they can improve. This is very commendable.</p>
			Indicator 6	partly achieved	<p>The site visit showed that a variety of teaching and learning activities is used in the modules. However, in the module descriptors a clear description of these activities and a close relation to the module learning outcomes was missing. The panel therefore recommends articulating the teaching and learning activities per module more clearly and showing a close correlation with the learning outcomes.</p> <p>For this study programme some links of opportunities for work-based learning were shown. In the SER the reflection on professional practices should be more clearly evidenced in future programme documentations.</p>
			Indicator 7	partly achieved	<p>The site visit showed that the students are satisfied with the progression of their learning.</p> <p>Regarding the claims about student choices, it was clear that there are no choices for the students up to this point and that the teachers make module choices for the students. A new Ukrainian law dictates that 25% of a programme must comprise of 'elective' modules, to be chosen by the student. Thus, during the discussion it was articulated by the programme managers that the programmes are in transition regarding the student choices. Essentially, 'real' opportunities for choice – the student selection of 'complementary' studies or the construction of individual student pathways were not available within the programme. The panel strongly recommends the clear articulation of options and providing the students with real choices</p>

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation		
			quantitative	quality	
		Indicator 8	partly achieved	Overall the panel found a good alignment to European standards for this indicator. It was noted that there are very small credit (ECTS) amounts for many modules. Some are divided into very small sections with 3 and 4 credits per module. The panel recommends adjusting these modules to bigger credit sections/modules according to European conventions.	
		Indicator 9	largely achieved	Overall the panel commends the electronic system which is fully implemented in the university. For the enrolled students there are good ways to receive information about the study programmes, modules, assessment criteria and exam results. The panel recommends offering a student programme handbook including clearly described programme aims, programme learning outcomes and other information which should also be publicly available. On the University's website there is only very little information in English available and no information on specific study programmes in English. In order to attract international students it is also recommended to have all relevant information about the study programme available on the University's website in English.	
		Indicator 10	partly achieved	Relationships between the lecturers and the students appears to be strong and students clearly feel that their lecturers care about them and are available (even after graduation) to provide guidance, advice and professional references – well done! During the meeting with the students it became clear, that student-centred learning is well implemented in the courses, though it is not well articulated in the documentation. The students are being enabled to prepare presentations, lead classes on their own, and are involved in many kinds of group work. According to the self-report, students are not involved in quality assurance and enhancement processes yet. The panel recommends implementing further the strategies that ensure that students are fully engaged in the design, review, monitoring and evaluation of their programmes	
	Economic Cybernetics for Masters Level	Set 1	Indicator 1	largely achieved	Internationally it is common to specify academic programme awards as Master of Science, Master of Engineering, Master of Arts, etc. However, these specifications are not mandatory in the European context. The learning outcomes for this programme are at Masters level.
			Indicator 2	largely achieved	Though currently there are no nationally approved professional standards in Ukraine, the programme team took requirements of educational and qualification characteristics of relevant professions and classifier of occupations OC 003:2010 into account. Such mapping needs to be clearly evidenced and explained in the SER documentation. During the site visit it was stated that a complex employer-survey was carried out within the project. The findings as well as the processing and implementation of these surveys were not well documented. Nevertheless, the panel recognizes that a lot of work has been done in to promote engagement with industry and employers, which the students also confirmed
			Indicator 3	partly achieved	In the self-report the aims for the academic programme are described. The panel found the programme aims not as attractive as they could be for the student intake, and it recommends simplifying them. Applicants should be encouraged to feel excited about the potentials and opportunities of participation on this programme, and its value to them in their lives and careers after graduation. The Programme Learning Outcomes represent a good start. However, they need improvement in terms of the terminology used. The word "skills", for example, is used far too excessively. Words should be differentiated according to the specific learning outcome. For Masters level, clearly differentiated LOs in comparison with a bachelors level should be formulated, deepening the skills, competencies and knowledge gained in a Bachelor programme. Presently, this is not the case. Moreover, the learning outcomes should overall be programme-specific. So far, the LOs are too generic and could be used for any kind of Masters. They need to be specifically written for Economic Cybernetics.
			Indicator 4	not achieved	The Learning Outcomes-module matrix articulates the knowledge, skills and competencies that students can acquire in each module. However, this is not consistent with the module descriptors. Each module descriptor should show what the learning outcomes are, how these learning outcomes are assessed and what criteria for assessment are being used. Furthermore, there should be a clear differentiation between summative and formative assessments. The percentage statements of the summative assessments are missing. Learning Outcomes are the fundamental component of the western model of programme or course design. Programme documentation must clearly show the pedagogical link between the learning outcomes and the summative assessment tasks. The programme team needs to show in the pedagogy of the module, in the teaching and learning activities, what the student and the lecturer do in order to achieve the learning outcomes. During the site visit the panel also advised to align the terminology of the module descriptors closer to the European context. In the European context it is required to state which modules should be finished/achieved before progressing to the next module level.
			Indicator 5	fully achieved	During the site visit the panel learned that all students are able to monitor their academic progress using the electronic system in the University. Furthermore, the students receive feedback about their assessments and examinations and how they can improve. This is very commendable.

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation				
			quantitative	quality			
			Indicator 6	partly achieved	The site visit showed that a variety of teaching and learning activities is used in the modules. However, in the module descriptors a clear description of these activities and a close relation to the module learning outcomes was missing. The panel therefore recommends articulating the teaching and learning activities per module more clearly and showing a close correlation with the learning outcomes. For this study programme some very commendable links to opportunities for work-based learning and engagement with employers and the industry were shown. In the SER the reflection on professional practices as well as the feedback cycle and implementation of criticism should be more clearly evidenced in future programme documentation		
			Indicator 7	partly achieved	The site visit showed that the students are satisfied with the progression of their learning. Regarding the claims about student choices, it was clear that there are no choices for the students up to this point and that the teachers make module choices for the students. A new Ukrainian law dictates that 25% of a programme must comprise of 'elective' modules, to be chosen by the student. Thus, during the discussion it was articulated by the programme managers that the programmes are in transition regarding the student choices. Essentially, 'real' opportunities for choice – the student selection of 'complementary' studies or the construction of individual student pathways were not available within the programme. The panel strongly recommends the clear articulation of options and providing the students with real choices		
			Indicator 8	partly achieved	Overall the panel found a good alignment to European standards for this indicator. It was noted that there are very small credit (ECTS) amounts for many modules. Some are divided into very small sections with 3 and 4 credits per module. The panel recommends adjusting these modules to bigger credit sections/modules according to European conventions.		
			Indicator 9	largely achieved	Overall the panel commends the electronic system which is fully implemented in the University. For the enrolled students there are good ways to receive information about the study programmes, modules, assessment criteria and exam results. The panel recommends offering a student programme handbook including clearly described programme aims, programme learning outcomes and other information which should also be publicly available. On the University's website there is only very little information in English available and no information on specific study programmes in English. In order to attract international students it is also recommended to have all relevant information about the study programme available on the University's website in English. The Programme Handbook (owned by the programme team) should be a central component in the distribution of accurate, transparent programme information.		
			Indicator 10	partly achieved	Relationships between the lecturers and the students appear to be strong and students clearly feel that their lecturers care about them and are available (even after graduation) to provide guidance, advice and professional references – well done! During the meeting with the students it became clear, that student-centred learning is well implemented in the courses, though it is not well articulated in the documentation. The students are being enabled to prepare presentations, lead classes on their own, and are involved in many kinds of group work. According to the self-report, students are not involved in quality assurance and enhancement processes yet. The panel recommends implementing further the strategies that ensure that students are fully engaged in the design, review, monitoring and evaluation of their programmes.		
			For both APs	Set 2	Indicator 1	partly achieved	In meetings during the site visit, it was evident that there are criteria for academic programme development. Even so, the panel was not shown written evidence of clear policies for approval, monitoring and review in English language. This is very much needed within the SER (e.g., the stages, processes, terms and responsibilities for approval, monitoring and review, step by step in a flow chart). What also needs to be documented within the SER are the procedures by which minor and major changes are made after an approval has been made.
					Indicator 2	partly achieved	During the site visit, it was made clear that roles and responsibilities are clearly articulated. Nevertheless, the panel was not offered written evidence of clear policies in English language. It needs to be clear who is responsible for which process/step/task within the approval, monitoring and review processes. Is there a team who regularly meets? If yes, how often and when? Who is consulted, and who makes decisions, and how are these decisions implemented?
					Indicator 3	not achieved	Despite the statement in the self-report that this indicator has not been achieved yet, the panel was informed that there are regular student surveys which are also part of the involvement of students in programme development. The students advised to add an open commentary section in this survey. The surveys should be designed to capture the range of student opinion and experiences, and to provide a basis for enhancement activities. There were no written evidences in English for this indicator and no evidences of analysis of the collected data. Also the implementation of changes and the feedback information to the students should be documented in the SER. Are these in place? What questions are asked? Who developed the questions? How (and why) were the questions developed? Crucially, who handled the answers, and what was done with those answers? Was the student voice heard and was it listened to? Were students satisfied that changes that had been made and that their voice had been listened to? These questions need to be addressed in the SER

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation	
			quantitative	quality
		Indicator 4	partly achieved	During the site-visit the panel was shown a document in Ukrainian which is meant to provide these policies. An English translation should have been provided. It is currently unclear how the University's academic standards for credits and awards are rigorously maintained at the appropriate level, and how student performance is judged against these standards. Academic standards are obviously high, but it is not at all clear what policies and procedures ensure the maintenance of academic standards, or how those policies or procedures function.
		Indicator 5	partly achieved	During the interview in the site visit it became evident that there are policies that enable student mobility but no policies for the accreditation of prior learning. There is a lack of evidence in English
		Indicator 6	partly achieved	In the self-report it is stated that the strategy 2016-2021 includes mechanisms for the cooperation with strategic partners from the employers' side. But there is also a lack of a translation into English of these mechanisms. In the SER it is stated that an employer survey has been conducted : 'The experience of external experts used occasionally. In particular, the within the project ALIGN, KhNU in cooperation with the Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs of Khmelnytskyi region in 2015 made survey of employers Khmelnytskyi region to identify the most important in their opinion general competencies of professionals. Results have been taken into account to develop aligned EPs. Which questions were asked? What were the results? Were the results analysed? How were they implemented by the academic programme teams? The SER lacks a clear documentation of the survey. Currently, the University has obviously started to consult employers, but it is as yet unclear as to how knowledge of professional standards/requirements and external expertise (e.g., from subject experts, employers and professional associations) will be used to inform the design, development, approval and monitoring of academic programmes.
		Indicator 7	partly achieved	During the meetings, the panel members had the impression that there are plenty of arrangements available in the university to train and support academic and professional/administrative staff. Something that was very obvious during the site visit was the limited English-language skills of some staff. The panel members strongly recommend developing the system for improvement of English skills of the staff (especially those who are involved in international projects and the writing of key programme documents and self-reports).
		Indicator 8	largely achieved	During the site visit it became evident that there are clear criteria for each assessment task of the students and that they are available beforehand to every student. Also the students are provided with feedback and comments on their assessed work. The panel recognizes this as a very good practice. In the self-report it was also stated that there are official university policies for student assessment. The panel should have been provided with more evidence of attainment of this indicator.
		Indicator 9	not achieved	Regulations are changed according to changes from the ministry. The policies of programme design, development, approval and monitoring do not appear to be regularly reviewed. The processes of programme design, development, approval and monitoring on the two programmes ('Applied Mathematics' and 'Economic Cybernetics') have been reviewed within the ALIGN project. Policies and processes of programme design, development, approval and monitoring must be regularly reviewed in order to ensure the effectiveness and continuous enhancement of current practices. It is suggested that such reviews are strictly scheduled – possibly reviewed in one year for a brand new (untried and untested) policy, once every three years for a standard policy, and once every five years for a well-established fundamental policy..
		Indicator 10	largely achieved	From what the panel has heard during its meetings and read in the self-report, there are policies in place to ensure that staff appointed to teach and support student learning are appropriately qualified. The electronic system as learning resource to showcase good practices and innovations is very commendable.

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators		Evaluation	
				quantitative	quality
SSU	Computer mechanics for Masters Level	Set 1	Indicator 1	largely achieved	<p>Outcomes for graduates need to be more clearly evidenced and explained in the SER documentation.</p> <p>Need formal/regulatory differentiation between MA and MSc awards in Ukraine. However, there is a differentiation between Professional Masters and Academic Masters programmes, with Professional Masters being described as ‘shorter programmes’.</p> <p>From a European perspective, these national-level Masters award titles will need to be clarified. The differentiation between MA and MSc is generally a useful and conventional one in most EC countries, taking Arts, Humanities and some Social Sciences away from Scientific Councils, Commissions and government advisory bodies.</p> <p>To facilitate mobility and to meet the needs and recognise the achievements of some students who may be unable to complete the full Masters degree, the University should consider providing students with the opportunity to exit the programme with a Postgraduate Certificate of Education or a Postgraduate Diploma, based on their attainment of the necessary number of ECTS at Masters Level.</p>
			Indicator 2	largely achieved	<p>There are currently no nationally approved professional standards in Ukraine.</p> <p>Mapping to EQF and Dublin Descriptors needs to be clearly evidenced and explained in SER documentation.</p> <p>Positive employability and academic outcomes should be more clearly and fully evidenced, argued and explained in future SER documentation.</p> <p>The programme’s engagement with industry and with employer stakeholders is to be commended, though again this is not obvious or well-articulated in the SER documentation. In discussions with the programme team, it was claimed that a council of employers has recently been established at the University, and that employers attend some assessment procedures and suggest some amendments to the programmes. Such linkages will need to be clearly explained in SER documentation and clear university policies, procedures and regulations would need to be shown to demonstrate how employers might inform assessment procedures, how and when employers would suggest amendments to university programmes, and how the University and the programme teams would respond to such employer advice. It will also be helpful to evidence examples of formal contractual agreements (or MoU) with employers and industry (perhaps as SER Annexes).</p>
			Indicator 3	partly achieved	<p>The Programme Aims are sound, if somewhat uninspiring and unexciting to students for further research. Applicants should be encouraged to feel excited about the potentials and opportunities of participation on this programme, and excited about the Programme’s Aims.</p> <p>The Programme Learning Outcomes represent a good start, though they do tend to be very knowledge-based. At Masters level, PLOs should be more advanced and sophisticated, even ambitious - explaining the opportunities to achieve deep knowledge of the specific field, but also expressing the programme in terms of more generic Masters skills. The Programme Learning Outcomes should tell applicants why they would want to do such a programme and should explain why such a programme would be attractive and of great value to various kind of applicants.</p>
			Indicator 4	partly achieved	<p>At module level, programme still seems to be excessively ‘taught’, rather than ‘learned’, with a highly iterative sequence of taught components (18 hours class-time per week, according to students and graduates), an intensity and volume of class-time quite unfamiliar to most European eyes at Masters level.</p> <p>According to the SER documentation, programme has 25 assessment tasks in one Semester, with little or no explanation of those specific assessment tasks (fieldwork report, group management exercises, essays, portfolios).</p> <p>Module descriptors must include clear descriptions of all summative assessments and must specify clear the links between the module LOs and the assessment tasks and assessment criteria. In order to facilitate alignment with European processes, the module descriptors (with clear module learning outcomes, clear assessment tasks and clear assessment criteria (all mapped back to the module learning outcomes) should replace ‘the syllabi’.</p> <p>At Masters level, summative assessments should be at the highest level. Checks of theoretical and practical knowledge, calculations and other learning that are developmental (though necessary before students gain attainment of Masters level standards and outcomes) should be clearly framed as ‘formative’ tasks.</p> <p>Programme documentation must clearly show the pedagogical link between the learning outcomes and the assessment tasks. The programme team needs to show in the pedagogy of the module, in the teaching and learning activities, what the student and the lecturer do in order to achieve the learning outcomes. In the current module descriptors, there are no clear statements about what the learning activities and experiences of the student will be. All this information may well be presented in the syllabi, but it must be evident in the module or course descriptor documents.</p>
			Indicator 5	partly achieved	<p>Mechanisms and procedures for feedback on the programme need to be clarified. Students can currently ask about their current records and can be told how they may improve.</p> <p>Mentoring or individual supervision only exists on the final paper, through the supervisor of the Masters thesis. This person does some supervision work, including some research work etc. Again, this system needs to be clarified, so that each lecturer and each student clearly understands what needs to be done to improve the students’ academic performance and so that feedback, especially on formative tasks, is distributed back to all students in a regular, routine, clear and timely fashion.</p> <p>Any solution will need to be pedagogically based and clear to all users (students and lecturers) and would need to be guided by clear University policies and</p>

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation		
			quantitative	quality	
				procedures.	
		Indicator 6	partly achieved	There are commendable links with professional practice in the programme, with strong links with industry and employers and solid opportunities for work-based learning and work placement. However, all such activity needs to be clearly evidenced in the programme's Self-Evaluation documentation. It is much less clear how such professional and practice-based activities actually help students to achieve the module learning outcomes. The links between assessment tasks and the achievement of LOs are not clear in the SER documentation provided. The 'assessments' presented in the documentation seem to include all manner of formative tasks. Formative tasks and summative Masters-level assessments will need to be more clearly differentiated in the future programme structure and in future programme documentation.	
		Indicator 7	partly achieved	Real opportunities for individual student choice within the programme – with the student selection of 'complementary' studies or the construction of true student postgraduate pathways were not available. Students and graduates were disappointed about the limited scope to create individual student 'pathways' through the programme.	
		Indicator 8	largely achieved	The documentation shows a solid understanding of ECTS on the programme. Conditions for student self-learning are defined, mostly about workload, specifying 'it should be no less than'. According to this regulation, there should be no more than 6 disciplines in each semester, no less than 5 credits per discipline. Within this structure, the programme teams have the flexibility to define where some lecturing should be strengthened, giving some more study hours in those specific areas. The panel also recognises that the University's recent move towards a coherent 5-credit-per-module system will allow for more rational distribution of student workload across modules, rather than (as elsewhere) a somewhat random system of 1 credit, 2 credit, 3 credit modules all existing in the same programme.	
		Indicator 9	partly achieved	The panel's key finding in this area is to recommend that Programme Handbooks be developed and published as soon as possible, and that clear QA policies should guide the updating, development and regular (perhaps annual) re-publication of such Handbooks. Programme information is also provided through the University website, although seems to point out problems with this system 'which is not always correct or from the information, which is provided by lecturer to the student in the beginning of lecture.	
		Indicator 10	partly achieved	Relationships between the lecturers and the students appear to be strong and very positive. Students feel that their lecturers care about them and are available (even after graduation) to provide guidance, advice and professional references. Students had heard of the term 'student-centred learning' but did not feel as if they were consulted (at least formally) about the programme very often. The panel would argue that a much deeper cultural and philosophical shift must yet occur in the programme for student-centred learning to be fully realized. A first stage is to ensure effective student engagement in the processes of quality assurance (in the design, monitoring, evaluation, and review of programmes) and quality enhancement, to make sure that the student voice (based on their needs, experiences, aspirations etc.) is clearly heard and acted upon.	
	Management of Organizations and Administration for Masters Level	Set 1	Indicator 1	partly achieved	Need formal/regulatory differentiation between MA and MSc awards in Ukraine. However, there is a differentiation between Professional Masters and Academic Masters programmes, with Professional Masters being described as 'shorter programmes'. From a European perspective, these national-level Masters award titles will need to be clarified. The differentiation between MA and MSc is generally a useful and conventional one in most EC countries, taking Arts, Humanities and some Social Sciences away from Scientific Councils, Commissions and government advisory bodies. To facilitate mobility and to meet the needs and recognise the achievements of some students who may be unable to complete the full Masters degree, the University should consider providing students with the opportunity to exit the programme with a Postgraduate Certificate of Education or a Postgraduate Diploma, based on their attainment of the necessary number of ECTS at Masters Level. Efforts to reframe the programme and the discipline remain a 'work in progress' and will need to be clarified further.
Indicator 2			partly achieved	There are currently no nationally approved professional standards in Ukraine. Mapping to EQF and Dublin Descriptors needs to be clearly evidenced and explained in SER documentation. Positive employability and academic outcomes should be more clearly and fully evidenced, argued and explained in future SER documentation. With or without international prescribed standards for Management, the 'Management of Organisations and Administration' programme team could clearly describe to applicants and to the world how their programme is highly differentiated and successful. In discussions with the programme team, it was claimed that a council of employers has recently been established at the University, and that employers attend some assessment procedures and suggest some amendments to the programmes. Again, such linkages will need to be clearly explained in SER documentation and clear university policies, procedures and regulations would need to be shown to demonstrate how employers might inform assessment procedures, how and when employers would suggest amendments to university programmes, and how the University and the programme teams would respond to such employer advice. It will also be helpful to evidence examples of formal contractual agreements (or MoU) with employers and industry.	

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation	
			quantitative	quality
		Indicator 3	partly achieved	<p>Current programme aims do not describe this programme well and do not do justice to the personal and professional value of the learning experiences and outcomes that students will gain from this programme. The programme should consider presenting its aims first in terms of attracting students, making it attractive to a wide variety of potential applicants. Students and graduates did understand the Programme Aims.</p> <p>The module learning outcomes are generally sound – a good basis for on-going refinement and development. Good use of active verbs ‘prepare, determine, apply, evaluate, explain, differentiate’ is very appropriate to Masters level learning. Even so, there is still far too much use of the word ‘know’ in the module learning outcomes; so there’s a lot of scope for on-going learning outcome refinement.</p>
		Indicator 4	partly achieved	<p>At module level, programme still seems to be excessively ‘taught’, rather than ‘learned’, with a highly iterative sequence of taught components (18 hours class-time per week, according to students and graduates), an intensity and volume of class-time quite unfamiliar to most European eyes at Masters level. According to the SER documentation, there are 40 assessment tasks in one Management semester (exams, calculations, projects, presentations, dissertations etc.). In the module descriptor, there is no statement about what are the summative assessment tasks, with little or no explanation of those specific assessment tasks. The programme team’s understanding of continuous assessment was not very convincing. Multiple iterative assessment ‘tasks’ (calculation tasks, practical calculations and checks of theoretical knowledge) are all framed as ‘assessments’, rather than as ‘formative learning tasks and exercises’.</p> <p>Module descriptors must include clear descriptions of all summative assessments and must specify clear the links between the module LOs and the assessment tasks and assessment criteria. In order to facilitate alignment with European processes, the module descriptors (with clear module learning outcomes, clear assessment tasks and clear assessment criteria (all mapped back to the module learning outcomes) should replace ‘the syllabi’.</p> <p>At Masters level, summative assessments should be at the highest level. Checks of theoretical and practical knowledge, calculations and other learning that are developmental (though necessary before students gain attainment of Masters level standards and outcomes) should be clearly framed as ‘formative’ tasks.</p> <p>Programme documentation must clearly show the pedagogical link between the learning outcomes and the assessment tasks. The programme team needs to show in the pedagogy of the module, in the teaching and learning activities, what the student and the lecturer do in order to achieve the learning outcomes. In the current module descriptors, there are no clear statements about what the learning activities and experiences of the student will be. All this information may well be presented in the syllabi, but it must be evident in the module or course descriptor documents.</p>
		Indicator 5	partly achieved	<p>Mechanisms and procedures for feedback on the programme need to be clarified. Students can currently ask about their current records and can be told how they may improve.</p> <p>Mentoring or individual supervision only exists on the final paper, through the supervisor of the Masters thesis. This person does some supervision work, including some research work etc. Again, this system needs to be clarified, so that each lecturer and each student clearly understands what needs to be done to improve the students’ academic performance and so that feedback, especially on formative tasks, is distributed back to all students in a regular, routine, clear and timely fashion.</p> <p>Any solution will need to be pedagogically based and clear to all users (students and lecturers) and would need to be guided by clear University policies and procedures.</p>
		Indicator 6	not achieved	<p>The links with professional practice in this ‘MSc in Management of Organisations and Administrations’ programme are not well explained or articulated in the SER documentation. Any student learning activity which might be informed by reflection on professional practices needs to be clearly evidenced in the programme’s Self Evaluation Document. At the moment, it is not evidenced.</p> <p>It is not clear how professional and practice-based activities actually help students to achieve the module learning outcomes. The links between assessment tasks and the achievement of LOs are not clear in the SER documentation provided. The ‘assessments’ presented in the documentation seem to include all manner of formative tasks (calculation exercises, theoretical checking, etc.). Formative tasks and summative Masters-level assessments will need to be more clearly differentiated in the future programme structure and in future programme documentation.</p>
		Indicator 7	partly achieved	<p>Real opportunities for individual student choice within the programme – with the student selection of ‘complementary’ studies or the construction of true student postgraduate pathways were not available. Students and graduates were disappointed about the limited scope to create individual student ‘pathways’ through the programme.</p>
		Indicator 8	largely achieved	<p>The documentation shows a solid understanding of ECTS on the programme. Conditions for student self-learning are defined, mostly about workload, specifying ‘it should be no less than’. According to this regulation, there should be no more than 6 disciplines in each semester, no less than 5 credits per discipline. Within this structure, the programme teams have the flexibility to define where some lecturing should be strengthened, giving some more study hours in those specific areas.</p> <p>The panel also recognises that the University’s recent move towards a coherent 5-credit-per-module system will allow for more rational distribution of</p>

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation	
			quantitative	quality
	Indicator 9	partly achieved	<p>Students on the 'MSc in Management of Organisations and Administrations' appeared to be relatively clear about the structure of their programme, the learning tasks and the assessments – all fine.</p> <p>The panel's key finding in this area is to recommend that Programme Handbooks be developed and published as soon as possible, and that clear QA policies should guide the updating, development and regular (perhaps annual) re-publication of such Handbooks. Programme information is also provided through the University website, although seems to point out problems with this system 'which is not always correct or from the information, which is provided by lecturer to the student in the beginning of lecture.</p>	
	Indicator 10	partly achieved	<p>Relationships between the lecturers and the students appear to be strong and very positive. Students feel that their lecturers care about them and are available (even after graduation) to provide guidance, advice and professional references. Students had heard of the term 'student-centred learning' but did not feel as if they were consulted (at least formally) about the programme very often.</p> <p>The panel would argue that a much deeper cultural and philosophical shift must yet occur in the programme for student-centred learning to be fully realized. A first stage is to ensure effective student engagement in the processes of quality assurance (in the design, monitoring, evaluation, and review of programmes) and quality enhancement, to make sure that the student voice (based on their needs, experiences, aspirations etc.) is clearly heard and acted upon.</p>	
For both APs	Set 2	Indicator 1	partly achieved	<p>In meetings during the site visit, it was evident that there are criteria for academic programme development. Even so, the panel was not shown written evidence of clear policies for approval, monitoring and review in English language. This is very much needed within the SER (e.g., the stages, processes, terms and responsibilities for approval, monitoring and review, step by step in a flow chart). What also needs to be documented within the SER are the procedures by which minor and major changes are made after an approval has been made.</p>
		Indicator 2	partly achieved	<p>Unstructured mechanism for approval, periodic review and monitoring of training programmes' work. Mechanism does not assign clear roles and responsibilities for programme design, development, approval and monitoring</p>
		Indicator 3	partly achieved	<p>Students are not involved in programme design and in the processes of programme development, approval, monitoring and review.</p>
		Indicator 4	not achieved	<p>No effective policies ensuring the maintenance of academic standards were detailed or explained in the SER documentation. The SER documentation refers to various SSU regulations concerning the awarding of qualifications etc., but how such regulations ensured the maintenance of academic standards and awards was not clearly explained.</p> <p>It is currently unclear how SSU academic standards for credits and awards are rigorously maintained at the appropriate level, and how student performance is judged against these standards. SSU academic standards are obviously high, but it is not at all clear what SSU policies or procedures ensure the maintenance of academic standards, or how those policies or procedures function.</p>
		Indicator 5	partly achieved	<p>There are not clear and effective policies and processes for assessing the recognition of prior learning and supporting student mobility between courses of study and institutions. The procedure for learning outcomes recognition, acquired within non-formal education is being currently worked out. There is a decision on the recognition of the learning outcomes obtained after completion of open online courses of SSU Examenarium.</p>
		Indicator 6	partly achieved	<p>External expertise (e.g., from subject experts, employers and professional associations) is not used to inform the design, development, approval and monitoring of academic programmes. Though SSU has obviously consulted employers, it is as yet unclear as to how knowledge of professional standards/requirements and external expertise (e.g., from subject experts, employers and professional associations) will be used to inform the design, development, approval and monitoring of academic programmes.</p>
		Indicator 7	largely achieved	<p>In general, support for the training and development of academic staff strong, with a 5-year review of lecturing staff and targeted assistance for new teachers. Workshops, trainings and internships are conducted for academic staff.</p> <p>The programme teams' understanding of continuous assessment was not very convincing, with multiple iterative assessment 'tasks', calculation tasks, practical calculations and checks of theoretical knowledge being framed as 'assessments', rather than as 'formative learning tasks'. On-going pedagogical training on modern assessment is required for all programme team members.</p> <p>In terms of the design, delivery, approval and monitoring of academic programmes, the training and support of SSU academic and professional/administrative staff still needs a lot of work and must be considered to be at a preliminary phase, especially in relation to professional/administrative staff.</p>
		Indicator 8	partly	<p>There are not clear policies and processes in place to ensure the integrity of student assessment (e.g., though marking schemes, moderation processes,</p>

HEI	Name of AP	Indicators	Evaluation	
			quantitative	quality
			achieved	examination board regulations), and the effectiveness of these policies is regularly reviewed. There are a lot of checking of assessment procedures, rather than checking whether assessments were actually related to the achievement of learning outcomes. There did not seem to be very clear and comprehensive SSU policies and processes to ensure the integrity of student assessment (e.g., though marking schemes, moderation processes, examination board regulations), and the regular review of the effectiveness of such policies was not mentioned.
		Indicator 9	not achieved	The institutional policies for APs design, development, approval and monitoring do not appear to be systematically or regularly reviewed. The processes of APs design, development, approval and monitoring on the two APs have been reviewed whilst the programmes have been undergoing revision. Policies and processes of programme design, development, approval and monitoring must be regularly reviewed in order to ensure the effectiveness and continuous enhancement of current practices. It is suggested that such reviews are strictly scheduled – possibly review after one year for a brand new (untried and untested) policy, once every three years for a standard policy, and once every five years for a really well-established, unchanging, fundamental policy. Structures and a policy governing minor changes to APs and other structures for major or substantial changes on programmes will also be needed. QA documents and mechanisms need a regulatory and procedural basis.
		Indicator 10	fully achieved	Staff are appropriately trained and qualified and that the delivery of the programmes is supported by the appropriate learning resources. The programme teams were also quite clear that employers and other experts could be supported in pedagogical roles.

2.6 Impact Statements

Міністерство освіти і науки України
СУМСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
 вул.Римського-Корсакова, 2, м.Суми, 40007
 тел. 64-04-99, тел/факс: (0542)33-40-58
 E-mail: kanc@sumdu.edu.ua
 www.sumdu.edu.ua
 Код ЄДРПОУ 05408289

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
SUMY STATE UNIVERSITY
 2, Rymysky-Korsakov, St., Sumy, Ukraine, 40007
 tel. 64-04-99, tel/ fax + 38(0542)33-40-58
 E-mail: kanc@sumdu.edu.ua
 www.sumdu.edu.ua
 USRF0U code 05408289

19 ВЕР 2017 20 р. № 09105-07/2017

На № _____ від _____ 20__ р.

To coordinating institution of ALIGN project of EU Tempus Programme
 Yerevan Brusov State University of Languages and Social Sciences

Participation in ALIGN project has served as a "trigger" for modernization of the quality assurance of educational activity at Sumy State University that in future will ensure its internationalization and integration into European higher education area. This was stipulated by the recommendations received from the international experts by the results of piloting accreditation of APs as well as the valuable experience gained by the University staff during the APs self-evaluation procedures, participation in site-visits, analysis of the results of APs evaluation.

Due to this experience a sustainable understanding of strategic approaches towards the improvement of quality assurance system at the University and academic programmes level has been developed. In particular, among the high priority tasks the following have been set:

- development of policy on the internal quality assurance of educational activities and the quality of higher education;
- formation of clear procedures for the design, monitoring and review of APs;
- effective engagement of student representatives;
- attracting external stakeholders to the programme design and approval;
- development of clear procedures for the student assessment system;
- creation of a questionnaire and conducting a survey of students regarding their level of satisfaction with the quality of education;
- development of the information model of the university, the structure of informational content that will be oriented at external information consumers (applicants, graduates, employers and the public), and will provide an opportunity for the creation of information blocks for licensing and accreditation of APs according to updated rules and criteria.

Part of the tasks that have been defined to be a priority during the project realization has already been solved:

- conducted SWOT-analysis of the university quality assurance system based on the evaluation of the principles of ESG 2015;
- developed detailed action plan for the improvement of the university quality assurance system and mechanisms for the design, approval, monitoring and review of APs;
- developed methodological recommendations for ensuring the quality of educational activities in institutes (faculties) on the basis of ESG-2015 for 2017/2018 academic years;
- designed institutional guide for the formation of programme competencies and programme results and their alignment with National and European qualification frameworks;
- conducted focus group study aimed at identifying advantages and disadvantages of organizing a quality assurance system at the university;
- analysed organization of work of the Expert Councils of employers;
- developed educational resources and student support, in particular, university adopted a standardised format for programme handbooks consisting of programme-specific information and generic material, such as University policies and regulations, and filling the handbook (handbook) for each educational program according to the template;
- developed questionnaire and conducted a corresponding survey of students regarding their level of satisfaction with the quality of educational resources and support for higher education applicants.

To sum up it should be pointed out that the ALIGN project does not only respond to the demands of teaching staff and students in terms of realization of high quality academic programmes but also assists dissemination of new academic approaches and standards that provide an impact to increase the level of competitiveness of higher education in Ukraine in general.



[Handwritten signature]

A.V. Vasylyev

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ ІМЕНІ ТАРАСА ШЕВЧЕНКА
 вул. Володимирська, 64/13, м. Київ, 01601 тел. 239-33-33

20.09.2017 № 014/190

На № _____

Coordinator of TEMPUS ALIGN Project,
 Yerevan Brusov State University of Language and Social Science

Dear Sir/Madam,

TEMPUS project "ALIGN: Achieving and Checking the Alignment Between Academic Programs and Qualification Frameworks" (543901-TEMPUS-1-2013-1-AM-TEMPUS-JPGR) has combined the knowledge, experience and potential of foreign and Ukrainian specialists with the aim of introducing European standards and procedures in the higher education system in Ukraine. In the course of the ALIGN project, the teams of Universities have created a synergistic platform for developing a common methodology and rules for ensuring the QA of AP, their implementation not only in the Universities of the project partners, but also in other Universities in Ukraine.

The strategic importance and impact of the ALIGN project for Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv is to implement and fulfil the following steps and procedures:

1. The goals and aims of the project influenced the understanding of the importance of the introduction of European standards into the Educational process by University representatives who work in the scientific and methodological commissions of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine and develop new educational standards in Ukraine.
2. Student-centred, oriented to a competent approach and learning outcomes APs were developed and introduced.
3. In the process of self-examination of APs within the framework of the project, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv introduced an alignment procedure for the development and support of QA of APs.
4. The QA system at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv is modernized on the basis of European policies and procedures. A unit for the quality assurance of APs has been developing, the software (Triton system) is

being developed and improving to support the educational process at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.

5. Master's AP "Social Informatics" is transformed into the International Master's AP "Business Informatics", which for the first time is opened in Ukraine and is based on European educational standards.

6. With the introduction of new APs, internal and international mobility is developing, which facilitates the understanding of the internationalization of education and science, as well as the launching of English-language APs that meet the requirements of the market.

7. Regular survey of students and graduates of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv with the purpose of monitoring the quality of education and their employment was noted by European experts as the best practice that can be spread in other HEIs in Ukraine. Forms and methods of monitoring are improving constantly taking into account the capabilities of modern information technologies and methods of conducting surveys.

8. A strategy for cooperation with employers and other stakeholders is being developed with a view to joint development and analyse of APs, organization of the educational process.

9. The ALIGN project became an example and a basis for the development of international contacts, trainings and new research projects among universities.

10. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv as the leading University in Ukraine makes a lot of efforts to improve the quality of APs and educational services. The ALIGN project promotes the professional growth of its scientific and pedagogical staff at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv in order to train highly qualified specialists and integrate into the European educational space.

Sincerely,
 Vice-Rector
 on International Cooperation

[Handwritten signature]

Professor Petro O. Bekh

20.09.2017

18.09.17 № 048/SCO

На № _____ від _____

Yerevan BRUSOV State University
of Languages and Social Sciences
Project Coordinator
TEMPUS IV – 6th Call for proposals
«ALIGN: Achieving and checking the alignment
between academic programmes and qualification
frameworks»

Activity of KhNU within Project 543901-TEMPUS-1-2013-1-AM-TEMPUS-JPGR ALIGN: «Achieving and checking the alignment between academic programmes and qualification frameworks» was aimed on using HEI's capacity to create and assess learning outcomes in condition of student-centered learning and to develop mechanisms for alignment between academic programmes and qualification frameworks.

The project's implementation was fully consistent with the University's activity on reform of the higher education system in accordance with the implementation of the main provisions of the Law of Ukraine "On Higher Education" 2015, "Strategy for the Development of Khmelnytskyi National University for 2016-2020".

During the project's implementation, the university leadership implemented a series of activities, in particular:

- A Training Center for the implementation in the educational process of qualification framework's standards on information technologies and management was created, the head of the Center is Grygoruk S, the project coordinator of the KhNU;

- The Department for Internal Quality Assurance of Higher Education was created;

- A collection of normative documents "The system of internal quality assurance for educational activities" was developed and implemented, which reflects the normative support of the functioning the quality assurance system of the educational process and the quality of higher education in accordance with the principles of student-centered education through the implementation of appropriate procedures and measures aimed, in particular, to the development of educational programmes in accordance with the descriptors of the NQF, their monitoring and periodic review, ensuring the publicity of information about educational programmes, supporting academic mobility of students and teachers; supporting information e-systems for effective management of educational process, etc.;

- A complex of educational programmes has been developed and put into operation from all accredited and licensed specialties at the University of educational levels of Bachelor, Master and Ph.D., their annual review is carried out;

- Conditions were created for involving students to the procedures of the development and revision of educational programmes, in particular, focus groups for higher education applicants were created, a series of seminars and trainings for students on their participation in processes of internal quality assurance of higher education were carried out;

XIIIY. Зам. № 145, 1. 2000, 2017

- Activity is underway to create and implement double-diploma programmes, in particular, with Poland universities.

Also in June 2016, within the project implementation, a site-visit for expert assessment of the educational programmes of "Applied Mathematics" and "Economic Cybernetics" was organized and conducted. Recommendations based on the expert assessment were taken into account in the further activities of the university.

Among the further actions to implement the project results, the university leadership plans:

- Further activities for alignment of the content and structure of educational programmes with the descriptors of the National Qualifications Framework;

- Development of world-class competitive educational programmes in accordance with the new Standards of Higher Education and other normative documents;

- Development of the Internal Quality Assurance System;

- Deploying a network of student focus groups to establish feedback with all participants of the educational process;

- Continuation of cooperation with higher education applicants in building their educational trajectory within the student-centered learning model;

- Implementation of English-speaking educational programmes to the educational process;

- Expansion of the system of partnerships with educational organizations, research centers, commercial and non-profit organizations, public authorities and other external stakeholders in the field of internal quality assurance, first of all, for the revision and renewal of educational programmes, the formation of learning outcomes in accordance with their requirements;

- Development of academic mobility of students and teachers in conditions of institutional openness of HEIs;

- Continuation of activities to increase the number of educational programmes of a joint or double diploma;

- Development and implementation of educational programmes accredited by foreign agencies from European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education as well as international professional associations;

- Increasing the level of professional training of teachers in the field of using European Standards and Guidelines regarding the organization of educational activities, promoting the use of pedagogical innovations in teaching;

- Involvement of foreign teachers to the educational process of the university;

- Development of the university information system to ensure all areas of its activities, creation of conditions for integration of the university's information system into the European and world information area, using university governing based on the information management;

- Development of cooperation with the National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance.

Respectfully,

Vice-Rector for International Relations



M. Yokhna

Phone: _____
S. Grygoruk
Tel. +380677865023

Annexes
Annex 1
List of Abbreviations

HEI - Higher Education Institution

EQAA - The European Quality Assurance Agency

QF - Qualification Framework

NQF - National Qualification Framework

EQF – European Qualification Framework

AP - Academic Programme

LO - Learning Outcome

ESG 2015 - The European Standards and Guidelines

ENQA – The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

MESU - Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

TSNUK - Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

KhNU - Khmelnytsky National University

SSU - Sumy State University

Annex 2

The Module “Decision Making in Financial Mathematics” Descriptors

1.	Module/unit code	ДBC.3.01.01(in Ukrainian version)
2.	Module/unit Title	DECISION MAKING IN FINANCIAL MATHEMATICS
3.	Subject field	System Sciences and Cybernetics
4.	Faculty/Department	Faculty of Cybernetics
5.	Programme(s) to which the module/unit is attached	Social Informatics
6.	Pathways	No
7.	Level	Master degree (NFQ 8)
8.	National Credits	3
9.	ECTS Credits	3 (1 credit-30 hours)
10.	Core or Optional	Optional
11.	Module/unit Dependencies (pre-requisites, co-requisites, incompatible module)	Prerequisites: Probability theory and Mathematical Statistics, Calculus, Algebra
12.	Acceptable for	Module “Decision Making in Financial Mathematics” is acceptable for master programmes of TSNUK: Social informatics, Decision Making Systems and Methods
13.	Excluded Combinations	No
14.	Class Contact Time	Total Hours: 30 Distribution of Hours: 30 hours in lectures, 60 in personal tutorials
15.	Guided Independent Study Time	60 hours
16.	Duration of the Module/Unit	17 weeks throughout 3 rd semester (15 weeks of contact hours and 2 weeks for attestation)
17.	Campus Location	Campus of Cybernetics Faculty
18.	Module/unit Co-ordinator	Rozora Iryna, Associate Professor
19.	Brief description of Module/unit	The purpose of module is achieving by learners the modern constructive, fundamental thinking and special knowledge’s system in the field of financial mathematics, decision making, risk theory, practical skills of their implementation in finance, insurance, reinsurance and other areas.
20.	Indicative Syllabus	<p style="text-align: center;">Module 1 Stochastic models in risk theory</p> <p>THEME 1. Stochastic situations and their mathematical models in financial and actuarial mathematics. Introduction. Mathematical models in financial and actuarial mathematics. Claim as a random variable, its characteristics. Characteristic functions of the distributions. The distribution of the sum of independent claims. Conditional and marginal distributions and density functions. Conditional mathematical expectation and variance. The formulas of full expectation and variance. Probability inequalities.</p> <p>THEME 2. The main types of individual claim distributions and the distributions for amount of claims. Discrete and continuous distributions for individual claims and amount of the claims, their properties. Mixture of distributions. Statistical methods for estimation of parameters.</p> <p>THEME 3. Risk Model. The model of collection risk. The model of individual risk. Variability and uncertainty of parameters. Module control</p> <p>Module 2 Decision Making under Uncertainties.</p> <p>THEME 4. Reinsurance. General overview. Proportional reinsurance. Reinsurance of loss excess. Excess insurance policies: conditional and unconditional deductible amount</p> <p>THEME 5. Discount systems under unenforceability. Bonus-Malus System (BMS) to calculate the premiums with respect to previous history of the claims. Markov chains with discrete time and finite states. Analysis of stationary states. Nonhomogenous portfolio.</p> <p>THEME 6. Bayesian risk estimation. Mathematical formulation of estimation risk problem. Bayesian statistics. The elements of decision theory. Bayesian risk and Bayesian decision. The procedures of decision making under uncertainties. The construction of Bayesian decision function. Bayesian premium. Estimation of parameters. Quadratic loss function. The Losses, proportional to absolute values of errors. Module control.</p>
21.	Module/unit Learning Outcomes On completion of the module a student should know	How assessed

	<p>1. The principles of stochastic nature in financial and actuarial models 2. The main types of individual claim distributions and the distributions for amount of claims 3. Statistical methods for estimation of parameters 4. The models of collection risk and individual risk 5. The principles of reinsurance technique. 6. Bonus-Malus System 7. Bayesian estimation. 8. The main approaches in decision making under uncertainties.</p> <p>On completion of the module/unit the learner will be able</p> <p>1. Construct stochastic models of finance and insurance 2. Find and analyze main characteristics of individual claim and amount of claims 3. Apply the principal methods of analysis of individual risk, to calculate main its characteristics and optimize its structure 4. Apply the principal methods of analysis of collection risk, to find its main characteristics and optimize its structure 5. Apply the principal methods of analysis in reinsurance 6. Apply Bonus-Malus System to calculate the premiums and their expectation and variance 7. Apply the methods of Bayesian estimation 8. Apply the methods of decision making in the field of finance under uncertainties 9. Analyze and summarize the investigated material and make a presentation of it</p>	<p>SA2</p> <p>SA1 SA2 SA5</p> <p>SA1 SA5 SA1 SA2 SA5 SA1 SA3 SA5 SA1 SA3 SA5 SA1 SA3 SA5 SA1 SA3 SA5</p> <p>SA2</p> <p>SA2 SA5</p> <p>SA1 SA2 SA5</p> <p>SA1 SA2 SA5</p> <p>SA3 SA5</p> <p>SA3 SA5</p> <p>SA3 SA5 SA3 SA5</p> <p>SA4</p>
22.	Programme Learning Outcome to which this is mapped.	PLO1, PLO5, PLO6, PLO7, PLO9, PLO11 (see in table 1)
23.	Teaching and Learning Activities is accomplished by tests, module controls, problem solving, intermediate checks during lectures, by discussions during lectures, by studying individually and preparing report and presentation.	
24.	<p>Assessment and Feedback</p> <p>Formative Exercises and Tasks:</p> <p>1. Claims on a certain portfolio of insurance policies arise as a Poisson process with annual rate λ. Individual claim amounts are independent from claim to claim and follow an exponential distribution with mean μ. The insurance company has purchased excess of loss reinsurance with retention M from a reinsurer who calculates premiums using a premium loading of θ. Denote by X_i the amount paid by the reinsurer on the i-th claim (so that $X_i = 0$ if the ith claim amount is below M). Explain why the claims arrival process for the reinsurer is also a Poisson process and specify its parameter. Show that</p> $M_{X_i}(t) = 1 + e^{-M/\mu} \cdot \frac{\mu t}{1 - \mu t}$ <p>. Determine mean $E(X_i)$ and variance $\text{Var}(X_i)$.</p> <p>2. Sara is a car mechanic for a racing team. She knows that there is a problem with the car, but is unsure whether the fault is with the gearbox or the engine. Sara is able to observe one practice race. If the underlying problem is with the gearbox there is a 40% chance the car will not complete the practice race. If the underlying problem is with the engine there is a 90% chance the car will not complete the practice race. At the end of the practice race Sara must decide, on the basis of whether the car completes the practice race, whether the fault lies with the gearbox or the engine.</p> <p>Write down the four decision functions Sara could adopt. If Sara correctly identifies the fault there is no cost. The cost of incorrectly deciding the fault is with the gearbox is \$1m. The cost of incorrectly deciding the fault is with the engine is \$5m. Show that one of the decision functions is dominated.</p> <p>The probability that the fault lies with the gearbox is p. Determine the range of values of p for which Sara will, under the Bayes criterion, choose a decision function whose outcome is affected by whether or not the car completes the practice race.</p>	

25.	<p>Assessment and Feedback Summative Assessments</p> <p>SA1. Student's activities at lectures SA2. Current module control 1 SA3. Current module control 2 SA4. Report and presentation SA5. Exam (at first written and than orally) Total score - 100 marks</p>	<p>Weightings 40%</p> <p>10% 15% 15% 20% 40%</p>
26.	<p>Learning Resources</p> <p>Key Texts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leonenko M.M., Mishura Yu.S., Parchomenko V.M., Yadrenko M.Y. Theoretical-probabilistic and statistical methods in econometrics and financial mathematics. – K.: Informtehnika, 1995. 2. FellerV. Introduction to probability theory and its applications. – M.: Mir, 1964. 3. Klugmann S., Panjer H., Willmot G. Loss models. From data to desicions. – John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1998. 4. Schmidli H. Lecture notes on risk theory. – Aarhus, 2000. <p>Key Web-based and Electronic Resources: www.univ.kiev.ua/libraries</p>	

Annex 3 Master Programme in Social Informatics

Programme Learning Outcomes

Programme Learning Outcomes (PLO)	On successful completion of this programme students will be able to:
PL01	Demonstrate an in-depth knowledge and critical understanding of social informatics and its applications
PL02	• Distinguish between different perspectives by drawing on their knowledge of social informatics
PL03	• Distinguish between quantitative and qualitative methods.
PL04	• Recognise the reciprocal relationship between theory and empirical evidence.
PL05	• Apply their knowledge and understanding of information technologies, innovation principles, social and business sciences to real world situations.
PL06	• Practise a range of research skills and scientific methods for studying information technologies, innovation process and social informatics, including those acquired as part of a piece of independent research in their final year.
PL07	• Demonstrate a wide range of generic skills, including skills in communication, information processing, teamwork, critical and creative thinking, computing and independent learning.
PL08	• Develop the capacity for lifelong learning in social informatics and other disciplines.
PL09	• Utilise a range of tools and techniques for statistical analysis of data.
PL010	• Adhere to high standards of ethical and professional behaviour.
PL011	• Take a creative approach to using new and existing information technologies, innovation systems for educational purposes, in business, industry and other areas.

Framework Descriptor	Programme LOs On successful completion of the programme the student will be able to:	Suggested Teaching Strategies	Possible Assessment Strategies	Module/Unit(s)
Knowledge-Breadth An understanding of the theory, concepts and methods pertaining to Social Informatics	PL01 PL04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lectures •Observational studies •Experiential learning through using technology •Lectures about the main areas of interest to social informatics. •Seminars-staff and student led •Reading research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lab reports on observational studies •Essays on appropriate topics •Development and presentation of practical technology use e.g. blog, wiki, poster, presentation 	All modules
Knowledge-Kind Detailed knowledge and understanding in one or more specialised areas, some of it at the current boundaries of the field(s)he	PL01 PL04 PL03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Seminars-staff and student led •Problem-solving questions •Observational studies of technology use •Reading research •Tasks in technology labs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Essays on appropriate topics •Reports •Development and presentation of scenarios of future technology use •Critiques of research literature 	All modules of cycle of fundamental, mathematical, natural-science, professional and practical training

<p>Know-How & Skill-Range Demonstrate mastery of a complex and specialised area of skills and tools; use and modify advanced skills and tools to conduct closely guided research, professional or advanced technical activity</p>	<p>PL02 PL04 PL05 PL06 PL07 PL09 PL03</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lectures/ • tutorials about research in social informatics including referencing • Literature reviews 	<p>Lab reports, • abstracts, posters, websites, wikis G, • Literature reviews • Research project • Assessment of project work</p>	<p>Innovative technology: theory and practice, Creation and commercialization of intellectual property, Information technology of virtual enterprises, Information technologies</p>
<p>Know-How & Skill-Selectivity Exercise appropriate judgement in a number of complex planning, design, technical and/or management functions related to products, services, operations or processes, including resourcing</p>	<p>PL02 PL04 PL05 PL06 PL07 PL09 PL03 PL011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem-solving • Workshops on technology and research • Designing and completing a research project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports, • Research project • Development and presentation of scenarios of future technology use • Assessment of project work 	<p>Computerization of project business management, Corporate Systems, Decision-making in the field of social and economic control, Mathematical models of insurance and pension schemes, System modelling of Economics</p>
<p>Competence-Context Use advanced skills to conduct research, or advanced technical or professional activity, accepting accountability for all related decision making; transfer and apply diagnostic and creative skills in a range of contexts</p>	<p>PL02 PL04 PL05 PL06 PL07 PL011</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem-solving questions of Internet use • Observational studies of technology use • Reading research • Given scenarios, analyse a situation and present a solution • Design experiments to test hypotheses • Apply theory to a known work or social context • Seminars • Reading research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report, policy development appropriate to scenario • Presenting experimental designs • Development and presentation of scenarios of technology use • Essay/presentation / blog/research report on practical context 	<p>Decision-making in the field of social and economic control, Methods and Models of Social Information, Major Research Project, The methods of modeling and optimization of socio-economic processes</p>
<p>Competence-Role Act effectively under guidance in a peer relationship with qualified practitioners; lead multiple, complex and heterogeneous groups</p>	<p>PL04 PL05 PL07 PL010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem-solving questions of Internet use • Observational studies of technology use • Doing research e.g. surveys, focus groups • Developing and being responsible for a blog, discussion group, wiki. • Research project • Designing and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research reports • Peer and self-assessment of role competence at regular intervals 	<p>Methodology and Organization of Scientific Research, Methods of Social research, Computerization of project business management</p>

		completing a research project		
Competence- Learning to Learn Learn to act in variable and unfamiliar learning contexts; learn to manage learning tasks independently, professionally and ethically	PL02 PL07 PL08 PL010 PL011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem-solving • Real life observation studies • Class wiki, web, blog to develop an online community of practice • Using appropriate online resources to work with other students, discussion forums, Wiki's etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self and peer assessment of learning • Statement of learning and action plan for future learning 	Methodology and Organization of Scientific Research, Methods of Social research, Computerization of project business management, Information systems, Corporate systems, Teaching and psychology of Higer School Methods of teaching Mathematics and Informatics in Higer School
Competence- Insight Express a comprehensive, internalised, personal world view, manifesting solidarity with others	PL04 PL05 PL07 PL010 PL011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem-solving • Discussion topic/wiki - impact of cyberworld • Real life observation studies • Evaluation of cognate disciplines, themes e.g. mobile phones and cancer. • Class wiki, web, blog to develop an online community of practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports, acceptable user policies • Self, peer and tutor assessment • Group presentation, creation of a website or Wiki 	All modules of cycle of humanitarian and socio-economic training

Annex 4
Action Plan
Sumy State University

№	Activities for improvement of internal QA system	Action agreed	Leading personnel	Deadline
1.	Development of policy on the internal quality assurance	1.1 Carrying-out a SWOT analysis of the internal QA system based on ESG 2015. Preparation of propositions to improve the main weak points.	Karpusha V.D., Yuskaiev V.B., Liuta O.V., Krykliy O.A.	February 2017
		1.2 Formation of methodological recommendations for ensuring the quality of educational activities in institutes (faculties) on the basis of ESG-2015 for academic year 2017/2018	Krykliy O.A.	June 2017
		1.3 Conduct a focus-group study aimed at identifying strong and weak points of QA organization at institutes/faculties.	Karpusha V.D., Liuta O.V., Svitaylo N.D.	September 2017
		1.4 Improvement of the internal QA system in part of the definition of the university's strategy for ensuring the quality of educational services.	Karpusha V.D., Liuta O.V.	December 2017
2.	Formation of clear procedures for the design, monitoring and revision of study programs	2.1 Formation of a clear institutional framework for determination of rights and responsibilities in the design, monitoring and revision of study programs. 2.2 Development of the regulation "On educational programs", which defines the procedures for the design and approval of study programmes and syllabi. 2.3 Formation of methodical recommendations for the design of study programmes and syllabi. Development of templates for profiles of study programmes and courses.	Karpusha V.D., Yuskayev V.B., Krykliy O.A., Lukyanikhin V.A., Deputy directors (deans) for methodological work	October 2017
3.	Effective engagement of student representatives	3.1 Development of procedures for student surveys and the use of survey results to improve the quality assurance system. 3.2 Development of the "Regulation on organization of assessment of the quality of study courses"	Karpusha V.D., Yuskayev V.B., Liuta O.V.	June 2017
		3.3 Review of representation policy and placing a stronger emphasis on student representation system. 3.4 In partnership with students, formalize the review and monitoring of student representation at all levels of the University governance	Karpusha V.D., Korol O.V., Student self-government bodies	December 2017

		structure. 3.5 Development of the mechanism for inclusion of students and postgraduates in the study programme design teams, in particular, an approach for selection representatives.		
		3.6 Introduction of annual report of institutes and faculties to present to the university QA Council on the engagement of student representatives and recommendations to improve the process.	Directors of institutes, deans of faculties	June 2018
4.	Attracting external stakeholders to program design and approval	4.1 Analysis of organization of work of the expert councils of employers in accordance with the decree of the Rector from 3.11.2015 № 0966-I "On the creation of expert councils of employers"	Directors of institutes, deans of faculties, department of practical training and integration with employers	March 2017
		4.2 Discussion of the results of the analysis at the meetings of QA Councils at faculties (institutes) and the University QA Council		October 2017
		4.3 Development of a regulation defining mechanisms for participation of external stakeholders in the internal quality assurance system. Aim: to create clear formalized and transparent procedures for attraction of external. Continue to engage with employers and ensure their voice is present from the conception of new programmes, through to the design, approval and delivery of them, including practice-based learning.	Karpusha V.D., Lukyanikhin V.A.	October 2017
		4.4 Development of a plan of measures for the certification of practice bases and potential employer partners in order to form employers' databases at the graduation departments.	Directors of institutes, deans of faculties, department of practical training and integration with employers	October 2017
		4.5 Development of questionnaires for interviewing graduates and employers on the development of new competitive study programs and improvement of existing ones.		November 2017
		4.6 Organization and realization of a survey of graduates and employers on the development of new competitive educational programs and improvement of existing ones.		December 2017
		4.7 Development of the software module "Integration with employers and graduates" in the University system for improving cooperation with		Information Systems Center

		external as well as with internal stakeholders and facilitation of creation databases of graduates and employers.		
5.	Student assessment	5.1 Discussion of the issue "On improving the student assessment system" at the University QA Council.	Krykliy O.A.	March 2017
		5.2 Development of the University Guide on assessment, standards, marking and feedback with clear and extensive advice on how various forms of assessment can be used to demonstrate the achievement of learning outcomes.	Karpusha V.D., Lyubchak V.O. , Yuskayev V.B., Krykliy O.A.	December 2017
		5.3 New edition of the Regulation on the organization of the educational process in relation to enrollment, achievement recognition and attestation of students (definition of rules for recognition of previous learning outcomes, competences acquired through academic mobility, additional, formal and non-formal learning, peculiarities of certification for students with disabilities)		
6.	Development of educational resources and student support	6.1 Filling the handbook for each educational program according to the template (information in Part A)	Directors of institutes (deans of faculties)	October 2017
		6.2 Developing a questionnaire and conducting a survey of students regarding their level of satisfaction with the quality of educational resources and support for higher education applicants.	Liuta O.V., Svitaylo N.D.	October 2017
		6.3 Implementation of the mechanism and organizational support for tutoring and counseling of higher education graduates (including persons with disabilities) throughout the entire period of study.	Karpusha V.D., Korol O.M.,	December 2017
		6.4 Adoption of a University standardised template for programme handbooks consisting of programme-specific information in Part A and generic material, such as University policies and regulations, in Part B.	Karpusha V.D., Chornous A.M., Korol O.M., Brizhatyi O.V. Krykliy O.A., Liuta O.V.	December 2017
7.	Ensuring information transparency of the university and study programmes	7.1 Development of the information model of the university, the structure of informational content that will be oriented both for external information consumers (applicants of higher education, graduates, employers and the public), and will provide an opportunity for the formation of information blocks for	Lyubchak V.O.	September 2017

		licensing and accreditation of study programmes according to updated rules and criteria.		
		7.2 Providing technical support for placement of information about study programmes.	Lyubchak V.O.	September 2017
		7.3 Providing publication of information about study programmes on the sites of institutes (faculties).	Directors of institutes (deans of faculties)	November 2017
		7.4 Placement of teachers' profiles in open access (on the websites of departments).	Directors of institutes (deans of faculties)	November 2017
8.	Dissemination of practical expertise gained in frames of ALIGN Project of the TEMPUS Programme	8.1 Modernization of the content of the piloted study programmes "Management of organizations" and "Computer Mechanics" according to findings of evaluation.	Study programmes teams	October 2017
		8.2 Approval by Academic Council of Institutional Guidelines for alignment of study programmes with qualification frameworks.	Yuskayev V.B., Krykliy O.A., Liuta O.V., Heads of QA councils at institutes/faculties	October 2017
		8.3 Carrying-out self-assessment of all master level programmes using criteria offered by the project.	Karpusha V.D., Yuskayev V.B., Krykliy O.A., Directors (deans), programme teams	December 2017
		8.4 Carrying-out trainings by SSU participants of the project on internal and external evaluation procedures.	Krykliy O.A., Project WG members	During academic year 2017/2018
9.	Improvement of the system of electives for students	9.1 Inclusion to bachelor study programmes a set of elective courses aimed at development of generic competences.	Directors of institutes (deans of faculties)	Constantly starting from academic year 2016/17
		9.2 Annual renewal of the list of courses based on offers from institutes (faculties) and approved by the QA Council.		
		9.3 Selection of courses by students by means of Electronic Cabinet		