

INDEPENDENT AGENCY FOR ACCREDITATION AND RATING

**STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES
FOR INTERNATIONAL SPECIALISED
(PROGRAMME) ACCREDITATION OF A JOINT
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME OF HIGHER AND
(OR) POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION
(based on ESG, the European Approach for Quality
Assurance of Joint Programmes, 2015)**

INDEPENDENT AGENCY FOR ACCREDITATION AND RATING



**STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES
FOR INTERNATIONAL SPECIALISED (PROGRAMME) ACCREDITATION OF
A JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME OF HIGHER AND (OR)
POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION
(based on ESG, the European Approach for Quality Assurance
of Joint Programmes, 2015)**

Nur-Sultan, 2020

CONTENTS

I PROCEDURE FOR INTERNATIONAL SPECIALISED (PROGRAMME) ACCREDITATION OF A JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME.....	3
Purpose and Principles of International Accreditation of a Joint Educational Programme	3
The Procedure for Conducting International Accreditation of a Joint Educational Programme	3
II SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT.....	10
Basic Principles of Report Preparation.....	10
Content of the Self-Assessment Report.....	10
Structure of the SAR	11
III INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF A JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME.....	22
1. RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE (ELIGIBILITY).....	22
2. LEARNING OUTCOMES	23
3. DESIGN AND APPROVAL OF PROGRAMME.....	24
4. STUDENT ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION	25
5. STUDENT-CENTRED LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT	26
6. STUDENT SUPPORT	28
7. RESOURCES	29
8. TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION	31
9. QUALITY ASSURANCE	32
10. ON-GOING MONITORING AND PERIODIC EVALUATION OF THE JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.....	34
11. PERIODIC EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES	35
Bibliography.....	36
ANNEX 1. Recommended Form of the Visit Programme.....	37
ANNEX 2. Sample of a Front Page.....	41
ANNEX 3. Responsibilities of the IAAR Coordinator within the Framework of the Procedure of International Specialised (Programme) Accreditation of a Joint Educational Programme	42
ANNEX 4. The Interaction with the EO Coordinator.....	43
ANNEX 5. Roles and Responsibilities of EEP Members	44
ANNEX 6. Preparation of the External Expert Panel for the Site Visit.....	47

I PROCEDURE FOR INTERNATIONAL SPECIALISED (PROGRAMME) ACCREDITATION OF A JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME

Purpose and Principles of International Accreditation of a Joint Educational Programme

The purpose of international accreditation (hereinafter - accreditation) of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education is to conduct an external assessment and recognition of the quality of the educational programme in accordance with the standards of international specialised (programme) accreditation developed on the basis of European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance of the European Higher Education Area (ESG, 2015) taking into account the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (Yerevan, 2015).

The procedure of international accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education serves the general purpose of assessing the quality of the activities of the educational organisation, the partner educational organisation, as well as compliance with European standards. International specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme provides for consideration of the legislation of the respective countries.

Standards and procedures for international accreditation of joint educational programmes of higher and (or) postgraduate education comply with the basic principles and documents of the Bologna Process.

For the international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education, in order to ensure a qualitative assessment, the use of individual and cluster approaches is provided. The cluster approach is implemented to ensure the effectiveness of the activities of the External Expert Panel (hereinafter - EEP). The cluster approach in the international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme allows dividing the total number of conscientious educational programmes submitted for external evaluation into clusters. One cluster includes no more than 5 joint educational programmes. During one visit of an External Expert Panel, no more than 20 joint educational programmes of the EO are subject to external evaluation.

The main principles of international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education are: independence, voluntariness, professionalism and accessibility of assessment; objectivity and professionalism; transparency, reliability and relevance of information on accreditation procedures; collegiality of decision-making, dissemination of information about positive and (or) negative results.

The Procedure for Conducting International Accreditation of a Joint Educational Programme

The procedure for international accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education includes the following stages:

1. Applying for accreditation

Submission by an educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations of an application to the IAAR for international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education with copies of title and permits attached.

IAAR considers the application of an educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations for the international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme.

The decision of the IAAR to initiate the procedure for international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme.

2. Conclusion of an agreement for the provision of services between EO and IAAR

The schedule of visits to educational organisations and (or) partner educational organisations, the conditions for conducting international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme and financial issues of accreditation are determined by an agreement between the IAAR and the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations.

At the request of the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations, IAAR can organise training of internal experts in order to clarify the requirements of standards and guidelines for international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education, external evaluation procedures at special seminars on the methodology of accreditation. The seminar is not a mandatory component of the international accreditation process, and the decision on the organisation of the seminar remains with the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations.

3. Preparation of a self-assessment report

An educational organisation independently organises and conducts a self-assessment of a joint educational programme (cluster of programmes) in order to establish compliance with international standards and guidelines for specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme, and also prepares a self-assessment report in accordance with section II of these standards and guidelines.

The standards and guidelines of the international specialised (programme) accreditation of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education are not provided for external evaluation of the joint educational programme of medical education.

The self-assessment report should contain the necessary, reliable information on the compliance of the activities of partner educational organisations with national qualification systems, which will be useful for foreign agencies and experts to evaluate the joint educational programme in the context of its positioning in national education systems.

In addition, the self-assessment report should disclose the peculiarity of the joint educational programme as an indicator of the joint work of educational organisations of one or more national systems of higher and (or) postgraduate education.

The self-assessment report and its appendices are sent to the IAAR by the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations at least 8 (eight) weeks before the visit of the EEP. IAAR, after conducting an internal examination of the report of the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations on the self-assessment of the joint educational programme for compliance with the standards and guidelines of the international specialised (programme) accreditation, sends independent experts for review at least 6 (six) weeks before the visit.

Independent experts study the self-assessment report for compliance with IAAR requirements, standards and guidelines for the international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme, prepare and submit reviews to the IAAR within 10 (ten) calendar days. In case of non-compliance with IAAR requirements, the review is sent to the expert for amendments and additions. In case of repeated non-

compliance, IAAR has the right to suspend this expert from participating in the work of the EEP.

Based on the analysis of the self-assessment report of the joint educational programme, IAAR has the right to make one of the following decisions:

- develop recommendations for making changes and additions to the report on the self-assessment of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education for compliance with the standards and guidelines of international specialised (programme) accreditation;
- conduct follow-up procedures for international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education (a site visit of the EEP to educational organisations and (or) partner educational organisations);
- to postpone the dates of subsequent accreditation procedures, due to the non-compliance of the self-assessment report with the standards and guidelines of the international specialised (programme) accreditation of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education.

4. EEP site visit to an educational organisation

The assessment of the quality of a joint educational programme (cluster of programmes) for compliance with the standards and guidelines of the international specialised (programme) accreditation of an educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education is carried out by an external expert panel, whose functions are regulated by the Regulation on Expert Activity Regulations of an IAAR External Expert. In the case of subsequent accreditation procedures in accordance with the Regulations on the IAAR External Expert Panel, an expert commission is formed, the composition of which is determined taking into account the volume of work of the external evaluation. The EEP consists of independent experts, including foreign experts with experience in teaching and expert work on quality assurance, representatives of the employers' community and students. The EEP is approved by the order of the General Director of the IAAR.

In case of continuation of the accreditation procedure, the IAAR will coordinate with the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations the dates and schedule of the site visit of the EEP.

The visit of the EEP is carried out to the educational organisation and (or) to the partner educational organisations according to the terms of the Agreement between the IAAR and the educational organisation and (or) to the partner educational organisations to conduct an external evaluation of the joint educational programme. In the case of a visit of the EEP to one of the educational organisations that is a partner in the implementation of a joint educational programme, the participation of representatives of all other partner educational organisations in the external evaluation procedures is mandatory. The format of participation (on-line and (or) off-line) of representatives of all other partner educational organisations in external evaluation procedures is agreed with the IAAR, the external evaluation procedures in which other partner educational organisations will be involved are specified in the Agreement between the IAAR and the educational organisation. The external evaluation procedures (activities) carried out during the site visit should be prescribed in the Programme of the visit of the EEP.

The programme of the EEP site visit is being developed by the IAAR Coordinator and the Chairman of the EEP with the participation of partner educational organisations. The programme of the EEP site visit is coordinated with all partner educational organisations. The agreed programme of the site visit to the EEP is approved by the General Director of the IAAR at least 2 (two) weeks before the site visit to the educational organisation and (or) to the partner educational organisations. The structure and content of the programme

is developed taking into account the specifics of the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations, a joint educational programme (cluster of programmes) according to the recommended sample of the visit programme of the EEP (Annex 1).

The duration of the EEP site visit is 3-5 days.

The visit should include meetings (interviews) and discussions with representatives of all partner educational organisations and, in particular, with the management of partner educational organisations and the joint educational programme, teachers, staff, students and other relevant stakeholders, both graduates and representatives of the professional sphere. During the initial international specialised (programme) accreditation of the joint educational programme (ex-ante), meetings (interviews) and discussions with students, in their absence, graduates and representatives of the professional sphere are not held.

The visit may be limited to a visit to one educational organisation, while the relevant documentation of the other (their) partner educational organisation must be taken into account.

During the visit, the educational organisation creates conditions for the work of the EEP in accordance with the Service Agreement:

- submits an electronic version of the self-assessment report for each of the panel members;
- provides the necessary office equipment in agreement with the representative of the IAAR and the number of members of the EEP;
- organises inspection of infrastructure and resources, meetings (interviews), questionnaires and other types of work of the EEP in accordance with the Programme of the EEP site visit;
- provides the information requested by the EEP.

The results of the site visit to the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations are reflected in the EEP review report on the results of the external evaluation.

The draft EEP report is reviewed by the IAAR and sent for approval to the educational partners. In case of identification of factual inaccuracies by partner educational organisations, the Chairman coordinates with the members of the EEP and makes the necessary changes to the report. In case of disagreement with the remarks of the partner educational organisation to the EEP report, the Chairman, together with the IAAR coordinator, prepares an official response with a collegially submitted justification.

The report contains a description of the EEP visit, a summary of the results of the quality assessment of a joint educational programme or cluster of programmes for compliance with international IAAR standards, recommendations for improving the activities of an educational organisation and (or) a partner organisation for quality assurance, recommendations to the Accreditation Council on the term of accreditation of a joint educational programme or cluster of programmes or refusal of accreditation.

The EEP report, including recommendations, is developed collectively by the members of the EEP.

5. Decision-making by IAAR

The self-assessment report of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education developed by the educational organisation with the participation of all partner educational organisations and the review report of the EEP on the results of the assessment serve as the basis for the decision on accreditation by the Accreditation Council.

The Chairman of the EEP at the meeting presents to the Accreditation Council the results of the external evaluation of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education.

The exclusive competence of the IAAR Accreditation Council includes making decisions on accreditation or refusal of accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education. The composition of the Accreditation Council is determined in accordance with the Regulations on its activities. The meeting is held if there is a quorum. The Accreditation Council has the right to make an informed decision that does not comply with the recommendations of the external expert panel.

The Accreditation Council has the right to make one of the following decisions:

- *accreditation for a period of 1 (one) year* - when the criteria are generally met, but there are some deficiencies and opportunities for improvement (when assessing criteria requiring improvement from 30% to 60%, with the absence of strong criteria);
- *accreditation for a period of 3 (three) years* - when the criteria are generally met, but there are some minor deficiencies and opportunities for improvement (when assessing criteria requiring improvement from 15% to 30%, with the presence of strong criteria);
- *accreditation for a period of 5 (five) years* - when the criteria are generally met and there are positive outcomes (when assessing criteria requiring improvement up to 15%, with the presence of strong criteria);
- *accreditation for a period of 7 (seven) years* - when the criteria are generally met and there are examples of best practice translation (when assessing criteria requiring improvement up to 5%, with no less than 10% strong criteria);
- *refusal of accreditation* - when there are significant deficiencies (when assessing at least one criterion as "unsatisfactory" or requiring improvement of 60% or more).

If the Accreditation Council makes a positive decision, IAAR sends an official letter to the educational organisation, as well as to partner educational organisations with the results of the decision and a Certificate of international programme accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education. Further, the decision on the accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education is sent to the authorised body in the field of education of the relevant country and posted on the IAAR website. Additionally, the review report of the EEP on the assessment results is also posted on the IAAR website.

After receiving the Certificate of Accreditation, the educational organisation places on its website a report on the self-assessment of the joint educational programme of the higher and (or) postgraduate education programme.

If the Accreditation Council makes a negative decision, IAAR sends an official letter to the educational organisation about the decision.

An educational organisation has the right to appeal to the IAAR against the decision of the Accreditation Council in accordance with the established procedure in accordance with the Service Agreement and the Regulations on the Appeals and Complaints Commission. In accordance with the Regulations on the Appeals and Complaints Commission, in case of doubt about the competence of the external expert panel and representatives of the Agency, or a gross violation committed by members of the external expert panel, the educational organisation has the right to send a complaint to IAAR.

6. Follow-up procedures

If the IAAR Accreditation Council makes a positive decision, the educational organisation provides the IAAR with an Action Plan for Improving a Quality of Education within the framework of the recommendations of an external expert panel (hereinafter - Plan), which is coordinated with the management of partner educational organisations, signed by the first head, certified by the seal of the educational organisation acting under the Agreement between the EO and IAAR for the international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme.

If the IAAR Accreditation Council makes a positive decision, the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations conclude a Contract with the IAAR for the provision of services for post-accreditation monitoring. Post-accreditation monitoring is carried out in accordance with the Regulations on the procedure for post-accreditation monitoring of educational organisations and (or) educational programmes.

The Contract and the Plan are the basis for post-accreditation monitoring. In accordance with the Regulations on the procedure for post-accreditation monitoring of educational organisations and (or) educational programmes, the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations must prepare interim reports on the implementation of the Plan. Interim reports are sent to the IAAR before the expected date of post-accreditation monitoring.

In case of non-fulfillment of the Plan and requirements put forward by the IAAR for post-accreditation monitoring, as well as the absence of information about changes carried out in the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations, the Accreditation Council has the right to make one of the following decisions:

- “temporarily suspend the accreditation status of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education”;
- “withdraw the certificate of accreditation of a joint educational programme by excluding from the Register of accredited joint educational programmes of higher and (or) postgraduate education, which may entail the cancellation of all previously achieved results of accreditation”.

If the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations refuse to conclude an agreement with the IAAR for post-accreditation monitoring, the AC has the right to decide on revocation of the certificate of accreditation of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education.

7. External Expert Panel (group of experts on external evaluation)

External evaluation of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education (cluster of programs) is carried out by an external expert panel consisting of independent experts, including foreign experts with experience in teaching and expert activities on quality assurance, a representative of employers and students, at least four experts per one joint educational programme.

The EEP is formed on the basis of the order of the General Director of the IAAR from among the certified representatives of the academic, professional and student community included in the database of IAAR experts. Foreign experts may be attracted from partner accreditation agencies.

The external expert panel should include representatives of at least two countries participating in the consortium providing a joint educational programme.

In case of programme accreditation, the composition of the EEP is formed depending on the number of joint educational programmes submitted for external evaluation.

In order to exclude a conflict of interest, IAAR sends an official letter on the composition of the EEP to the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations 14 (fourteen) calendar days before the visit.

The educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations have the right to notify IAAR by an official letter of the existence of a conflict of interest with justification within 3 (three) working days. IAAR replaces the expert if necessary.

All members of the EEP sign a commitment statement on the absence of a conflict of interest and the code of ethics of an external IAAR expert during each visit.

The expert is obliged to notify the IAAR coordinator of any connection with the educational organisation and (or) partner organisations, as well as of the existence of his own interests, which may lead to a potential conflict related to the external evaluation

process. Each member of the EEP must perform his functions and duties efficiently. Non-compliance and refusal without a reasonable reason are considered as a violation of the Code of Ethics of an external IAAR expert and may lead to exclusion from the IAAR expert database.

The information about the EO received during the external evaluation is presented as confidential and is not subject to disclosure.

Members of the EEP should not announce or comment on the recommended terms of accreditation before the decision of the AC.

The External Expert Panel consists of:

- Chairman of the External Expert Panel, responsible for coordinating the work of experts, preparation and oral presentation of preliminary conclusions formed during the visit to the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations, as well as responsible for preparing the final report on the results of the external evaluation of the joint educational programme (cluster of programmes).

- External experts - representatives of the academic community responsible for assessing the compliance of the evaluated joint educational programme with international standards and IAAR accreditation guidelines.

- An external expert is a representative of the professional community (employer), who must assess whether the accredited joint educational programme (cluster of programmes) and the professional competencies of its graduates meet the requirements of the labor market.

- An external expert is a representative of the student community responsible for assessing the compliance of the accredited joint educational programme (cluster of programmes) with the needs and expectations of students (for each cluster at least 1 representative of the student community).

IAAR appoints from among its employees a coordinator responsible for coordinating the work of the external expert panel. The educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations, for their part, appoint an authorised person responsible for the process of international accreditation of a joint educational programme (cluster of programmes).

IAAR informs experts about the external evaluation activities, identifying their specific functions and responsibilities according to the Regulations on the Activities of the External Expert Panel; and also provides information on the specifics of the procedure for international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education.

II SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT

The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) is one of the main documents of the international specialised (programme) accreditation of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education.

The self-assessment procedure at the international level should contain the following sections: Standards 1-11 and relevant annexes.

These standards and guidelines are applicable for the international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education (non-medical educational organisations), including the initial accreditation of a joint educational programme (ex-ante).

Basic Principles of Report Preparation

1. Structuring: strict compliance of the presented material with the sections of the document.
2. Readability: the text of the document should be easy to read from the point of view of printing, semantic and stylistic features of the text.
3. Analyticity: analysis of advantages and disadvantages, analysis of the dynamics of the development of EO and (or) EP (cluster of programmes).
4. The objectivity of the assessment.
5. Validity: providing facts, data, information as arguments for conclusions.

The features of the joint educational programme that are not described in the manual should be included in the relevant part of the documents.

During the external evaluation of a cluster of programmes, aspects common to all programmes are described once in the introductory section to avoid repetition.

The final document should be clearly structured, numbered (including annexes).

Content of the Self-Assessment Report

The SAR consists of an introduction, three main sections and applications.

It is recommended that the introduction include information about the conditions and organisation of self-assessment, its goals and objectives.

The first section provides general information about the educational organisation and (or) partner educational organisations, the structural unit implementing the evaluated joint educational programme (cluster of programmes):

- short information;
- organisational and legal support of activities;
- organisational structure and management system;
- interaction with educational, research, professional organisations at the local, regional and national levels;
- international activities;
- number of students (annual);
- dynamics of the body of students of different forms of education over the past 3-5 years.

In the case of initial international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme, the presentation of information about the dynamics of the body of students is excluded.

The second section includes an analysis of the compliance of the activities of an educational organisation and (or) educational partner organisations in ensuring the quality of a joint educational programme (cluster of programmes) with the standards of international accreditation.

The text of the section should be organised in accordance with the procedure specified in these standards and the guidelines of the international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme. The SAR must provide answers to all the basic questions and include all the necessary documentary evidence in the appendices.

The educational organisation should provide information on the achievements of the educational organisation and (or) the educational programme over the past 3-5 years for each standard. It is also assumed that the report will indicate problems and areas requiring improvement that were identified using SWOT analysis.

At the end of each self-assessment standard, a conclusion is given according to the model: "According to the assessment of the working group on the Standard "RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE (ELIGIBILITY)", a "strong/satisfactory/improving" position is noted".

The third section of the report should include general conclusions and a conclusion on the self-assessment process, giving grounds for applying for an external quality assessment procedure.

Appendices should include tables, general information about the educational organisation, information about the accredited educational programme (cluster of programmes), achievements of educational programmes (at least 2 pages) (in the case of programme accreditation), and a list of materials and documentary evidence submitted for consideration by an external expert group during a visit to the educational organisation.

The SAR must be submitted in English¹ - officially in electronic format, unless otherwise agreed. The report should not exceed 50-60 pages (without annexes).

The report should be written in the following format: font size – 12, space between lines – 1.5, at the beginning of the report should be given an automatically editable embedded table of contents, page numbers.

The SAR should be submitted on behalf of the head of the educational organisation and must be signed by him/her.

The main provisions and conclusions of the report should be brought to the attention of all participants in the self-assessment process; published on the internet resource of the educational organisation. All those responsible for self-assessment and reliability of the material presented in the report should participate in filling out the table "Conclusion of the Self-Assessment Commission".

Structure of the SAR

The content of the SAR should be presented in accordance with the following structure:

Content

Introduction

1. General information

2. Compliance with the standards of international accreditation of the joint educational programme:

¹ If not otherwise agreed by the parties, documents of large size may be submitted in the original language provided that they are accompanied by a brief summary in English.

Standard 1. Right to participate (eligibility)

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

Standard 2. Learning outcomes

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

Standard 3. Design and approval of programme

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

Standard 4. Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

Standard 5. Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

Standard 6. Student support

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

Standard 7. Resources

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

Standard 8. Transparency and documentation

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

Standard 9. Quality assurance

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

Standard 10. On-going monitoring and periodic evaluation of the joint educational programme

- description of the activity;
- achievements over the last 3 years and 5 years;
- areas of activity requiring improvement.

3. Conclusions

4. The last section of the self-assessment report should include the completed table "Conclusion of the Self-Assessment Commission" (Table 3).

5. Annexes

The front page

The cover page of the SAR should be separate for each report (Annex 2).

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE ORGANISATION OF EDUCATION

Full name of the educational organisation	
Full name of the partner university	
Founders	
Founders of the partner university	
Year of foundation (name, renaming (when implemented))	
Current status of accreditation:	
Location of EO	
Location of the partner university	
Head of EO	
Head of the partner University	
License (title document)	
License (title document) of the partner university	
Number of students (full-time, part-time)	
Number of students (full-time, part-time) of the partner university	
Cooperation document	
Special Profile	<i>Double degree</i>

Table 2

INFORMATION ABOUT THE JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME SUBMITTED FOR INTERNATIONAL ACCREDITATION (EXAMPLE)

PART I	<i>Examples</i>
Joint educational programme(s)	<i>"Computer Science and Computer Engineering" (230100.62, 230100.68), "Applied Computer Science" (230700.62, 230700.68)</i>
The level of education of JEP in according with the NQF (for example, 6,7,8)	
The level of education JEP in according with the FQ-EHEA (for example, 1,2,3 cycles)	
Assigned degree (qualifications)	
Level / Period of study	<i>Bachelor's degree / 4 years Master's degree / 2 years</i>
Structural division (head)	<i>Faculty of Technical Cybernetics (Akhmetov Serik, Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor Smagulov Kanat, Candidate of Technical Sciences, senior lecturer)</i>

Standards and guidelines for international accreditation of joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education

Main departments (heads of departments)	<i>Department of Computer Engineering (Nurgaliyev Samat, Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor)</i>
Date of the site visit	<i>March 2-4, 2021</i>
Person responsible for accreditation (tel./fax/e-mail)	<i>Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, Sultanova Maral, Doctor of Technical Sciences, Professor</i>
PART II	
Number of ECTS credits	
Duration of study (number of semesters), form of study	
Start of training (winter semester / summer semester)	
Date of introduction of the joint educational programme	
Previous accreditation (date, validity period, accreditation agency)	
Requirements for applicants	
Further education opportunities (upon completion of the programme)	

Table 2 continued

Goals and objectives of joint EP	
Brief description of the joint EP	
Learning outcomes	
Qualification	
Additional features	
Number of students, including those studying for mobility	
Tuition fees	
Employment opportunities, possible career directions	

Joint Curriculum (Study Plan)

The title page is followed by a joint educational programme containing the following information:

- modules/programmes/disciplines;
- the number of ECTS credits for each module/discipline and the duration of the module/discipline (number of semesters);
- total number of ECTS credits / credit allocation in each semester or academic year;
- if possible, the teaching method is indicated: lecture, seminar, practical lesson, etc., exams and assessment methods.
- practical experience and preparation of final qualifying work, final exams (semester and number of ECTS credits).

Conclusion of the Self-Assessment Commission

№	№	Standards and criteria of the international specialised (programme) accreditation of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education	The position of the joint educational programme			
			Strong	Satisfactory	Suggests improvement	Unsatisfactory
1 Standard «Right to Participate (Eligibility)»						
1.1 Status						
1.	1.1.1	Educational organisations planning to implement a joint programme should be recognised by the relevant authorities of the country in which they are located.				
2.	1.1.2	Participation in the implementation of a joint educational programme, assignment of a joint academic degree must comply with national regulations.				
3.	1.1.3	The institutions awarding the degree(s) should ensure that the degree(s) belong to the higher education degree systems of the countries in which they are based.				
1.2 Joint Design and Delivery						
4.	1.2.1	A joint educational programme should be developed and implemented with the involvement of all partner educational organisations.				
1.3 Cooperation Agreement						
5.	1.3.1	The conditions for the development and implementation of a joint educational programme should be clearly set out in the cooperation agreement between partner educational organisations.				
<i>The cooperation document should set out the following:</i>						
6.	1.3.2	information about the academic degree (qualifications, degrees) awarded upon mastering (completion) of a joint educational programme				
7.	1.3.3	coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation (including funding, sharing of costs and income etc.)				

8.	1.3.4	admission and selection procedures for students				
9.	1.3.5	mobility of students and teachers				
10	1.3.6	examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of ECTS credits and procedures for awarding joint academic degrees				
Total according to the standard						
2. Standard «Learning Outcomes»						
2.1 Education Level						
11.	2.1.1	The joint educational programme should be developed in accordance with the set goals, including the expected learning outcomes.				
12.	2.1.2	The qualifications obtained as a result of the development of a joint educational programme should be clearly defined, explained and correspond to a certain level of the national qualifications framework(s) in higher education and, consequently, with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA).				
2.2 Disciplines						
13.	2.2.1	The disciplines of the joint educational programme should ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, including knowledge, skills and competencies of the respective field(s) of education.				
2.3 Achievement						
14.	2.3.1	The joint educational programme should ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes by each student.				
2.4 Regulated Professions						
15.	2.4.1	The joint educational programme, if relevant, should take into account the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC, or the relevant common trainings frameworks established under the Directive.				
Total according to the standard						
3 Standard «Design and Approval of Programme»						
3.1 Joint Educational Programme						
16.	3.1.1	The structure and content of the joint educational programme should be defined and developed on the basis of a student-centered approach in teaching to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.				
17.	3.1.2	A joint educational programme should be developed with the participation of students and other stakeholders.				

3.2 Credits					
18.	3.2.1	The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) should be applied properly and the distribution of credits should be clear.			
3.3 Academic Workload					
19.	3.3.1	The joint educational programme provides coverage of the required workload. The bachelor's degree programme is at least 180-240 ECTS-credits; the joint master's programme is at least 90-120 ECTS-credits and should not be less than 60 ECTS-credits at the second level of the cycle (credit ranges according to FQ-EHEA); for joint doctorates there is no credit range specified.			
20.	3.3.2	The joint educational programme has mechanisms to control the workload and the average time to complete the programme.			
Total according to the standard					
4. Standard «Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification»					
4.1 Admission of Students					
21.	4.1.1	Partner educational organisations must have pre-defined, published and consistently applied admission rules and relevant requirements for applicants.			
22.	4.1.2	Selection procedures should correspond to the level of the joint educational programme, regulate all periods of the "life cycle" of training, i.e. admission, academic performance, recognition and certification.			
4.2 Recognition					
23.	4.2.1	Recognition of qualifications and periods of studies (including recognition of prior learning) should be applied in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and subsidiary documents.			
Total according to the standard					
5. Standard «Student-Centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment»					
5.1 Learning and Teaching					
24.	5.1.1	The joint educational programme should be designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes.			
25.	5.1.2	The applied approaches to teaching and learning should be adequate for their achievement of the intended learning outcomes.			
26.	5.1.3	A joint educational programme should take into account the diversity of students, respect their needs, including potentially different cultural backgrounds of students.			

5.2 Assessment of Students						
27.	5.2.1	The examination regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes should correspond with the intended learning outcomes.				
28.	5.2.2	Examinations and evaluation of the results achieved by students should be conducted by partner educational organisations in accordance with the established rules.				
Total according to the standard						
6. Standard «Student Support»						
29.	6.1.1	Partner educational organisations should ensure the functioning of appropriate student support services.				
30.	6.1.2	Student support services should contribute to achieving the intended learning outcomes.				
31.	6.1.3	Student support services should take into account the possible specific challenges of mobile students.				
32.	6.1.4	Support services should, when allocating, planning and providing educational resources, take into account the needs of various groups of students (mobile students, adults, working, distance learning, as well as students with disabilities) and take into account the principles of a student-centered approach in teaching and learning.				
Total according to the standard						
7. Standard «Resources»						
7.1 Teaching Staff						
33.	7.1.1	The teaching staff must be sufficient and adequate (qualifications, professional and international experience) to implement a joint educational programme.				
7.2 Conditions						
34.	7.2.1	The conditions provided must be sufficient and adequate, taking into account the intended learning outcomes.				
<i>Partner educational organisations are responsible for the quality of their employees and providing favorable conditions for their effective work. Therefore, educational organisations, recognising the importance of teaching, should:</i>						
35.	7.2.2	develop clear, transparent and objective criteria for hiring, appointment, promotion, dismissal and comply with them in their activities;				
36.	7.2.3	provide opportunities for career growth and professional development of teachers;				
37.	7.2.4	encourage scientific activities to strengthen the link between education and scientific research;				
38.	7.2.5	encourage the use of innovative teaching methods, teaching and the use of advanced technologies.				

39.	7.2.6	The EO should strive to ensure that the educational equipment and software used to ensure that students achieve the intended learning outcomes of a joint educational programme are similar in the relevant industries.				
Total according to the standard						
8 Standard «Transparency and Documentation»						
40.	8.1.1	Relevant information about the joint educational programme should be documented and published taking into account the specific needs of mobile students.				
41.	8.1.2	Information about the joint educational programme should take into account the admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures, etc.				
42.	8.1.3	Partner educational organisations should have and implement mechanisms for collecting and analysing information about their activities, about the partner's activities within the framework of a joint educational programme and use the information obtained in the work of an internal quality assurance system.				
43.	8.1.4	The EO should ensure the involvement of students and employees in the collection, analysis of information and planning of subsequent procedures.				
<i>When collecting information, the EO should take into account the following:</i>						
44.	8.1.5	key performance indicators;				
45.	8.1.6	information about the body of students;				
46.	8.1.7	academic performance, student achievements and dropout rates;				
47.	8.1.8	satisfaction of students with the quality of implementation of the joint educational programme;				
48.	8.1.9	availability of educational resources and student support services;				
49.	8.1.10	employment of graduates.				
Total according to the standard						
9. Standard «Quality Assurance»						
50.	9.1.1	Partner educational organisations should have a published quality assurance policy that is part of their strategic management.				
51.	9.1.2	The quality assurance policy is more effective if it reflects the relationship between learning, teaching, and scientific research and takes into account the national contexts in which partner educational organisations operate.				
52.	9.1.3	Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes involving external stakeholders.				

53.	9.1.4	Partner educational organisations should apply joint internal quality assurance processes in accordance with part one of the ESG.				
<i>The quality assurance policy supports:</i>						
54.	9.1.5	the organisation of a quality assurance system that provides for joint internal quality assurance processes of partner educational organisations;				
55.	9.1.6	departments, schools, faculties, institutes and other departments, as well as the management of the educational organisation, employees and students performing quality assurance duties;				
56.	9.1.7	academic integrity and freedom, as well as intolerance to manifestations of various kinds of academic dishonesty;				
57.	9.1.8	processes that provide intolerance of any kind or discrimination of students and teachers;				
58.	9.1.9	participation of external stakeholders in quality assurance.				
Total according to the standard						
10. Standard «On-Going Monitoring and Periodic Evaluation of the Joint Educational Programme»						
59.	10.1.1	Partner educational organisations should monitor and periodically evaluate the joint educational programme to achieve their goals and confirm compliance with the needs of students and society.				
60.	10.1.2	The results of these processes should lead the EO to the continuous improvement of the joint educational programme.				
61.	10.1.3	All stakeholders should be informed of any planned or undertaken actions regarding the joint educational programme.				
62.	10.1.4	The joint educational programme should be regularly evaluated and reviewed with the involvement of students and other stakeholders.				
11. Standard «Periodic External Quality Assurance Procedures»						
63.	11.1.1	Partner educational organisations should undergo external quality assurance procedures in accordance with European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) on a regular basis.				
64.	11.1.2	The educational organisation should strive to ensure that the progress made since the last external quality assurance procedure is taken into account when preparing for the next procedure.				
Total according to the standard						
Total						

Annexes to the Self-Assessment Report

Required annexes:

1. Document on cooperation between EO within the framework of the implementation of a joint EP
2. Documents on the organisation of the educational process:
 - Study and examination regulations.
 - Admission regulations.
 - Diploma and Diploma Supplement.
 - Diploma Supplement with the indication of studied disciplines and ECTS.
 - Provisions of organising and conducting practices.
3. Documents regulating the contents of the study process:
 - Requirements for the development of a joint educational programme, work and/or study plans.
 - Plans for the implementation of a joint educational programme.

Additional Annexes:

- Qualification profiles of the teaching staff.
- Work plan for the entire duration of the study programme (target/realisation).
- Description of existing and prospective cooperation of agreements (documents on cooperation).
 - Regulations on the teaching staff appointments.
 - The decision on previous accreditation, the report of the external expert panel, accreditation certificate, a letter from the accreditation agency about the fulfillment of obligations and recommendations (if applicable).

Documents on the Quality Assurance System:

- Results of evaluation surveys on student and teacher workload.
- Student questionnaires (e.g. polling first year students at the end of the first semester).
 - Students' evaluation of the content, methods and results of teaching.
 - Information on the employment of graduates.

Statistical Data (must be transparent, understandable, accessible, verifiable and confirmed):

- Data on the current number of students in each discipline as of the date of compilation of the self-evaluation report.
 - Examination results.
 - The total number of applicants, the number of admitted students, the number of graduates, and the drop-out percentage.
 - The number (percentage) of foreign students.
 - Gender ratio.

III INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF A JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME

1. RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE (ELIGIBILITY)

Standard:

1.1 Status

Educational organisations planning to implement a joint programme should be recognised by the relevant authorities of the country in which they are located.

Participation in the implementation of a joint educational programme, assignment of a joint academic degree must comply with national regulations.

The institutions awarding the degree(s) should ensure that the degree(s) belong to the higher education degree systems of the countries in which they are based.

1.2 Joint Design and Delivery

A joint educational programme should be developed and implemented with the involvement of all partner educational organisations.

1.3 Cooperation Agreement

The conditions for the development and implementation of a joint educational programme should be clearly set out in the cooperation agreement between partner educational organisations.

The cooperation document should set out the following:

- information about the academic degree (qualifications, degrees) awarded upon mastering (completion) of a joint educational programme
- coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation (including funding, sharing of costs and income etc.)
- admission and selection procedures for students
- mobility of students and teachers
- examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of ECTS credits and procedures for awarding joint academic degrees.

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

✓ *Confirmation of the recognition of an educational organisation and partner universities planning to implement a joint educational programme by the relevant authorities of the country in which they are located.*

✓ *On the basis of what documents is the participation of the EO allowed in the implementation of a joint educational programme?*

✓ *Compliance of the awarded joint academic degree with the national qualification system of the countries in which the EO is located.*

✓ *Participation of all partner universities in the development and implementation of a joint educational programme.*

✓ *Validity of the conditions for the development and implementation of a joint educational programme set out in the agreement on cooperation between partner universities.*

2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

Standard:

2.1 Education Level

The joint educational programme should be developed in accordance with the set goals, including the expected learning outcomes.

The qualifications obtained as a result of the development of a joint educational programme should be clearly defined, explained and correspond to a certain level of the national qualifications framework(s) in higher education and, consequently, with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA).

2.2 Disciplines

The disciplines of the joint educational programme should ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, including knowledge, skills and competencies of the respective field(s) of education.

2.3 Achievement

The joint educational programme should ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes by each student.

2.4 Regulated Professions

The joint educational programme, if relevant, should take into account the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC, or the relevant common trainings frameworks established under the Directive.

Guidelines:

Study programmes are at the core of the higher education institutions' teaching mission. The joint educational programme provides students with both academic knowledge and the necessary skills and competencies that can have an impact on their personal development and be applicable in their future career.

When developing a joint educational programme, partner educational organisations should ensure:

- *compliance with a certain level of the national qualifications framework in higher education and, consequently, the qualifications framework in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA)*
- *achieving the four goals of higher education defined by the Council of Europe;*
- *unhindered advancement of the student in the process of mastering the programme;*

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

✓ *What is the purpose of the joint educational programme/general qualification/target group (students)? Are the qualification objectives adequately set out in the documents regulating the educational process and the evaluation of educational achievements and in the Diploma Supplement?*

✓ *Does the joint educational programme have a special profile (double-degree, additional education, dual training, related research, distance, intensive training, combined training, etc.), and has it been properly stated and justified?*

✓ *What skills and methodological competencies are being formed?*

- ✓ *What knowledge, skills and competencies can be developed within the framework of a joint EP?*
- ✓ *How does the EO track changes that have occurred since the last quality assurance procedure?*
- ✓ *What recommendations and suggestions were presented to the EO/management of the joint EP following the results of the last quality assurance procedure? What decisions were made at the university based on the results of the last external quality assurance procedure? How and to what extent are they implemented?*
- ✓ *How are the changes taken into account when preparing for the upcoming external evaluation procedure?*
- ✓ *Are the requirements of the professional environment properly reflected?*
- ✓ *How is it ensured that the content of academic disciplines and learning outcomes correspond to the level of education (bachelor's, master's, doctoral studies)?*

3. DESIGN AND APPROVAL OF PROGRAMME

Standard:

3.1 Joint Educational Programme

The structure and content of the joint educational programme should be defined and developed on the basis of a student-centered approach in teaching to ensure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

A joint educational programme should be developed with the participation of students and other stakeholders.

3.2 Credits

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) should be applied properly and the distribution of credits should be clear.

3.3 Academic Workload

The joint educational programme provides coverage of the required workload. The bachelor's degree programme is at least 180-240 ECTS-credits; the joint master's programme is at least 90-120 ECTS-credits and should not be less than 60 ECTS-credits at the second level of the cycle (credit ranges according to FQ-EHEA); for joint doctorates there is no credit range specified.

The joint educational programme has mechanisms to control the workload and the average time to complete the programme.

Guidelines:

The structure and content of the joint educational programme should be defined and developed at the institutional level of partner universities according to joint internal quality assurance processes.

When developing a joint educational programme, the educational organisation must ensure:

- *formal approval of the programme at the institutional level compliance of the programme objectives with the institutional strategy and the presence of clearly defined expected learning outcomes;*
- *participation of students and other stakeholders in the development of the programme;*
- *conducting an external expertise;*

- *determination of the expected workload of students through the correct application of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS)*
- *providing opportunities for mobility of students and teachers, for practical training by students, if necessary.*

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

- ✓ *Have the joint procedures for developing the structure and content of the joint EP and its approval at the institutional level of partner universities been defined and documented?*
- ✓ *Is it envisaged to conduct an external examination of the joint EP? Who is involved in it and what requirements are imposed on them?*
- ✓ *How is it ensured that the content of academic disciplines and learning outcomes correspond to the level of education (bachelor's, master's, doctoral studies)?*
- ✓ *Is the volume of compulsory, elective and elective modules/disciplines justified?*
- ✓ *Is there a window of mobility for students and teachers (for example, a semester abroad)? Is it advisable to have it in a joint EP?*
- ✓ *Is the joint educational programme harmonious with respect to the expected learning outcomes? Does the content of the disciplines (modules) ensure the achievement of the planned results of joint EP in the local EP?*
- ✓ *To what extent does the students' knowledge assessment system correlate with the ECTS system?*
- ✓ *Is joint EP technically possible in relation to the workload of students?*
- ✓ *Does the name of the module (discipline) coincide with the content?*
- ✓ *Is the description of the modules complete and competent? Are they informative enough?*
- ✓ *Are the modern achievements of science reflected in the joint EP?*
- ✓ *Is the ratio of classroom classes and self-study time appropriate?*

4. STUDENT ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION

Standard:

4.1. Admission of Students

Partner educational organisations must have pre-defined, published and consistently applied admission rules and relevant requirements for applicants.

Selection procedures should correspond to the level of the joint educational programme, regulate all periods of the "life cycle" of training, i.e. admission, academic performance, recognition and certification.

4.2. Recognition

Recognition of qualifications and periods of studies (including recognition of prior learning) should be applied in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and subsidiary documents.

Guidelines:

Providing the conditions and support necessary for students to develop an academic career in the interests of individual students, programmes, educational organisations and systems. The admission, recognition and graduation procedures corresponding to the goals play an important role in this process, especially if there is mobility of students within the systems of higher and (or) postgraduate education.

It is important that the access policy, processes and admission criteria of students are carried out consistently and transparently. Familiarity with the organisation of education and the joint educational programme should be provided.

The educational organisation should have mechanisms and tools available for collecting, monitoring and follow-up actions based on information about the academic achievements of students.

Objective recognition of higher education qualifications, periods of study and prior education, including recognition of non-formal education, is an integral component of ensuring students' academic performance in the learning process and promotes mobility. In order to guarantee proper recognition procedures, the educational organisation must:

- ensure that the actions of the educational organisation comply with the Lisbon Recognition Convention;*
- cooperate with other educational organisations and national ENIC/NARIC centers to ensure comparable recognition of qualifications in the country.*

Graduation represents the culmination of a student's period of study. Partner educational organisations must provide students with documents confirming the qualifications obtained, including the achieved learning outcomes, as well as the context, content and status of the education received, and evidence of its completion.

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

✓ What is the policy of forming a body of students and what additional requirements does the EO impose on applicants?

✓ How do students and applicants learn about the procedures for the formation of a body (admission rules, the procedure for continuing education at a partner university, transfer from course to course, from other universities, transfer of credits mastered at other universities, deductions, etc.)?

✓ How does the university assess the correspondence between the admission process and subsequent progress students?

✓ Is the recognition of prior learning outcomes and qualifications carried out in accordance with the Lisbon Convention?

✓ Are the training requirements transparent for all target groups? What areas of information are available to students (Internet, university fairs, information days, contact partners, etc.)?

✓ Is there a mechanism for recognising the results of students, including those mastered during academic mobility, as well as the results of additional, formal and informal education?

✓ What requirements are defined for the recognition of previous learning outcomes? Give examples of recognition of previous learning outcomes.

✓ What regulatory document of the university regulates the procedure for recognising the results of academic mobility?

✓ Is it possible to prepare students for professional certification? What types of certification are possible in the professional field?

5. STUDENT-CENTRED LEARNING, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

Standard:

5.1 Learning and Teaching

The joint educational programme should be designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes.

The applied approaches to teaching and learning should be adequate for their achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

A joint educational programme should take into account the diversity of students, respect their needs, including potentially different cultural backgrounds of students.

5.2 Assessment of Students

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes should correspond with the intended learning outcomes.

Examinations and evaluation of the results achieved by students should be conducted by partner educational organisations in accordance with the established rules.

Guidelines:

Learning and teaching requires a balanced approach to the development and implementation of a joint educational programme and the evaluation of learning outcomes.

By implementing a student-centered approach in teaching and learning, the educational organisation must ensure:

- respect and attention to different groups of students and their needs, providing flexible learning paths;*
- use of various teaching methods (where appropriate);*
- flexible use of a variety of pedagogical methods;*
- regular feedback on the methods and methods used to evaluate and adjust teaching methods, teaching;*
- support of the student's autonomy with proper guidance and assistance from the teacher at the same time;*
- strengthening mutual respect between the teacher and the student;*
- availability of appropriate procedures for responding to students' complaints.*

Taking into account the importance of assessing students' academic performance for their future careers, quality assurance mechanisms for evaluation should take into account the following:

- evaluators should be familiar with the methods of testing and verifying students' knowledge and improve their own competence in this area;*
- evaluation criteria and methods should be published in advance;*
- assessment should allow students to demonstrate the level of achievement of the planned learning outcome. The student should receive feedback, and, if necessary, advice on the learning process;*
- the exam should be conducted by more than one examiner, where possible;*
- evaluation rules should include consideration of mitigating circumstances;*
- the assessment should be consistent, objective in relation to all students and conducted in accordance with the established rules;*
- there should be a formal appeal procedure.*

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

✓ How is respect and attention to different groups of students and their needs ensured, are flexible learning paths provided to students?

✓ How are the needs of students taken into account when forming a joint EP?

✓ What opportunities are provided to students when forming an educational trajectory?

✓ How are equal opportunities for students to achieve learning outcomes ensured, including in the context of different groups of students?

✓ How are the individual characteristics of students taken into account when implementing a joint EP?

- ✓ *Does the EO have its own research in the field of teaching academic disciplines of joint EP? (Give examples).*
- ✓ *Does the EO have a feedback system for the use of various teaching methods, teaching and evaluation of learning outcomes?*
- ✓ *How is academic freedom of students ensured?*
- ✓ *Is the consistency, transparency and objectivity of the mechanism for evaluating the results of joint EP training provided in the EO?*
- ✓ *How is the mechanism for assessing knowledge, skills and competencies implemented?*
- ✓ *What forms of learning and teaching, including innovative teaching methods (for example, online learning) are used? Is there sufficient variability?*
- ✓ *Do didactic concepts ensure the formation of career-oriented competencies among students?*
- ✓ *Are the learning achievement assessment tools competently oriented? Is there sufficient variability in the consideration of different qualification criteria?*
- ✓ *Are the learning achievement assessment tools module-oriented? Are combined learning achievement assessment tools used?*
- ✓ *Are the regulations/training documents reflected in the procedure for conducting and types of exams?*
- ✓ *Do the regulatory documents for conducting exams take into account the conditions for students with disabilities?*
- ✓ *What methods of evaluation of learning outcomes are used in the framework of a joint educational programme?*
- ✓ *How is the training and professional development of evaluators carried out?*
- ✓ *Are there procedures in the EO to respond to complaints and appeals of students?*

6. STUDENT SUPPORT

Standard:

Partner educational organisations should ensure the functioning of appropriate student support services.

Student support services should contribute to achieving the intended learning outcomes.

Student support services should take into account the possible specific challenges of mobile students.

Support services should, when allocating, planning and providing educational resources, take into account the needs of various groups of students (mobile students, adults, working, distance learning, as well as students with disabilities) and take into account the principles of a student-centered approach in teaching and learning.

Guidelines:

During their studies, students need support, which is especially important for stimulating the mobility of students both within the educational system and between different higher education systems.

Support services and their activities should be organised taking into account the situation of a specific educational organisation, an educational partner organisation.

When providing support services, the key role belongs to the administration and specialised services, therefore, the organisation of education must ensure the professionalism of employees and opportunities for the development of their competencies.

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

✓ *Is the regulation and planning of individual support and counseling of students properly ensured (guidance on the educational programme, consultation hour, support with textbooks, etc.)? Are students assisted in finding housing, internships, semesters abroad?*

✓ *What are the procedures for supporting various groups of students, including information and counseling?*

✓ *Are there support programmes for students with disabilities and those in special life situations and do they meet the requirements?*

✓ *Have cooperation relationships with other organisations been established for professional practice?*

✓ *How does the EO ensure compliance with safety requirements in the learning process?*

✓ *How are the needs of various groups of students in the context of joint EP taken into account (mobile students, adults, working, foreign students, as well as students with disabilities, etc.)?*

✓ *What information systems are used at the university and what problems do they solve, what processes do they serve?*

7. RESOURCES

Standard:

7.1 Teaching Staff

The teaching staff must be sufficient and adequate (qualifications, professional and international experience) to implement a joint educational programme.

7.2 Conditions

The conditions provided must be sufficient and adequate, taking into account the intended learning outcomes.

Partner educational organisations are responsible for the quality of their employees and providing favorable conditions for their effective work. Therefore, educational organisations, recognising the importance of teaching, should:

- develop clear, transparent and objective criteria for hiring, appointment, promotion, dismissal and comply with them in their activities;
- provide opportunities for career growth and professional development of teachers;
- encourage scientific activities to strengthen the link between education and scientific research;
- encourage the use of innovative teaching methods, teaching and the use of advanced technologies.

The EO should strive to ensure that the educational equipment and software used to ensure that students achieve the intended learning outcomes of a joint educational programme are similar in the relevant industries.

Guidelines:

Students require educational resources, which can be both material (such as libraries or computers) and human (mentors, tutors, and other consultants).

The role of the teacher is paramount in ensuring quality learning and the development of knowledge, skills, and competencies. Educational institutions must ensure the availability of sufficient, accessible, and relevant educational resources. The internal quality system ensures the accessibility and relevance of all resources to the learning objectives, as well as informing students about available services.

When distributing, planning, and providing educational resources, the needs of various student groups (such as mobile learners, adults, working students, distance learners, international students, as well as students with disabilities) must be taken into account, considering the trends of student-centered learning.

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

- ✓ Is the human resource suitable for implementing the joint educational programme and ensuring the programme's profile? Which documents reflect the personnel policy, considering appointment and promotion within the service? Are the decisions made by the management transparent?*
- ✓ Does the human potential of the teachers correspond to the university's development strategy and the specifics of the joint educational programme?*
- ✓ How is the level of teachers' competence determined in connection with professional standards, industry frameworks and NQF (the European Qualifications Framework (EQF))?*
- ✓ What are the requirements for teachers occupying positions at different qualification levels?*
- ✓ How do the qualification requirements for teachers differ depending on the level of the joint educational programme (BA, MA, PhD)?*
- ✓ Is the workload for teaching and examination balanced?*
- ✓ Is an interdisciplinary approach to teaching implemented?*
- ✓ What measures are in place for staff professional development and qualification?*
- ✓ How is the professional and personal development of programme teachers stimulated? For example, is self-improvement encouraged, knowledge acquisition, innovative teaching methods application, integration of scientific and educational activities?*
- ✓ Do teachers apply information and communication technologies in the educational process (e.g., online learning, e-portfolios, MOOCs, etc.)? Have changes in teaching quality and the quality of graduates' knowledge, skills, and competencies been identified in connection with the introduction of new technologies?*
- ✓ Are practitioners from relevant fields involved in teaching?*
- ✓ How are practitioner-teachers selected?*
- ✓ Describe the dynamics and results of academic mobility of teachers within the joint educational programme (for example, over the past 3 or 5 years) and their contribution to ensuring the quality of education and the development of the joint educational programme.*
- ✓ How are teachers from partner universities and other educational organisations attracted to teaching, including for scientific research?*
- ✓ Are there sufficient financial resources and educational infrastructure to achieve the goals of the joint educational programme?*
- ✓ Do material, technical, and informational resources ensure the achievement of planned results of the joint educational programme? How is the development of material resources of the joint educational programme planned?*
- ✓ How is the compliance of educational equipment and software used in the joint educational programme with the analogs used in relevant industries determined?*
- ✓ Demonstrate the developed rules for the acquisition of educational equipment and software, as well as the extension of contracts for the use of proprietary software.*
- ✓ What information systems are used in the university, and what problems do they solve, what processes do they serve?*
- ✓ How do students access information on disciplines in the joint educational programme?*
- ✓ What is the role of the website in informing students, staff, and all interested parties? What information is published, how often is it updated, and is access to the most current information available through the university website?*

✓ *Do information resources correspond to the specifics of the joint educational programme? Is expertise conducted on the results of research, graduation papers, dissertations for plagiarism? Is access to educational internet resources available, and does Wi-Fi function?*

✓ *Are library resources sufficient? Is the library open for extended periods?*

✓ *Are online technologies used in education? Are they appropriate?*

✓ *Is educational equipment and software used in the university? Is the extension of contracts for the use of proprietary software provided for? Provide a list of equipment and software used in the university within the joint educational programme.*

✓ *How does the educational institution ensure compliance with safety requirements during the learning process?*

✓ *How are the needs of various student groups within the educational programme (adults, working individuals, foreign students, as well as students with disabilities, etc.) taken into account?*

8. TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION

Standard:

Relevant information about the joint educational programme should be documented and published taking into account the specific needs of mobile students.

Information about the joint educational programme should take into account the admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures, etc.

Partner educational organisations should have and implement mechanisms for collecting and analysing information about their activities, about the partner's activities within the framework of a joint educational programme and use the information obtained in the work of an internal quality assurance system.

The EO should ensure the involvement of students and employees in the collection, analysis of information and planning of subsequent procedures.

When collecting information, the EO should take into account the following:

- key performance indicators;
- information about the body of students;
- academic performance, student achievements and dropout rates;
- satisfaction of students with the quality of implementation of the joint educational programme;
- availability of educational resources and student support services;
- employment of graduates.

Guidelines:

The educational organisation should inform the public, interested parties about its activities in the context of joint EP.

The information should cover admission requirements and procedures, a catalogue of courses, elective subjects, examination and assessment procedures, etc.

Information in the context of joint EP should be documented and published taking into account the specific needs of mobile students.

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

- ✓ *What processes of informing stakeholders are defined in the EO?*

- ✓ *Is there a special information resource in the EO (website, portal, etc.) through which information is distributed (including relevant) regarding the formation and implementation of the development plan of the EP?*
- ✓ *What methods of information dissemination, including mass media, information networks for informing the general public and interested persons are used in the EO?*
- ✓ *Does the information published by the EO meet the needs of stakeholders (intended learning outcomes of joint EP training, assigned qualifications, training and teaching, admission requirements and procedures, information about compulsory disciplines, catalog of elective disciplines (courses), examination and assessment procedures, tuition fees, educational opportunities provided to students, information about the disciplines of the joint educational programme, teachers, employment opportunities, cooperation with a partner university and other organisations, financial statements, etc.)?*
- ✓ *How is the satisfaction of interested parties investigated in the quality of the information received and in its completeness?*
- ✓ *What information systems are used to improve the internal quality assurance system?*
- ✓ *How is the effectiveness and efficiency of the EO's activities assessed in the context of joint educational policy?*
- ✓ *What quality system assessment processes are available in the EO (teaching assessment, satisfaction monitoring, analysis of employment and career growth of graduates, collection and processing of information on areas of activity, etc.)?*
- ✓ *What information management processes are implemented in the EO? How are stakeholders involved in the processes of collecting and analysing information, as well as making decisions based on them?*
- ✓ *To what extent is processed, adequate information constantly used to improve the internal quality assurance system?*
- ✓ *How are risks identified and predicted based on the analysis of information?*
- ✓ *How is internal information management reporting carried out in the EO?*
- ✓ *How do the tools change when the requirements for the nature and structure of information change?*
- ✓ *What mechanisms of informing about the implementation of the joint EP plan and changes are used in the EO?*
- ✓ *How does the EO ensure the protection of information?*

9. QUALITY ASSURANCE

Standard:

Partner educational organisations should have a published quality assurance policy that is part of their strategic management.

The quality assurance policy is more effective if it reflects the relationship between learning, teaching, and scientific research and takes into account the national contexts in which partner educational organisations operate.

Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes involving external stakeholders.

Partner educational organisations should apply joint internal quality assurance processes in accordance with part one of the ESG.

The quality assurance policy supports:

- the organisation of a quality assurance system that provides for joint internal quality assurance processes of partner educational organisations;

- departments, schools, faculties, institutes and other departments, as well as the management of the educational organisation, employees and students performing quality assurance duties;
- academic integrity and freedom, as well as intolerance to manifestations of various kinds of academic dishonesty;
- processes that provide intolerance of any kind or discrimination of students and teachers;
- participation of external stakeholders in quality assurance.

Guidelines:

The quality assurance policy and its implementation mechanisms are the basis of a logically structured and consistent system. The quality assurance system of the organisation of education is a cycle of continuous improvement and contributes to the accountability of the organisation of education. The system supports the development of a quality culture in which all stakeholders take responsibility for quality at all levels of the functioning of the educational organisation. To strengthen it, the policy and mechanisms for its implementation have an official status and are available to the general public.

The policy is embodied in activities that provide for a variety of processes and procedures for internal quality assurance, which involve the participation of all departments of the educational organisation. The degree of policy implementation is regulated, monitored and reviewed at the level of the educational organisation itself, taking into account the interests of the partner university.

The quality assurance policy also applies to any activity carried out by subcontractors or other partners.

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

✓ *What documents reflect the quality assurance policy? Where is it published? Is it posted on the open resources of partner universities or only on the internal resources of each EO?*

✓ *Is the quality assurance policy available to teaching staff, employees and students? Is it known and available to employers and other interested persons of educational organisations cooperating in the framework of a joint EP?*

✓ *Are other institutions or stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of quality assurance policies?*

✓ *How did the quality assurance policy change?*

✓ *Demonstrate the results of assessing the satisfaction of the main stakeholders with the quality assurance policy.*

✓ *Does the joint EP correspond to the stated missions or strategies of the cooperating EO?*

✓ *How is the link between scientific research, teaching and learning reflected in the quality assurance policy?*

✓ *Does the quality policy provide for joint interaction between the business community, the scientific community, teaching staff and students?*

✓ *What mechanisms are used to implement this complex relationship. Give examples.*

✓ *Have the competencies and decision-making processes of the bodies cooperating with the NGO in the development of a joint EP been defined?*

✓ *How much information on the educational process is available and transparent for students?*

✓ *Are there procedures for reviewing the objectives of the joint EP, the concept and its implementation?*

- ✓ *How much do the developed joint ops correspond to the regulatory documents of the EO?*
- ✓ *Describe the quality assurance system in place at the university. Demonstrate the application of joint internal quality assurance processes. How is it applied during the implementation of the EP? How is its continuous improvement ensured?*
- ✓ *What types of activities are outsourced (contractors, partners) and what are the requirements for them? How is their compliance monitored?*

10. ON-GOING MONITORING AND PERIODIC EVALUATION OF THE JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Standard:

Partner educational organisations should monitor and periodically evaluate the joint educational programme to achieve their goals and confirm compliance with the needs of students and society.

The results of these processes should lead the EO to the continuous improvement of the joint educational programme.

All stakeholders should be informed of any planned or undertaken actions regarding the joint educational programme.

The joint educational programme should be regularly evaluated and reviewed with the involvement of students and other stakeholders.

Guidelines:

The purpose of constant monitoring, periodic evaluation and revision of the joint educational programme is to ensure effective implementation and create a favorable learning environment.

This includes an assessment of:

- *the content of the joint educational programme taking into account the latest scientific achievements in a particular discipline to ensure the relevance of the discipline taught;*

- *changing needs of society;*

- *workload, academic performance and graduation of students;*

- *effectiveness of student assessment procedures;*

- *expectations, needs and satisfaction of students with studying in a joint educational programme;*

- *the educational environment and support services and their compliance with the objectives of the programme.*

The collected information is analysed and the programme is brought into line with modern requirements. The changes made are published.

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

- ✓ *How is the monitoring and evaluation of programmes carried out at the university?*

- ✓ *How is the achievement of goals monitored within the framework of the joint EP?*

- ✓ *How is the need to change the content of curricula and educational programmes determined in the EO (changes in the labor market, employers' requirements and the social demand of society)?*

- ✓ *Are students represented in collegial bodies? Do students participate in the process of further development of the joint educational programme?*

- ✓ *How do students, employers and other stakeholders participate in the revision of the joint EP?*

- ✓ *Do the surveys take into account the verification of students' academic workload?*
- ✓ *What are the tools for determining student satisfaction with the quality of joint EP?*
- ✓ *Are there surveys of students and graduates? Are the survey results taken into account in the assessment and revision of the joint EP?*
- ✓ *Does the content of the joint EP reflect the latest achievements of science in a particular discipline?*
- ✓ *How is satisfaction with the quality of the practice organisation and its results monitored?*
- ✓ *How is the achievement of the goals and objectives of professional practice guaranteed, its compliance with the upcoming professional activity?*
- ✓ *How is the satisfaction of the needs of students and society monitored? Demonstrate its results.*
- ✓ *Describe how the student's personal development is monitored in the process of mastering a joint EP? What methods are used for this? Where are the results recorded?*

11. PERIODIC EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES

Standard:

Partner educational organisations should undergo external quality assurance procedures in accordance with European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) on a regular basis.

The educational organisation should strive to ensure that the progress made since the last external quality assurance procedure is taken into account when preparing for the next procedure.

Guidelines:

External quality assurance procedures in various forms allow us to evaluate the effectiveness of quality assurance processes within an educational organisation. They are catalysts for the development and realisation of new opportunities. They also provide information about the quality of the organisation's educational activities to the public.

The educational organisation should regularly participate in external quality assurance procedures, which, where necessary, take into account the requirements of the legislation within which they operate. Therefore, depending on the context, external quality assurance can take different forms and be implemented at different levels (such as a programme, faculty or educational organisation).

Quality assurance is a continuous process that does not end with receiving an external review, writing a report, or the processes of subsequent procedures in an educational organisation.

Exemplary subject of evaluation:

- ✓ *Does the EO and EP participate in external evaluation procedures?*
- ✓ *How regularly does the EP undergo external evaluation? What are the results of the external evaluation, national and international, in which the EO participated? If the results are published in open sources, provide links.*
- ✓ *What decisions were made in the EO following the results of the last external quality assurance procedure? How and to what extent have the recommendations and proposals based on the results of the last external evaluation procedure been implemented? How are the changes taken into account when preparing for the upcoming external evaluation procedure?*
- ✓ *What is the role of the effectiveness of external evaluation in the development of the internal quality assurance system of the EO?*

Bibliography

- [1] Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On Education" dated July 27, 2007 No. 319-III SAM.
- [2] The Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On Amendments and Additions to Some Legislative Acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan on the expansion of academic and managerial independence of higher education institutions" dated July 4, 2018 No. 171-VI.
- [3] Order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On approval of the Rules for recognition of accreditation bodies, including foreign ones, and formation of the Register of recognised accreditation bodies, accredited educational organisations and educational programs" dated November 1, 2016 No. 629.
- [4] Quality Procedures in the European Higher Education Area and Beyond - Second ENQA Survey, ENQA, 2008, Helsinki.
- [5] Guidelines for the use of ECTS (European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System). - European Union Publications Office, 2015, ISBN 978-92-79-43562-1 (Approved at the Yerevan Conference of Ministers of Education on May 14-15, 2015).
- [7] Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). (2015). Brussels, Belgium
- [8] European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes. Approved by EHEA ministers in May 2015.
- [9] Salzburg recommendations. EUA-CDE. Munich, 2015

ANNEX 1. Recommended Form of the Visit Programme

AGREED
Rector _____
(name of the educational organisation)
_____ Full name
20_ «_» _____

APPROVED
General Director, Independent Agency for
Accreditation and Rating
_____ A.B. Zhumagulova
20_ «_» _____

**PROGRAMME OF THE VISIT
FOR THE IAAR EXTERNAL EXPERT PANEL
TO _____**
name of the educational organisation

Data of the visit: _____ 20__

Arrival day: _____ 20__

Departure day: _____ 20__

Accredited Joint EP(s)

Cluster 1	joint EP
	joint EP
	joint EP
Cluster 2	joint EP
	joint EP
	joint EP
Cluster 3	joint EP
	joint EP
	joint EP

Standards and guidelines for international accreditation of joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education

Date and time	EEP work with target groups	Full name and job title of the target groups	Venue
«__»__20__			
During the day	Arrival of the EEP team members		Hotel
16.00-18.00	Preliminary meeting of the EEP (distribution of responsibilities, discussion of key issues and the programme of the visit)	<i>External experts of the IAAR</i>	Hotel
18.00-19.00	Dinner (EEP members only)	<i>External experts of the IAAR</i>	
Day 1, «__»__20__			
9.00-9.30	Discussion of organisational issues with experts	<i>External experts of the IAAR</i>	Main building, office for the EEP
9.30-10.00	Meeting with the head of EO	Head (full name)	Office of the head of EO
10.00-10.30	Meeting with the head of EO	Head of the institution (full name)	Office of the head of EO
10.30-11.15	Meeting with the deputy heads of the organisation (Vice-rector, Deputy director, Vice-presidents)	<i>Job title, full name</i>	Main building, Conference hall
11.15-11.30	Coffee-break for working discussions	<i>Only EEP members</i>	EEP room
11.30-12.45	<i>Visual inspection of the EO (in the case of specialised accreditation only facilities for EPs under accreditation)</i>	<i>Job title, full name</i>	Itinerary based
13.00-14.00	Lunch (EEP members only)	Lunch break	
14.00-14.15	EEP work		EEP room
14.15-15.00	Meeting with Heads of accredited EPs	<i>Job title, full name (or Appendix No. __)</i>	Main building, Conference hall
15.00-15.45	Meeting with the heads of the departments of accredited EPs	<i>Job title, full name (or Appendix No. __)</i>	Main building, Conference hall

Standards and guidelines for international accreditation of joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education

15.45-16.00	Coffee-break for working discussions	<i>Only EEP members</i>	
16.00-17.00	Meeting with teachers of accredited EP	<i>Lecturers' list (Appendix No. __)</i>	1-cluster: lecture theater 1 2 cluster: lecture theater 2 3 cluster: lecture theater 3
17.00-18.00	Questionnaire survey by teachers (in parallel)	<i>Academic teaching staff of the EPs under accreditation</i>	Computer rooms no. 513-519
17.00-18.00	Work of the EEP (discussion of results and summarising outcomes of the 1 st day)		EEP room
18.00-19.00	Dinner (only EEP members)		
Day 2, « __ » 20__			
09.00-09.30	The work of the EEP (discussion of organisational issues)		EEP room
09.30-12.30	Visiting graduate departments of the EP (in case of programme accreditation)	<i>Job title, full name</i>	Academic building no. 5 Academic building no. 2
09.30-12.30	Attending classes	According to the class schedules of EPs under accreditation	Academic buildings no. 2, 5
12.30-13.00	Work of the EEP (exchange of views)		EEP room
13.00-14.00	Lunch (only EEP members)	Lunch break	
14.00-15.00	Meeting with students	<i>Students of EP under accreditation (Appendix No. __)</i>	1-cluster: lecture theater 1 2 cluster: lecture theater 2 3 cluster: lecture theater 3
15.00-16.00	Questionnaire survey of students (in-parallel)	<i>Students under accreditation</i>	Computer rooms no. 513-519
15.00-16.00	Meeting with employers	<i>Representatives of state and financial institutions, heads of manufacturing enterprises and organisations (Appendix No. __)</i>	Lecture theater 1
16.00-16.30	Coffee-break for working	<i>Only EEP members</i>	EEP room

Standards and guidelines for international accreditation of joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education

	discussions		
16.30-17.00	Meeting with graduates of EP	<i>Graduates - representatives for each EP (Appendix No. _)</i>	Lecture theater 1
17.00-18.00	Work of the EEP (discussion of results and summarising outcomes of the 2 nd day)	<i>Only EEP members</i>	EEP room
18.00-19.00	Dinner (only EEP members)		
Day 3, « _ » 20_			
09.00-09.30	The work of the EEP (discussion of organisational issues)		EEP room
09.30-12.30	Site visits to professional internship venues, branches of departments (clinical cites, educational and clinical centers)	<i>Full name, practice bases</i>	<i>Appendix no.</i>
12.30-13.00	Work of the EEP (collegial coordination and preparation of an oral preliminary review of the visit results)		EEP room
13.00-14.00	Lunch (only EEP members)	Lunch break	
14.00-16.30	Work of the EEP		EEP room
16.30-17.00	Final EEP meeting with the management of the EO	<i>Management of HEI and its structural units</i>	Main building, Conference hall
18.00-19.00	Dinner (only EEP members)		
Schedule based	EEP members departure		
« _ » 20_			
Schedule based	EEP members departure		

ANNEX 2. Sample of a Front Page

Name of the EO

Name of the Faculty

Name of the Department

APPROVED

Rector

_____ Name, Surname

signature

«____» _____ 20__

seal stamp

SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT

(programme accreditation)

JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME

or

ACCORDING TO THE CLUSTER OF JOINT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES

"Name of the programme"

City, year

ANNEX 3. Responsibilities of the IAAR Coordinator within the Framework of the Procedure of International Specialised (Programme) Accreditation of a Joint Educational Programme

Before the visit:

- provide normative and methodological materials on the organisation and conduct of self-assessment of joint EP, developed by IAAR;
- keep in touch with the EO and participate in meetings on the accreditation procedure;
- advise the EO on the accreditation procedure, including on self-assessment and the preparation of a self-assessment report;
- carry out technical proofreading (examination) self-assessment report for completeness and applicability (if important omissions are found, request missing materials from the EO coordinator);
- Instruct external experts on the requirements of international accreditation.
- Provide external experts with regulatory and methodological materials (developed by IAAR) defining the activities of the external expert panel.
- provide the necessary information in a timely manner, including a self-assessment report to the members of the EEP for study and review;
- send, if necessary, recommendations to the EO on finalising the self-assessment report based on expert reviews;
- coordinate the time frame of the EEP visit to the EO;
- organise a visit to the EEP (accommodation, meals, transfer, etc.);
- provide the EEP with an approved programme of the visit;
- send the composition of the EEP to the EO to exclude a conflict of interest 14 calendar days before the visit;
- act as the main contact person and maintain communication between the EEP, EO and IAAR;
- organise information support for the preliminary meeting of the members of the external expert panel before the visit to the EEP.

During the visit:

- regulate the activities of the EEP, provide the necessary methodological materials;
- to create a favorable psychological climate for the work of the EEP;
- monitor the integrity of the accreditation process and ensure compliance with IAAR requirements.

After the visit:

- send the draft of the EEP report to the EO in order to prevent factual inaccuracies in the content of the report;
- Ensure timely transfer of materials to the AC Secretary;
- send the report of the EEP to the EO after the decision of the AC on the accreditation of the joint EP (in case of a positive decision of the AC on accreditation, provide a request for an Action Plan to implement the recommendations of the EEP);
- inform the members of the EEP about the decision of the AC;
- provide feedback on the accreditation procedure of the EO and (or) the EP (online survey of the members of the EEP and the EO after the decision on accreditation).

ANNEX 4. The Interaction with the EO Coordinator

The coordinator is appointed by the head of the EO. The coordinator does not have to be the head of the working group on the preparation of a self-assessment of a joint educational programme for compliance with the standards of international programme accreditation.

The Coordinator interacts with the IAAR Coordinator on planning and organising a visit to the EO.

To ensure the effectiveness of the international specialised (programme) accreditation procedure, the EO coordinator contributes to:

- coordination of the process of preparing a self-assessment report on a joint educational programme;
- ensuring timely submission of the self-assessment report to IAAR;
- assistance in the timely coordination of the programme of the visit of the EEP;
- ensuring the organisation of visits to facilities according to the visit programme, including the provision of transport;
- ensuring meetings (interviews) of the EEP members with the target groups of the EEP during the EEP visit;
- organisation of the approval of the EEP report for the presence of actual inaccuracies.

The EO Coordinator facilitates the provision of the necessary additional information about the joint educational programme at the request of members of the external expert panel.

ANNEX 5. Roles and Responsibilities of EEP Members

Functions of the Chairman

- participation in the development of the programme of the visit to the EO and responsibility for its implementation, management of the work of the members of the EEP, preparation of the final report of the EEP with recommendations for improving the quality of the joint educational programme and recommendations for the Accreditation Council;
- interaction with the IAAR coordinator prior to conducting an external assessment on the organisation of the visit and the approval of the program;
- setting the agenda and holding meetings;
- ensuring the participation of members of the expert commission in meetings (interviews) with various target groups, as well as monitoring compliance by experts with the main purpose of the external assessment and visit to the EO;
- ensuring collegial discussion of the evaluation table of parameters by the entire staff of the EEP in accordance with international standards and guidelines for specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education;
- holding a final meeting with the members of the EEP to coordinate recommendations on accreditation;
- Presentation of the results of the external evaluation in the EO and the main provisions of the report of the EEP at the meeting of the Accreditation Council. In case of his absence for a good reason, the obligation to submit the results of an external assessment to the EO is assigned to one of the members of the EEP.

Duties of the Chairman

Before the visit:

- get acquainted with the data of the EO;
- study the report of the EO on the self-assessment of the joint educational programme and write a review according to the requirements of the IAAR;
- take part in the development of the programme of the visit of the EEP;
- officially present all the members of the EEP at a preliminary meeting, inform the purpose of the visit, discuss the programme of the visit and the self-assessment report of the joint educational program.

During the visit:

- to hear the opinions of the members of the EEP on the self-assessment of the joint educational programme and identify areas that require clarification;
- distribute responsibilities among the members of the EEP;
- speak at meetings with target groups;
- hold a final meeting with the members of the EEP to agree on recommendations;
- to provide oral feedback on the results of the visit of the EEP, to familiarise with the draft recommendations of a general nature during the final meeting with the management of the EO.

After the visit:

- prepare a draft report on the results of the external evaluation of the EEP and coordinate it with the members of the EEP;
- send a draft report on the results of the EEP visit for consideration by the IAAR;
- if there are actual inaccuracies identified after the approval of the EEP report with

the EO, make the necessary adjustments and additions to the EEP report and coordinate them with the members of the EEP;

- in case of disagreement with the comments of the EO to the EEP report, together with the IAAR coordinator, prepare an official response to the EO with justification;
- prepare a report of the EEP for submission to the Accreditation Council for consideration.

Functions of an external expert

- assessment of the completeness and reliability of the results of the self-assessment of the joint educational programme in accordance with the standards of the international specialised (programme) accreditation IAAR;
- Preparation for each meeting with the target groups of the EO with the definition of key issues in accordance with international standards and IAAR guidelines;
- preparation of a report on the results of an external evaluation of a joint educational programme for compliance with the standards and guidelines for international specialised (programme) accreditation of a joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education;
- development of recommendations to improve the quality of EO activities within the framework of a joint educational program;
- Development of recommendations on accreditation to the Accreditation Council in accordance with the level of preparedness of the EO for international programme accreditation.

Responsibilities of an external expert

Before the visit:

- to study all the documentation, including self-evaluation report and any other available information (Standards, legal acts in the field of education, websites of IAAR, EOs, etc.);
- to maintain liaisons with IAAR and the EEP Chair;
- to prepare a review (except for employers and students) for compliance with the international standards for accreditation in accordance with IAAR requirements;
- to discuss a visit to the EO with the IAAR Coordinator and the Chair;
- to agree with the IAAR Coordinator on the details of the visit;
- to participate in preliminary meeting of the EEP.

During the visit:

- to actively participate in all meetings and discussions, contribute to the EEP work;
- to carry out duties within the EEP related to the evaluation procedure;
- to inform the IAAR Coordinator and the Chair about any doubts and questions arising in the course of the EEP work;
- not to interrupt EEP work during the whole period of the visit;
- to speak at meetings as it may be agreed with the EEP Chair;
- to document the data received;
- to provide the EEP Chair with the necessary documentation related to the data received during the external evaluation;
- to conduct interviews with the target groups;
- to attend various types of classes, study rooms, training places, etc. according to the programme of the EEP visit;
- to participate in the online survey of teachers and students aiming to identify the

degree of satisfaction with the educational process;

- receive additional information necessary to analyse the prospects of a joint educational programme through the IAAR Coordinator and the Chairman.

After the visit:

- to participate in the preparation of the EEP report;
- to destroy confidential materials received during the visit;
- not to disclose the results of the external evaluation of the joint educational programme until the official decision of the AC is made.

ANNEX 6. Preparation of the External Expert Panel for the Site Visit

The purpose of the visit to the educational organisation of the external expert panel of the Independent Accreditation and Rating Agency is to assess the quality of the joint educational programme for compliance with the standards and guidelines for international specialised (programme) accreditation of the joint educational programme of higher and (or) postgraduate education and to develop recommendations on accreditation for consideration by the Accreditation Council.

To achieve the goal, the following tasks are defined:

- control of completeness and reliability of the results of self-assessment of the joint educational programme;
- assessment of compliance with the standards and guidelines for international specialised (programme) accreditation of joint educational programmes of higher and (or) postgraduate education, developed on the basis of ESG, the European approach for quality assurance of joint programmes, 2015;
- development of the EEP report on the results of the evaluation of the EO and (or) EP;
- preparation of recommendations to improve the quality of the EO and (or) EP;
- preparation of recommendations for the Accreditation Council for accreditation in accordance with the level of readiness of the joint educational programme for international accreditation.

Materials considered by the EEP before the visit to the EO

Prior to the visit to the EO, the following methodological and regulatory documentation is sent to the members of the external expert panel:

- Regulatory documents concerning the external verification of the joint educational programme;
- Standards and guidelines for international accreditation of joint educational programmes of higher and (or) postgraduate education (based on ESG, European approach for quality assurance of joint programmes, 2015);
- Self-assessment report submitted as part of an accredited joint educational programme;
- Information about the composition of the expert panel;
- The programme of the visit to the EO;
- Additional information about the joint educational programme (at the request of members of the external expert panel).

Review of the self-assessment report of the accredited joint educational programme

After receiving the self-assessment report of the joint educational programme accredited by IAAR, copies of the SAR are sent to the expert panel no later than 6 weeks before the date of the visit.

Each member of the expert panel must carefully study the SAR and write a review (except for the employer and the student) according to the requirements of the IAAR.

Preliminary meeting of the EEP

The preliminary meeting is held in order to coordinate and distribute the responsibilities of the EEP members by the Chairman, discuss the programme of the visit, report on the programme self-assessment to identify key points and issues requiring additional information.

The preliminary meeting of the EEP is held according to the programme the day before the visit to the EO. Only EEP members are present at the meeting.

The preliminary meeting provides for consideration of the following issues:

- Does the SAR provide sufficient information on all aspects specified in this Manual at the level of the EO and (or) the programme?

- What additional information about the EO and (or) the joint educational programme under consideration should be provided?

- Is the specifics of the programme under consideration sufficiently reflected?

- Have the strategic goals been achieved?

- Are the mechanisms of strategic management of the EO clearly defined within the framework of the accredited educational programme?

- Are the problems associated with the implementation of the accredited educational programme clearly formulated? Have specific ways of solving problems been presented?

- What are the main lines of inquiry which need particularly to be addressed during the site visit?

The Chairman and members of the external expert panel should discuss their impressions based on the results of the information received prior to the visit, in order to identify any additional documentation they would like to access, and the main structure and strategy of the visit should also be determined.

Recommendations for planning the work of the EEP

The educational organisation provides the IAAR and the chairperson of the expert panel with a preliminary schedule of events planned during the visit.

The agenda of the site-visit should be well-planned in order to make schedule more efficient. The planned meeting should provide opportunity for crosschecking the facts provided in the self-evaluation report.

The timetable should include meetings with institutional management, department chairs, employees, students, postgraduate students, graduates and representatives of professional associations.

When planning the site visit, it should be kept in mind that the review panel should have a sufficient amount of time for conducting panel meetings at which the panel members can review the evidence presented, draw and discuss preliminary findings, as well as decide the basic structure and agenda of the following meetings and interviews with key institution and programme personnel and stakeholders. The panel should also have a reasonable amount of time for the panel to meet with the institution's staff members and students individually.

The site visit timetable of EO for the external evaluation of the review panel should also include the information on participants from the educational institution.

To use the time allocated for the site visit with maximum benefit, the panel may be divided in smaller teams for conducting meetings and interviews at the institution.

Meetings and interviews during the visit

During meetings (interviews) with representatives of the EO, the expert group verifies the information provided by the EO in the self-assessment report. It is expected that the scheduled meetings should provide an opportunity for cross-checking the facts.

The results of the meetings (interviews) serve as the basis for evaluating the joint educational programme. For this purpose, each member of the expert commission receives reference tables with verification criteria.

Meeting with the managerial staff

The meeting (interview) with the management staff is aimed at obtaining general information about the activities of the EO, quality assurance policies and mechanisms, the implementation of regional and national quality assurance requirements.

During the interaction, the parties discuss the participation of all interested parties (administrative bodies, teachers, students and employers) in determining the goals and development strategy of the joint educational programme.

Meetings with department heads

The meeting (interview) with the heads of departments is aimed at discussing issues related to the development and implementation of the joint educational programme under consideration, as well as research activities and general management.

The optimal number of participants in group discussions is from ten to twenty people.

Meetings with students

Students are a valuable source of information, and their opinions should be compared with the information provided by the teaching staff.

During meetings (interviews) with students, the EEP receives information about the scope of the joint educational programme, the academic load, the level of professional competence of teachers, the systematicity and consistency of the structure and content of the joint educational programme, the clarity of goals and objectives, the development of curricula, as well as educational and material resources available for the implementation of the educational process.

Meetings (interviews) with students should be held in a favorable environment with the participation of only students. The optimal number of students for a meeting (interview) is no more than twenty people. Students invited to meetings (interviews) must present the evaluated joint educational programme.

It is recommended that the selection of candidates from among the students for meetings (interviews) be carried out by members of the expert panel.

Meetings with the teaching staff

During meetings (interviews) with the teaching staff, issues related to the implementation of a joint educational programme, as well as research, mobility, resources and funding are discussed.

Topics/questions that were previously discussed at meetings (interviews) with students are also raised.

The preferred number of participants in meetings (interviews) is 15-25 people.

Meeting with undergraduates and doctoral students

Interviews with undergraduates and doctoral students provide information about the degree of continuity and consistency; the role of research work at each level of education; the quality and availability of material and technical resources for research work.

The expert group should include undergraduates, doctoral students of different years of study, graduates of an accredited educational programme (clusters of programmes).

Meeting with graduates

Graduates are a very important source of information. The opinions of graduates provide information about satisfaction with the level of education, the realisation of expectations for promotion and salary increases, employment opportunities and opportunities for further education.

Meetings (interviews) should be held in the absence of representatives of the teaching staff so that respondents can express their opinions. The optimal number of group members is up to 25 people. The group should include graduates of a joint educational programme.

Meeting with employers

The key issues that should be discussed during meetings with employers are the level of professional readiness of graduates of the assessed joint educational programme (cluster of programmes), the demand for graduates in the regional labor market. The meetings (interviews) also discuss the problems of cooperation and interaction with the EO in the field of management, coordination of the content of the joint educational programme and quality assessment.

Representatives of the teaching staff should not participate in this meeting (interview). The group of employers should include representatives of organisations that regularly hire graduates of the evaluated joint educational programme (cluster of programmes). If possible, the employer organisations should not be represented by graduates studying in the evaluated joint educational programme, if the network has the opportunity to choose, then so should the EO.

The optimal number of group members is 15-25 people.

Summing up and preparing recommendations

Summing up the results in accordance with the Conclusion of the evaluation commission (Table 3) is carried out on the basis of an individual external assessment collectively.

The conclusion of the evaluation commission is the final document for summarising the work of the EEP. The conclusion of the evaluation commission allows the EEP to determine the position of the EO and (or) EP, which is evaluated according to each criterion as follows:

- "Strong" is characterised by a high level of indicators of one criterion of the international standard of programme accreditation. This position of this criterion makes it

possible to serve as an example of good practice for dissemination among other EPs.

- “Satisfactory” is determined by the average level of indicators of one criterion of the international standard of programme accreditation.

- “Suggests improvement” is characterised by a low level of performance of one criterion of the international standard of programme accreditation.

- “Unsatisfactory” means that this criterion of EP do(-es) not meet the international standard of programme accreditation.

Based on a collegial decision on the results of the assessment, EEP prepares a report with recommendations on accreditation for the AC and on improving the quality of the EO or EP.

The EEP recommends one of the following decisions to the Accreditation Council:

- to accredit a joint EP for a period of 1/3/5/7 years;

- not to accredit a joint educational programme.

If the joint EP complies with IAAP Standards, the EEP makes a recommendation to improve the quality.

In case of non-compliance of the joint EP with IAAP Standards, the EEP recommends determining the measures necessary to conduct the joint EP in accordance with IAAR Standards.

The final meeting of the external expert panel members with representatives of the EO

The chairman of the external expert panel should clearly and concisely present the key issues that are important for the effective implementation of the joint educational programme, indicate the advantages and disadvantages of the joint EP under consideration, suggest alternative ways to solve the identified problems and recommendations on the action plan aimed at improving the quality of the joint educational programme.

The conclusions of the review should not be mentioned. The results of the review are also not discussed.

Working facilities for the review panel

For the duration of the visit, the EO must provide a separate workplace for the expert panel to work, meetings. During the entire visit, only members of the expert panel should have access to the premises.

The room for the expert panel should be spacious and separate from other rooms, also have a large desk for documents, a desk for collegial work, an international telephone, a computer with Internet access and a printer.

All documentation related to the external evaluation process, including a list of teachers, a joint educational programme (clusters of programmes), work programmes, student papers, research documents, catalogs of elective disciplines, leaflets, etc. should be collected in the specified workplace.