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# Users instruction

This template is intended to give you the directives for writing a report on all your findings. At the same time most tables in this report can also be used to collect the data during each interview. By systematically collecting for each interview your data in the different tables you have already all input of related data brought together. From this you need to make some summarizing steps (select, combine, order) to condense everything and to make a good summary. Part of the instructions below intend to give the directive to do this.

Before going on for an interview each time simply print this set. During the interview use this print to keep track of the answers of your respondent. And once back in the office, fill in the collected information in the report template. In this way in the end you have collected everything in just one document!

Lots of success,

# Introduction

QM&CQAF is an international collaborative project of successful and proved educational quality assurance solution adaptation and deployment in the partner countries’ educational institutions. The general objective of this project is the adaptation of the educational quality assurance model successfully used in European Union as well as its positive experience and practices promotions in order to provide the common higher education assurance.

This project considers the close collaboration of EU- and partner countries’ educational and researching institutions. The network comprises three types of institutions. The first (Revalento, the Netherlands and Folkuniversitet, Sweden) contains the EU-representatives that developed and popularized CQAF model during recent projects and also possess the methodology and experience of the CQAF model dissemination. The second contains four universities (University North (the grant holder), the Republic of Croatia; Ivanovo State University and Tomsk State University, the Russian Federation; Belarus State Economic University, the Republic of Belarus), which are to embrace the CQAF model, train the tutors and specialists and familiarize students and postgraduates with the quality management and CQAF model, distribute the CQAF model at national level universities. The third group contains partner countries’ educational institutions (Pastukhov Academy, the Russian Federation; Republican Institute for Vocational Education, the Republic of Belarus) for university managers and tutors advanced CQAF model training for having the collaborative experience with the 1st group. Alongside with the CQAF model adaptation they are to perform methodological support of the 2nd group universities.

Tasks to be performed in order to achieve this objective:

1. CQAF conception adaptation to Croatian, Russian and Belarusian education.

2. Educational quality assurance QM&CQAF model elaboration based on adapted CQAF conception and 2015 version ISO 9001 standards.

3. Croatian, Russian and Belarusian university tutors, teachers and specialists training for using and distributing QM&CQAF model.

4. QM&CQAF model approbation to the partner countries’ economic systems. Monitoring (internal auditing) and processes indicator estimation (self-estimation).

5. Holding the QM&CQAF model dissemination impacts and outcomes analysis in partner countries’ universities.

6. Educational quality assurance QM&CQAF model usage full guide elaboration. Two steps: the first variant of the recommendations will be elaborated alongside with the guidance materials for recipient universities. The second will contain the model using experience analysis and higher education quality assurance best practices description.

There are seven stages being held during the project:

- Research of quality model CQAF appreciation in the partner countries;

- The exploitation concept CQAF quality model elaboration in the partner countries

- Resource and promotional materials elaboration;

- Training the tutors in the CQAF model recipient-countries universities;

- Higher education quality model Guide elaboration and discussion on the national level;

- CQAF model exploitation processes support and monitoring in the recipient-countries;

- Additional research of the CQAF quality model appreciation in the partner countries and deliverables according to Quality Management principles.

There are four different kinds of activities performed during the project (researches, teaching/training, deliverables, events).

The main stages of the research on questionnaire were as follows:

1) Development of the printed version of the questionnaire;

2) Conducting interviews with survey respondents;

3) The first stage of the analysis of the interview results;

4) Clarification of the responses;

5) The final analysis of the interview results;

6) Preparation of a report on the research (National report).

On average, an interview with one respondent took an hour and a half.

The National report on this research is part and a source of input data for the consolidated report on primary reaction at QM&CQAF model application, QM&CQAF model components and typical bottle-necks advance, backgrounds and improvement resources.

# National context

In the Republic of Belarus, to improve the quality of education is one of the most important priorities of the state’s social policy. The country is expected to shift from the principle of quality control of education to the creation of education quality assurance system.

***The main directions of activities to improve VET quality***

Nowadays, the category of "quality" is firmly established in the field of education. In the Education Code the term "quality" is defined as follows: "Quality of education is the compliance of education with the requirements of the educational standard, with the training and programme documentation of the corresponding educational programme".

The main directions of activity to improve the quality of education in the country include the following activities:

* improvement of regulatory and legal, and scientific and methodological support of the education system;
* development of a network of educational institutions according to the needs of the labour market and educational services market, improving their material base;
* improvement of pedagogic education, improvement of professional excellence and of social status of the teacher;
* introduction of modern educational technologies, of e-learning aids;
* improvement of the procedure of the students' training achievement evaluation, of final certification of the graduates from educational institutions.

***State control over quality assurance in education***

State control over quality assurance in education is activity of state bodies to verify compliance of education with educational standard, training and programme documentation of educational programmes, of educational activities with legal requirements.

State control is divided into three types according to the authorities carrying it out: departmental (sectoral), internal control, supradepartmental.

*Departmental (sectoral) control* is carried out in the system of education sector (sphere) by superior bodies in relation to the subordinate ones. It is present both in the system of the Ministry of Education and in other systems where there are educational institutions (in the Ministry of Health system, the Ministry of Culture system, the Ministry of Defence system, etc.).It is daily and operational control exercised by the leadership of the relevant ministries, state committees and committees, by structural subdivisions of these bodies, by educational authorities at the local level.

*Internal control* is carried out in an educational institution by this educational institution itself. This is self-control.

Self-control of quality assurance in education is a comprehensive analysis of educational activity, which includes self-examination, self-evaluation of educational activities carried out by the educational institution. The order and periodicity of conducting self-control over quality assurance in education are determined by the head of the educational institution.

*Supradepartmental (supra-sectoral) control* is carried out externally, from outside, by the bodies outside the system of the industry, for example, of health care, internal affairs, defence, etc. In the Ministry of education system supradepartmental control is not carried out. In other systems, it is carried out by the Ministry of education, its agencies which are Offices/directorates (committees) for education and for youth issues.

The Ministry of Education set up a special body to control the quality of education in the country, it is ***the Department for quality control of education*** with supradepartmental powers.

The Department for quality control of education coordinates the activities of directorates (committees), the departments for education and for youth issues of local executive and regulatory bodies, and other organisations to control the quality assurance of education provided by educational institutions. Today, the Department sets targets to improve the system of control over quality assurance in education, to study and to apply progressive forms of international experience in improving the methods of control over education quality assurance.

***Accreditation of VET institutions and programmes***

In the Republic of Belarus an accreditation procedure, which the Department for quality control of education conducts, is applied to guarantee the quality of education.

State accreditation of an educational institution is an activity of state bodies to establish the compliance of educational activities of the educational institution with the legislation on education, of the content and quality of education provided with the requirements of educational standards, with the training and programme documentation of educational programmes.

As a result of carrying out state accreditation of the educational institution a decision is made on accreditation of the educational institution or on refusal of accreditation of the educational institution.

If there is a decision on accreditation of the educational institution, it is considered to be accredited, and a certificate (-s) of state accreditation is issued to it. By decision on accreditation of the educational institution the right of the educational institution to issue documents on education to graduates is established.

It is important to note that the educational institution is obliged to reaffirm/verify its state accreditation. The confirmation of the state accreditation is held in order to prove conformity with the claimed type, according to the profile of education, direction of education at least once in five years from the date of receipt of the corresponding certificate of state accreditation. In case of not having confirmed the state accreditation the educational institution loses corresponding state accreditation.

One of the key factors ensuring VET quality, the spread of modern technologies and methods of teaching, is the condition of its staff capacity.

The educational process in higher educational institutions of the country is provided by pedagogic and scientific workers, the correlation of whose population to the number of students is in the average of 1:10. And Candidates of sciences and Doctors of sciences make up more than 40% of the academic teaching staff of universities, which corresponds to international practice.

***The introduction of quality management system***

Evaluation of the quality of education is open and conducted by representatives of the academic community, by employers, consumers of educational services.

The introduction of a quality management system based on ISO-9001 series of standards in VET institutions is aimed at ensuring optimization of the quality management system of education, the formation of organizational and pedagogical conditions, methods, principles, technological management approaches specific to market economy. It should be noted that in all higher educational institutions of the Republic of Belarus a quality management system in accordance with international standards of ISO 9001 series has been implemented.

The quality management system allowed to systemize the analysis according to management levels: strategic analysis at the level of the head of the educational institution, the tactical one at the level of deputies of the head (as process owners: of training process, of educating process, of industrial training process), process analysis at the level of teacher, trainer, supervisor of the group.

The system analysis results are used for collective discussion at the meetings of pedagogical boards that is reliable information for decision-making on the improvement (correction) of a process, depending on where the problem situations are identified and where the planned measurable indicators have not been achieved.

In addition, the quality management system introduction allowed to provide flexibility of the educational process in relation to changing requirements of organisations which are customers of personnel, including the process of development of educational programmes for new specialities.

Thus, the steps taken are intended to put into practice effective mechanisms for improving the quality of education, which are associated with high educational achievements of learners, with creating a modern informational and educational environment in educational institutions, with the satisfaction of all participants in the educational process with training conditions and its results, with motivation of teachers to increase the personal contribution to achieve general results of pedagogical activity.

# Target group the research aims at and definitions used

A total of 13 respondents from 13 higher educational institutions were surveyed. The survey was conducted in different cities of the Republic of Belarus (Minsk, Vitebsk, Grodno, Polesia, Molodechno, Gomel).

The survey polled senior managers (3 pers., 23%), heads of divisions (6 pers., 46%), associate professors (4 pers., 31%). Furthermore, the survey participants have occupied their positions since:

less than 5 years - 2 persons (15%),

from 5 to 10 years - 4 persons (30%),

more than 10 years - 7 people (55%).

Participants in the survey represent exclusively state educational institutions of higher education.

Respondents indicated that the maximum level of education, realized at a higher educational institution, is mostly 06 - postgraduate studies (10 people, 77%), 3 universities prepare also 05 - specialists (3 persons, 23%).

The average age of students at higher educational institutions is 20 years.

The survey was attended by representatives of higher educational institutions, which have a number of staff more than 300 people (13 replies, 100%).

The higher educational institution that was the largest one by number of students, which respondent participated in the survey, is BSEU, the "Belarusian State Economic University", it trains about 9,000 students yearly.

The average percentage of drop-out students in all higher educational institutions according to the answers of respondents was 5.5%. In this case, three of the respondents found it difficult to give an answer about the number of drop-out students.

The respondents participated in the survey, whose higher educational institutions implement the training in humanitarian (71.9%), the public (62.5%), technical (56.6), natural (46.9%), medicine (15.6%) and agriculture (15.6%) sciences. Most HEI’s train in more than one area, so the total score is significantly higher than 100%.

All respondents reported that their HEI was certified in accordance with the requirements of ISO 9001. At the same time, the reason for the application of ISO 9001 model is:

because it is one of the requirements of the Ministry of education of the Republic of Belarus;

improving the competitiveness of the HEI;

international quality recognition level;

satisfaction of consumers’ demands;

improving the effectiveness of processes;

is the most common model in the country;

It focused on the latest achievements in science, on the newest educational standards.

Respondents also indicated that other models are also used at the HEI. For example, the module-rating technology is used. The main reason for the implementation is the fact that in this case, the student's ranking is determined by the level of his/her competency.

**Annex 1**

**List of participants**

# Profile of respondents and respondents organisation

See the profile of activities as the tables in the Annex 2.

# Good quality of education: what does it mean?

### 3.1 Respondent’s definition of good quality of education

Table 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Respondent:** | **Definition / description given:** |
| 4 | High quality of education is expressed primarily in the employment of graduates and the subsequent satisfaction of employers. |
| 3 | High quality of education is the satisfaction of all stakeholders. |
| 3 | High quality of education is manifested through acquired competences of students, meeting the requirements of the educational standard. |
| 3 | The quality of education is considered as compliance with regulatory requirements of a particular kind. |
| 13 |  |

**Conclusion**: the respondents (4 people) emphasize the employment and satisfaction of employers as the main criterion of high quality of education. 2 respondents noted the importance of addressing both the students and prospective employers.

In addition to this, 3 respondents did not mention the importance of the parties' satisfaction, but they noted that "high quality of education" is, first of all, particular relevant competences of students meeting the requirements of the educational standard.

3 respondents more stressed the importance of external quality attributes: improving the documentation, compliance of procedures and the results of education with all present requirements, and others.

### 3.2 Respondent’s most decisive criteria for good quality of education

Table 2

|  | **N- times mentioned** | **Short description** | **Why chosen by respondents?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Employment | 3 | The share of employed graduates and employers' satisfaction with the quality of specialists’ training | personal opinion 1  experience 2 |
| The presence of high competitive selection for admission to a higher educational institution | 2 | High appreciation of the HEI by applicants, high level of applicants’ training | personal opinion 2 |
| The ability of graduates to be included in the activities independently | 1 | The ability to independently solve problems, to be flexible and capable of continuous further training | experience and research |
| High citation index of scientific publications | 1 | A high level of students’ involvement in the scientific life of the university | criteria of higher educational institution |
| The ability to meet the needs of society | 1 | Possessing currently important competences, rapid response to changes in the environment | personal opinion |
| The presence of joint projects with production | 1 | The close relationship with production of the university, which certifies the modernity of education provided by the HEI | experience and research |
| Decent remuneration of labour of academic teaching staff | 1 |  | personal opinion |
| 100% placement to the job of graduates | 1 |  | personal opinion |

The most frequently mentioned criteria indicate that a special role in the respondents' understanding plays the assessment of quality by the stakeholders: 1) of employers by graduates of the HEI, 2) of applicants during the choice of a higher educational institution, which provides the education of highest quality.

In addition to this, the criteria mentioned once show that the concept of "education", according to respondents, is not homogeneous and includes many different-type components.

### 3.3 Existing measurements of quality

Totally, the respondents' answers made it possible to identify 9 mayor directions (systems) of education quality indicators and 4 ways to measure them.

Table 3 Basic education quality indicators, measurement methods and stakeholders

| **Indicator:** | **Way of measurement** | **Impact on what stakeholder (government, employer, student, parent?** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| - Employment (4) | Feedback collection | Learners |
| - Continuing qualification upgrading of academic teaching staff (3) | The specialists’ expert evaluation, external rating, self-analysis | All stakeholders |
| - Availability of training and methodical materials (2) | The specialists’ expert evaluation, questionnaire survey of stakeholders | Learners  Teachers  Administration of educational institution |
| - The demand of applicants for educational programmes (2) | Feedback collection in different ways | Learners  Employers  Teachers  Administration of educational institution |
| - Satisfaction of learners (2) | Questionnaire survey of stakeholders | All stakeholders |
| - Possibility of continuing education (Master's degree, postgraduate and doctorate) on the basis of the knowledge gained and competences (2) | Feedback collection in different ways | All stakeholders |
| - Satisfaction of consumers (2) | Questionnaire survey of stakeholders | All stakeholders |
| - Practical importance of graduation projects | Feedback collection in different ways | All stakeholders |
| - Number of projects linking the HEI with production | Feedback collection in different ways | All stakeholders |
| - Absolute qualitative performance | Rating, testing | All stakeholders |
| - Use of effective innovative technologies | The specialists’ expert evaluation, questionnaire survey of stakeholders | All stakeholders |

Conclusion: As in previous issues, the respondents note the importance of employment as the main indicator of the quality of education. It is noteworthy that the second highest frequency of references belongs to an indicator not mentioned until then, which is qualification upgrading of academic teaching staff. Satisfaction of all stakeholders is also, in the eyes of the respondents, of great importance.

The respondents offered different ways to measure the indicators. These methods were evenly distributed between the indicators themselves.

The fact that the question "What are the stakeholders affected by an indicator?" caused the greatest difficulties of the respondents in terms of selection of any one or more sides, is worth mentioning: the majority of the respondents see possible impact of an indicator on all stakeholders.

### 3.4 Respondents example of good practice in which these criteria are reflected / clearly respected

Table 4

|  | **Short description (I or 2 lines!)** | **Indicators selected as part of the start?** | **How was effect established?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Implementation of score-rating system |  | Yes | Improving student assessment effectiveness |
| Introduction of a rating system for assessment of knowledge and skills of students |  | Not completely, but to a significant extent | Improving assessment effectiveness of students’ performance |
| Victories in national competitions |  | No or partly | By receipt of awards |
| Creation of high-tech material and technical base |  | Yes | Peer review, satisfaction of all stakeholders |
| QMS implementation (4) |  | Yes | Peer review |
| Mobility programmes for students and teachers |  | Yes | Satisfaction of all stakeholders |
| Introduction of module-rating system |  | Not completely, but to a significant extent | Improving assessment effectiveness of students’ performance |
| Future-oriented scientific research |  | Partly | By practical application/practicability, receiving awards and grants, citation frequency |
| Employment after graduation |  | Yes | By share of graduates who have got a job; by position of graduates who have got a job |
| New technical possibilities of the HEI | Opening and equipping of practical skills laboratories, computer rooms, the centre for telecommunications, electronic training and methodological complexes, computer testing | Yes | Satisfaction of all stakeholders |
| Integration of the training process with scientific and industrial activities | Through participation in state programmes | No or partly | Satisfaction of all stakeholders |
| Using the Moodle platform for distance learning |  | Yes |  |
| Development of educational standards of the third generation | From September 1, 2013 the University went over to 4-year programmes of specialists’ training which meets the international standards. | Yes | Peer review |
| Development of electronic training and methodological materials (electronic training and methodological complexes) and supplying with them curricula disciplines |  | Yes | Peer review |

**The most illustrative practice: mobility programmes for students**

The cooperation of the Belarusian State Economic University with the Polytechnic Institute in Portugal, Bragança, in double degree programme (Erasmus + mobility project)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| With what practice started | The practice began with a trip of the rector of the university and of the dean of faculty to the university and with spoken negotiations about possible cooperation. |
| Why a decision was made to start this way | There was little information about the programme itself, there was no experience of participation in such programmes. It seemed necessary to get acquainted with the terms of training in Portugal for further possible participation of Belarusian students in the programme. |
| What results were achieved | Currently, 7 students of the Belarusian State Economic University (4 Bachelors and 3 Masters) are studying in Portugal. Next year, it is planned to send another 7 students to study. |
| Which indicators were used to assess the effect | When implementing the practice the feedback from the participants of the project themselves was taken into account, the competencies they have acquired during the training in the EU were evaluated, the reviews from the host party were taken into account, the project works of the students performed during the stay in Portugal, were peer-reviewed. |
| If PDCA cycle was performed | By now, all the information about disadvantages of the practice of the current year has been collected, the necessary corrections for a more effective continuation of the practice have been made. |

# EQAVET indicators in use

### 4.1 Effective use of the EQAVET cycle

Evaluating the effectiveness of measures to improve the quality of education:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scores** | **Number of respondents** |
| 5 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 |
| 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 2 |
| 10 | 1 |

Average score: 7,8

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent:** | **Attention area of then cycle:** | **Why / how?** |
| 1 | Evaluation of the process of implementation of activities to improve the quality of education | The results of the activities are not always brought to the information of the participants. It is necessary to exercise regularly informing the stakeholders on the effectiveness of each event that has been organised or is being organised. |
| 2 | Phase of activities implementation | This is necessary, because in the process of implementation there is a large number of participants involved in the educational process. There should be an interaction between departments and a well-established social partnership. |
| 3, 4 | Financing of mobility | This is connected with insufficient funds allocated for the conduction of conferences, research and internships.  It is necessary to involve individuals and legal entities interested in practical use of research results, the introduction thereof into production and other processes. It is also possible to participate in international projects. |
| 5, 6 | Checking and correcting | These measures should improve the efficiency of the educational process, taking into account adjustments of deficiencies and use of results in further activities. It is necessary to improve methods of self-control and independent quality control of education (by third parties). |
| 7 | Stages of implementation of activities, reflection of results and corrective actions | It is necessary to bridge the gap between these phases. This requires the implementation of preventive planning actions and the implementation of operational management decisions. |
| 8,9 | Control | It is necessary to study in detail the activities related to control, as well as their participants. Activities should be consistent. It is necessary to control both the implementation stage and correction stage. |
| 10, 11, 12 | Planning of activities | Planning is a key step. It is necessary to clearly see the goals and ways to achieve them. To do this, one can explore more deeply the processes taking place in the fields related to education. It is necessary to take more time to planning, as it will reduce the time for implementation and enhance the effectiveness of activities. |
| 13 | Resource availability of processes | It is necessary to correctly match the resources (often they are limited) and a volume of tasks scheduled for execution. |

The average score of 7.8, which shows the effectiveness of the implementation of measures to improve the quality of education according to the respondents is high enough. This means that the activities to improve the quality of education are carried out in educational institutions at a high level. However, all respondents note problems that exist in EQAVET cycle. In this case the same attention should be paid to the planning, implementation of activities, control and correction. The majority of respondents believe that planning is the most important stage, on which depend future activities and the effectiveness of implemented measures. The respondents also note the need for concerted action at all stages of the cycle and the lack of a clear plan of action on implementation, control and correction.

### 4.2 Use of EQAVET quality criteria/descriptors

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning descriptors** | **Yes, it is applied** | **Applied not to the full extent** | **No, it isn’t applied** |
| Studies on process (teaching and pedagogics) and product (learning outcome). | **10** | **0** | **3** |
| Focus on local needs and value added to the customer | **6** | **0** | **7** |
| Transparency in the intake (criteria) | **3** | **0** | **10** |
| Design of new courses adapted to market needs | **13** | **0** | **0** |
| Plan the internal resources e.g. teachers to intended learning outcome and to student population | **13** | **0** | **0** |

As can be seen from the table, there is a weak concentration on the needs of the region and the value added for consumers due to lack of transparency in the labour market demands. Well-functioning educational process and achievement of learning outcomes are not provided to the full extent.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation descriptors** | **Yes, it is applied** | **Applied not to the full extent** | **No, it isn’t applied** |
| Run courses according to syllabus / set procedures | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Have internal standardized procedures for QA | 11 | 0 | 2 |
| Have formulated indicators for success (completion rate, placement rate in related jobs, utilisation of acquired skills, % of drop-out, % of unemployment) | 10 | 0 | 3 |
| Invest (appropriate) time and resources for the delivery | 8 | 0 | 5 |
| Secure internal cooperation. | 11 | 0 | 2 |

The respondents note the full realization of the curriculum according to the accepted educational programme. The remaining activities are performed to a sufficiently full extent. The exception is the lack of time and resources to provide education of high quality. This can be attributed to a lack of motivation among teachers due to low wages.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation descriptors** | **Yes, it is applied** | **Applied not to the full extent** | **No, it isn’t applied** |
| Be willing to take criticism from both external and internal stakeholders | 10 | 0 | 3 |
| Assess the activities and take the time for analysis | 12 | 0 | 1 |
| Involve stakeholders in the analysis / evaluation | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Have regular meetings and evaluations | 12 | 0 | 1 |

The respondents note the performing of all the activities in the review/verification stage. However, as a weak point, some respondents note the unwillingness to accept criticism from internal and external stakeholders.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review descriptors** | **Yes, it is applied** | **Applied not to the full extent** | **No, it isn’t applied** |
| Use the analysis and facts (of your indicators for success) | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Secure the follow-up. | 12 | 0 | 1 |
| Give feedback to students and all stakeholders | 12 | 1 | 0 |

The respondents note the performing of all the activities at this stage. However, follow-up measures are not always taken, and contacts/connection with learners and stakeholders are not fully established in all educational institutions.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Actors / stakeholders descriptors** | **Yes, it is applied** | **Applied not to the full extent** | **No, it isn’t applied** |
| Listen to the market needs and meet the professionals here | 12 | 0 | 1 |
| Listen to the students and support both strong students and students with personal problems | 11 | 0 | 2 |
| Educate trainers even more | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Take all stakeholders seriously and involve them | 9 | 0 | 4 |

The involving of all stakeholders in the provision of educational services occurs insufficient actively. Also, there is a need to pay more attention to both students “strong” regarding their performance and students who have personal problems.

# Indicators used in the EU provider model on quality of education

In the chart "Relevance" an average value is shown. The "Usage" column shows the number of respondents in brackets.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** of CQAF VET model | **Relevance** (1 is not relevant, 5 very relevant): | **Usage:**  Yes – No |
| **Curriculum** |  |  |
| Taking account of learners experience | 3,2 | Yes (10)  No (3) |
| Arranging employers involvement in development and delivery of education | 3,5 | Yes (11)  No (2) |
| The status of your education programmes | 4,4 | Yes (13)  No (0) |
| **Learning methods** |  |  |
| The didactical approach | 4,2 | Yes (13)  No (0) |
| Teaching adapted to target group | 4,0 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
| **Intake and entry level** |  |  |
| Collecting of learner’s information | 3,5 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
| **Coaching, mentoring, tutoring** |  |  |
| Specification of tasks and roles within the learning process | 3,8 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
| Allocation as well as development of proper staff | 4,0 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
| **Leadership** |  |  |
| Shared vision on quality | 3,9 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
| Arranging for systematic evaluation | 4,3 | Yes (13)  No (0) |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** of CQAF VET model | **Relevance** (1 is not relevant, 5 very relevant): | **Usage:**  Yes – No |
| **Outcome and accountability** |  |  |
| Transparency regarding results achieved | 3,9 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
| **Staff development and staff allocation** |  |  |
| Arranging for competence profile of teaching staff | 3,8 | Yes (12)  No (0) |
| **Social responsibility** |  |  |
| Incorporation of social responsibility in education | 4,3 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
| Demonstration of Institute’s social responsibility | 4,3 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
| **Accessibility** |  |  |
| Arranging for open access to all potential students | 4,9 | Yes (13)  No (0) |
| Arranging for equal opportunities for groups at risk | 4,5 | Yes (13)  No (0) |
| **Guidance and care** |  |  |
| Arrangement regarding guidance and care structure | 4,6 | Yes (13)  No (0) |
| Arrangements for rights and responsibilities of learners | 4,4 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
| **Apprenticeship work based learning** |  |  |
| Transparency of tasks and responsibilities in work based learning and similar forms of education | 4,5 | Yes (13)  No (0) |
| Achieving minimum level of entry requirements for work based earning and similar forms of education | 4,7 | Yes (13)  No (0) |
| **Examination** |  |  |
| Examination reflects demands of stakeholder (of government etc. as well as of employers) | 4,5 | Yes (13)  No (0) |
| Recognition of learning outcome by professionals (non-teachers) | 4, 0 | Yes (12)  No (1) |
|  |  |  |

According to the data given in the table, we can draw the following conclusions:

1) The most commonly used are such indicators of high quality assurance in education as а) organisation of public access to information to potential students (this is a prerequisite for attracting the largest possible number of students and to prevent a shortage in admission to some specialities); b) organisation of tutoring and social and psychological support of the educational process (the tutors’ work is given special attention at higher educational institutions, due to the need to supervise the students and to ensure following the rules of conduct at university and of living in dormitories); c) compliance with the minimum requirements for on-the-job receiving of education and other similar forms of education (the respondents note that distance learning is becoming more available in educational institutions; however, this implies the need to ensure its continuity and effectiveness).

2) The least frequently used is such criterion as taking into account personal and professional experience of learners. According to the respondents, this is due to the partial inapplicability of its use. It is also not always possible.

3) Other criteria, which are not often used, are: а) involvement of employers in developing programmes (it is one of the main disadvantages in the process of training programmes development); b) gathering information about a learner (the respondents report about uncertainty of objectives, with which the collection of information is made); c) specification of tasks and roles within the educational process; d) use of teaching staff competency model (the respondents find it difficult to explain the reasons); e) uniformity of views on the quality of education (the respondents attribute this to the age differences of participants of the educational process); f) transparency of the results achieved (lack of feedback, lack of information on the results of planned inspections, questionnaires, surveys).

# Main challenges regarding improvement of the quality of education

### 6.1 Main challenges and support needed

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent** | **Main Challenge** | **Support** |
| 1 | Development of a new-generation educational standards | Financial support |
| 2, 5, 10, 12, 13 | Social partnership development, training of the skilled and competitive specialists, improvement of the quality management system, optimization of the educational process content and organization | Establishment of sectoral councils, interaction with social partners, active introduction of interactive training methods into the teaching process, active participation of teachers and trainees in the implementation of the quality assurance policy |
| 3 | Improvement of didactical approaches in the educational process | State support |
| 4 | Correspondence of the applied training technologies to the modern level state-of-the-art technology level | Financial support, training for teachers |
| 6 | Practical orientation, interaction with scientific-research institutes | Up-to-date renewal of material and technical base |
| 7 | Decrease in bureaucratic procedures | Reduction of all kinds of unreasonable reporting |
| 8 | Hundred-per-cent employment of graduates | Constant interaction with employers |
| 9, 11 | Academic mobility of students and teachers | Financial support |

The following tasks are mentioned most frequently: optimization of the content and organization of the educational process (may include development of a new-generation standards, practical orientation), close cooperation with employers. Educational institutions count on themselves as well as on the financial support of the state.

### 6.2 Main challenge regarding teachers involvement and support needed

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent** | **Main Challenge** | **Support** |
| 1,4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13 | Improvement of the methodology, use of the interactive training methods; self-improvement | Personal motivation, improvement of the material and technical base of educational institutions |
| 2, 6, 8 | Timely undergoing of the qualification upgrading in the scientific institutions | Financing of the international traineeships |
| 3,10 | Organization of the exchange of teachers’ experience in the sphere of software, didactics, special knowledge | Financing of the experience exchange programmes and peer learning |

The main tasks of the academic teaching staff are the qualification upgrading and self-improvement. This is possible if desired to improve the own professional skills and acquire knowledge. However there is a need for the state support in order to motivate the educational sphere employees.

# Conclusion on the use of EQAVET indicators and CQAF VET indicators

The problem of quality assurance of education is important and of current interest in Belarus. Quality assurance issues are raised by all stakeholders who are graduates of educational institutions, specialists of higher and vocational educational institutions, employers and others. After all, high quality of education determines the competitiveness of the economy, the effectiveness of the transition to knowledge economy and as a consequence the well-being of the country and the people.

Belarus analyses regularly vocational education through self-evaluation in the framework of the Torino Process. In 2014, the following priorities were identified:

• improving VET quality as one of the most important resources for innovative development of the country;

• giving a new impulse to social partnership in order to ensure consistency of the labour market and the educational services market;

• improving VET image and attractiveness for young people, their parents and the society as a whole;

* speeding up the process of improving the national qualifications system which will ensure the transparency of qualifications, employers’ and society trust in qualifications as well as the quality of vocational education and training corresponding to labour market needs;
* integration of vocational education system of the Republic of Belarus in the world’s educational space while maintaining its own national traditions and achievements.

In May 2015, Belarus joined the Bologna process and prepared its plan for the introduction of the Bologna principles into higher education system. This opens new opportunities for Belarus in the coming years to make a step forward in comparison with the years of "isolation" to ensure better integration of its education and training system at all levels with the European one.

The state control of quality assurance in education is the activity of state bodies to verify the compliance of education with educational standard, training and programme documentation of educational programmes, the compliance of educational activities with the requirements of the legislation. State control is divided into three types according to the authorities carrying it out: departmental (sectoral), internal control, supradepartmental.

The Central Information and Analytical Centre of the Ministry of Education collects and publishes the data on VET. The Republican Institute for Vocational Education (RIPO) conducts targeted scientific research to determine reliable data for education reforming policy.

The Ministry of education and the Ministry of labour and social protection play an important role in the qualifications system development. The Ministry of education / regional authorities are responsible for educational and qualification standards development and implementation, organising examination and certification, while the Ministry of labour and social protection has responsibility for occupational standards.

Qualifications requirements regarding educators of vocational educational institutions of all levels are stated in Edition 28 of the Unified Qualification Reference Book of Employees’ Positions (UQRBEP). The Ministry of education and regional authorities are responsible for training and professional development of teachers. The mechanisms of evaluation and certification of VET educators include an examination, an evaluation of practical activities, interviews and peer reviews, which lead to awarding qualification category by a board of examiners. For young educators there are different forms of mentoring. Every year the Ministry of education issues an order on qualification upgrading and retraining of education personnel, including the educators of vocational educational institutions. The training is provided by Republican and regional educational institutions.

The Department for education quality control coordinates the activities of Offices (committees), of the departments for education and for youth issues of local executive and regulatory bodies and other organisations to control the quality assurance of education provided by educational institutions. The Department carries out inspections in order to guarantee the quality of vocational education in educational institutions, organisations, of the self-employed etc.; analyses evaluation results and gives recommendations on training quality improvement.

The external audit of quality in higher educational institutions is carried out by their certification on the matter if they meet the national standards STB ISO 9001-2009 (in line with the international standards ISO 9001-2009). This approach takes into account not only the requirements of state educational standards, but also individual needs of students, teachers and other stakeholders.

Educational institutions are independent when making decisions regarding the following: internal operations, educational process organisation, carrying out financial and economic activities, staff provision, and other resources. They also cooperate with organisations, regional and local labour markets, develop plans on admission according to occupations and specialities. Educational institutions carry out self-evaluation on the basis of comprehensive analysis of educational activities involving stakeholders, for example, by means of getting opinions of learners, parents, co-workers, employers, and other bodies on quality of educational programmes. On the basis of feedback changes are made to improve the quality of education.

The conducted research showed that the problem of quality assurance is quite of current interest at the level of education providers and covers all the actors of educational process. Respondents note that a particular model of quality assurance is used in all the higher educational institutions, at the same time they point out that its introduction and implementation is determined by the order of the Ministry of education, on the one hand, and on the other hand, and this is the most important, by the positive effects of its introduction.

*An analysis of the implementation of EQAVET cycle in educational institutions allowed us to find out that:*

equal attention should be paid to all stages of the cycle, that is to planning, implementation of activities, control and correction. Planning is the most important stage, on which the future activities and the effectiveness of implemented activities depend.

there is a need for coordinated actions at all stages of the cycle, and the availability of a clear plan of actions for implementation, control and correction.

there is little focus on the needs of the region and the added value for consumers due to lack of transparency of the labour market demands. Well-functioning educational process and achieving learning outcomes are not provided to the full extent.

the curriculum is implemented to the full extent in accordance with the educational programme. Most educational activities are carried out to quite full extent. The exception is the lack of time and resources to provide education of high quality. This can be attributed to a lack of motivation among the teachers due to low wages.

the check (control) phase is also characterized by implementation of all the actions submitted for evaluation. However, unwillingness to accept criticism from internal and external stakeholders was pointed out as the weak spot.

the correction stage is also characterized by implementation of all activities. But at the same time it is not always the case that upcoming measures are taken, and contacts with students and stakeholders are not fully established in all educational institutions.

the involvement of all stakeholders in the process of educational services provision isn’t going on actively enough. And there is also a need to pay more attention not only to students who are “strong” regarding their performance, but also to students who have personal problems.

*According to the interview data the respondents have identified common and distinctive CQAF VET indicators:*

such indicators of education high quality assurance are used most commonly as

а) organisation of public access to information for potential students (this is a necessary prerequisite to attract the largest number of students being possible and to prevent a shortage in admission to some specialities);

b) organisation of tutoring and social and psychological support of the educational process (special attention is given to the tutors’ work in higher education institutions due to the need to supervise the students and ensure following the rules of conduct at university and of living in dormitories by them);

c) following the minimum requirements to receive education while on-the-job and other similar forms of education (the respondents note that distance learning is becoming more available in educational institutions; however, this implies the need to ensure its continuity and effectiveness).

such criterion as taking into account personal and professional experience of learners is the least frequently used. According to the respondents’ opinion, it is due to partial impracticability of its use.

other criteria that are used infrequently, are:

а) involvement of employers in development of programmes (it’s one of the main weaknesses in the process of training programme development);

b) gathering information about the learner (the respondents report the uncertainty of objectives, with which the collection of information is made);

c) specification of tasks and roles within the educational process;

d) the use of teaching staff competence model (the respondents find it difficult to explain the reasons);

e) the uniformity of views on quality of education (the respondents attribute this to the age differences of participants of the educational process);

f) transparency of the results achieved (lack of feedback, insufficient information on the results of planned inspections, questionnaires, surveys).

Further research is required regarding monitoring of development and updating of the standards containing the qualifications of educators of higher and vocational educational institutions, regarding involving the social partners in quality assurance management of their qualifications formation, as well as regarding the involvement of social partners in quality assurance management mechanisms of VET institutions, regarding the definition of internal criteria of evaluation, of standards, processes and procedures.

In general, improving VET quality is needed to ensure that the system is modern and attractive, and also is able to offer young people and adults the skills and knowledge required in the context of the transition period and the globalization of national economy. Within such approach, measures to implement the approach to quality assurance (QA) in VET to analyse and assess the strengths and weaknesses of the system both at the level of political decision-making and at the level of educational institutions are needed. All this should be supported by exchange and research of other countries’ experience as well as by benchmarking. The central place in QA issues of VET should belong to an extensive campaign to build the capacities of policy makers, practitioners as well as social partners and other stakeholders who have to agree on a strategy of improving vocational education in order to achieve the objectives of economic and social development in the country.

# Annexes

## Annex 1. Participant list

|  | **Date**  **of interview** | **Name** | **Organisation** | **Signature** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 03.02.2016 | Zhuk Elena Yuryevna | International Sakharov Environmental InstituteofBelarusian State University |  |
|  | 03.02. 2016 | Vlasova Svetlana Viktorovna | PoleskyState University |  |
|  | 03.02. 2016 | Timonova Elena Timofeevna | Vitebsk State Technological University |  |
|  | 03.02. 2016 | Nikonovich Tamara Vladimirovna | Belarusian State Agricultural Academy |  |
|  | 05.02. 2016 | Mogilenskikh Natalia Pavlovna | Belarusian State Economic University |  |
|  | 11.02. 2016 | Dirchuk Yevgeny Petrovich | Belarusian National Technical University |  |
|  | 18.02. 2016 | Klokel Michael | Molodechno State College |  |
|  | 27.02. 2016 | Beliayeva Oksana Anatolyevna | Republican Institute for Vocational Education |  |
|  | 28.02. 2016 | Egorova Yuliya Sergeyevna | Belarusian State Pedagogical University named after M. Tank |  |
|  | 03.03. 2016 | Petrova Marina Nikolaievna | Belarusian State Medical University |  |
|  | 03.03. 2016 | Popok Khuan Leonidovich | Minsk State Linguistic University |  |
|  | 25.03. 2016 | Dedkova Natalia Ivanovna | Industrial Pedagogical College affiliate to the Republican Institute for Vocational Education |  |
|  | 25.03. 2016 | Sychev Alexander Vasilyevich | Gomel State Technical University named after P.O. Sukhoi |  |

**Annexes 2. Profiles of the respondents involved**

Table 1. Summarized data on the respondents

**Annex 2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Head of the Department |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 10 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 20 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 450 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 4450 |
| Drop-out %: | 6 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Pedagogy  Psychology  Communication |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | Order of the Ministry of Education №1000 |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | No |
| If “yes” which one? |  |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Dean of the Faculty |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 2.5 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 45 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 41 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 3000 |
| Drop-out %: | 4 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Pedagogy. Vocational education |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | Order of the Ministry of Education №1000 |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | No |
| If “yes” which one? |  |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Dean |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 16 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 19 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 720 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 7350 |
| Drop-out %: | 7.8 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Technical  Technological  Economical |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | In order to enhance the competitiveness of the university, students’ interest in the learning outcomes |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | No |
| If “yes” which one? |  |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Associate professor |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 19 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 4 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 20 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 1800 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 4500 |
| Drop-out %: | 7 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Agricultural ecology  Agronomy  Zootechnics  Reallocation of land  Bookkeeping |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | In order to enhance the competitiveness of the university |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | Yes |
| If “yes” which one? | Modular-rating technology |
| Reason for choosing this model? | A student’s rating is defined by the level of his/her competency |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Department Chairman |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 2 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 4 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 20 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 5000 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 5000 |
| Drop-out %: | 3500 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | 4.5 |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | Order of the Ministry of Education №1000 |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | Yes |
| If “yes” which one? | Modular-rating technology |
| Reason for choosing this model? | Insures objectiveness, systematic character of the assessment |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Department Chairman |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 15 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 5 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 24 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 250 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 3000 |
| Drop-out %: | 10 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Bioecology  Environmental medicine  Nature protection activities  Medical physics |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | Order of the Ministry of Education №1000 |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | No |
| If “yes” which one? |  |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Associate professor |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 9 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 20 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 285 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 4900 |
| Drop-out %: | 2 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Finance and credit  Biotechnology  Physical culture  Information technologies |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | Insures objectiveness, systematic character of the assessment |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | No |
| If “yes” which one? |  |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Director |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 8 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 4 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 19 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 199 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 3400 |
| Drop-out %: | 5,4 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Pedagogy  Economics of production organization  Tourism and hospitality  Architecture and construction  Techniques and technologies |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | The international level of quality recognition, meeting the consumers’ requirements, performance improvement of the processes, motivation and involvement of the personnel |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | No |
| If “yes” which one? |  |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Director |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 15 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 20 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 41 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 2800 |
| Drop-out %: | 7 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Public catering  Economic activity |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | Order of the Ministry of Education |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | No |
| If “yes” which one? |  |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Department Chairman |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 30 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 5 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 20 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 1300 |
| Amount of students at institute: | *7000* |
| Drop-out %: | 7 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Medical |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | *The offered educational, scientific and research services are oriented at the recent developments in the science and up-to-date educational technologies. They are based on the state educational standards, as well as on the international standards ISO 9001-2009.* |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | No |
| If “yes” which one? |  |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Department Chairman |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 13 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 20 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | Over 300 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 9500 |
| Drop-out %: | 7 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Economics |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | Introduced by the Ministry of Education |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | Yes |
| If “yes” which one? | Introduction of the rating system of students’ knowledge assessment |
| Reason for choosing this model? | It was supported by the need to stimulate the educational-cognitive activity of trainees and to motivate them to work systematically when acquiring knowledge, as well as to broaden the trainees’ competency in the field of studying a discipline. As a result, the multiple forms of the students' academic performance rating contribute to the consistent mastering of the material during the semester. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Deputy rector for academic affairs |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | 6 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 19 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 954 |
| Amount of students at institute: | 7000 |
| Drop-out %: | 1,8 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Economics  Mechanical-engineering technology  Information technologies |
| ISO certified? | Yes, certified in the national and German accreditation system |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | It is the most acknowledged and attested model around the world |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | No |
| If “yes” which one? |  |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item:** | **Respondents N= 10 to 15** |
| Role/position: | Associate professor of the Chair |
| Years in this position:  < 5  5-10  > 10 | >10 |
| Public or private? | Public |
| Higher Adult Prof Education (4, 5, 6, ) | 6 |
| Pure AVET institute? | Yes |
| Estimate average age of participants: | 20 |
| Amount of staff:  <25  25 – 49  50 – 299  300> | 300> |
| Amount of students at institute: | 300> |
| Drop-out %: | 3 |
| Areas of education (technical, economics etc.) | Philology, linguistics |
| ISO certified? | Yes |
| Reason using ISO: yes / no | It is the most common in Belarus |
| Other QA model used? Yes / no | Yes |
| If “yes” which one? | Rating assessment system |
| Reason for choosing this model? |  |

**Annexes 3. List of the main regulations related to education in the Russian Federation**

The Federal Law of December 29, 2012, No 273-FZ "On Education in the Russian Federation"

The Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of December 19, 2013, No 1367 "On approval of the Procedure of organization and implementation of educational activities on educational programs of higher education – bachelor’s degree programs, specialist degrees program, master's degree program"

The Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of July 1, 2013, No 499 "On approval of the Procedure of organization and implementation of educational activities on additional professional programs"

The Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation of October 28, 2013, No 966 "On licensing of educational activity"

The Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of May 22, 1998, No 1327 "On approval of the Regulations for the procedure of attestation and state accreditation of educational institutions"

The Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation of December 10, 2013, No 1324 «On approval of performance indicators of an educational organization subjected to self-evaluation»

The method of calculation of indicators for monitoring the effectiveness of the educational organizations of higher education 2015 (on the basis of the data of the form N1-Monitoring for 2014) approved by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation on March 30, 2015,No АК-30/05vn

The Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of April 16, 2014 «On the Presidential National Council for Professional Qualifications»

The procedure of professional-public accreditation of professional educational programs, execution of its results and reporting to the Presidential National Council for Professional Qualifications, approved by the Decision of the Presidential National Council for Professional Qualifications (the Minutes of May 20, 2015, No. 10)

**Annexes 4. Respondent’s definition of good quality of education**

| **Respondent:** | **Definition / description given:** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Quality of education is compliance of the competencies acquired through education with the requirements of the educational standard, curricula documentation of the relevant educational programme. A high quality of education is a definite level of knowledge, skills and competencies, intellectual, physical, moral and other personal qualities, which are achieved by trainees of an educational institution in accordance with the planned training and upbringing goals. At the same time the quality of education is not only the result, but also the process, determined both by the changes in the activity of educational institutions and of an individual itself, and also by the transformation of the social, economic and technological environment. |
|  | As high level of satisfaction as possible of both trainees and future employers. |
|  | A high quality of education is a high level of training satisfaction of both students and employers |
|  |  |