



CLASS: 602-04/21-04/0039  
FILE NUMBER: 355-06-02-21-0001  
Zagreb, 21 July 2021

Pursuant to Article 7 Paragraph 2 of the Ordinance on Cross-border Evaluation (CLASS: 003-05/20-02/0003; FILE NUMBER: 355-01-20-0001, dated 3 July 2020) (hereinafter: The Ordinance), and pursuant to Article 4 of the Act on Quality Assurance in Science and Higher Education (Official Gazette, number 45/09), on 20 July 2021, the Accreditation Council of the Agency for Science and Higher Education (hereinafter: the Accreditation Council) on its 129<sup>th</sup> session passed the following:

## OPINION

1. The Accreditation Council hereby adopts the final report of the expert panel in the procedure of programme accreditation of the **Doctoral study programme of Law**, delivered by the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management (IAPM), 03039 Kyiv, Frometivska St, 2, Ukraine, which includes the **concluding recommendation of the expert panel that the said study programme meets the conditions for issuance of an accreditation certificate**.
2. The **Doctoral study programme of Law**, delivered by the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management (IAPM) is hereby **awarded the Accreditation Certificate**.

## Rationale:

At the request of the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management (IAPM), the Agency for Science and Higher Education (hereinafter: the Agency) conducted an external evaluation (accreditation) outside the territory of the Republic of Croatia in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), with the consent of the Agency's Management Board and the Accreditation Council, and after notifying the relevant state bodies.

The Agency and the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management (IAPM) mutually determined and defined the manner of implementation and the external evaluation procedure, as well as other issues of importance for the implementation of external evaluation procedure.

The Accreditation Council appointed an expert panel that carried out the external evaluation procedure via video-link in the period 24-25 May 2021. The expert panel drafted the final report on the basis of documentation analysis, and information gathered during the site visit and meetings with different representatives and stakeholders of the higher education institution. The final report contains: a short description of the study programme, recommendation of the Expert panel to the Agency's Accreditation Council, recommendations for institutional improvement and measures to be implemented in the following period (and checked within a follow-up procedure), a brief analysis of the institutional advantages and disadvantages, a list



of good practices found at the institution, conclusions on compliance with the prescribed conditions of delivery of a study programme, conclusions on compliance with the criteria for quality assessment.

The final recommendation of the expert panel is that the said study programme Doctoral study programme of Law delivered by the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management (IAPM) meets the conditions for issuance of an accreditation certificate.

**The rationale for the final recommendation of the expert panel is included in the final report.**

The higher education institution submitted its official statement to the final report.

Based on the expert panel's final report and HEI's official statement, and taking into consideration the opinion and analysis of the expert panel included in the final report, as well as the final recommendation of the expert panel that the said study programme meets the conditions for issuance of an accreditation certificate, the Accreditation Council has at its 129<sup>th</sup> session held on 20 July 2021 issued an opinion that the positive final report be adopted, and that the said study programme be awarded an accreditation certificate, i.e. it issued an opinion as stated in the dispositive part of this Opinion.

**The final report of the expert panel is an integral part of this Opinion.**

This opinion of the Accreditation Council is submitted to the evaluated higher education institution, which has the right to file a **written objection to the opinion of the Accreditation Council within 15 days from the day of receipt of the opinion**. An objection can be filed for substantial violations of the accreditation rules which have or could have rendered inaccurate the opinion of the Accreditation Council. New facts or evidence that was not presented during the site visit of the expert panel cannot be presented within the objection. The objection is submitted to the Agency for Science and Higher Education, Donje Svetice 38, Zagreb, Republic of Croatia, indicating "For the Complaints Committee".

President of the Accreditation Council  
  
Prof. Sonja Vila, PhD  


**Attached:**

1. Report of the Expert Panel on the Re-accreditation of the University Postgraduate (Doctoral) programme Doctoral study programme of Law Interregional Academy of Personnel Management (IAPM).

**Deliver to:**

1. Interregional Academy of Personnel Management (IAPM), for the attention of President, dr. Rostislav Schokin, 03039 Kiev, Frometivska str. 2, Ukraine;  
2. Archive.



**Report  
of the Expert Panel  
on the RE-ACCREDITATION  
of the University Postgraduate (Doctoral) Programme  
*Doctoral study programme of Law*  
Interregional Academy of Personnel Management (IAMP)**

**Date of the visit:  
May, 2021**

**June, 2021**



The project was co-financed by the European Union within the European Social Fund.

The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the Agency for Science and Higher Education.

**CONTENTS**

**INTRODUCTION ..... 3**

**SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME..... 5**

**RECOMMENDATION BY THE EXPERT PANEL TO THE ASHE'S ACCREDITATION  
COUNCIL..... 6**

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME ..... 7**

**DISADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME..... 7**

**EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE ..... 7**

**COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRESCRIBED CONDITIONS FOR THE DELIVERY OF A STUDY  
PROGRAMME..... 8**

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT ..... 9**

## INTRODUCTION

The Expert Panel appointed by the Agency for Science and Higher Education (ASHE) created this Report on the Re-accreditation of the University Postgraduate (Doctoral) Programme Doctoral study programme of Law on the basis of the Self-Evaluation Report of the Programme, other documentation submitted and a virtual visit to the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Kiev, Ukraine.

The Agency for Science and Higher Education (ASHE), a public body listed in EQAR (European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education) and a full member of ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education), re-accredits higher education institutions (hereinafter: HEIs) and their study programmes in line with the Act on Quality Assurance in Science and Higher Education (Official Gazette 45/09) and the Ordinance on the Content of a Licence and Conditions for Issuing a Licence for Performing Higher Education Activity, Carrying out a Study Programme and Re-Accreditation of Higher Education Institutions (OG 24/10). In this procedure parts of activities of higher education institutions and university postgraduate study programmes are re-accredited.

The Expert Panel is appointed by the Agency's Accreditation Council, an independent expert body, to carry out independent evaluation of post-graduate university study programmes.

The Report contains the following elements:

- Short description of the study programme,
- The recommendation of the Expert Panel to the Agency's Accreditation Council,
- Recommendations for institutional improvement and measures to be implemented in the following period (and checked within a follow-up procedure),
- A brief analysis of the institutional advantages and disadvantages,
- A list of good practices found at the institution,
- Conclusions on compliance with the prescribed conditions of delivery of a study programme,
- Conclusions on compliance with the criteria for quality assessment.

Members of the Expert Panel:

1. **President, Asst. Prof. Karina Palkova**, PhD, Head of doctoral study programme of Law, Riga Stradiņš University, Republic of Latvia;
2. Professor **Marko Petrak**, PhD, Faculty of Law, University of Zagreb, Republic of Croatia;
3. Lect. **Anna Bara**, PhD, Faculty of Law, Friedrich-Schiller-University of Jena, Federal Republic of Germany;
4. Professor **Tamás Hoffmann**, PhD, Institute for Legal Studies, Hungarian Academy of Sciences Centre of Excellence, Hungary;
5. Doctoral student **Kanad Bagchi**, Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law, Federal Republic of Germany.

In the analysis of the documentation, site visit and writing of the report the Panel was supported by:

- Dr. sc. Josip Hrgović, coordinator, ASHE.

During the visit to the Institution the Expert Panel held meetings with the representatives of the following groups:

- Management,
- Study programme coordinators,
- Doctoral candidates,
- Teachers and supervisors,
- External stakeholders.

## ***SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME***

Name of the study programme contained in the licence: Doctoral study programme of Law

Institution delivering the programme: Interregional Academy of Personnel Management

Institution providing the programme: Interregional Academy of Personnel Management

Place of delivery: Kiev, Ukraine

Scientific area and field: Social Sciences

Number of doctoral candidates (all): 14

Number of HEI-funded doctoral candidates: 0

Number of self-funded doctoral candidates and employer-funded doctoral candidates: 14

Number of inactive doctoral candidates: 0

Number of teachers: 12

Number of supervisors: 10

Number of doctoral candidates with officially appointed supervisors: 14

Number of doctoral candidates with officially defended/approved research thesis proposal: 14

Learning outcomes of the programme:

According to the HEI provided information (Letter of approval, Educational and Scientific Program and Annex Table 3. Matrix of correspondence of program learning outcomes, educational components, teaching methods and assessment) there are several learning outcomes of the programme:

1. Ability to think systematically, acquire knowledge and use their own research and practice;
2. Be able to select, analyse and apply regulations to address specific legal issues in their professional practice;
3. Understanding and use of legal terminology in a foreign language in the preparation and analysis of legal acts and legal documents;
4. Ability to formulate working hypotheses of the researched problem, to make analytical forecasts of development of legal life in Ukraine and in foreign countries;
5. Ability to conduct discussions on scientific issues with the scientific community in the field of professional activity, including at the international level, demonstrating a broad scientific worldview and creativity;
6. Ability to collect, process and analyse the source base for research, to formulate the purpose of their own research as part of the general civilization process;
7. Ability to establish the scientific value of sources, using appropriate criteria and standards through comparative analysis with other sources, identified research objectives and from the standpoint of the doctrine of the rule of law;
8. Understanding the procedure for financing research work and the structure of estimates for its implementation, the ability to prepare a request for funding, to prepare current and reporting documentation;
9. Carrying out of the argued professional presentation of results of the researches at the international scientific conferences, seminars, practical use of a foreign language in scientific, innovative activity and pedagogical activity;
10. Ability to initiate, organize and conduct comprehensive research in the field of research and innovation, which lead to the acquisition of new knowledge;
11. The desire to cooperate in scientific activities, participating in the formation of a team of researchers to solve a predetermined task (formulation of a research problem, working hypotheses, gathering information, preparing proposals);
12. Ability to form communication strategies and interact with the scientific community and the public in the relevant field of scientific, professional and pedagogical activities;

13. Ability to efficiently reflect the research results in scientific articles published both in professional domestic media and in similar foreign ones;

14. Ability to use IT resources in communication, information exchange, collection, analysis, processing, interpretation of sources using high standards of text analysis for both electronic and traditional written and oral sources;

15. Ability to use specialized knowledge for the logical foundations of the construction of scientific activity, from new research positions to formulate a common methodological basis for their own research, purpose and significance for the development of other branches of science;

16. Initiation and conduct of comprehensive research in the field of research and innovation, which lead to the acquisition of new knowledge.

Structure of programme:

First year - first semester: Philosophy of law ECTS 4, General load of hours 120, Methodology and organization of legal investigations ECTS 5, hours 150, Foreign language for professional purposes ECTS 3, General load of hours 90, ECTS 4, General load of hours 120.

First year – second semester: Foreign language for professional purposes ECTS 3 general load of hours 90, Current theories of legal relations ECTS 3, General load of hours 90, Practical directions of preparation of speeches at scientific conferences, scientific reports ECTS 3, General load of hours 90, Current issues in civil law in the context of European integration into the EU ECTS 4, General load of hours 120.

Second year - first semester: Current issues in administrative law and process, ECTS 3, General load of hours 90, Current issues in financial law, ECTS 3, General load of hours 90, Current issues in criminal law and procedure, ECTS 3, General load of hours 90, Selective discipline, ECTS 3, General load of hours 90/

Second year - second semester: Selective discipline 1 ECTS 4, General load of hours 120, Selective discipline 3, ECTS 4, General load of hours 120, Selective discipline 4, ECTS 4, General load of hours 120, Assistant practice ECTS 4, General load of hours 120.

Third and fourth year: Registration of dissertation research.

Taught/research ratio: 40/60

***RECOMMENDATION BY THE EXPERT PANEL TO THE ASHE'S ACCREDITATION COUNCIL***

**On the basis of the analysis of submitted Self-Evaluation Report for Doctoral study programme of Law, interviews conducted during the meetings with IAPM's stakeholders and a virtual tour of the IAPM's facilities as well as the analysis of other relevant documentation obtained during the site visit IT IS THE OPINION OF THIS EXPERT PANEL THAT the Doctoral study programme of Law at the Interregional Academy of Personnel Management**

**MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUANCE OF ACCREDITATION CERTIFICATE.**

## ***RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME***

1. The HEI needs to internationalize and individualize its PhD programme to specifically tailor its curriculum to individual needs of its students.
2. Change in pedagogy and research methods to include courses on sociology of law, law and economics, etc.
3. Improve language skills (teaching staff, administrative staff and PhD candidates).
4. Formalize procedures (feedback procedure, research ethics, cooperation agreements, admissions procedure, defence procedure).
5. Substantial decrease of teaching load and balancing research and teaching.
6. Improve the quality of research participation in international projects, ensure the quality of scientific publications.
7. Enhance the internationalisation of the programme by making available material in English for non-Russian/Ukrainian speakers to apply, offering opportunities for students to participate in international conferences, international projects and publish in international journals.
8. More efficient use of Moodle system in the educational process.
9. Procure subscription to international legal databases (e.g. Heinonline, Westlaw, JSTOR etc.)

## ***ADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME***

1. The HEI is well established within the national education system and has deep connections to public and private institutions. This is an advantage which can be used to build and scale up the HEI's PhD programme in Law.
2. The HEI has faculty members who are highly motivated and responsive.
3. Specialization in certain fields of Ukrainian law (e.g. police, military).
4. Relatively small number of students allows for individual approach and raises efficiency of their studies.

## ***DISADVANTAGES OF THE STUDY PROGRAMME***

1. Lack of internationalisation and individualisation.
2. Teaching load is too heavy.
3. Lack of foreign language skills.
4. Lack of formalized procedures.
5. Education almost exclusively focuses on Ukrainian law.

## ***EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE***

1. Institutional scientific journal.
2. Cooperation between supervisors and PhD candidates.
3. Active cooperation with state institutions on developing textbooks.
4. Organization of academic events.

**COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRESCRIBED CONDITIONS FOR THE DELIVERY OF A STUDY PROGRAMME**

<b>Minimal conditions:</b>	<b>YES/NO notes</b>
1. HEI delivers programmes in the two cycles leading to the doctoral programme, i.e., first two cycles in the same area and field/fields (for interdisciplinary programmes), and employs a sufficient number of teachers.	Yes
2. At least 50% of teaching as expressed in norm-hours is delivered by teachers employed at the HEI (full-time, elected into scientific-teaching titles).	Yes
3. Teacher: student ratio at the HEI has to be below 1: 30.	Yes
4. The HEI (or HEIs in joint programmes) has at least five teachers appointed to scientific-teaching titles in the field, or fields relevant for the programme involved in its delivery.	Yes
5. The doctoral programme is aligned with the HEI's research strategy.	No
6. The candidate: supervisor ratio at the HEI is not above 3:1.	Yes
7. All supervisors meet the following conditions: a) PhD, elected into a scientific title, holds a scientific or a scientific-teaching position and/or has at least two years of postdoctoral research experience; b) active researcher in the scientific area of the programme, as evidenced by publications, participation in scientific conferences and/or projects in the past five years (table 2, Supervisors and candidates); c) trained for the role before assuming it (through workshops, co-supervisions etc.)	Yes  Yes  Yes
8. All teachers meet the following conditions: a) holds a scientific or a scientific-teaching position; b) active researcher, recognized in the field relevant for the course (table 1. Teachers).	Yes  Yes
9. The supervisor normally does not participate in the assessment committees.	Yes
10. The programme ensures that all candidates spend at least three years doing independent research (while studying, individually, within or outside courses), which includes writing the thesis, publishing, participating in international conferences, field work, attending courses relevant for research, etc.	No

## QUALITY ASSESSMENT

	<p><b>Quality assessment (“Not implemented / Partially implemented / Fully implemented”) and the explanation of the Expert Panel</b></p>
<p><b>1. RESOURCES: TEACHERS, SUPERVISORS, RESEARCH CAPACITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE (ESG 1.5., 1.6.)</b></p>	<p><b>The Expert Panel assesses each criterion and may use the form of a table or not.</b> (Explanations of the criteria are provided here only for consultation purposes and they should be removed from the final report). <b>The Expert Panel evaluates for each criterion whether it is not implemented, partially implemented or fully implemented (writes it down and provides a short explanation, and explains it by stating which improvements are necessary).</b></p>
<p>1.1. HEI is distinguished by its scientific/ artistic achievements in the discipline in which the doctoral study programme is delivered.</p>	<p>The scientific achievements enabling the HEI to deliver the doctoral study programme rest with the expertise of the academic staff in certain areas of law and their experience with certain agencies (police, military, etc.) in a professional capacity. The bio on the website, and the visit, suggest specialised knowledge of the teaching staff, with a particular focus on applied elements of law.</p> <p>The benefits of this specialised knowledge are garnered by the PhD seekers through the teaching. However, this has an effect on the academic/teaching staff in terms of a heavy preparatory load and time allocation. Each faculty member teaches numerous courses, up to 3 per person. This time distribution comes at the expense of the time that could potentially be allocated for research.</p> <p>According to the SER documents and the visit, there is a heavy teaching load in the first 2 years of the PhD programme, with a balance between theoretical and practical courses (lectures, seminars, case studies, project-based learning and problem-based learning).</p> <p>A system of monitoring the learning progress is in place, which includes oral and written exams.</p> <p>The training of the academic staff is adequate for the delivery of the programme, with faculty members offering professional experience between 7-21 years.</p> <p>Areas of improvement concern publications, mainly in the Ukrainian language. The quality of international publications is questionable. There is a lack of publications</p>

	<p>in referred reputable journals. Moreover, the SCOPUS and Web of Science seems to be the only criterion and standard for publications. Linguistic competences are clearly established in UA and Russian, but not other languages, which impedes keeping abreast with the international scholarship.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>1.2. The number and workload of teachers involved in the study programme ensure quality doctoral education.</p>	<p>SER states that there are 14 doctoral candidates vs. 12 teachers and 10 lecturers, which represents an excellent ratio (confirmed during the visit).</p> <p>However, the teaching load for the staff is well over 10 hours per week including their undergraduate teaching obligations, across programmes, delivered on multiple courses. This is a heavy, labour intense teaching workload due to the necessity to prepare, update, and deliver lectures in a range of subjects to a range of audiences (BA, MA, Ph.D. levels).</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>1.3. The teachers are highly qualified researchers who actively engage with the topics they teach, providing a quality doctoral programme.</p>	<p>The meeting with students and their evaluation of qualifications of teaching staff was positive. It seemed that the level of expectations matched the level of teaching, and students were satisfied. According to them, the HEI provides sufficient level of education. They appreciate practical work and experience of their supervisors.</p> <p>Student evaluations emphasise the preference for creative teaching formats and charismatic, engaged, motivated teachers. The visit tends to support this observation.</p> <p>Whether sufficient scientific capital is offered to qualify for a PhD programme remains doubtful, especially when it comes to international publications or publications on topics beyond domestic issues. Connected to this is also the scope of research being limited to the national language. Thus, the problem is the relationship between qualifications and ability to deliver training adequate to PhD level.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>1.4. The number of supervisors and their</p>	<p>The selection of the PhD candidates and their research</p>

<p>qualifications provide for quality in producing the doctoral thesis.</p>	<p>topics matches the profile of the teaching staff. If the applicant applies outside of the competences covered by professors' body, he is advised to look for a programme elsewhere.</p> <p>The HEI cooperates with national scientific and administrative institutions to tailor to the maximum range of research interests, engage part-time visiting lectures from various governmental agencies (Ministry of Defence, state security agencies, police, etc.). A special agreement with the Ministry of Defence, to tailor to national security teaching portfolio, is being discussed and prepared.</p> <p>However, cooperation and engagement with international scientific research is lacking, so is relevant engagement with international publications.</p> <p>So far, no PhD student has completed their thesis, but the HEI expects to have some students completing this year.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>1.5. The HEI has developed methods of assessing the qualifications and competencies of teachers and supervisors.</p>	<p>There is a written framework for assessment and evaluation. From our site visit we also gathered that students have a possibility to provide feedback on the courses and programme structure.</p> <p>According to the information provided by SER, multiple methods of quality assurance are in place, which are mainly regulated at the level of the HEI. But specific examples were not forthcoming, except for students' evaluations.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>1.6. The HEI has access to high-quality resources for research, as required by the programme discipline.</p>	<p>Students provided feedback that they have access to everything needed.</p> <p>The HEI maintains a library of 360,000 books (textbooks, scientific volumes, and a thesis repository).</p> <p>Additionally, there is a possibility to use resources and libraries of other educational institutions, namely the Academies, Kiev National University, and Kharkov National University. A range of books on economic law, administrative/financial/info law, criminal law and processes, assurance of state security of UA are available to the Ph.D. candidates through these institutions.</p>

	<p>Some of the examples include catalogues on Theory of state and law, World History of Law, History of Law of Ukraine, branches of law, Areas of knowledge related to law, Justice, etc.</p> <p>Electronic resources seem to be lacking. For instance, SCOPUS database does not seem to be listed in the library equipment catalogue. The HEI also does not have access to essential legal databases like JStor, Westlaw, Heinonline, etc. Majority of electronic resources and titles are in RU and UA. The HEI mostly provides access to open and freely accessible databases.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p><b>2. INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE OF THE PROGRAMME (ESG 1.1., ESG 1.2., 1.4., 1.5.,1.7.,1.8., 1.9.)</b></p>	
<p>2.1. The HEI has established and accepted effective procedures for proposing, approving and delivering doctoral education. The procedures include identification of scientific/ artistic, cultural, social and economic needs.</p>	<p>From the HEI strategy it appears that the PhD programme largely follows the mandate of the Law of Ukraine "On Higher Education". This law required among other things innovation and improvement in the quality of education and research.</p> <p>While we do not know anything as to whether the HEI conducted any analysis of social, academic, economic or other needs of the community before launching the programme, it appears that the PhD programme benefits the community of domestic lawyers, ministries and other institutions, like the national pension fund. This seemed to be the impression from the meeting with different stakeholders and current PhD students. The students especially seem to be looking at the PhD programme to further deepen their knowing in their own subject and work area and in this regard, find the programme to be useful.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>2.2. The programme is aligned with the HEI research mission and vision, i.e. research strategy.</p>	<p>While the research mission and vision documents were high in terms of aspirations, we found that their existing research capacities, infrastructure, level of internationalization, output of the faculty members did not fully match this aspiration. Especially on the point of international legal engagement and discourse, the faculty members need a significant re-orientation.</p> <p>Similarly, the PhD students, while well established in their</p>

	<p>own practical fields, did not demonstrate a high level of output with respect to fundamental (doctrinal, analytical, theoretical, critical) research.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>2.3. The HEI systematically monitors the success of the programmes through periodic reviews, and implements improvements.</p>	<p>According to the site visit results, the programme is not periodically reviewed, at least not formally. There is a lack of clear information about the quality of the doctoral programme and the large number of lecturers. There is a questionnaire for students (once per year). But it is not possible to make changes in the programme regularly. There is no clear mechanism to identify research productivity of supervisors and candidates. Students are not adequately informed, and the teaching staff is not aware of the feedback procedure.</p> <p>It was not possible to identify the position of the alumni (because there are no alumni).</p> <p>Representation of the stakeholders was weak. The Head of the Department of Pension of Kiev region informed the experts, that there is a cooperation based on topicality of the programme. But there seems to be no evidence of any changes being implemented on the basis of feedback received, if any. Moreover, there was no written cooperation agreement with this institution.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>2.4. HEI continuously monitors supervisors' performance and has mechanisms for evaluating supervisors, and, if necessary, changing them and mediating between the supervisors and the candidates.</p>	<p>The students are not informed about the feedback system from current and former candidates.</p> <p>No written guidelines in place to streamline supervisor performance.</p> <p>No institutional mechanism for resolving complaints of PhD students vis-a-vis supervision.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>2.5. HEI assures academic integrity and freedom.</p>	<p>The HEI does have written regulations for checking academic and scientific texts for plagiarism. The HEI also has a plagiarism software.</p> <p>It also seems that the HEI has a specific documentation related to academic and research freedom.</p> <p>From our virtual site visit we could not find any potential threat to such academic freedom.</p>

	<b>Fully implemented</b>
2.6. The process of developing and defending the thesis proposal is transparent and objective, and includes a public presentation.	<p>There are procedures in place for informing students about thesis proposal and PhD defence, however, they seem to be done in an ad-hoc manner. These procedures do not seem to be contained in a particular document.</p> <p>The thesis defence committee comprises two external examiners who are referred to as “opposition members”.</p> <p>There is a lack of formalization and written regulations.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
2.7. Thesis assessment results from a scientifically sound assessment of an independent committee.	<p>On-site visit revealed that the HEI invites external examiners to sit as ‘opposition ‘member’ in thesis defence committees.</p> <p>The HEI does not have detailed written internal guidelines and thesis assessment guidelines.</p> <p>The HEI has an informal protocol on the thesis defence. It is not publicly available.</p> <p>There are printed and online templates, available for the thesis defence of students. Methodological support is available.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
2.8. The HEI publishes all necessary information on the study programme, admissions, delivery and conditions for progression and completion, in accessible outlets and media.	<p>The admission procedure is based on an exam and then students are admitted based on a system of ranking and gradations.</p> <p>However, informality plays a big part in the process, especially with respect to recommendations, but not prescribed as a formal part of the admissions process. The information on the website is incomplete and unclear.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
2.9. Funds collected for the needs of doctoral education are distributed transparently and in a way that ensures sustainability and further development of doctoral education (ensures that candidates' research is carried out and supported, so that doctoral education can be completed successfully).	<p>The HEI is a self-financed institution and does not receive support from the state. The PhD students are all self-funded.</p> <p>The students however, do get financial support with respect to publications, etc. But it must be noted, that the experts were not provided with any specific examples or regulations which could verify this claim.</p>

	<b>Partially implemented</b>
2.10. Tuition fees are determined on the basis of transparent criteria (and real costs of studying).	The tuition fees are published, but the fees do not cover the entire cost of education, for example, thesis defence, attachment to the department, etc., are charged in addition to the course fees.  <b>Partially implemented</b>
<b>3. SUPPORT TO DOCTORAL CANDIDATES AND THEIR PROGRESSION (ESG 1.3., 1.4., 1.5., 1.6.)</b>	
3.1. The HEI establishes admission quotas with respect to its teaching and supervision capacities.	The supervisor-PhD student ratio is reasonable for the moment with 14 PhD students, with no one having more than three PhD students. But it might be a matter of concern if the HEI inducts more PhDs in the future.  However, there are concerns with respect to the teaching load of the supervisors. Since the PhD programme is heavily teaching-based in the first two years, supervisors are required to devote a lot of time to teaching. In addition, supervisors also teach Bachelor and Master students.  There are no clearly defined obligations (regulations) of supervisors and co-supervisors, candidates and researchers.  <b>Partially implemented</b>
3.2. The HEI establishes admission quotas on the basis of scientific/ artistic, cultural, social, economic and other needs.	There is a centrally allotted quota set by the HEI and then specific quotas are reserved for each department.  So far, they have not been able to fulfil the quota as against the sanctioned strength of 30. From the conversations with HEI representative it did not transpire that the HEI conducted any surveys to decide the relevant quota.  Most of the PhD students are currently employed in different public and private institutions.  <b>Not implemented</b>
3.3. The HEI establishes the admission quotas taking into account the funding available to the candidates, that is, on the basis of the absorption potentials of	All the PhD students are self-funded.  <b>Not implemented</b>

<p>research projects or other sources of funding.</p>	
<p>3.4. The HEI should pay attention to the number of candidates admitted as to provide each with an advisor (a potential supervisor). From the point of admission to the end of doctoral education, efforts are invested so that each candidate has a sustainable research plan and is able to complete doctoral research successfully.</p>	<p>From the Panel's point of view, it seems that PhD students are allotted a supervisor early on in the programme. The Panel was also told that students are not accepted unless they have a supervisor willing to supervise beforehand.</p> <p>The Panel was told by the students that they remain connected to their supervisor and that they are available for help whenever the students need them.</p> <p>It also transpired that some of their students are very near completion.</p> <p><b>Fully implemented</b></p>
<p>3.5. The HEI ensures that interested, talented and highly motivated candidates are recruited internationally.</p>	<p>So far there does not seem to be much interest in the programme from international students. As the language of education and the entrance exam is exclusively Ukrainian or Russian, it is impossible for foreign students that do not speak these languages to be admitted.</p> <p>Moreover, most PhD candidates admitted are not interested in a career in research. Most of them are already working and do not intend to enter academia.</p> <p>The HEI does not seem to publish their call for applications internationally to attract international candidates.</p> <p><b>Not implemented</b></p>
<p>3.6. The selection process is public and based on choosing the best applicants.</p>	<p>The HEI does not seem to call for applications. Students who are interested to pursue a PhD directly contact the faculty and are then advised to take an internal exam of the university. The exam is followed by an interview of the prospective candidate.</p> <p>A research proposal is usually not part of the PhD application and selection process. Although, in some cases a letter of recommendation is produced by candidates.</p> <p>There does not seem to be any public call for applications.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>3.7. The HEI ensures that the selection procedure is transparent and in line with published criteria, and that there is</p>	<p>As noted above, the admissions process and selection criteria do not feature as part of any written documentation. It works mostly on an informal basis,</p>

<p>a transparent complaints procedure.</p>	<p>usually initiated by the candidate who hopes to secure an admission. Experts were not informed of any complaint's procedure for aggrieved applicants.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>3.8. There is a possibility to recognize applicants' and candidates' prior learning.</p>	<p>There are no written procedures in place that were brought to the attention of the Panel to recognize applicants' prior learning.</p> <p><b>Not implemented</b></p>
<p>3.9. Candidates' rights and obligations are defined in relevant HEI regulations and a contract on studying that provides for a high level of supervisory and institutional support to the candidates.</p>	<p>Candidates seem to be informed about their rights and obligations but this is done in a highly informal and unstructured way. There is no separate institutionalized procedure in place for that. Nevertheless, there are the regulations on postgraduate training in the Private Joint-Stock Company "Institution of Higher Education "Interregional Academy of Personnel Management", where some necessary information can be found.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>3.10. There are institutional support mechanisms for candidates' successful progression.</p>	<p>The HEI states that conferences and other academic events are being organized. The HEI hosts and encourages PhD students to contribute to its own journals. Experts could not gather any specific examples or instances where the HEI supported, financially or otherwise, the research publications/conference participation of the PhD candidate.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p><b>4. PROGRAMME AND OUTCOMES (ESG 1.2., 1.3., 1.4., 1.5.)</b></p>	
<p>4.1. The content and quality of the doctoral programme are aligned with internationally recognized standards.</p>	<p>The content and quality of the doctoral programme are aligned with the basics of internationally recognized standards. There is a need for a greater extent of internationalization and individualisation of the whole content of the doctoral programme.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>4.2. Programme learning outcomes, as well</p>	<p>Programme learning outcomes, as well as the learning</p>

<p>as the learning outcomes of modules and subject units, are aligned with the level 8.2 of the EUQF. They clearly describe the competencies the candidates will develop during the doctoral programme, including the ethical requirements of doing research.</p>	<p>outcomes of modules and subject units, are formally aligned with the level 8.2 of the EUQF.</p> <p>There is a constant need to implement these outcomes during the PhD studies.</p> <p>The Panel is unable to access the precise learning outcomes because there are no dissertations to evaluate at the moment.</p> <p>No ethical requirement is submitted in the very programme, but, at the level of the institution, the rules on antiplagiarism are prescribed.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>4.3. Programme learning outcomes are logically and clearly connected with teaching contents, as well as the contents included in supervision and research.</p>	<p>SER and interviews with candidates show that learning outcomes are logically and clearly aligned with individual courses, supervisory work and research and partly aligned with individual courses, supervisory work and research.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>4.4. The doctoral programme ensures the achievement of learning outcomes and competencies aligned with the level 8.2 of the EUQF.</p>	<p>There is no completed PhD thesis so far. The information about the PhD students' publications is available on: <a href="https://maup.com.ua/ua/pro-akademiyu/instituti/institut-prava/publikaci-aspirant-phd-pravo.html">https://maup.com.ua/ua/pro-akademiyu/instituti/institut-prava/publikaci-aspirant-phd-pravo.html</a></p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>4.5. Teaching methods (and ECTS, if applicable) are appropriate for level 8.2 of the EUQF and assure achievement of clearly defined learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Teaching methods (and ECTS, if applicable) are partially appropriate for level 8.2 of the EUQF and assure achievement of clearly defined learning outcomes.</p> <p>There is no adequate level of internationalisation of the methods, starting from more extensive application of comparative law methods and more international approach to mandatory and recommended reading for the individual courses. Also, apart from philosophy of law, there are no “metapositive” methods from sociology of law, law and economics, legal history, etc.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>4.6. The programme enables acquisition of general (transferable) skills.</p>	<p>The HEI holds conferences and seminars for its PhD students.</p> <p>Despite the fact that foreign languages are included within</p>

	<p>the programme, our impression during the site visit reveals that students do not actually possess those skills.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>4.7. Teaching content is adapted to the needs of current and future research and candidates' training (individual course plans, generic skills etc.).</p>	<p>In the first two years the students have to attend general courses but they can also choose specialized subjects.</p> <p>There is no information that students can tailor the programme to their individual needs beyond that. In the final two years of their PhD programme, they can fully focus on their research but there is no indication that they have individual course plans.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>
<p>4.8. The programme ensures quality through international connections and teacher and candidate mobility.</p>	<p>There are just three contracts on national cooperation provided by the HEI, and no documents on international cooperation provided by the HEI.</p> <p>The information about the cooperation with supervisors or teachers from foreign HEIs were not provided. There is no evidence of international cooperation and connections.</p> <p>The main reason could be the language barrier, that hinders not only international cooperation but also the opportunity to write the PhD thesis in a foreign language. During our visit we found that the level of the English language competence was inadequate among the teachers, students, and the administrative staff.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no evidence that PhD candidates participate in study abroad programmes.</p> <p><b>Partially implemented</b></p>

**\* NOTE: RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXPERT PANEL TO THE ASHE'S ACCREDITATION COUNCIL AND QUALITY LABEL**

The role of the Expert Panel in the re-accreditation of doctoral study programmes is manifold. The Expert Panel or part of the Expert Panel visiting a higher education institution drafts a report on the basis of a self-evaluation report, the accompanying relevant documentation, and a site visit to HEI. The draft report is adopted by all members of the Cluster Expert Panel, while the president of the Cluster Expert Panel is responsible for coordinating the assessment levels.

The report contains an assessment on whether a doctoral study programme delivered at a higher education institution complies with the prescribed laws and by-laws, as well as any additional/recommended requirements defined by the Agency's Accreditation Council, and whether a higher education institution can obtain a positive, i.e. satisfactory quality assessment according to the criteria set out in this document. Moreover, the Expert Panel must make recommendations for quality improvement.

When making its final recommendation, the expert panel is guided by the following:

- if any of four assessment areas is graded as *not implemented*, the expert panel shall issue a final recommendation that the study programme does not meet the conditions for issuance of an accreditation certificate.
- if all assessment areas are graded as *partly implemented*, the final decision on whether the doctoral study programme meets or does not meet the conditions for issuance of an accreditation certificate shall be left to the discretion of the expert panel.
- if all assessment areas are graded as *partly implemented* and *fully implemented*, the expert panel shall issue a final recommendation that the doctoral study programme meets the conditions for issuance of an accreditation certificate.

Before making its final recommendation, the expert panel may request the correction of minor deficiencies, which impair the quality of the doctoral study programme delivery, but which - in the opinion of the expert panel - can be remedied within 5 days at the latest. In case the expert panel requests the correction of minor deficiencies, the coordinator informs the higher education institution thereof, and the institution is obliged to submit a revised study programme proposal to the Agency, in accordance with the request of the expert panel, within 5 days from the date of receipt of the notice. In such case, the expert panel shall prepare the final version of the report on doctoral study programme, based on the review of the revised study programme proposal, and make a final recommendation.

The grades of standards and assessment areas shall be based on decisions made by consensus. If a consensus is not reached, the grade is passed by the majority vote of expert panel members. If a panel member, even after a grade has been passed for a particular standard or assessment area, opposes the grade or the rationale / analysis of a particular standard or assessment area, he/she may provide a reasoned separate opinion. The panel member providing a separate opinion shall submit to the coordinator a signed rationale. The reasoned separate opinion shall be annexed to the expert panel's final report, and shall be an integral part thereof.

If the expert panel considers that all the conditions have been met and the quality assessment is satisfactory, i.e. that a doctoral study programme fulfils the learning outcomes appropriately defined for that level and scientific area, the expert panel shall propose a positive recommendation that the doctoral study programme meets the conditions for issuance of an accreditation certificate.