



**Guide to the Peer-Review Process
and
Documentation Required for Peer Review
(version: 27th November 2019)**

WP 5: 'New/Revised Curriculum, Evaluation, and National Guidelines'

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

2. PEER REVIEW PANELS

2.1 Remit and Conduct of Panels

2.2 Composition of Panels

2.3 Work of Panels

3. DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED FOR PEER REVIEW

Part 1: Two New/Revised Programme Descriptors (BA and MA)

Part 2: A Self-Evaluation Document (SED)

Part 3: Evidence of the Alignment of the Design of New/Revised Programmes with the EQF

Part 4: Evidence of the Quality of the Curriculum of the New/Revised Programmes

1. INTRODUCTION

This document is a guide to some of the key things that we will need to do.

Each Ukrainian university partner will have a Course Development Team (CDT); the people who will be working on the re-design and changes made to the two new/revised Journalism/Media programmes. Members of the CDT will have responsibility for deciding who will produce the documents needed for peer review, and who should represent the CDT when the peer-review panel conducts its site visit.

2. PEER REVIEW PANELS

Our DESTIN Application document says that we will form three peer-review panels that will study the documentation provided by each CDT, conduct site visits to each Ukrainian university, and produce a report on the findings. Although we should expect each panel to be quite formal in the

way that it operates (as if it were an official validating/course-approval panel), it is important to remember that the purpose of the panel is *developmental* (to give advice about what has been achieved and what enhancements can be made) rather than *judgemental*.

2.1 Remit and Conduct of Panels

The remit of each panel is to conduct desk- and site-visit review the two new/revised Journalism/Media programmes at each university; to report its findings; and to offer any advice that may help the CDT at each university to further enhance its new/revised programmes.

Panels will conduct their work in a professional manner, in accordance with European conventions for peer review of academic programmes. Each panel will be chaired by one of the EU members: she/he will be responsible for the work of the panel and the production of the Report following a desk review and site visit. A draft of the Report (excluding reference to particular individuals by name or title) will be shared with the CDT for comment and advice. It will aim to do this within a month of the site visit. The CDT will be asked only to check matters of factual accuracy. The Panel will review the draft report in the light of any feedback received from the CDT, and send its final report to the DESTIN Governing Board.

It is important that everyone respects the integrity of the work of the panels. All members of a panel (including all 'internal' members from the host university) will therefore be expected to work confidentially once the peer-review process begins. This may include correspondence between panel members and online discussions during desk review, and private meetings and discussions during and after site-visits. Throughout the review process, any and all questions about the work of the panel should therefore be addressed to, and answered through, the Chair of the panel.

Following the production of the 10 Peer Review Reports, the DESTIN 'National Guidelines Group' will prepare two 'National Guideline Statements for Journalism Programmes'.

2.2 Composition of Panels

The composition is set out in the DESTIN Application document. In short, we will establish three panels (all working to the same remit) in order to share the work (including site visits) among all of our partners and make the review process as educationally productive and economically efficient as we can. We expect each panel to be chaired by an EU partner and to have about 9 members:

- 5 'external' members (3 from EU partners, 1 from UAS, and 1 from HR).
We will need to plan the 'external' membership of each panel according to the availability and expertise of colleagues.
- 4 'internal' (host university) members (i.e., 2 members of staff, one student/recent graduate, one local employer representative).
Staff. We will ask each Ukrainian university to nominate its two 'internal' staff members of the panel. Between them, the two staff members of the panel should have some knowledge of the EQF and the nature of Journalism/Media programmes. One of them might be a Journalism 'academic' (e.g., Head of Department), and the other might be from the

university's Professional Services/Administrative staff (such as a Quality Assurance officer, or a senior manager).

Student. The student member of the panel could be nominated by the CDT or the university's Students' Union or equivalent. The student might be currently enrolled on one of the Journalism/Media degrees, or be a recent graduate from one of them. As with the staff members, the student member will need to be able to contribute to the overall work of the panel.

Employer. It would probably be best if this person, chosen by the CDT, has already been involved in the work of the Journalism/Media programmes; someone who knows and cares about the 'employability' of Journalism/Media graduates. We would expect the employer member to contribute to the overall work of the panel.

So, the 5 'external' members of each panel will be fixed, and the 4 'internal members' will change for each university's review. We will discuss the composition of the panels at our Kyiv meetings in May 2019.

Note. All panel members should have a working knowledge of English. If a panel member does not, then the host university must ensure that translation is available for that member throughout the peer-review process. The host university should also try to ensure that any staff, students or employers who have been asked to meet the peer-review panel, but who have not previously been involved in the DESTIN project, are sufficiently prepared/briefed about the purposes of the review, the documentation that the panel has received, and the way that the panel will conduct its work.

2.3 Work of Panels

The work of each panel will be the same; conducting a desk review of the documents submitted by the CDT of the university, conducting a site visit to the university, holding online discussions among panel members, and producing a report.

We expect Panel 1 to be responsible for 4 peer reviews (IFNUL, UCU, UzhNU, CHNU); Panel 2 to undertake 3 peer reviews (MSU, ZNU, SSU); and Panel 3 to undertake 3 peer reviews (TSNUK, BKNUC, MEHU).

- ***Desk Reviews***

Each panel will share the documents submitted by each CDT for review and (through the Chair) may allocate any particular responsibilities that they would like any individual members of the panel to undertake.

- ***Site Visits***

The site visits to each university will last 1 day.

The agenda for a site-visit might typically look like this:

- ***Arrival. (half-hour meeting)***

- 'Private Meeting' of the Panel. (1 hour)
- Meeting with some members of the CDT at the host university; max. 4 people. (1 hour)
- Review of the Design of the two New/Revised Programmes; max. 6 people, 3 persons from each programme. (2 hours (1 hour per programme))
- Review of the Curriculum of the two New/Revised Programmes; max. 6 people, 3 persons from each programme. (2 hours (1 hour per programme))
- Meeting with Students/Alumni from the New/Revised Programmes; max. 8 people. (1 hour)
- 'Private Meeting' of the Panel. (1 hour)
- Outline Feedback to the CDT team. (1 hour)

It may be of benefit if a small number of colleagues from the host university or other DESTIN partners were able to observe the site-visit meetings of the panels (except those marked 'private meeting'). If the Chair of the Panel agrees to such attendance, these colleagues would have strictly 'observer' status: they would not be members of the panel, and the work of the panel would not entail any discussions with them. All such observers would be expected to respect the integrity of the panel's work.

- **Reports**

Each Peer Review Panel will produce a Report on each university that it has reviewed (i.e., Panel 1 will produce four reports). The Report will set out key findings, outcomes, recommendations and commendations according to agreed criteria and format. The Panels will follow a common format for their Reports. A common format would be:

1. Brief statement about the DESTIN project; its goals, activities and outputs.
 2. Brief statement about the peer-review process for DESTIN and list of panel members.
 3. Observations on the documentation received.
 4. Observations on the site-visit programme and process.
 5. Assessment of the Design of the new/revised programmes. *
 6. Assessment of the Curriculum of the new/revised programmes. *
 7. Summary of findings: this may include commendations and/or recommendations.
- Annex 1. List of the names and roles of staff and students met during the visit.
- Annex 2. Programme for the site-visit.

* In sections 5 and 6 of the Report, the panel will use the Ukrainian National Agency rating-scale (F: not achieved / E: partly achieved / B: largely achieved / A: fully achieved) or 'not applicable' to assess each of the 'indicators of good practice' for the new/revised programmes. Each assessment will be accompanied by a short commentary on the rating given. Each Section will also include a summary account of the extent to which the general Expectation has been met.

3. DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED FOR PEER-REVIEW

We need to ensure that each of our Peer Review Panels has the documentation that it needs in order to conduct its reviews; no more and no less. It is important that everyone understands what is

needed. The full documentation from each university should be provided at least six weeks before the start of the site-visit and should be sent (as a Word document) to the Chair of the Peer-Review Panel who will share it with the other members of the panel.

Note on Additional Information/ Documentation. It may be the case that following the desk review of documents or during a site visit, the panel may ask for some additional information from members of the CDT, or be offered it. We should try to avert the need for any additional documentation before or during a site visit by ensuring that the review panel has received the full and appropriate documentation required before the desk review begins. So, in normal circumstances, there should be no need for presentations, university tours, additional materials etc., to be undertaken or submitted before or during the site visit.

There are *four parts* to the documentation to be prepared by each CDT for the Peer Review Panel.

PART 1: TWO NEW/REVISED PROGRAMME DESCRIPTORS (BA AND MA)

A Descriptor should be provided for *each* of the two academic programmes in Journalism/Media. In some places these Descriptors might be called 'programme handbooks' or 'student handbooks', but whatever they are called locally, they should contain:

1.1 A 'Brief Description of the Programme'; its history and place within the academic strategies and structure of the university, its students, staff, resources, etc. (*guideline: maximum 2 pages.*)

1.2 A statement of the 'Aims/Goals of the Programme': explain its academic/educational rationale, and its value to students in terms of their needs and aspirations and employability/careers. (*max. 2 pages*)

1.3 An outline of the 'Structure of the Programme'; including the list of modules at each level, what is mandatory (required) and optional (elective), the mode of delivery (e.g., full/part time, online), the sequence of delivery, ECTS values, etc. (*max. 2 pages or in a diagram*)

1.4 A matrix showing the 'Alignment of Learning Outcomes with Programme Aims'. (*max. 2 pages*)

1.5 The 'Module Descriptors'. These contain information about each module/course unit's level, learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, class-contact hours, student assessment tasks (and their relationship to the module learning outcomes), ECTS awarded. (*max. 1 page per module*)

1.6 'Summary Description of Programme-level Quality Assurance Procedures': the key processes for monitoring (during course delivery: e.g., student consultations), evaluating (after the delivery of the course: e.g., end-of-module questionnaires), and enhancing (acting upon data collected from monitoring and evaluation, and from the programme team's reflections: e.g., on student performance, new learning facilities, employment data, or professional association advice) to make changes that will enhance the quality of students' learning opportunities, experiences and outcomes in the future. (*max. 3 pages*)

Note. The programme and module descriptors may contain many other kinds of information (e.g., about rooms, staff profiles, complaints procedures, learning resources, assessment regulations, etc.)

There is no need to delete this information if it is already included in the programme descriptor or handbook.

PART 2: A SELF-EVALUATION DOCUMENT (SED)

The SED is central to the review process and should provide an evidence-based evaluation of the two academic programmes being reviewed. When writing the SED, it is important to consider that it will be read by all members of the peer-review panel: some of these members will not be familiar with the university's particular structure and processes, so please include a glossary of acronyms if you think this will help.

The SED should be prepared by the CDT and in consultation with current students. It is also recommended that relevant stakeholders are consulted who can offer guidance about some aspects of the SED, in particular where it relates to a specific area of responsibility and interest. It is helpful to record in the SED where consultation has taken place and with whom.

The SED should contain information and reflection about *both* of the two academic programmes that have been aligned. If there are significant or substantial differences in the ways that the programmes have been developed at the university, these should be noted in the relevant sections of the SED.

To aid the writing and review process, I propose that we follow a common Template for the SED, using the following headings.

2.1 National, Institutional and Professional Contexts (max. 3 pages)

a) The National Context

An account of how the CDT has addressed the main requirements of course design in the European Qualifications Framework (EQF) and National Qualifications Framework (NQF).

Where the NQF is in strict or close alignment with European standards and requirements, there is no need for any comment. Attention should only be given here to any elements of the NQF that do not appear to be consistent with European standards, or that have posed particular difficulties for the CDT. (For example, if the NQF requires that universities award marks/grades simply for student class-attendance, such things should be noted.)

b) The Institutional Context

An account of any additional academic requirements that the university requires for the approval, validation and re-approval of its programmes. (For example, if the university regulations state that all students must undertake a module in a foreign language, or that all students must undertake traditional unseen examinations, these things should be noted.)

c) The Professional Context

If either of the two Journalism/Media programmes is governed by national/external professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (e.g., for the professional accreditation of graduates), please summarise the requirements of that organisation and how the requirement is met in the relevant academic programme. (For example, an external organisation requires all Journalism Masters students to undertake a six month internship, or to take a particular national test, these things should be noted.)

2.2 Development of the Academic Programmes (*max. 3 pages*)

This should be an account of how the two programmes have been developed within the university during the DESTIN project. It should include the following information:

- a) a list of the main people (CDT) who have been involved, their university roles, and their roles within the DESTIN project;
- b) a brief summary of how the CDT has undertaken its work, and the key stages of development in aligning the academic programmes;
- c) a short statement of the main challenges that have been faced, and how (if possible) these have been addressed; e.g., as noted in the CDT 'Action Plan'.

2.3 Key Changes (*max. 4 pages*)

- a) an account of the main changes that have been made to the design and delivery of the programmes in the light of the DESTIN project;
- b) an account of the main changes that have been made to the content/curriculum of the programmes in the light of the DESTIN project.

2.4 Information about Students (*max. 3 pages*)

Please provide information about the students studying the programme. This should include:

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

PART 3: EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT OF NEW/REVISED PROGRAMMES WITH THE 2019 UKRAINIAN NATIONAL study programme peer-review criteria

A key part of the review documentation consists of a CDT self-assessment of the nature and extent to which academic programmes have been designed / developed to align with the 2019 national standards and requirements. The peer-review panel will have an 'Expectation' of what good alignment looks like.

To check alignment with the national standards and requirements, we are using the Ukrainian National Agency 10 Criteria. The panels will be using the 10 MAIN criteria only – we include the sub-criteria here only in order to guide and inform our discussions. The panels' experience of different international contexts may also inform their discussions and reports.

We ask you to provide some critical reflection on how far you think you meet these indicators. In some cases, the indicators may only require a few lines of commentary and refer to evidence contained in the SED. In some cases, you may need to write a short paragraph about a particular indicator. Overall, you should not need to write more than 5 pages to cover all of the 10 Indicators. The panels will be looking for clear and short commentaries, and we will use our site visits to discuss your self-assessments.

Please remember that the primary purpose of our peer-review process is developmental and collaborative. There are few (if any) universities anywhere in the world that would claim to have a perfect set of answers with all the supporting evidence in response to every indicator, and certainly every university has its own particular ways of doing things. So, we are not looking for perfect answers and solutions. Try to give an honest account of how things stand at present (there's no need to exaggerate success or to hide problems), as this will provide us with an excellent platform for our discussions on how we can best help and support your development.

Assessment of the Expectation for Alignment of the Academic Programme with current Ukrainian National Standards and Requirements

(The panel will provide a short account of how far and in what ways the expectation has/has not been met.

Programme 'YYY'

The expectation of the panel will be:

In designing, delivering and monitoring an academic programme, the programme team (including its teachers and supporters of student learning) will meet the appropriate European and national standards and requirements.

The panel has used a rating-scale to assess each of the '10 Criteria of good practice' for assessment of academic programmes. Each assessment may be accompanied by a short commentary on the rating given.

Criterion 1. The design and objectives of the study programme.	DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT
<p>1. The study programme has clearly formulated objectives that meet the mission and strategy of the higher education institution.</p> <p>2. The study programme objectives and programme learning outcomes are defined based on the positions and needs of interested parties (stakeholders).</p> <p>3. The study programme objectives and programme learning outcomes are defined based on the trends of development of the Program Subject Area (speciality), labor market, sectoral and regional context, as well as the experience of similar Ukrainian and international study programmes.</p> <p>4. The study programme fosters the achievement of the learning outcomes stated by the higher education standard for the respective Program Subject Area (speciality) and higher education level (if available). If no approved higher education standard is available for the respective Program Subject Area (speciality) and higher education level, programme learning outcomes should meet requirements of the National Qualification Framework for the respective qualification level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or cannot be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor; ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.
<p>Comment</p>	

Criterion 2. The structure and content of the study programme.	DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT
<p>1. The scope of the study programme and its separate educational components (in ECTS credits) are in line with the requirements of legislation concerning the learning workload for the relevant higher education level and meet the relevant higher education standard (if available).</p> <p>2. The content of the study programme has a clear structure; educational components included into the study programme constitute a logical consistent system and, taken together, allow the achievement of the stated objectives and programme learning outcomes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or cannot be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not

<p>3. The content of the study programme is in line with the Program Subject Area (speciality) (or specialities in cases of interdisciplinary programmes).</p> <p>4. The structure of the study programme envisages the possibility of forming an individual educational trajectory, in particular, though the individual choice of modules by students in the amount stipulated by legislation.</p> <p>5. The study programme and curriculum envisage practical training of students that allows them to gain the competencies necessary for further professional activity.</p> <p>6. The study programme envisages the development of soft skills in students that meet stated objectives.</p> <p>7. The content of the study programme takes into account requirements of the respective professional standard (if available).</p> <p>8. The scope of the study programme and its separate educational components (in ECTS credits) realistically reflects the actual workload of students, is relevant for achieving objectives and programme learning outcomes.</p> <p>9. If students are trained under a dual form of education, the structure of the study programme and its curriculum are harmonized with the tasks and specific features of this form of education.</p>	<p>meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor; ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.
<p>Comment</p>	

<p>Criterion 3. Access to the study programme and learning outcomes recognition.</p>	<p>DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT</p>
<p>1. The admission rules for the study programme are clear and easy-to-understand, do not contain any discriminatory provisions and are published on the official website of the higher education institution.</p> <p>2. The admission rules for the study programme take into account any peculiarities of the study programme itself.</p> <p>3. Clear and easy-to-understand rules are established for recognition of learning outcomes received at other education institutions, in particular during academic mobility, which are in line with the Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region (Lisbon, 1997), are available to all participants of the educational process and are consistently observed during realization of the study programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or cannot be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period;

<p>4. Clear and easy-to-understand rules are established for recognition of learning outcomes received in the frame of non-formal education, are available to all participants of the educational process, and are consistently observed during realization of the study programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor; ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.
<p>Comment</p>	

<p>Criterion 4. Teaching and learning under the study programme.</p>	<p>DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT</p>
<p>1. The forms and methods of teaching and learning contribute to achieving objectives and programme learning outcomes stated in the study programme; meet requirements of student-centered approaches and the principles of academic freedom.</p> <p>2. All participants of the educational process are provided, in a timely manner, with available and clear information regarding the objectives, content, programme learning outcomes, and the evaluation procedure and criteria employed in individual educational components (in the form of a syllabus or in another similar way).</p> <p>3. The higher education institution provides a combination of learning and research during realization of the study programme appropriate to the higher education level, Program Subject Area (speciality) and objectives of the study programme.</p> <p>4. Academic staff, researchers (herewith “academics”) update their educational content based on the latest scientific achievements and modern practices in the respective sector.</p> <p>5. Learning, teaching and scientific research are related to the internationalization activities of the higher education institution.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or cannot be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor; ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.
<p>Comment</p>	



Criterion 5. Control measures, evaluation of students and academic integrity.	DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT
<p>1. Forms of control measures and evaluation criteria for students are clear, easy-to-understand, allow for the assessment of achievement of learning outcomes by the student in each individual educational component and/or in the study programme as a whole, and are published in advance.</p> <p>2. Forms of attestation of students are in line with the requirements of the higher education standard (if available).</p> <p>3. Clear and easy-to-understand rules for conducting control measures are established, these rules are available to all participants of the educational process, provide for the impartiality of examiners, in particular include procedures to prevent and solve conflicts of interest, define procedures for challenging the results of control measures and re-assessment, and are consistently observed during realization of the study programme.</p> <p>4. Clear and easy-to-understand policies, standards and procedures are established at the higher education institution to observe academic integrity, and are consistently observed by all participants of the educational process during realization of the study programme. The higher education institution promotes academic integrity (firstly, through the implementation of such policies for the development of an internal quality culture) and uses relevant technological solutions as instruments to counteract violations of academic integrity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or cannot be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor; ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.
<p>Comment</p>	

Criterion 6. Human resources	DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT
<p>1. The academic and/or professional qualification of academics involved in the realization of the study programme ensure achievement of the objectives and programme learning outcomes stated by the respective programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or

<p>2. Procedures of competitive selection of academics are transparent and allow for the ensurance of a necessary level of professionalism for successful realization of the study programme.</p> <p>3. The higher education institution engages employers into organization and realization of the educational process.</p> <p>4. The higher education institution involves professional practitioners, sector experts, representatives of employers into classroom activities.</p> <p>5. The higher education institution supports the professional development of academics through its own professional development programmes or by working together with other organizations.</p> <p>6. The higher education institution promotes development of teaching excellence.</p>	<p>cannot be eliminated within a one-year period;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor; ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.
<p>Comment</p>	

<p>Criterion 7. Educational environment and material resources.</p>	<p>DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT</p>
<p>1. The financial, material and technical resources (the library, other infrastructure, equipment, etc.), and other learning and teaching materials of the study programme ensure achievement of the objectives and programme learning outcomes stated by the study programme.</p> <p>2. The higher education institution ensures free access to relevant infrastructure and information resources necessary for learning, teaching and/or scientific activities of academics and students of the study programme.</p> <p>3. The educational environment is safe for the life and health of students of the study programme, and allows them to meet their needs and interests.</p> <p>4. The higher education institution provides educational, organizational, informational, consultative and social support to students of the study programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or cannot be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor;

<p>5. The higher education institution creates sufficient conditions for the realization of the right to education by persons with special educational needs, who study in the programme.</p> <p>6. A clear and easy-to-understand policy and procedures exist for mitigation of conflict situations (in particular, related to sexual harassment, discrimination and/or corruption, etc.), which are available to all participants of the educational process and are consistently observed during realization of the study programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.
<p>Comment</p>	

<p>Criterion 8. Internal quality assurance of the study programme.</p>	<p>DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT</p>
<p>1. The higher education institution consistently observes its established procedures for development, approval, monitoring and periodic review of the study programme.</p> <p>2. Students, directly and through student governance bodies, are engaged as partners in the process of periodic review of the study programme and in procedures related to its quality assurance. The position of students is taken into consideration in reviewing the study programme.</p> <p>3. Employers, directly and/or through their associations, are engaged as partners in the process of periodic review of the study programme and other procedures related to its quality assurance.</p> <p>4. A practice exists to collect, analyze and take into consideration information about the career path of graduates of the study programme.</p> <p>5. The quality assurance system of the higher education institution ensures reaction to shortcomings identified in the study programme and/or educational activities related to the realization of the study programme.</p> <p>6. The results of external higher education quality assurance (in particular, comments and suggestions formulated during previous accreditations) are taken into account during reviews of the study programme.</p> <p>7. A culture of quality is formed in the academic community of the higher education institution that contributes to the constant development of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or cannot be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor; ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.

the study programme and educational activity related to this programme.	
<p>Comment</p> <p> </p>	

<p>Criterion 9. Transparency and publicity. Note. Criterion 9 is applied taking into account the requirements and restrictions regarding disclosure of restricted information established by legislation.</p>	<p>DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT</p>
<p>1. Clear and easy-to-understand rules and procedures are established that regulate the rights and responsibilities of all participants of the educational process, and are accessible to them and consistently observed during realization of the study programme.</p> <p>2. At least a month prior to approval of the study programme or changes to it, the higher education institution publishes the respective draft study programme on its official website with the aim of receiving comments and suggestions from interested parties (stakeholders).</p> <p>3. The higher education institution publishes, in a timely manner, on its official website, correct and reliable information about the study programme (including its objectives, expected learning outcomes and components, in an amount sufficient to inform respective interested parties (stakeholders) and society.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or cannot be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor; ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.
<p>Comment</p>	

<p>Criterion 10. Study through research. Note. Criterion 10 is applied during accreditation of study programmes of the third cycle of</p>	<p>DESTIN PROJECT INDICATIVE ASSESSMENT</p>
--	--

<p>higher education. This Criterion will probably NOT apply to the BA and MA study programmes being reviewed in the DESTIN project.</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The content of the study programme is consistent with the research interests of doctoral students (adjuncts) and ensures their full-fledged preparation for research and teaching activities in higher education institutions within their Program Subject Area (speciality) and/or sector. 2. The research activity of doctoral students (adjuncts) is in line with the research topics of their supervisors. 3. The higher education institution organizationally and materially provides, under the study program, opportunities to conduct research and to test research results in accordance with the research topics of the doctoral students (adjuncts) (i.e. regular conferences, seminars, colloquia, access to the use of laboratories, equipment, etc.). 4. The higher education institution arranges opportunities for doctoral students (adjuncts) to join their international academic community by Program Subject Area (speciality), in particular through conference presentations, publications, participation in joint research projects, etc. 5. A practice exists whereby supervisors participate in research projects, the results of which are regularly published and/or practically implemented. 6. The higher education institution ensures observance of academic integrity in the research activities of supervisors and doctoral students (adjuncts), in particular by taking measures to preclude the possibility of student supervision by persons who have committed violations of academic integrity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level F – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion, and identified shortcomings are of a fundamental nature and/or cannot be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level E – the study programme and/or educational activities under such programme do not meet the defined criterion in general, but identified shortcomings can be eliminated within a one-year period; ○ Level B – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme meet the defined criterion in general, with possible shortcomings that are deemed minor; ○ Level A – the study programme and/or the educational activity under such programme fully meet the defined criterion and are of an innovative/exemplary character.
<p>Comment</p>	

PART 4: EVIDENCE OF ALIGNMENT OF NEW/REVISED PROGRAMMES WITH EQF

Note: this section is from the TEMPUS ALIGN project and we've decided (November 2019 – Poznan) that it is 'additional' to the DESTIN project. Evidence of alignment with the EQF would be 'nice to do' rather than 'need to do' and so we will not refer to this in the DESTIN project.

(we have left this ALIGN EQF alignment in this DESTIN document for informational purposes only).

A key part of the review documentation consists of a CDT self-assessment of the nature and extent to which academic programmes have been designed / developed to align with European and national standards and requirements. The peer-review panel will have an 'Expectation' of what good EQF alignment looks like.

To check alignment with the EQF, we have provided 'Ten Indicators of Good Practice' and we ask you to provide some critical reflection on how far you think you meet these indicators. In some cases, the indicators may only require a few lines of commentary and refer to evidence contained in the SED. In some cases, you may need to write a short paragraph about a particular indicator. Overall, you should not need to write more than 5 pages to cover all of the 10 Indicators. The panels will be looking for clear and short commentaries, and we will use our site visits to discuss your self-assessments.

Please remember that the primary purpose of our peer-review process is developmental and collaborative. There are few (if any) universities anywhere in the world that would claim to have a perfect set of answers with all the supporting evidence in response to every indicator, and certainly every university has its own particular ways of doing things. So, we are not looking for perfect answers and solutions. Try to give an honest account of how things stand at present (there's no need to exaggerate success or to hide problems), as this will provide us with an excellent platform for our discussions on how we can best help and support your development.

3.1 Evidence of Alignment of Course Design with the EQF (*max. 5 pages*)

Note: this section is from the TEMPUS ALIGN project and we've decided that it is 'additional' to the DESTIN project. Evidence of alignment with the EQF would be 'nice to do' rather than 'need to do' and so we will not refer to this in the DESTIN project. (we have left this ALIGN EQF alignment in here for informational purposes only).

The expectation of the panel will be:

'In designing and delivering the two new/revised programmes, the programme teams (including its teachers and supporters of student learning) will meet the appropriate European and national standards and requirements.'

10 Indicators of Good Practice:

1. The academic programmes are properly titled and lead to awards at the appropriate level, consistent with European and national frameworks for higher education qualifications, and the Dublin Descriptors for Masters' awards.
2. The academic programmes are informed by and consistent with professional/industry standards/requirements, where appropriate.
3. The aims of the programmes are appropriate for the student intake, and can be realised through students' attainment of the programme aims and module learning outcomes.
4. All learning outcomes for modules are at the appropriate level, and are assessed through fair, valid and reliable student assignments/tests.
5. Throughout their course of study, students are able to monitor their academic progress and development, and receive advice on how they can improve and enhance their work.
6. The teaching and learning activities employed within the modules are informed by reflection on professional practices, and designed to enable students to develop the knowledge, skills, abilities and professional competencies that will enable them to achieve the modules' learning outcomes.

7. The structure of the programme ensures the progression of students' learning, and provides appropriate opportunities for student choice.
8. The credit ratings (national and ECTS) for modules are properly aligned with the designated student workloads for the modules.
9. Students are provided with clear and up-to-date information about the learning opportunities and support available to them.
10. The design, delivery and monitoring of the academic programmes is 'student centred', engaging students collectively and individually as partners in the development, assurance and enhancement of their educational experiences (e.g., through effective representation of the student voice, discussions about opportunities for course enhancement, involvement in quality assurance processes, and the monitoring and evaluation of student experiences).

PART 4: EVIDENCE OF THE QUALITY OF THE CURRICULUM OF NEW/REVISED PROGRAMMES

4.1 Evidence of the Quality of the Curriculum (*max. 5 pages*)

As with PART 3, a key part of the review documentation consists of a CDT self-assessment of the nature and intended impact of the changes that are being made to the curriculum of the new/revised Journalism/Media programmes. The peer-review panel will have an 'Expectation' of what we might expect a Journalism/Media programme to look like within a specific university context, and we will agree a general 'Expectation' for this, together with a set of 'Indicators of Good Practice' during 2019.

We ask you to provide some critical reflection on how far you think you meet these indicators. In some cases, the indicators may only require a few lines of commentary and refer to evidence contained in the SED. In some cases, you may need to write a short paragraph about a particular indicator. Overall, you should not need to write more than a 5 pages to cover all of the 10 Indicators. The panels will be looking for clear and short commentaries, and we will use our site visits to discuss your self-assessments.

A Draft of the Expectation might be,

'In developing the curriculum of the two new/revised programmes, the programme teams have provided a curriculum that is well informed by knowledge of good international practices and is appropriate to national and institutional needs and contexts.'