



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union

# **PEER REVIEW REPORT**

**An Evaluation of the Alignment of the Masters Degree Academic Programme in 'Management of Research, Development, Innovation in Universities' and Quality Assurance at 'Moscow State University of Education'**

2017

## **Contents**

1. Introduction
2. The Peer-Review Process
3. Observations on the Documentation Submitted and the Conduct of the Site Visit
4. Review of the Academic Programme
5. Review of Quality Assurance at the institutional level
6. Summary of Findings

### Annexes

Annex 1: List of Documents Submitted to the Panel

Annex 2: List of Participants at Moscow State University of Education

Annex 3: Programme for the Site Visit

## 1. Introduction

The ALIGN project seeks to enhance the intelligibility, consistency and transferability of qualifications through development and implementation of mechanisms for Higher Education Institutions (HEI) to achieve alignment with Qualifications Frameworks (QF) and for European Quality Assurance (EQA) to check such alignment.

It aims at:

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

## 2. The Peer-Review Process

The aim of the Peer Review process is to review one academic programme, and the quality assurance principles and processes that relate to the approval/validation, review and enhancement of academic programmes at the university. The panel will seek to advise the university (through discussion and a written report) on the nature and extent to which

- (a) the selected academic programme has been aligned with European (EHEA) standards and national qualification frameworks;
- (b) the HEI's quality assurance processes are aligned with European and national requirements and expectations; and provide
- (c) any recommendations that may help the university to further the alignment of its academic programmes and quality assurance processes with European and national standards.

The panel visiting MSPU consisted of the following members:

- 1) David Quin (chair), Lecturer, Institute of Art Design and Technology, Dublin, Ireland
- 2) Zbigniew Palka, Professor, Dr hab., Head of Department of Algorithms and Programming, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, Poland
- 3) Oksana Matveeva, Deputy Head of the Accreditation Office, National Centre for Public Accreditation, Yoshkar-Ola, Russia
- 4) David Sihuralidze, Deputy Chair of the Russian Students Union, Moscow, Russia
- 5) Maria Gonchar, Head of Educational Systems Management Department, MSPU, Moscow, Russia
- 6) Margarita Zobnina, Director of the Department of Ecosystem Projects of the Internet Initiatives Development Fund, Moscow, Russia
- 7) Alexey Fominykh, Head of International Projects Department of Volga State University of Technology, Yoshkar-Ola, Russia

Note: The ALIGN panel recognises that the University name has recently changed. For the purposes of this report, the acronym 'MSPU' will be used to refer to the university.

### **3. Observations on the Documentation Submitted and the Conduct of the Site Visit**

MSPU provided the following documentation by the agreed date of 17/08/17:

- Self-evaluation report for Management of Research, Development, Innovation in the University’.
- Programme Handbook for Master’s Degree Programme ‘Management of Research, Development, Innovation in the University’ in academic area ‘Pedagogical education’ (44.04.01).

There was some confusion about the programme documentation, and updated versions of the Programme Handbook and an updated Self Evaluation Document were presented to the ALIGN Peer Review Panel on the morning of the ALIGN review.

The documents provided the ALIGN peer review panel with sufficient information to conduct the review. Considering the short time the MSPU team had to prepare their programme and their documentation, the fact that the MSPU programme team was changing during the preparation time and considering the obvious disruption which was caused by the university’s merger with another university, the documentation showed commendable effort and development. The ALIGN panel pointed out omissions and errors where they could.

The ALIGN peer review panel thanks the management of MSPU for the huge hospitality and their interest in this peer review and in the ALIGN project. We note the professionalism of the staff who served in the panel, the helpfulness and honesty of the whole staff, the students and the other stakeholders during the meeting with the panel. The professional organisation and support by the university staff ensured that our work could be conducted as efficiently and effectively as possible.

## 4. Review of Academic Programme

### 4.1 Programme 'Management of Research, Development, Innovation in Universities'

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 indicators of good practice' for alignment of academic programmes. Each assessment may be accompanied by a short commentary on the rating given.

INDICATOR 1	ASSESSMENT
The academic programme is properly titled and lead to an award at the appropriate level, consistent with European and national frameworks for higher education qualifications, and the Dublin Descriptors for Masters' awards.	<b>partly achieved</b>
<b>Comment</b>  The MSPU programme team should carefully consider the title of this programme, in order to be clear that the programme is aimed at the broader higher education or university sector, and in order to attract students from other universities and from abroad.  Though this programme is related to existing MSPU programmes, the panel observes that this is a new, untried and largely untested programme. As the programme rolls out, the programme team and university management must carefully monitor progress and make any necessary changes in order to protect and enhance student learning.  The Programme Learning outcomes will need ongoing development and refinement.  The panel observes that the programme handbook includes a commendable attempt at comparative analysis and an attempt to align with the Dublin Descriptors.  However, the panel would strongly recommend that the MSPU programme team would in the future attempt to benchmark their programme against best international practice.	

INDICATOR 2	ASSESSMENT
The academic programme is informed by and consistent with professional/industry standards/requirements, where appropriate.	<b>largely achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>According to the documentation provided, the programme conforms with Russian professional standards. The university seems to have very effective linkages with external stakeholders, other universities, schools etc. These strong linkages could be explained more clearly in future programme documentation.</p>	

INDICATOR 3	ASSESSMENT
The aims of the programme are appropriate for the student intake, and can be realised through students' attainment of the programme/module learning outcomes.	<b>partly achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>The aim of the programme is quite clear, though the ALIGN panel would observe that there are dangers in attempting to cover such broad subjects – education and management. The programme mission statement (handbook page 7) is very broad – such ambition is commendable in many ways, but could potentially lead to student confusion and to shallow learning (not appropriate at Masters level).</p> <p>Enrolment procedures are not clearly explained in the documentation provided to the ALIGN panel. However, the MSPU programme team did explain university enrolment procedures, the recognition of prior learning and the procedures for accommodating international applicants.</p> <p>The programme team must be clear about applicant language requirements and must ensure that applicants have the required skills and competencies in order to successfully complete their studies.</p>	

INDICATOR 4	ASSESSMENT
All learning outcomes at module level are at the appropriate level, and are assessed through fair, valid and reliable student assignments/tests.	<b>partly achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>The Programme Learning Outcomes need development, are too numerous and are sometimes quite poorly articulated. The current Programme Learning Outcomes appear to be closely based on the Russian Professional Standards (Scientist and Scientific Researcher). The programme Learning Outcomes are also expected to work as Module Learning Outcomes – these will be difficult for the programme team to assess and could confuse students.</p> <p>The assessment procedures as articulated in some of the documentation provided are potentially fair, valid and reliable, though the ALIGN panel would observe that, as a new programme, actual student assessment has not happened yet on this programme. At institutional level, the university seems to have strong assessment procedures, with the use of electronic cabinet systems etc.</p>	

INDICATOR 5	ASSESSMENT
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.	<b>fully achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>This is a new programme and no students have enrolled yet. However, at Institutional and Faculty level, the academic systems seem to work well, with good policies and procedures and strong use of technology.</p>	

INDICATOR 6	ASSESSMENT
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.	<b>largely achieved</b>



**Comment**

This is a new programme and no students have enrolled yet.

Once again, the Programme Learning Outcomes need development, are too numerous and are sometimes quite poorly articulated. The current Programme Learning Outcomes appear to be closely based on the Russian Professional Standards (Scientist and Scientific Researcher). The programme Learning Outcomes are also expected to work as Module Learning Outcomes – these will be difficult for the programme team to assess and could confuse students.

At institutional and Faculty level, there seems to be a strong understanding of professional practice and many MSPU postgraduate students are coming from a professional background. Systematic linkages with professional bodies and external entities need to be more clearly explained in future programme documentation.

INDICATOR 7	ASSESSMENT
The structure of the programme ensures the progression of students' learning, and provides appropriate opportunities for student choice.	<b>fully achieved</b>
<b>Comment</b>  The university seems to have a strong capacity to ensure opportunities for student choice and for the creation of individualised student study pathways.	

INDICATOR 8	ASSESSMENT
The credits ratings (national and ECTS) for modules are properly aligned with the designated student workloads for the modules.	<b>not applicable in this stage of the alignment</b>
<b>Comment</b>  This is a new programme and no students have enrolled yet – as a result student workloads only exist on paper, untried and untested. The earlier versions of the Programme Handbook contained fractionalised ECTS credits (totally unfamiliar at international level), though this has been amended in the (updated) Handbook (provided on the morning of the review).	

INDICATOR 9	ASSESSMENT
Students are provided with clear and current information about the learning opportunities and support available to them.	<b>fully achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>This is a new programme and no students have enrolled yet. However, at institutional and Faculty level, there seem to be strong student supports at MSPU.</p>	

INDICATOR 10	ASSESSMENT
The design, delivery and monitoring of the academic programme 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).	<b>partly achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>The ALIGN panel were disappointed to hear from the programme team that students had not been involved in the development of this programme and that the programme team 'looked forward to involving students in the future'. However, at institutional and Faculty level there does seem to be a sound understanding of the concept of student centred learning, though it seems to work better at certain levels (horizontally rather than vertically). MSPU has to do more in achieving student centredness, on the one hand by consulting guidelines produced, for example, by the European Students' Union, and on the other hand through actively encouraging involvement of students in programme design, as expected by the ESG.</p>	

### **Assessment of the Expectation for Alignment of the Academic Programme**

This is a new programme. All of the programme documentation is still in development. As students start to study on this programme (sometime in 2018?), the programme team will need to carefully monitor how the programme is working and will need to make any necessary changes in order to protect and enhance student learning.

Students need to be involved in programme development and monitoring from now on.

We would strongly recommend that the programme team would benchmark this programme against similar programmes from around the world. The programme would benefit from more international perspectives, a clearer use of ECTS, European Diploma Supplement etc. The team should consider ingoing and outgoing mobility, for students and for lecturing staff. Such mobility experience will greatly enhance and enrich this programme.

The Learning Outcomes for this programme need a critical rethink, redesign and rewrite. This is understandable as the learning outcomes approach is still relatively new to Russia. The programme team should look at reducing the number of Programme Learning Outcomes and should carefully consider the introduction of separate and discreet Module Learning Outcomes. Learning Outcomes should better describe generic professional competencies and should be more specific. Learning Outcomes should be closely aligned with the Dublin Descriptors.

The programme title needs to be reviewed, possibly to be replaced by a clearer, shorter and less technical title.

## 5. Review of Quality Assurance for Academic Programmes

The Expectation of the Panel will be:

**In setting and maintaining standards and assuring quality, the university will operate clear and effective processes for the design, approval, delivery, monitoring, and support and development of its academic programmes in accordance with European and national standards and requirements.**

The panel has used a rating-scale to assess each of the 10 indicators for alignment of quality assurance. Each assessment may be accompanied by a short commentary on the rating given.

INDICATOR 1	ASSESSMENT
There are clear criteria against which academic programmes are assessed in the programme approval, monitoring and review processes.	<b>fully achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>The documents provided clearly detailed the regulations and the national regulatory framework governing academic programmes at MSPU.</p>	

INDICATOR 2	ASSESSMENT
The roles and responsibilities for programme design, development, approval and monitoring are clearly articulated.	<b>partly achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>The team involved in the development of this programme seemed to be quite small and was somewhat disrupted by recent staff changes etc. This could have been mitigated by involving more people (including students and stakeholders) in programme development.</p> <p>However, at institutional and Faculty level, there does seem to be a sound understanding of roles and responsibilities for programme approval and monitoring. Such roles and responsibilities need to be more clearly articulated in future programme documentation.</p>	

INDICATOR 3	ASSESSMENT
Students are involved in programme design and in the processes of programme development, approval, monitoring and review.	<b>partly achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>The ALIGN panel were disappointed to hear from the programme team that students had not been involved in the development of this programme. At institutional and Faculty level, student involvement in all Quality Assurance processes is not explicit.</p>	

INDICATOR 4	ASSESSMENT
There are effective policies which ensure that the academic standards for credits and awards are rigorously maintained at the appropriate level, and that student performance is judged against these standards.	<b>largely achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>Though the documentation provided was not very clear on the maintenance of academic standards at MSPU, the MSPU programme team did explain the university procedures in detail.</p>	

INDICATOR 5	ASSESSMENT
There are clear and effective policies and processes for assessing the recognition of prior learning and supporting student mobility between courses of study and institutions.	<b>partly achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>Recognition of prior learning was explained by the MSPU programme team. Student mobility between courses at MSPU seemed to have good potential, especially offering students elective subject choices. However, outgoing student mobility seemed to be limited, though there were references to the university's International Affairs office. The panel didn't see any MSPU policies for supporting student mobility.</p>	

INDICATOR 6	ASSESSMENT
Knowledge of professional standards/requirements and external expertise (e.g., from subject experts, employers and professional associations) is used to inform the design, development, approval and monitoring of academic programmes.	<b>largely achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>The university seems to have very effective linkages with external stakeholders, other universities, schools etc. Such strong and systematic linkages should be explained more clearly in future programme documentation.</p>	
INDICATOR 7	ASSESSMENT
There are appropriate arrangements to train and support academic and professional/administrative staff who are involved in the design, delivery, approval and monitoring of academic programmes.	<b>fully achieved</b>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>At institutional and Faculty level, there seemed to be effective supports for staff professional development. These procedures clearly follow national regulations.</p>	

INDICATOR 8	ASSESSMENT
<p>There are clear policies and processes in place to ensure the integrity of student assessment (e.g., through marking schemes, moderation processes, examination board regulations), and the effectiveness of these policies is regularly reviewed.</p>	<p><b>fully achieved</b></p>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>This is a new programme and no students have enrolled yet – as a result student assessment only exists on paper, untried and untested. On paper, (according to the documents provided to the ALIGN panel), it's not yet clear how assessment will exactly be rolled out, (what marking schemes will exactly be used etc). However at institutional and Faculty level there seemed to be strong assessment policies and procedures, an effective appeals process and good use of assessment technology.</p>	

INDICATOR 9	ASSESSMENT
<p>The policies and processes of programme design, development, approval and monitoring are regularly reviewed in order to ensure the effectiveness and continuous enhancement of current practices.</p>	<p><b>largely achieved</b></p>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>This is a new programme and such regular review, monitoring and development will be essential as the students work through their studies. The programme must continue to be refined and developed. At institutional and Faculty level, there are strong policies and processes for programme design, development, approval and monitoring.</p>	

INDICATOR 10	ASSESSMENT
<p>There are effective policies in place to ensure that staff appointed to teach and support student learning on academic programmes are appropriately qualified, and that delivery of the programmes is supported by the appropriate learning resources.</p>	<p><b>fully achieved</b></p>
<p><b>Comment</b></p> <p>MSPU operates fully in accordance with national regulations on staffing and qualifications.</p>	

## **Assessment of the Expectation for Alignment of Quality Assurance**

At institutional and Faculty level, there does seem to be a sound understanding of roles and responsibilities for programme development, approval and monitoring. Such roles and responsibilities need to be more clearly articulated in future programme documentation.

Students and stakeholders should be involved in all aspects of programme development and monitoring, with especial emphasis on Quality Assurance.

Outgoing student mobility at MSPU seems to be limited, though there were references to the university's International Affairs office. The panel didn't see any MSPU policies for supporting student mobility. Again, this needs to be more clearly explained in future documentation.

The university seems to have very effective linkages with external stakeholders, other universities, schools etc. but such strong and systematic linkages should again, be explained more clearly in future programme documentation.

This is a new programme and no students have enrolled yet – as a result student assessment only exists on paper, untried and untested. On paper, (according to the documents provided to the ALIGN panel), it's not yet clear how assessment will exactly be rolled out, (what marking schemes will be used etc). This should be more clearly explained in future programme documentation.

## **7. Summary of Findings**

### **Learning outcomes**

The Learning Outcomes for this programme are too numerous and are sometimes quite poorly articulated so they need ongoing development and refinement. Learning Outcomes should better describe generic professional competencies and should be more specific. Learning Outcomes should be closely aligned with the Dublin Descriptors.

The programme title needs to be reviewed, possibly to be replaced by a clearer, shorter and less technical title.

### **Curriculum**

The programme is currently virtual (a programme document, untried and untested), though MSPU team made a move on designing several quite detailed module descriptions which could be helpful for perspective students.

The team strongly recommends that the programme team would benchmark this programme against similar programmes from around the world. The programme would benefit from more international perspectives, a clearer use of ECTS, European Diploma Supplement etc. The team

should consider ingoing and outgoing mobility, for students and for lecturing staff. Such mobility experience will greatly enhance and enrich this programme.

### **Staff**

The staff who will take part in delivery of the study programme seems to be highly qualified and includes representatives from academic and professional societies.

The university seems to have very effective linkages with external stakeholders, other universities and schools.

### **Students**

This is a new programme and no students have enrolled yet. However, at Institutional and Faculty level, the academic systems seem to work well, with good policies and procedures and strong use of technology. Student support seems to be quite strong at institutional and faculty level.

Students need to be involved in programme development and monitoring from now on.

### **Results achieved**

It is not possible at this stage to state whether the alignment between programme and qualification framework is achieved as the study programme is new and all of the programme documentation is still in development. However MSPU has potential capacity to enhance the content of the study programme and carefully make changes in order to protect and enhance student learning in the nearest future.



## Annexes

### Annex 1: List of Documents submitted to the Panel

- The Self-Evaluation Document, with detailed descriptions of the University, its quality assurance system and the programmes reviewed, as well as comments on all the indicators of the review process
- Programme Handbook of the Master's Degree Programme 'Management of Research, Development, Innovation in the University'
- Curriculum for academic area 'Pedagogical education'
- Local documents on QA policies in the University in the Russian language

### Annex 2: List of Participants at 'MSPU' University

#### Representatives of MPSU responsible for the AP (aligning of AP):

No	Surname, name	Position	Contact information
1	Victor Dronov	First Vice-Rector	Vp.dronov@mpgu.edu
2	Ludmila Dudova	Vice-rector for International and Regional policy	lv.dudova@mpgu.edu
3	Rustem Gibadulin	Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies	rya.gibadulin@mpgu.edu
4	Renad Zhdanov	Chief Researcher of the Institute for Advanced Studies	ri.zhdanov@mpgu.edu
5	Olga Antropova	Head of the Scientific and Organizational Department of the Institute for Advanced Studies	Oa.antropova@mpgu.edu
6	Alexey Mikhalskij	Head of the Department of the Institute for Advanced Studies	Av.mikhalskij@mpgu.edu
7	Yuliya Mironova	Head of the department for the promotion of student employment and the employment of graduates	yup.mironova@mpgu.edu
8	Olga Shklyarova	Professor of Educational Systems Management department	
9	Alla Akimova	Head of the Department for Study Programmes	
10	Anna Nikiforenkova	A student of the 2nd course of the	studsovet@mpgu.edu

		master's degree, the chairman of the MGPU Student Council	
11	Lidiya Gerasimova	Chief Researcher of the Institute for Advanced Studies	ls.gerasimova1@mpgu.edu

**Representatives of MPSU responsible for the AP (Review of Quality Assurance Alignment):**

<b>№</b>	<b>Surname, name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Contact information</b>
1	Rustem Gibadulin	Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies	rya.gibadulin@mpgu.edu
2	Renad Zhdanov	Chief Researcher of the Institute for Advanced Studies	ri.zhdanov@mpgu.edu
3	Lidiya Gerasimova	Chief Researcher of the Institute for Advanced Studies	ls.gerasimova1@mpgu.edu
4	Alexej Mikhalskij	Head of the Department of the Institute for Advanced Studies	Av.mikhalskij@mpgu.edu
5	Olga Antropova	Head of the Scientific and Organizational Department	Oa.antropova@mpgu.edu
6	Alla Akimova	Head of the Department for Study Programmes	
10	Yuliya Mironova	Head of the department for the promotion of student employment and the employment of graduates	yup.mironova@mpgu.edu

**Students:**

<b>№</b>	<b>Surname, name</b>	<b>Course of studies</b>	<b>Contact information</b>
1	Anna Nikiforenkova	A student of the 2nd course of the master's degree, the chairman of the MGPU Student Council	studsovet@mpgu.edu
2	Natalia Mishoutina	Master program graduate for "Program and Project Management in Education", MSPU	
3	Ksenija Dvoryadkina	Master program graduate for "Program and Project Management in	

		Education”, MSPU	
--	--	------------------	--

### Annex 3: Programme for the Site Visit

Time	Activity	Participants	Venue
<b>September 6, Wednesday</b>			
8.45	Transfer to MSPU from Hotel «Blyuz»		Address: Moscow, Dovatora st., 8
09.00 – 10.00	Private meeting of the Panel	Peer Review Panel	
10.00 – 13.30	Meeting with ALIGN Project leaders at MSPU and MSPU representatives responsible for the AP (Review of the alignment of the AP)	MSPU representatives responsible for the AP, Peer Review Panel	Moscow, Pirogovskaya st. 1 Administrative Conference Room
13.30 – 14.30	Lunch		
14.30 – 15.30	Meeting with the students of the educational programme	Students, Peer Review Panel	Administrative Conference Room
15.30 – 15.40	Coffee break	Peer Review Panel	
15.40 – 17.30	Meeting with MSPU representatives responsible for the AP (Review of Quality Assurance Alignment)	Representatives of MSPU, Department of Licensing and Accreditation, Centre for Quality Management, Peer Review Panel	Administrative Conference Room
20.00	Dinner		

<b>September 7, Thursday</b>		
08.45	Transfer to MSPU from Hotel «Blyuz»	Address: Moscow, Dovatora st., 8
09.00	Arrival at MSPU	
09.00 – 11.00	Internal meeting of Peer Review Panel	Peer Review Panel Administrative Conference Room
11.00 – 13.00	Work with the report and check-lists	Administrative Conference Room
13.00-14.00	Lunch	
14.00 – 15.00	Closing meeting on the ALIGN Project results	Peer Review Panel Administrative Conference Room
16.00	Tour around Moscow for foreign guests	
20.00	Dinner	