

Ministry of Education and Science of  
UkraineSumy National Agrarian University  
Faculty of Economics and Management  
Department of Management named after Professor L.I. Mikhailova

**Work program (syllabus) of the educational component**  
**ORGANIZATION AND METHODOLOGY OF CONDUCTING TRAINING**  
**SESSIONES**

(required OK)

(required / optional)

Implemented within the framework of the educational and scientific program  
Food Technologies

in specialty 181 Food Technology  
(code, name)

at the III (educational and scientific) level of higher  
education


Sumy – 2023

Розробники

  
(підпис)

Скляр І.Д., к.е.н., професор, доцент кафедри менеджменту  
(прізвище, ініціали)

(вчений ступінь та звання, посада)

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Розглянуто,<br>схвалено та<br>затверджено на<br>засіданні кафедри:<br>Менеджменту імені<br>професора Л.І.<br>Михайлової<br>(назва кафедри) | протокол від 10.06.2023 № 14  |
|  | Завідувач<br>кафедри<br><br>(підпис) <u>Альвіна ОРСХОВА</u><br>(прізвище, ініціали) |

Погоджено:

Гарант освітньої програми

  
(підпис)

Оксана МЕЛЬНИК  
(ПІБ)

Декан факультету, де реалізується освітня програма

  
(підпис)

Наталія БОЛГОВА  
(ПІБ)

Рецензія на робочу програму(додається) надана:

  
(ПІБ)

Світлана ТУРЧИНА

  
(ПІБ)

Ольга СЕРЕДА

Методист відділу якості освіти,  
ліцензування та акредитації

  
(підпис)

Ігор БОРИШЧУК  
(ПІБ)

Зареєстровано в електронній базі: дата: 20.06. 2023 р.

Information on reviewing the work program (syllabus):

| Educational year in which the contributions are made changes | Number of the appendix to the work program with a description of the changes  | Changes reviewed and approved                      |                        |                                |
|--|---|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|
|  |   | Date and number of the meeting minutes departments | Head of the Department | Educational guarantor programs |
| 2022-2023  | Taking into account x changes in the OP (PRN, ZK and SK) the syllabus content has been updated (DRN (table 2, assessment methods) and submitted in an updated form                            | Protocol No.13 from 06/14/22                       |                        |                                |
| 2023-2024  | Changes in assessment, DNR, alignment with relevant competencies of the professional standard taking into account changes in the SNP due to the HE standard (updated and submitted in updated | Protocol No. 14 from 05.06.2023                    |                        |                                |
|  |   |  |                        |                                |

# 1. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT

|      |  |   |                    |            |
|------|--|---|--------------------|------------|
| 1.   | Name MC  | Organization and methodology of conducting training sessions  |                    |            |
| 2.   | Faculty/department   | Faculty of Food Technology  |                    |            |
| 3.   | Status MC  | Mandatory   |                    |            |
| 4.   | Program/Specialty (programs), which include MC for                           | ESP "Food Technologies", 181 Food Technologies  |                    |            |
| 5.   | MC can be offered for(to be filled in for selective OK)                      | —   |                    |            |
| 6.   | NQF level  | Level 8 NQF   |                    |            |
| 7.   | Semester and duration study  | 2nd semester, 10 weeks  |                    |            |
| 8.   | Number of credits ECTS   | 3 ECTS credits  |                    |            |
| 9.   | Total hours and their distribution<br><br>day uniform<br>correspondence form | Contact work (classes)  |                    |            |
|      |  | Lectures  | Practical /seminar | Laboratory |
|      |  | 18  | 18                 |            |
|      |  |   |                    |            |
| 10.  | Language of instruction  | Ukrainian   |                    |            |
| 11.  | Teacher/Coordinator educational component                                    | Sklyar I.D., Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor  |                    |            |
| 11.1 | Contact information  | Sklyar I.D., <a href="mailto:educator.cited@gmail.com">educator.cited@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:Iryna.Skliar@rau.ac.uk">Iryna.Skliar@rau.ac.uk</a><br>You can apply for a consultation online every Wednesday, 12:00-13:00 link<br><a href="https://us04web.zoom.us/j/5612957262?pwd=cVVybnNGQnBnb2h4MHYrdE1zdDNydz09">https://us04web.zoom.us/j/5612957262?pwd=cVVybnNGQnBnb2h4MHYrdE1zdDNydz09</a>  |                    |            |
| 12.  | General description of the educational component                             | <p>The discipline is a mandatory part of the training of doctors of philosophy, in particular, training for teaching. The discipline is based on the requirements of the Standards and Recommendations for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG, 2015), constructivism as an educational theory, modern pedagogical concept(student-centered learning, competency-based approach). The discipline is formed taking into account the experience of participation in international educational projects (TEMPUS project, “ALIGN”), as well as based on the professional standard for the group of professions “Higher Education Teachers”, <a href="https://mon.gov.ua/ua/news/zatverdzheno-standart-na-grupu-professions-founders-of-higher-education">https://mon.gov.ua/ua/news/zatverdzheno-standart-na-grupu-professions-founders-of-higher-education</a> and also professional standards for teachers in higher education in the United Kingdom (UK Professional Standards Framework – UKPSF) <a href="https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/uk-professional-standards-framework-ukpsf">https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/uk-professional-standards-framework-ukpsf</a></p> |                    |            |

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 13. | Purpose of the educational component   | The goal of the discipline is to develop teaching competencies in students to implement approaches to teaching and learning that are consistent with the competency-based approach and the principle of student-centeredness.  |
| 14. | Prerequisites for studying MC, connection with other educational components of the ESP | Discipline is a prerequisite for the OK "Pedagogical Practice".  |
| 15. | Academic Integrity Policy  | <p>If a candidate submits another candidate's work as their own, such work is canceled and retaken.</p> <p>In case of cheating, retake the corresponding assignment.</p> <p>In the case of using text borrowings without proper citation (academic plagiarism) - the work is canceled.</p> |
| 16. | Link to Moodle   | <a href="https://cdn.snau.edu.ua/moodle/course/view.php?id=5333">https://cdn.snau.edu.ua/moodle/course/view.php?id=5333</a>  |

## 2. LEARNING OUTCOMES BY EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

| <b>Learning outcomes for OK:</b><br><br>After studying the educational component, the candidate is expected to be able to:  | Program learning outcomes that the MC aims to achieve   |  | Professional competencies (according to the professional standard for the group of professions "Higher Education Teachers") | How is the DLO assessed?  |
|---|---|--|---|---|
|   | PRN8. Develop and teach special disciplines in food technology in higher education institutions, provide educational and methodological support for the educational process | PRN10. Know and understand the philosophical methodology of scientific knowledge and the psychological and pedagogical aspects of professional and scientific activity. Plan and implement the educational process based on modern methodological principles, demonstrate leadership skills and self-regulation based on self-knowledge. |   |   |
| <b>DLO 1.</b> Develop and plan learning activities based on a competency-based approach, the principle of constructive engagement, and research results on problems related to learning and teaching. and assessment in higher education in the context of the specialty. | X   | X  | A1,<br>A2.C1<br><br>A2.U2<br>B1.Z4,<br>B1.U4<br>G1.U3<br>D2<br>E2   | 1. Educational component program draft<br>2. Written exam (test) multiple choice and short answers)   |
| <b>DLO 2.</b> Conduct student assessments, provide feedback and support to students in a variety of learning environments, valuing equality, diversity and inclusivity  | X   |  | B2<br>B1, B2, B3  | 1. Review and feedback on the project educational component programs <sup>1</sup>                     |
| <b>DLO 3.</b> Understand the broader context in which higher education operates, including society's orientation towards the Sustainable Development Goals, recognizing its implications for higher education in general and teaching practice in particular              | X   | X  | G2.U2,<br>G2.U3   | 1<br>Written exam (test) multiple choice and short answers)<br>2. Draft educational program component |

<sup>1</sup>Anonymous

### 3. CONTENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT (COURSE PROGRAM)

| Topic.<br>List of issues to be addressed within the topic   | Distribution within the overall time budget |                    |              |                    |             |                    |                  |                        | Recommended reading       |
|---|---|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
|   | Classroom work                              |                    |              |                    |             |                    | Independent work |                        |                           |
|   | L   |                    | PC / semin.z |                    | LabC. with. |                    |                  |                        |                           |
|   | daytime                                     | correspo<br>ndence | daytime      | correspo<br>ndence | daytime     | correspon<br>dence | daytime          | corres<br>ponde<br>nce |                           |
| <b>Topic 1. Development of the modern space of higher education: national and international context.</b><br>Introduction to the discipline, its place in the preparation of PhD candidates. How to organize assessment.<br>Features of the learning process in the modern information environment. The process of transformation of the European Higher Education Area. Qualifications Framework and educational continuity. Quality of higher education. Standards and recommendations for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area. Student-centered learning. Lifelong learning.  | 2   |                    | 2            |                    |             |                    | 7                |                        | [3-5]<br>[6-9]            |
| <b>Topic 2 Educational Theories</b><br>Behaviorism, constructivism, connectivism.<br>Pedagogy, andragogy, hyutagogy   | 2   |                    | 2            |                    |             |                    | 7                |                        | 5.1, 5.3                  |
| <b>Topic 3. Learning outcomes-based approach (competence approach).</b> The concept of learning outcomes and competencies. General and professional competencies. Bloom's taxonomy. The principle of constructive coordination in the planning of educational components. The connection in the chain "learning - teaching - assessment".   | 4   |                    | 4            |                    |             |                    | 8                |                        | [1-3]<br>[18, 20, 21, 28] |
| <b>Topic 4. Learning-teaching-assessment: role in effective learning.</b> Methods of learning, teaching: principles of forming an effective learning strategy. The concept of assessing students' learning outcomes. The role of assessment in modern higher education. ESG requirements for the assessment system. Types of assessment: assessment of learning, assessment for learning, assessment as learning (formative, summative, self-assessment). The role of the teacher in assessment. Types of assessment: diagnostic, normative, synoptic, objective, criteria-based.<br>Principles of developing an evaluation strategy. Evaluation, | 4   |                    | 4            |                    |             |                    | 10               |                        | [18]<br>[1-3]             |

|  |           |  |           |  |  |           |  |                                       |
|--|-----------|--|-----------|--|--|-----------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Programme Focused Assessment (PFA). Teaching and learning methods in different educational settings.   |           |  |           |  |  |           |  |                                       |
| <b>Topic 5. Educational program in higher education: development, implementation, monitoring, periodic review.</b> Concept and types of educational programs. International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED). Monitoring and periodic review of educational programs. Standards of higher education. | 2         |  | 2         |  |  | 7         |  | [1-5]                                 |
| <b>Topic 6. Sustainable Development Goals and Education for Sustainable Development: the role and tasks of higher education</b><br>Sustainable Development Goals and experience in their implementation in learning, teaching and assessment. Education for Sustainable Development (ESD)                        | 2         |  | 2         |  |  | 8         |  | [5.2, 62]<br>[41, 42, 44, 48, 49, 51] |
| <b>Topic 7. Ethical principles of teaching in higher education.</b> Academic integrity and mechanisms for ensuring it. Ethics of teaching at the university. Artificial intelligence: issues of technology and ethics  | 2         |  | 2         |  |  | 7         |  | [22-27]                               |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>18</b> |  | <b>18</b> |  |  | <b>54</b> |  |                                       |



### 3. TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS

| <b>DLO</b>  | <b>Teaching methods</b> (work that will be carried out by the teacher during classroom lessons, consultations)       | <b>Number of hours</b> | <b>Teaching methods</b> (what types of learning activities should the student perform independently)  | <b>Number of hours</b> |
|---|--|------------------------|---|------------------------|
| <b>DLO 1.</b> Develop and plan learning activities based on a competency-based approach, the principle of constructive engagement, and research results on issues related to learning, teaching, and assessment in higher education in the context of a specialty | Flipped classroom,<br>lecture-presentation<br>Group discussion<br>Teacher consultations<br>Simulation,<br>group work | 16                     | Reading (studying theoretical material) and studying video materials<br>Learning through action<br>Learning through inquiry   | 24                     |
| <b>DLO 2.</b> Conduct student assessments, provide feedback and support to students in diverse learning environments, valuing equality, diversity and inclusion   | Flipped classroom, lecture-presentation, case study method<br>Group work Teacher consultations Simulation            | 16                     | Reading (studying theoretical material) and studying video materials<br>Peer-to-peer learning Peer review of the educational component program<br>Learning through action | 14                     |
| <b>DLO 3.</b> Understand the broader context in which higher education operates, including society's orientation towards the Sustainable Development Goals, recognizing its implications for higher education in general and teaching practice in particular      | Flipped classroom, lecture-discussion, case study method<br>Teacher consultations<br>Peer to peer learning           | 8                      | Reading (studying theoretical material) and studying video materials<br>Learning through research   | 12                     |

#### 4. EVALUATION BY EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT

4.1. Diagnostic assessment – testing applicants on their understanding of the provisions of the Law of Ukraine "On Higher Education", Standards and Recommendations for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, and the National Qualifications Framework.

#### 4.2. SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

4.2.1. To assess the expected learning outcomes in the discipline, the following is provided:

| No. | Summative assessment methods  | Points / Weight in the overall score | Date of compilation                |
|-----|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1.  | Educational component program draft   | 40 points / 40%                      | 7th <sup>2</sup> and the 10th week |
| 2.  | Review (based on rubrics) + feedback on the draft educational component program | 20 points /20%                       | Week 8                             |
| 3.  | Written exam (multiple choice and short answer test)                            | 40 points /40%                       | Week 11-13 (according to schedule) |
|     | <b>Total</b>  | <b>100 points</b>                    |                                    |

---

<sup>2</sup>Applicants submit a draft of the educational component program for review by other students, who provide their review and feedback throughout the week. And the author of the OK program draft can make changes to his work before submitting it for evaluation to the instructor.

#### 4.2.2. Evaluation criteria

| <b><i>Program draft educational component</i></b>  | <i>&lt;24 points</i>   | <i>24-29 points</i>  | <i>30-35 points</i>   | <i>36-40 points</i>   |
|--|--|--|---|---|
|  | Not all components of the program have been developed and/or the information is presented in an unstructured manner, there is no understanding of the logical structure of the educational component, the results are presented in an inappropriate format. The requirements for design have not been met. | All components are present without detailed justification. Learning outcomes are not always formulated in accordance with the SMART principle, information on teaching methods is not structured, compliance with the principle of constructive coordination is not fully demonstrated. The program project is formalized according to the requirement | Learning outcomes are formulated in accordance with the SMSRT principle, aligned with teaching, learning, and assessment methods. The document is presented in the appropriate format, in compliance with the requirements. | Learning outcomes are formed in accordance with the SMART principle, and constructive coordination is fully implemented. The program is based on benchmarking and contains innovative teaching and learning practices that are the result of the applicant's research (education for sustainable development, active learning methods, etc.). The results are presented in an appropriate format. |
| <b><i>Review (on based on rubrics) + feedback on the draft program educational component</i></b> | <i>&lt;12 points</i>   | <i>12-14 points</i>  | <i>15-18 points</i>   | <i>18-20 points</i>   |
|  | The review provided was not provided in a timely manner, there are no comments and recommendations, only sections with obvious non-compliance of the assessment with the criterion were filled in.   | Feedback is not structured, recommendations and comments are not provided. Evaluation is mostly formal – not based on the evaluation criteria of the educational component program project.  | Submitted in a timely manner. The author demonstrates an understanding of how to apply criteria for evaluating work. Contains comments that provide an understanding of why the work was scored in each rubric              | Delivered in a timely manner. Demonstrated understanding of how to apply criteria for evaluating work, which were fully applied. Contains comments that make it possible to understand why each rubric was evaluated in a particular way, recommendations that allow you to improve your work. Recommended literature to study for improvement  |
| <b><i>Written exam</i></b>   | <60% correct answers, problem tasks not completed  | 60-74% correct answers, problem tasks completed superficially with significant   | 75-89% correct answers, problem tasks completed with minor inaccuracies   | 90-100% correct answers, problem tasks completed with full justifications answers   |

### 4.3. Formative assessment:

To assess current progress in learning and understand areas for further improvement,

| No. | Elements of formative assessment   | Date   |
|-----|--|--|
| 1   | Oral feedback at each seminar session where group work, discussion or simulation is provided   | Each seminar session                                   |
| 2   | 1) Verbal feedback from the teacher while working on the program project,<br>2) written feedback on the program draft from the teacher and fellow applicants | 1) during classes,<br>2) within 2 weeks after assembly |
| 3   | Preliminary testing  | Week 9   |

The discipline includes peer to peer assessment as an element of summative assessment. This approach allows students to develop assessment, self-assessment, and responsibility skills, which are critically important for them as future teachers.

## 5. LEARNING RESOURCES (LITERATURE)

### Main

1. Формування результатів навчання в науках про навколишнє середовище: тренінг-курс / Ю. В. Рибалко, О.В. Зазимко. – НУБІП, 2017. – Одеса: НУ «ОМА», 2017. – 50 с.  
[https://nubip.edu.ua/sites/default/files/1.\\_formuvannya\\_rezultativ\\_navchannya\\_v\\_naukah\\_pro\\_navkolishnie\\_seredovishche.pdf](https://nubip.edu.ua/sites/default/files/1._formuvannya_rezultativ_navchannya_v_naukah_pro_navkolishnie_seredovishche.pdf)
2. Розроблення освітніх програм. Методичні рекомендації / Авт.: В.М. Захарченко, В.І. Луговий, Ю.М. Рашкевич, Ж.В. Таланова / За ред. В.Г. Кременя. – К. : ДП «НВЦ «Пріоритети», 2014. – 120 с.
3. Рашкевич Ю. М. Болонський процес і нова парадигма вищої освіти: монографія / Ю.М. Рашкевич. – Львів: Видавництво Львівської політехніки, 2014. – 168 с.
4. Тренінг – курс Рамки кваліфікацій: призначення, розроблення та впровадження. – Режим доступу: [http://onma.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/QFs\\_Trenyng-kurs\\_11-11-2016.pdf](http://onma.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/QFs_Trenyng-kurs_11-11-2016.pdf)
5. Вступне слово до Проекту ТЬЮНІНГ – гармонізація освітніх структур у Європі. Внесок університетів у Болонський процес. – Режим доступу: [http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/images/stories/documents/General\\_Brochure\\_Ukrainian\\_version.pdf](http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/images/stories/documents/General_Brochure_Ukrainian_version.pdf)
  - 5.1. Марчук А. В. Андрагогіка : навч. посібник. Львів : ЛьвДУВС, 2020. 300 с
  - 5.2. Глобальні цілі сталого розвитку: кейси для ухвалення управлінських рішень : навчальний посібник / за заг. ред. Ю.М. Петрушенка. – Суми: СумДУ, 2020. – 122 с.
  - 5.3. Zhou, M., & Brown, D. (Eds.). (2017). Educational learning theories. Retrieved from <https://oer.galileo.usg.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=education-textbooks>

### Legislative and regulatory documents

6. Закон України «Про вищу освіту» від 01.07.2014 № 1556-VII. – Режим доступу: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18>
7. Національна рамка кваліфікацій. Затверджена постановою Кабінету Міністрів України від 23 листопада 2011 р. № 1341. – Режим доступу: <http://zakon3.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1341-2011-%D0%BF>
8. ЄКТС – Довідник користувача 2015 р. – Режим доступу: <http://www.erasmusplus.org.ua/novyny/1161-yekts-dovidnyk-korystuvacha-2015-r-ukrainskoiu-movoio-vzhe-dostupno.html>
9. Стандарти і рекомендації щодо забезпечення якості в Європейському просторі вищої освіти (ESG) Ухвалено Міністерською конференцією в Єревані, 14-15 травня 2015 р. – Режим доступу: [http://www.britishcouncil.org.ua/sites/default/files/standards-and-guidelines\\_for\\_qa\\_in\\_the\\_ehea\\_2015.pdf](http://www.britishcouncil.org.ua/sites/default/files/standards-and-guidelines_for_qa_in_the_ehea_2015.pdf)
10. QF EHEA 2018 (Рамка кваліфікацій ЄПВО) – [http://www.ehea.info/Upload/document/ministerial\\_declarations/EHEAParis2018\\_Communique\\_AppendixIII\\_952778.pdf](http://www.ehea.info/Upload/document/ministerial_declarations/EHEAParis2018_Communique_AppendixIII_952778.pdf)
11. EQF 2017 (Європейська рамка кваліфікацій) – <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/cee970-518f-11e7-a5ca-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>;  
<https://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/content/descriptors-page>
12. ISCED (Міжнародна стандартна класифікація освіти, МСКО) 2011 – <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf>
13. Методичні рекомендації щодо розроблення стандартів вищої освіти. Схвалено сектором вищої освіти Науково-методичної Ради Міністерства освіти і науки України, протокол від 29.03.2016 № 3. – Режим доступу: <http://edumns.org.ua/img/news/8635/Nak;http://uis.unesco.org/en/topic/international-standardclassification-education-isced-5>.

14. ISCED-F (Міжнародна стандартна класифікація освіти – Галузі, МСКО-Г) 2013 – <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standardclassification-of-education-fields-of-education-and-training-2013-detailed-field-descriptions-2015-en.pdf> MON\_1254\_19.pdf

### **Additional**

15. Національний глосарій: вища освіта, 2014 – <http://erasmusplus.org.ua/korysna-informatsiia/korysni-materialy/category/3-materialynatsionalnoi-komandy-ekspertiv-shchodo-zaprovadzhennia-instrumentiv-bolonskohoprotsesu.html?start=80>
16. Гриньова М. В., Кононець Н. В. Компетентнісний підхід у професійній підготовці. Електронний посібник для самостійної роботи здобувачів третього освітньо-наукового рівня (доктор філософії)
17. Cedefop (2016). Application of learning outcomes approaches across Europe: a comparative study. Luxembourg: Publications Office. Cedefop reference series; No 105. [https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/files/3074\\_en.pdf](https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/files/3074_en.pdf)
18. Guide for Busy Academics Using Learning Outcomes to Design a Course and Assess Learning <http://sweb.cityu.edu.hk/teachingandlearning/new/resources/OBTL%20Action%20Verb.pdf>
19. Bowe Brian and Fitzmaurice Marian Guide to Writing Learning Outcomes <https://www.dit.ie/litc/media/ditlittc/documents/Microsoft%20Word%20-%20LearningOutcomesGuide.pdf>
20. Declan Kennedy, Áine Hyland, Norma Ryan Writing and Using Learning Outcomes: a Practical Guide [https://www.fibaa.org/fileadmin/uploads/content\\_uploads/Writing\\_and\\_Using\\_Learning\\_Outcomes\\_02.pdf](https://www.fibaa.org/fileadmin/uploads/content_uploads/Writing_and_Using_Learning_Outcomes_02.pdf)
21. Accept Jonathan Deller (2019) The Ultimate Guide to Understanding Bloom's Taxonomy. Available at: <https://kodosurvey.com/blog/ultimate-guide-understanding-blooms-taxonomy#:~:text=The%20six%20levels%20of%20the%20original%20Bloom's%20taxonomy%20%2D%20Knowledge%2C%20Comprehension,for%20higher%20levels%20of%20thinking.>
22. Стадний Є. Деякі рекомендації щодо впровадження етичних кодексів в українських вищих навчальних закладах <https://ntb.pstu.edu/images/files/rekomendazij.pdf>
23. Heuser, B. L. & Drake, T. A., 2011. Toward Global Academic Ethics through Accountability Systems. In: Creating the Ethical Academy. Abingdon: Routledge
24. Методичні рекомендації для закладів вищої освіти з підтримки принципів академічної доброчесності [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IJtjefmfqO1uNCn4p9cT5g6\\_58h0Cxq9/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IJtjefmfqO1uNCn4p9cT5g6_58h0Cxq9/view)
25. Mihaylo Milovanovitch, Caroline Macready, Tinde Kovac-Cerovic, Muriel Poisson (2017) OECD Reviews of Integrity in Education: Ukraine 2017.
26. Review of the Education Sector in Ukraine Moving. Toward Effectiveness, Equity and Efficiency (RESUME3) <http://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/884261568662566134/pdf/Review-of-the-Education-Sector-in-Ukraine-Moving-toward-Effectiveness-Equity-and-Efficiency-RESUME3.pdf>
27. Рекомендації для закладів вищої освіти щодо розробки та впровадження університетської системи забезпечення академічної доброчесності. Доступно на: <https://naqa.gov.ua/>
28. Bloom's Taxonomy: The Ultimate Guide <https://tophat.com/blog/blooms-taxonomy/>

### **Scientific literature for essays**

- 29) Alfieri, L., Brooks, P. J., Aldrich, N. J., & Tenenbaum, H. R. (2011). Does discovery-based instruction enhance learning? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(1), 1–18.
- 30) Allen, D. O., & Webber, D. J. (2010). Attendance and exam performance at university: a case study. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 15(1), 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596740903565319>
- 31) Åsa Hirsh, Claes Nilholm, Henrik Roman, Eva Forsberg & Daniel Sundberg (2020): Reviews of teaching methods – which fundamental issues are identified?, *Education Inquiry*, DOI: 10.1080/20004508.2020.1839232

- 32) Bannigan, K., & Moores, A. (2009). A Model of Professional Thinking: Integrating Reflective Practice and Evidence Based Practice. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 76(5), 342–350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000841740907600505>
- 33) Barefoot, H., Oliver, M. and Mellar, H. (2016) ‘Informer choice? How the United Kingdom’s key information set fails to represent pedagogy to potential students’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 22(1), 3-19
- 34) Bennett, R. and Kane, S. (2014) ‘Students’ interpretations of the meanings of questionnaire items in the National Student Survey’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 20(2), 129-164.
- 35) Biesta, G. (2015) ‘What is Education For? On Good Education, Teacher Judgement, and Educational Professionalism’, *European Journal of Education*, 50(1), 75-87.
- 36) Bunce, L., Baird, A. and Jones, S. E. (2016) ‘The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance’, *Studies in Higher Education*, 2016, 1-21.
- 37) Cheng, M. (2011) ‘“Transforming the learner” versus “passing the exam”: Understanding the gap between academic and student definitions of quality’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 17(1), 3-17.
- 38) Cheng, M. (2017) ‘Reclaiming quality in higher education: a human factor approach’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 23(2), 153-167.
- 39) Dean, A. and Gibbs, P. (2015) ‘Student satisfaction or happiness? A preliminary rethink of what is important in the student experience’, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 23(1), 5-19.
- 40) Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Sluijsmans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24(3), 331–350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079912331379935>
- 41) Education for Sustainable Development Guidance, AdvanceHE and QAA, March 2021
- 42) Education for Sustainable Development: Towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (ESD for 2030)
- 43) Engstrom, C., & Tinto, V. (2008). Access Without Support is not Opportunity. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(1), 46–50. <https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.40.1.46-50>
- 44) [Fiselier, E.S.](#), [Longhurst, J.W.S.](#) and [Gough, G.K.](#) (2018), "Exploring the current position of ESD in UK higher education institutions", [International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education](#), Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 393-412
- 45) Gray, C., Swan, J. and Rodway-Dyer, S. (2014) ‘Student voice and engagement: connecting through partnership’, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20(1), 57-71.
- 46) Hirsh, Å., & Nilholm, C. (2019). Reviews of teaching methods – what are the fundamental problems? Paper presented at ECER Conference, Hamburg. Retrieved from <https://eera-eceer.de/eceer-programmes/conference/24/contribution/47337/>
- 47) Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 75–86.
- 48) Lemarchand P, McKeever M, MacMahon C and Owende P (2022) A computational approach to evaluating curricular alignment to the united nations sustainable development goals. *Front. Sustain.* 3:909676. doi: 10.3389/frsus.2022.909676
- 49) Mapping the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the University Curriculum Prepared by Sarah Kate Reid. Published April 2020 Available at: [https://www.ed.ac.uk/sites/default/files/atoms/files/geosciences\\_report\\_aug2020.pdf](https://www.ed.ac.uk/sites/default/files/atoms/files/geosciences_report_aug2020.pdf)
- 50) Nair, C. S., Adams, P. and Mertova, P. (2008) ‘Student Engagement: The Key to Improving Survey Response Rates’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(3), 225-232.

- 51) Ndubuka, N.N.; Rey-Marmonier, E. Capability approach for realising the Sustainable Development Goals through Responsible Management Education: The case of UK business school academics. *Int. J. Manag. Educ.* 2019, 17, 100319
- 52) Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003786559>
- 53) Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- 54) Nilholm, C., & Göransson, K. (2017). What is meant by inclusion? An analysis of European and North American journal articles with high impact. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 32(3), 437–451
- 55) Polanin, J., Maynard, B., & Dell, N. (2017). Overviews in education research: A systematic review and analysis. I. Review of Educational Research, 87(1), 172–203.
- 56) QAA (2015) UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part B: Assuring and Enhancing Academic Quality, Chapter B5: Student Engagement, Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency.  
QAA (2017) *Taking the long view of the student voice: Analysis of student written submissions to QAA review and audit*, Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency.
- 57) Rosa, M. J., Sarrico, C. S. and Amaral, A. (2012) ‘Academics’ perceptions on the purposes of quality assessment’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 18(3), 349–366.
- 58) Schmidt, H. G., Rotgans, J. I., & Yew, E. H. (2011). The process of problem-based learning: what works and why: What works and why in problem-based learning. *Medical Education*, 45(8), 792–806. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04035.x>
- 59) Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189.
- 60) Smetana, L. K., & Bell, R. L. (2012). Computer simulations to support science instruction and learning: A critical review of the literature. *International Journal of Science Education*, 34(9), 1337–1370
- 61) Tangen, R. (2014) ‘Balancing Ethics and Quality in Educational Research – the Ethical Matrix Method’, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 58(6), 678–694
- 62) The United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014).
- 63) van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in teacher-student interaction: A decade of Research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22(3), 271–296.
- 64) Wolfgramm-Foliaki, E. (2017) ‘The potential of student narratives to enhance quality in higher education’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 23(1), 53–64.
- 65) Yanniris C. (2021). Education for Sustainability, Peace, and Global Citizenship: An Integrative Approach. *Education Sciences* 11(8):430. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11080430>