PEER REVIEW REPORT (TEMPLATE)

An Evaluation of the Academic Programs

"**Name of programme**"

at **Name of HEI**

Dates of visit

This report is the result of the site-visit to name of HEI, conducted by a group of experts on Dates in the framework of the EU ERASMUS+ QUAERE project. During two days, the peers reviewed the academic programs (AP) "Name of programme", the existing quality assurance principles and processes that relate to its approval/validation, review and enhancement.

The review team consisted of the following persons: list of experts.

The group of experts used a set of criteria for external evaluation of APs, which in the first phase of the QUAERE project had been elaborated by ASIIN in cooperation with the Ukrainian project partners by using as point of departure the existing national criteria of the National Accreditation Agency of Ukraine, but updating and modernizing them in the process and aligning them with an outcome based, ESG compatible set of standards and guidelines, listed below. On this basis, the expert panel has performed a piloting of external evaluation procedures related to the name of programme review to advise on improvement of HEI's quality assurance processes and their correspondence to European models of programme design, delivery and quality assurance.

The site-visit took place upon review of the self-assessment report provided by the programme team. The self-assessment report was general evaluation of self-assessment report including information about involvement of key stakeholders in the process.

Along with observations on each of the evaluation criteria, the following assessment scale is applied:
- not achieved
- partly achieved
- largely achieved
- fully achieved
- not applicable in this stage of the alignment

In the following alignment of the program with the 11 criteria listed has been systematically checked. Here are the results:

Criteria/Guiding questions	Assessment	Observations and comments
1. Eligibility for program accreditation		

1.1. Is the HEI applying for program accreditation a legal entity of Higher Education according to the law of Ukraine?		
2. Creation of programs and formulation of qualification profile 2.1. How has the intended qualification profile of the degree program been developed (regarding launch of the process, procedure, participants)? 2.2. Have all relevant stakeholders been involved?		

2.3. Have the comments from the different stakeholder groups (teachers, students, employers) been taken into consideration?		

2.4. What processes are in place to reflect on the appropriateness of the qualification profile? How is the program being revised or further developed?		

2.5. What are the distinguishing features of the program in comparison to similar programs?		
2.6. Does the intended qualification profile comply with the qualification criteria of the profession?		

2.7. Who is the target group of the program and do the learning outcomes take the specific needs of the target groups into consideration?		
3. Curriculum, structure/ work load and mobility 3.1. Has the program a clear and plausible structure? Do the modules build on one another?		
3.2. Is the program divided into different courses that form a sum of learning and teaching? 3.4. Is it plausible how the program objectives and intended learning		

outcomes are substantiated in the modules?		
3.3. Does the curriculum contain aspects of technical and non-technical competences?		
3.5. Is the workload realistic, can the study program be carried out in the regular study duration?		
3.6. Is a credit point system in place considering contact time and time for self-study?		

3.7. Do students have the possibility to take elective courses? Do the elective courses enable students to develop an individual focus?		
3.8. Are there possibilities for international mobility? Is this supported by the HEI and does the curriculum offer a timeframe where mobility can take place without prolongation of the study time?		
4. Admission Requirements 4.1. Are the admission requirements clearly defined and transparently available?		

4.2. Are all applicants treated equally? Do all students meeting the criteria have a chance of being admitted? What are the selection criteria?		
4.3. Do the admission requirements ensure that all applicants have the necessary academic background to be able to study the program successfully?		
4.4. How can students compensate a lack of competences?		

4.5. Are there clear and transparent rules of student enrollment? 4.6. How are academic achievements obtained at other HEI recognized? Is this a fair and transparent procedure? Does it meet the Criteria of the Lisbon Treaty?		
5. Teaching and Learning / Support 5.1. What kind of teaching methods are being applied? Do the teaching methods support the achievement of the intended learning outcomes?		

5.2. Do the teaching methods also provide time for self-study and independent work?		
5.3. What kind of general advisory and support services are in place?		
5.4. What kind of course specific support services are being provided?		
5.5. Do students have the chance to apply for additional		

support services if need arises?		
5.6. Does the HEI provide academic guidance for students with regards to academic development and the choice of specialties?		
5.7. How does the HEI deal with conflicts? Are there clear rules and procedures for conflict resolution in place?		
5.8. How are conflicts being settled practically?		
6. Examinations		
6.1. How are examinations being organized? Are they announced in a timely and transparent manner to students? Can students voice out queries if examinations clash or if there is insufficient preparation time?		

6.2. Is the number of examinations manageable without excessive failure rates?		
6.3. Are the examinations designed in a way to appropriately assess the competences achieved by students?		
6.4. Does the program contain a final thesis that shows that students can work on an academic task independently? Is the thesis of adequate standard, using up-to-date literature?		
6.5. How does the university prevent plagiarism and other kinds of unethical behavior?		

6.6. Is all relevant course information being provided in a transparent and timely manner? 6.7. Are there rules for re-sits, cheating and compensational measures for students with disabilities?		

6.8. Does the correction time of cause any delays in student progression?		
6.9. What kinds of marking criteria are in place? Are they transparent and plausible? Is it secured that all students are treated equally and fairly?		
6.10. How is it ascertained that examinations and marks are comparable between different lecturers teaching the same subject?		
7. Human Resources 7.1. Do the staff members have adequate proficiency / academic credentials to teach the courses in an appropriate professional and academic standard?		

7.2. Is there sufficient staff (academic, technical, administrational) available to successfully implement the program without structural overload (including advisory services)?		
7.3. Are any staff members close to pension age? What are the plans for the succession?		
7.4. How are external lecturers being selected and what kind of contribution do they provide for the implementation of the program?		
7.5. Is there any kind of procedure in place to harmonize the content of courses / modules?		
7.6. Is overlap between different courses being avoided?		
8. Material Resources		

8.1. Is the infrastructure and technical equipment appropriate to achieve the academic and professional learning outcomes? 8.2. Is the general academic infrastructure (access to relevant up-to-date literature, computer labs, etc.) available in sufficient quality and quantity? 8.3. Is there an adequate learning environment (learning space, rooms for group work, etc) in place?		
9. Financial Resources 9.1. Are the financial resources sufficient to implement the program successfully? 9.2. Are the financial resources secured for the entire accreditation period?		

10. Quality Management		
10.1. Does the HEI have a quality management policy in place?		
10.2. What kind of quality assurance procedures does the HEI have in place? Do the procedures take different stakeholder groups like students, alumni, teachers, professional partners, employers, and graduates on-board?		
10.3. Are the results being analyzed systematically and made available to relevant stakeholder groups?		
10.4. What kinds of feedback mechanisms are in place to		

use the data for critical self-reflection? 10.5. What kind of concrete measures have been derived from the evaluation results?		
11. Transparency / Documentation 11.1. Are all kinds of relevant rules and regulations defined covering all aspects of the student life cycle? Are they published and transparently available to all relevant stakeholders?		

11.2. Are there mechanisms in place to review and update them regularly?		
11.3. Is all program relevant information being made available to interested stakeholders?		
11.4. Do the course / module descriptions contain all relevant information about course objectives, learning outcomes, teaching methods, required literature, examinations etc.?		