ECAQA

Eurasian Centre for Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education and Health Care

GUIDE TO THE PhD PROGRAMME SELF-EVALUTION IN BIOMEDICAL AND HEALTH SCIENCES

Almaty 2017

EURASIAN ц ENTRE FOR ACCREDITATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND HEALTH CARE

GUIDE TO THE PhD PROGRAMME SELF-EVALUTION IN BIOMEDICAL AND HEALTH SCIENCES

ALAMATY 2017

GUIDE TO THE PhD PROGRAMME SELF-EVALUTION IN BIOMEDICAL AND HEALTH SCIENCES

Guide to the PhD programme self-evaluation provides an overview of the accreditation process, the basic elements of the process of programme self-evaluation, including student participation in an independent student analysis, standards and criteria for programme accreditation, based on the Organisation for PhD Education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in the European System (ORPHEUS), the Association of Medical Schools in Europe (AMSE), the World Federation for Medical Education (WFME) Standards for PhD education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in Europe with the national specifications of health professions education and healthcare system.

Guide to the programmel self-evaluation is intended to the leadership, faculty and staff, students at the higher education institutions in the Republic of Kazakhstan, ECAQA experts, representatives of health agencies and organizations and Ministry of Health of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

CONTENTS

1. THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS OVERVIEW

Accreditation is the process by which the accrediting agency, non-governmental organizations, professional associations grant formal recognition to higher education institutions and their educational programs that meet stated standards and criteria of educational quality.

The general steps of the accreditation process include: the submission of a formal application to the accrediting agency; access to accreditation, conducting of educational programme self-evaluation, and preparation of an external expert commission to site-visit and the site-visit, decision on accreditation, fellow up activities- annually repost, re-accreditation.

GENERAL STEPS IN THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

	STEPS IN THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS	**Time frame (+/-months)**
1	**Submission the application to the accrediting agency**	0- +4
	Submission of application form with database and copy of the HEIôs State License of Kazakhstan Ministry of Education and Science to the accrediting agency	0
	ECAQAôs consideration of the HEIôs completed application and database to confirm its eligibility	+2
	Finalise the arrangements and sign the Contract between the ECAQA and HEI	+3
	ECAQA establishes site-visit dates with the Rector of HEI	+3
	Accrediting agency arranges the consultant visit at the HEI and Workshop on accreditation orientation for administrative staff, faculty and students.	+4
2	**Educational Programme self-evaluation**	+4 - +14
	Appointment of the self-evaluation coordinator and the members of the educational programme self-evaluation commission and needed subcommittees.	+4
	The Coordinator and Chairs of committee/subcommittees define their responsibilities for conducting the self-evaluation and establish objectives, scope of study, methods of data collection, initiate student analysis.	+4
	Completion of and the data collection and the student analysis and of supporting documents and Educational programme Self-evaluation Report	+8
	Submission preliminary Educational programme Self-evaluation Report to the accrediting agency	+10
	Receive ECAQAôs expertsô comments on preliminary self-evaluation repost and incorporate their comments or send some clarification as requested.	+11
	The self-evaluation coordinator reviews the database, Educational programme Self-evaluation Report, and other required documents for accuracy, consistency, and currency.	+12
	Submission final Educational programme Self-evaluation Report to the accrediting agency (Kazakh/ Russian/ English on CD)	+14
3	**Preparing for the Site-visit**	+15
	Development and approval of the ECAQAôs External Expert	

	Commission (EEC) Site-visit Program	
	The accrediting agency sends external evaluation instructions and list of ECAQA ECC Members to Rector of HEI	
	Each member of the EEC receives a copy of the Educational programme Self-evaluation Report and additional documentation that sent by the accrediting agency.	
	The ECAQAôs EEC reviews the database, Educational programme Self-evaluation Report, and other relevant materials or request additional information prior to the site-visit.	
4.	**The ECAQAôs EEC Site-visit**	+16 - +17
	ECAQAôs EEC carries out external review according to approved Site-visit Programme.	+16
	Members of the ECC develop a list of strengths, areas of partial or substantial non-compliance with accreditation standards, and any areas in transition and prepare Preliminary draft of the Site-visit Report that includes information from the database and self-study summary report, as well as the survey team's findings and conclusions.	+16
	The summary of findings will be reported orally to the Rector and the HEIôs Council at the end of ECCôsite-visit.	+16
	A draft of the Site-visit Report sends to the Rector for correction of any factual errors. The HEI is requested to provide a response to the draft Site- visit Report that includes a factual review and recommendations.	+16
	Submission of the ECAQAôs EEC final Site-visit Report and recommendations to the accrediting agency.	+17
	Submission of the ECAQAôs EEC final Site-visit Report and recommendations and relevant documents to the ECAQAôs Accreditation Council.	+17
5	**Decision on accreditation**	
	The final EEC final Site-visit Report is considered by the ECAQAôs Accreditation Council its next meeting at which time the decision about accreditation is made. Full accreditation status will be granted for a period of five years.	+18
	The HEIôs Rector is notified of the ECAQA decision regarding accreditation along with the final Site-visit Report.	+18
	Summary of the Site-visit Report and accreditation status are posted on official web-site of the accrediting agency	+18
	The ECAQA as accrediting agency submits the information about HEIôs accreditation status and the Summary of the Site-visit Report to the Ministry of Education and Science to be listed at the National Register #3 for HEIôs accredited educational programme.	+19
6	**Re-accreditation**	after 5 years
	Re-accreditation after 5 years Submission of updated database and information about higher education institutionôs educational programmeto the accrediting agency.	

2. ORGANAISING AND CONDUCTING THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME SELF-EVALUATION

Educational Programme self-evaluation is the main element of the accreditation process and involves representatives of the HEIôs administration, faculty (academic staff), student organizations and other stakeholders to collect and analyze data on HEI and its educational programmes, to identify their own strengths and weaknesses, issues requiring decisions and areas for improvement.

In the educational programme self-evaluation process should involve many participants, publish and distribute the results for increasing of benefits of self-evaluation - as a guide for strategic planning and continuous renewal.

The educational programme self-evaluation procedure requires time and effort from leadership, management, administrative staff, faculty, students and other relevant stakeholders.

THE SAMPLE OF SCHEDULE FOR PhD PROGRAMME SELF-EVALUATION

Time frame (+/-months)	Activity
-16	Accreditation agency coordinates the site-visit date with the Rector of higher education institution
-15	Accreditation agency arranges the training for staff and faculty and provides the Guide for Educational Programme Self-evaluation and data collection forms to the higher education institution. Institution appoints its representative, who is responsible for conducting the educational programme self-evaluation.
-15	Institution appoints the Chair and members of the Commission for educational programme self-evaluation. The Chair of this commission establishes its main objectives, functions, methods and terms of data collection, and defines the required sub-commissions responsibilities for relevant data collection and analysis, submission their reports.
-6	The Commission for educational programme self-evaluation reviews sub-commissionsô reports and prepares the final Report. The Educational Programme Self-evaluation Report should conclude with the list of its strengths, issues to be addressed and recommendations to address any identified problems.
-3	Accrediting agency sends the Site-visit Program and the External Expert Commission (ECC) members to the HEI Rector. HEIôs representative for Educational Programme Self-evaluationanalyzes the database, final report on programme self-evaluation and other required documents for reliability, correspondence and objectivity. Following the required revision documents are sent to the Accrediting agency and to each member of External Expert Commission.
-3	Consideration of Educational Programme Self-evaluation report by accrediting agency EECôs members before the site-visit at the HEI.
-2	HEI sends any required additional information or data to EEC and to the Accrediting agency.

-1	The Accrediting agency coordinates the final Site-visit Programme and finalizes the schedule with the HEI.
0	ECCôs Site-visit at the Higher Education Institution.
	Preliminary draft of the Site-visit Report that includes information from the database and self-study summary report, as well as the survey team's findings and conclusions presented to the HEI Leadership and staff.
+1	The final Site-visit Report finalized by ECC, the Secretariat of the Accrediting agency sends the final Report to the Rector of HEI
+ 1	Leader of the ECC sends the final Report to the Accrediting agency
+3	The final EEC final Site-visit Report is considered by the ECAQAôs Accreditation Council its next meeting at which time the decision about accreditation is made. Full accreditation status will be granted for a period of five years. The HEIôs Rector is notified of the ECAQA decision regarding accreditation along with the final Site-visit Report.

2.1 The HEIôs representative responsible for PhD programme self-evaluation in biomedical and health sciences

The representative of the higher education institution responsible for educational programme self-evaluation should be an officer with experience in medical education and recognized and respected by the colleagues, have an academic or research degree, the ability to identify sources of information and explain documents on the higher education institution activities with administration, faculty and students within the programme self-evaluation process.

The HEIôs representative for educational programme self-evaluation is responsible for:

– appointment the members of the commission/sub-commissions on educational programme self-evaluation;

– coordination of the activity of internal commission/ sub-commissions on educational programme self-evaluation;

– collection of the information and completing a database and educational programme self-evaluation report;

– reliability of information and database and educational programme self-evaluation report;

– effective communication with the accrediting agencyôs secretariat regarding the educational programme self-evaluation and the external expert commission site-visit at the HEI.

– submitting the information and responding to requests from the accrediting agencyôs secretariat and members of the external expert commission.

2.2 Commission and sub-commissions on educational programme self-evaluation

Educational programme self-evaluation process requires the participation of all staff/faculty of higher educationinstitution. The primary responsibility of HEIôs representative and members of commission for educational programme self-

evaluation is preparing the final educational programme self-evaluation report. This commission determines the objectives and time-frames for conducting the self-evaluation.

Commission on educational programme self-evaluation should be broadly represented by the staff of the HEI and includes: representatives of administration departments (academic, finance and management), faculty, medical students, graduates, representatives from clinical affiliates.

Commission on educational programme self-evaluation should establish relevant sub-commissions to gather information and data for the database completion and submit the conclusions for relevant sections of the programme self-evaluation report.

Each sub-commission should include representatives of administration, faculty and when appropriate, students. It is more preferable to assign one or more commission members in each sub-commission to provide continuity and cooperation.

Commission on educational programme self-evaluation should also establish sub-commission from an appropriate group of students to conduct their own independent student review. The HEI representative on educational programme self-evaluation should provide an administrative support for the student review that is afforded to other commissions on educational programme self-evaluation. The sub-commission that completing the database and provides the data collection on sections of accreditation standards dealing with medical students should include information about independent student analysis.

The sub-commissions should take two or three months to complete their data gathering, analysis, and reporting. The sub-commissions reports should be forwarded to the HEI representative on educational programme self-evaluation. The sub-commissions reports should not simply summarize the information but should include detailed analyses of each area, based on the combined perceptions and expertise by each sub-commission member. The analyses should lead to conclusions about educational programme strengths and challenges (including potential or suspected areas of partial or substantial noncompliance with accreditation standards), and recommendations to addressthese problems.

The competence of educational programme self-evaluation commission includes the development and summarizing the results of sub-commissions activities and the preparation of the final report on programme self-evaluation.

Consequently, the programme self-evaluation commission studies sub-commissionsô reports which must reflect a comprehensive assessment, analysis of strengths and weaknesses and then synthesized into a summary as the main educational programme strengths and the problems that need attention. For each identified problem area should be offered possible solutions and strategies. Any action taken in relation to identified problems must be described.

2.3 The database and other documents completion.

The forms for data gathering and analysis are related to specific sections of accreditation standards. Each database section should be completed by specialists

most competent in appropriate areas. Special attention should be given to the reliability and consistency of information provided in relevant database sections. HEI representative on educational programme self-evaluation is responsible for and has to ensure that submitted data provide completeness and reliability of information and were subjected to detailed analysis to eliminate inconsistencies in report documentation.

Independent student review and copies of graduatesô questionnaires are assembled in a separate folder that forms part of the database to be reviewed by educational programme self-evaluation commission and external expert commission.

The period of the time covered by the database collection should be clearly indicated, and should be consistently allocated. As the database will be prepared within six - eight months before the site visit by external expert commission, some documents as appropriate can be revised. The external expert commission may request a current financial information, student enrollment data, and updates on changes in the educational programs, and any other significant information. These data should be verified prior to the submission to external expert commission members and to the secretariat of the accrediting agency and should be sent three months prior the external expert commissionôs site-visit at the HEI.

2.4 Final PhD programme self-evaluation Report

Final PhD programme self-evaluation report should be sent to the accrediting agency and to external expert commission members, along with the database on educational programme of the HEI, about two months prior to the external expert commissionôs site-visit at the HEI. Copies of each sub-commissions report should be available for review by external expert commission during the site-visit.

Final PhD programme self-evaluation report should summarize advantages and disadvantages, and define priorities for improvement and consistency of their achievements; should analyze all changes.

When making a final PhD programme self-evaluation report should be concise and specific in describing the ongoing activities and actions to be taken. The summary report resulting from the self-evaluation process provides an evaluation of the quality of the HEIôs educational programme and the adequacy of resources that support it.

2.5 Abbreviation

The following abbreviations are used in the Standards:

AC	Accreditation Council
AMSE	Association of Medical Schools in Europe
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
EB	Expert Board
ECAQA	the Eurasian Centre for Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education and Healthcare
EEC	External Expert Commission

ESG	Standards for accreditation the Higher Education Institutions for Health Professions Education based on the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
MoH RK	Ministry of Health of the Republic of Kazakhstan
MoEDSc	Ministry of Education and Scienceof the Republic of Kazakhstan
ORPHEUS	Organisation for PhD Education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in the European System
PME	Postgraduate Medical Education
PGMEP	Postgraduate Medical Educational Programme
PhD	
WFME	World Federation for Medical Education
WHO	World Health Organization

THE STRUCTURE OF PhD PROGRAMME SELF-EVALUATION REPORT

Title (the first) page of Educational Programme Self-evaluation Report:

- name of the higher education institution;
- name of the HEIôs Rector;
- signature
- the date of submission;
- HEIôs address/phone/fax/e-mail

1. Statement confirming the accuracy of the Educational Programme Self-evaluation Report signed by the HEI Rector;
2. List of the HEIôs Commission on Educational Programme Self-evaluation members with indicating their responsibilities;
3. Name of HEIôs representative responsible for Educational Programme Self-evaluation:
   Contact details:
   Address:
   Phone:
   Fax:
   E-mail:
4. Abbreviations
5. Introduction to the Educational Programme Self-evaluation Report (the HEIôs educational programme brief description)
6. The Educational Programme Self-evaluation Report with conclusions on each Standard section including the description of its strengths and weaknesses and actions for improvement.
7. Summary
8. Annexes

Supporting documents relating to the Standards and attached to the Programme Self-evaluation Report should be listed.

3. STANDARDS FOR PhD PROGRAMME IN BIOMEDICINE AND HEALTH SCIENCES ACCREDITATION

STRUCTURE OF STANDARDS FOR PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION
1. **RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT**
2. **OUTCOMES**
3. **ADMISSION POLICY AND CRITERIA**
4. **PhD TRAINING PROGRAMME**
5. **SUPERVISION**
6. **PhD THESIS**
7. **ASSESSMENT**
8. **GRADUATE INSTITUTION STRUCTURE**

STANDARD 1: RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

Terms and definitions:

Measurements of the *suitability of the research environment* could be made using e.g. publication record (number of publications, impact factor, etc.), level of external funding, and numbers of qualified researchers in the group, record of department and graduate institute.

International ethical standards are e.g. Helsinki Declaration II (clinical), EU Directive 2010/63/EU (animal), and Oviedo Convention (bioethics).

Other *competences* relevant for PhD programmes would include those PhD candidates:

- have demonstrated a systematic understanding of a field of study and mastery of the skills and methods of research associated with that field;
- have demonstrated the ability to conceive, design, implement and adapt a substantial process of original research with scholarly integrity at a level that merits international refereed publication;
- can communicate with their peers, the wider scholarly community and with society in general about their areas of expertise both orally and in writing;
- can be expected to be able to promote, within academic and professional contexts, technological, social or cultural advancement in a knowledge based society.

Further competencies include leadership, ability to supervise work of others, project management and ability to teach.

The PhD qualification corresponds to level 8 in the European Qualifications Framework10.

The *resources* (internal or external) include: infrastructure for the project, the running costs, costs of courses, costs for participation in relevant international scientific meetings, and enrolment fees where applicable; laboratory, informatics and office facilities for the PhD candidate; stipend/salary for the PhD candidate (although the manner in which candidates are remunerated will vary).

Standards 1: *RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT includes:* research environment, supervisorôs research group, international ethical standards, Institutions lacking facilities.

1. RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

1.1 The success of individual PhD programmes **must** be ensured by being performed in a suitable research environment that would reflect the research strength of the supervisorôs research group, of the department, and of the graduate institution, as well as possibilities for national and international networking with strong research institutions.

- *Describe the research environment of the HEI.*
- *Describe the research base.*
- *What scientific programs are being implemented?*
- *Describe the equipment of scientific centers.*
- *Describe which sections of the scientific work the doctoral student conducts in other scientific bases.*
- *Describe the research team of the scientific supervisor (the scope of scientific interests, the research base, the number of people in the group, the length of service in the field of research and doctoral research, achievements)*

1.2 The facilities available to the PhD candidates **must** be compatible with the requirements of completing their PhD.

- *Describe the material and technical basis of the HEI.*
- *What resources (equipment, laboratories, auditoriums) does the HEI have?*
- *Describe the departments where the doctoral students are trained.*

1.3 Research **must** be consistent with international ethical standards and approved by appropriate and competent ethics committees.

- *Thesis research works must undergo an ethical review.*
- *Describe the principles of the Local Ethics Committee (LEC). What documentation does the LEC follow in its work? Describe the procedure for examining scientific research performed by doctoral students.*
- *Describe the training of doctoral students in bioethics.*
- *Where, how and by whom are the issues of correspondence of the thesis to international ethical standards discussed?*

1.4 There **must** be arrangements to allow PhD candidates, if relevant, to perform part of their PhD programme at another institution, including those in other countries.

- *Describe the mechanisms to achieve the internationalization of PhD programmes.*
- *Describe the criteria for selecting foreign institutions for the training of PhD students.*
- *Provide a list of partner institutions of the HEI.*
- *Provide information on foreign co-leaders of the PhD student.*
- *What is the effectiveness of training doctoral students in other educational institutions included in the PhD programme. How is the control carried out?*

1.5 Institutions lacking facilities or expertise in particular fields **should** collaborate with stronger institutions to ensure that the graduate school can offer these.

- *Describe joint PhD programmes with domestic and foreign HEIs. How is the quality assurance of the PhD programmes carried out?*
- *What are the mechanisms for updating and strengthening physical facilities and for ensuring that they meet modern technologies in learning?*
- *Specify what are the plans for improving these facilities in relation to developments in educational practices.*
- *How is management of research organaised?*
- *What are the mechanisms to ensure that research activities are reflected in the curriculum and teaching?*

STANDARD 2: OUTCOMES

Terms and definitions

Good research practice

Competences

Clinical research

Critical analysis

Educational outcomes or learning outcomes/competencies refer to statements of knowledge, skills and attitude that students demonstrate at the end of a period of learning. Outcomes might be either intended or acquired. Educational/learning objectives are often described in terms of intended outcomes.

Professional training

Standards 2: *OUTCOMES includes:* educational outcomes; potential benefit for students, solution of complex problems by critical analysis and evaluation, appropriate transfer of new technology and synthesis of new ideas.

2. OUTCOMES

2.1 The PhD programme leading to the PhD degree **must** provide students with competences that enable them to become a qualified researcher; that is a scientist able to conduct responsible, independent research, according to principles of good research practice.

- *Describe the educational strategy resulting in a health professionals competencies and their postgraduate specialty training or research.*
- *How does the higher education institution analyse performance of cohorts of students and graduates and what are the results of such analyses in relation to mission and intended outcomes?*
- *Describe the learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and attitudes / professional values) of the PhD programme graduates.*

2.2 Completion of a PhD programme **must** also be of potential benefit for those who pursue careers outside of academic or clinical research, by use of competences achieved during the PhD programme, including solution of complex problems by critical analysis and evaluation, appropriate transfer of new technology and synthesis of new ideas.

- *How these educational outcomes are related to the subsequent graduates training and commitments to lifelong learning*
- *Describe the availability of intended educational outcomes to public.*

2.3 The outcomes expected from PhD candidates with a background in medicine or other professional training are the same as for any other PhD.

- *How do the competencies relate to existing and emerging needs of the society in which the students will practice?*
- *Provide references to educational outcomes statements that refer to these areas*
- *What educational outcomes (knowledge, skills, and attitude/professional values) are required from students at graduation?*
- *Specify how the educational outcomes are related to the postgraduate training.*

STANDARD 3: ADMISSION POLICY AND CRITERIA

Terms and definitions

Criteria for admission might include documentation of proven research competence through, for example, predoctoral research programmes and published papers, achievements in previous studies, and ï for medical candidates - clinical experience.

The wish for *transparency* in the admission process notwithstanding, for many institutions a PhD programme is seen as the continuation of a master's or medical programme. The admission of the institutionôs own candidates ought not to prevent the admission of candidates from other institutions.

The *statement on process of selection of students* would include both rationale and methods of selection such as secondary school results, other relevant academic or educational experiences, entrance examinations and interviews, including

evaluation of motivation to become doctors. Selection would also take into account the need for variations related to diversity of medical practice.

Periodically review the admission policy would be based on relevant societal and professional data, to comply with the health needs of the community and society, and would include consideration of intake according to gender, ethnicity and other social requirements (socio-cultural and linguistic characteristics of the population), including the potential need of a special recruitment, admission and induction policy for underprivileged students and minorities.

Standards 3: *ADMISSION POLICY AND CRITERIA includes:* transparent process, scientific quality, the project encourages innovation and creativity, the qualifications of the nominated supervisors, an external assessment of the written project description.

3. ADMISSION POLICY AND CRITERIA

3.1 To ensure quality of PhD programmes, PhD candidates **must** be selected on the basis of a competitive and transparent process.

- ❖ *What are the academic criteria for admission to the medical education institution?*
- ❖ *Are there any additional requirements at institutional or state levels?*
- ❖ *What body is responsible for selection policy and what methods are used?*
- ❖ *What methods does this body use?*

3.2 Applicants for a PhD programme **must** have an educational level corresponding to a masterôs degree, or to a medical degree.

- ❖ *Specify the size of student intake and any their allocation on different categories.*
- ❖ *How is student intake determined in relation to the capacity of the higher education institution?*
- ❖ *What are the mechanisms for adjusting the intake and quotas?*
- ❖ *With whom does the higher education institution consult concerning changes in the size and composition of student intake?*
- ❖ *How do they comply with the social responsibilities and health needs?*

3.3 Before enrolling a PhD candidate, or at a clearly defined time point in the programme, the institution **must** evaluate and approve the following:

- the scientific quality and feasibility of the research project to be performed by the PhD candidate;
- whether the project is suitable and may reasonably be expected to result in a thesis;
- the degree to which the project encourages innovation and creativity;
- the qualifications of the nominated supervisors (see Standard 5).

- ❖ *How can the methods used to select doctoral candidates test their suitability and ability to research in various fields of medicine?*
- ❖ *Describe the procedure for assessing the quality of a research project, the implementation of which is planned by a PhD student.*

- *Describe the degree to which the scientific work of doctoral candidates corresponds to social obligations and needs in the field of public health.*
- *Describe the innovativeness and creativity of scientific papers of doctoral students?*
- *How is the degree of innovation and creativity of the research performed by a PhD student analyzed?*
- *How is the preliminary selection of scientific leaders for each PhD student carried out?*

3.4 A PhD programme **should** not be initiated unless the resources for completion of the PhD research project are available or predicted not to be a risk.

3.5 In choosing PhD candidates, the potential of the applicant for research ought to be considered, and not just past academic performance.

- *Describe the selection of doctoral students, starting with the application, selecting for the interview, the interview process, making the decision and enrolling in the HEI.*
- *For each stage of the selection, describe the meaning and criteria on the basis of which decisions on admission of doctoral candidates to the HEI are made.*
- *Describe the progress of doctoral students before they enter the PhD programme.*
- *Provide data on the number of doctoral candidates accepted for the PhD programme and those who have not completed their studies by the due date.*

3.6 Projects ought to be assessed either by an external assessment of the written project description or else by presentation of the project to a panel of independent scientists. Where the candidate is obliged to obtain extra income, it ought to be ensured that the candidate has the necessary time to complete the programme.

- *Describe what is the basis for choosing the topic of the thesis?*
- *Describe the procedure for external evaluation of the research work of the doctoral candidate at the approval stage?*
- *What works precede the beginning of the research on the topic of the thesis?*
- *How and by whom is the discussion of the choice of the research topic, the procedure for approving the topic carried out? How is the composition of independent experts formed?*
- *Are there any requirements for a written description of the project or presentation of the project?*

STANDARD 4: PhD TRAINING PROGRAMME

Terms and definitions

A *3-4 year full time* limit has several purposes: it guarantees that there is an upper limit to the amount of scientific work, which can be expected to be included in a PhD thesis, and is an effective way to avoid the requirements for a PhD degree escalating over time; it encourages the PhD candidate to devote concentrated time to the scientific problem, and to ensure that the programme is based on original research; it allows graduate schools to develop structures for handling a steady stream of PhD candidates.

The *courses* would include courses in ethics, safety, animal experimentation (if applicable), research methodology and statistics and elective discipline-specific components to support candidates in their scientific research.

Courses in *transferable skills* could include training of PhD candidates in presentation of their research (oral/poster/papers) to academic and non-academic audiences, in university teaching, in linguistic skills, in project management, in grant application, in critical evaluation of scientific literature, in supervision of technicians and research candidates, and in career development and networking.

Courses in transferable skills are important both for those who may be expected to continue in research, in either public or private institutions, and for those who continue towards careers in other fields.

For the supervisor to be *scientifically qualified in the field* implies that he or she will normally have a PhD or equivalent degree, and is an *active scholar* with a steady scientific production that contributes to the peer-reviewed literature.

Standard 4: *PhD TRAINING PROGRAMME* includes: framework of the programmes and instructional methods; scientific methods; medical ethics; clinical sciences and skills; curriculum structure, composition and duration; programme management.

4. PhD TRAINING PROGRAMME

4.1 PhD training programmes **must** be based on original research, courses and other activities which include analytical and critical thinking.

4.2 PhD programmes should be performed under structured supervision.

4.3 PhD programmes **must** ensure that candidates have appropriate training in the rules concerning ethics and responsible conduct in research.

- *What are the mechanisms of innovations implementation in teaching, education, assessment and educational programme of this structural unit responsible for educational programmes in higher education institution?*
- *How do other relevant stakeholders involve in the educational programmes management?*
- *How will the educational programme and methodological approach encourage students actively accept the responsibility for their own learning?*
- *Specify the process of the higher education institution forecasting that these methods help students to be prepared for lifelong learning.*

- *Specify how the higher education institution envisages that these methods prepare students for lifelong learning.*
- *Which of the behavioral and social sciences and the disciplines of medical ethics and medical jurisprudence contribute to the medical programme?*
- *How does the curriculum provide for contributions of these sciences and disciplines to foster effective communication, clinical decision making and ethical practices?*
- *Which components of the curriculum inculcate the principles of scientific method and evidence-based medicine and enable analytical and critical thinking?*
- *What special opportunities are available for students in higher education institution to acquire research training?*
- *How do the research activities reflect the institutionôs overall mission and goals?*
- *How is research linked to teaching activities in the institution?*

4.4 PhD programmes **must** be structured with a clear time limit, a length equivalent to 3-4 years full time. Extension of the time frame ought to be possible, but be limited and exceptional rather than typical. The time frame should be extended in connection with parental leave or sick leave.

- *What are the principles guiding the design of the curriculum and the types of teaching and learning methods actually used to deliver it?*
- *How will curriculum and instructional methods encourage students to take active responsibility for their learning?*
- *What policies guide integration (horizontal/vertical and basic/clinical sciences) of the programme?*
- *What mechanisms exist to ensure that it occurs?*
- *What instructional and learning methods are used in practice to implement the educational programme?*
- *Does the medical education institution respect the equal treatment to students regardless of their gender, ethnicity, religion, social and economic status and take into account studentsôphysical abilities?*
- *How does study programme design and approval function in the institution? Who does what?*
- *What are the policies and processes covering the various phases of the student life-cycle?*

4.5 The training programme must include documented activities not directly related to the project (e.g. courses, journal clubs, participation in conferences, seminars and workshops, including preparation time) totalling about 15% of the programme parallel with conduct of the PhD project. A substantial part of these training activities should be concerned with transferable skills.

4.6 PhD programmes that are performed in parallel with clinical or other professional training **must** have the same time for research and course work as any other PhD.

- *Present a summary on compulsory elements of the educational programme in the form of training topics/subjects and duration (hours/weeks) of the*

semester/academic year. Specify the relation between lectures, teaching in small group, seminars, laboratories, clinical cycles and etc.

- *Which elements of the basic biomedical sciences, the behavioural and social sciences and medical ethics and relevant clinical sciences are included in the programme?*
- *What are the basic principles that provide integration (horizontal/vertical and basic/clinical sciences) of the educational programme?*
- *What are the mechanisms for such integration?*
- *Present a summary on elective elements of the educational programme in the form of training topics/subjects and duration (hours/weeks) of the semester/academic year*
- *Specify whether such issues as health promotion, preventive medicine, alternative/non-conventional medical practice are reflected in the educational programme*

4.7 There **must** be continuous, structured assessment of the progress of PhD candidates throughout their PhD programme/

- *What is an obligatory or elective analytic and experimental studies included as part of the curriculum?*

4.8 For PhDs performed by clinicians, leave-of absence from clinical duties **should** be provided for the PhD part of such programmes unless these are coincident.

4.9 PhD programmes **should** where relevant have an element of interdisciplinary.

- *What is the process by which the higher education institution adapts the curricular contributions of the clinical sciences to developments in the science, technology, practice and delivery of health care?*
- *What are the internal mechanisms of the design and approval of educational programmes?*
- *How feedback on the conditions of postgraduate training is carried out?*
- *What policy does the higher education institution have for collaborating with other educational institutions?*
- *Provide a summary of the existing collaborative links with other institutions and describe the nature of those links.*
- *What is the higher education institution ôs policy and practice on the transfer of educational credits?*
- *Describe any activities directed towards regional and international cooperation with other higher education institutions.*

STANDARD 5: SUPERVISION

Terms and definitions

For the supervisor to be *scientifically qualified in the field* implies that he or she will normally have a PhD or equivalent degree, and is an *active scholar* with a steady scientific production that contributes to the peer-reviewed literature.

The term ó*regular consultations*ô will normally mean at minimum several times per month, but frequency will vary during the course of the programme according to the requirements of the individual PhD candidate. The consultations ought to discuss progress of the PhD project and PhD programme, provide general scientific advice, help on project management, help to identify and initiate follow-up projects, thesis writing, and assistance during publication.

Web-based supervisor courses could be arranged for all supervisors to ensure that they know the local regulations of the PhD programmes as well as their basic duties as supervisors.

Standard 5: *SUPERVISION* includes: a principal supervisor, regular consultations, career development, international scientific networks, scientific community, supervision process.

5. SUPERVISION

5.1 Each PhD candidate **must** have a principal supervisor and normally at least one co-supervisor to cover all aspects of the defined programme.

- *Describe the selection criteria for the thesis supervisor and co-supervisor.*

5.2 The number of PhD candidates per supervisor **must** be compatible with the supervisor's cumulative workload.

5.3 Supervisors **must** be scientifically qualified and active scholars in the field concerned.

5.4 Supervisors **must** have regular consultations with their candidates.

- *Teachers' qualifications must be confirmed by a scientific degree, academic title.*
- *Qualifications and potential of teachers should correspond to the scientific direction of the doctoral programme.*
- *Describe the participation of co-supervisor in the preparation of the thesis (thesis writing, research practice, publications, and presentations).*

5.5 The institution **must** ensure that training in supervision is available for all supervisors and potential supervisors.

- *Describe mechanisms for developing and supporting the capacity of thesis supervisors and assessing their performance.*
- *Describe the training programmes for thesis supervisors.*
- *Describe the HEI's practice of ensuring proper recognition and worthy remuneration for thesis supervisors?*

5.6 The supervisor-candidate relationship is the key to a successful PhD programme. There **must** be mutual respect, planned and agreed shared responsibility, and a contribution from both parties.

- *Describe the HEI's practice in implementing the requirements of this standard (joint participation in the selection of topics, the implementation of stages of the research work, preparation of publications on the topic of the thesis, decision on co-authorship).*
- *Describe the feedback of the PhD student and supervisor.*

5.7 Institutional assistance **must** be provided for career development. This should be continuous, starting from the time of enrolment.

- *Describe the principles of the career development division of PhD programme graduates.*
- *Provide information on employment of PhD programme graduates for 5 years.*
- *How does the HEI maintain liaison with graduates?*

5.8 The responsibility of each supervisor **ought to/should** be explicit and documented.

- *Describe the documents in which the duties and responsibilities of a thesis supervisor of a PhD student are stated.*
- *Describe the duties and responsibilities of a thesis supervisor in relation to the PhD student and the HEI.*

5.9 Supervisors **ought to/should** have broad local and international scientific networks to be able to introduce the PhD candidate into the scientific community.

5.10 Supervisors **ought to/should** in co-operation with the institution assist with career development.

- Describe the international relations of the HEI and the thesis supervisors of doctoral students (memoranda, contracts).
- Describe the participation of thesis supervisors in the work of the interdisciplinary associations.
- Give examples of PhD students' participation in scientific events.

5.11 Institutions **should** consider having documented agreements describing the supervision process that are signed by supervisor, PhD candidate and head of graduate school.

- *Describe the structure and content of the contract, as well as the procedure for signing the contract, responsibility of the parties, compliance monitoring. Where is the contract kept?*

5.12 The principal supervisor, at least, **ought to/should** have some formal training as a supervisor.

5.13 Supervisors **should** where possible also act as co-supervisors for PhD candidates at other graduate institution within the country but also internationally.

5.14 Graduate schools **ought to** consider appointing a mentor or equivalent for each PhD candidate, in addition to the supervisor team, to discuss programmes from another aspect than the science topic alone.

- *What policy does the higher education institution conduct to ensure that the staffing profile matches the range and the balance of teachers of basic biomedical science, behavioral, social and clinical sciences required to perform the curriculum?*
- *What policies does the higher education institution have for ensuring that the staffing profile matches the range and balance of teaching skills required to deliver the curriculum?*
- *What requirements are specified to the qualification of teachers for their appointment?*

- *Are there institutional or governmental policies or requirements that affect the higher education institution's stuffing decisions?*
- *What is the balance between medical and non-medical staff and between full-time and part-time staff?*
- *How frequently does the higher education institution review its policy for staff recruitment and selection and priority list for staffing?*
- *How does the higher education institution propose to improve its policy of staff recruitment to meet its mission and objectives?*
- *How will this improvement influence on the improvement of its faculty's scientific, educational and clinical qualifications?*
- *What is the higher education institution policy that allows a balance of capacity between teaching, research and service functions and includes provision of protected time for each function, taking into account the needs of higher education institution and professional qualifications of the teachers?*
- *What is the higher education institution policy for ensuring an appropriate recognition and relevant award of teachers in academic, research, clinical and management areas?*
- *What is the higher education institution's policy for ensuring that teaching, research and service contributions of staff members are appropriately recognised and rewarded?*
- *Are there any additional institutional or governmental policies or regulations?*
- *What are the mechanisms for faculty's capacity development and support and assessment of their activity?*
- *What staff development programs exist or are proposed to enable teachers to upgrade their skills and to obtain appraisals of their teaching performance?*
- *How is participation in staff development programmes encouraged them?*
- *What staff development programmes exist or are proposed to enable teachers toupgrade their skills and to obtain appraisals of their teaching performance?*

STANDARD 6: PhD THESIS

Terms and definitions

By *internationally recognized journals* is meant good quality journals in the field concerned that are included in PubMed, Science Citation Index, or similar biomedical and health science literature databases.

The recommendation of *English* as best practice relates to this language being the language most widely used in the biomedical and health sciences literature, and thus the language best suited to encouraging internationalisation.

Relevant stakeholders would include graduate institution heads, graduate institution administrations, research directors, supervisors, PhD candidates, faculties, universities, governments and appropriate international organisations.

Standard 6: *PhD THESIS* includes: the PhD thesis, the literature relevant to the themes in the papers, methodological considerations, examined in English, manuscripts, joint publications,

6. PhD THESIS

6.1 The PhD thesis **must** be the basis for evaluating if the PhD candidate has acquired the skills to carry out independent, original and scientifically significant research and to critically evaluate work done by others.

6.2 The benchmark for the PhD thesis **must** be the outcome to be expected from 3-4 yearsô research at international level. In biomedicine and health sciences this benchmark should be the equivalent of at least three *in extenso* papers published/ submitted/in preparation in internationally recognized, peer-reviewed journals.

6.3 In defining the benchmark for a PhD thesis, the assessment committee **must** take account of the provisos listed in the Annotations, for example the annotation indicating that fewer than three papers may be accepted if published in highly rated journals.

- *What contribution to science and practical health care has been made by doctoral students as a result of the thesis.*
- *Describe the mechanisms for supporting PhD studentsôpublications.*
- *Which unit monitors compliance with the requirements for the number and quality of publications of doctoral students?*
- *Who analyzes the quality and originality of published works?*
- *Describe the procedure for preliminary assessment of the thesis.*

6.4 In addition to the papers presented, the PhD thesis **must** include a full review of the literature relevant to the themes in the papers, a full account of the research aims, methodological considerations, results, discussion, conclusions, and further perspectives of the PhD project.

6.5 Where the PhD thesis is presented in other formats, such as a single monograph, the assessment committee **must** ensure that the contribution is at least equivalent to the above benchmark.

- *Describe the structure of the thesis.*
- *Describe the cases when the thesis was presented in the form of a monograph.*

6.6 A PhD thesis in clinical medicine **must** meet the same standards as other PhD theses.

- *Describe the structure of the thesis and give a link to the document where this structure is recommended.*

6.7 To encourage international recognition the thesis **ought to/should** be written, and optimally also examined in English, unless local regulations stipulate

otherwise, or where this is not possible or desirable. An abstract of the PhD thesis ought to be published in English.

- *Provide information on the writing and defense of the thesis in different languages (state, Russian, English) for 5 years.*
- *The management of the programme should demonstrate the EEC author's abstracts of theses for 5 years, theses themselves and show examples of theses defense (video materials) in a foreign language (if available).*

6.8 Where the articles or manuscripts are joint publications, co-author statements **ought to/should** document that the PhD candidate has made a significant contribution to these. Ownership of results from PhD studies **ought to/should** be clearly stated.

- *Present in the form of a table a list of publications of PhD students with the indication of co-authorship (title of the publication, information about the publication, the year of publication, language of publication, authors, while the full name of a PhD student should be marked with a color or marker).*

6.9 PhD theses **ought to** be published on the graduate school's homepage, preferably *in extenso*. If patent or copyright legislation or other reasons prevent this, at least abstracts of the theses ought to be publicly accessible.

6.10 There **should** be a lay summary of the thesis in the local language.

- *The EEC members should obtain convincing data on compliance with the requirements of this Guide.*

STANDART 7: ASSESSMENT

Terms and definitions

ñ*Assessment utility****ò*** is a term combining validity, reliability, educational impact, acceptability and efficiency of the assessment methods and formats.

Evaluate and document the reliability and validity of assessment methods would require an appropriate quality assurance process of assessment practices.

Use of external examiners may increase fairness, quality and transparency of assessments.

Assessment principles, methods and practices refer to assessment of student achievement and would include assessment in all domains: knowledge, skills and attitudes.

Decisions about academic progress would require rules of progression and their relationship to the assessment process.

Adjustment of number and nature of examinations would include consideration of avoiding negative effects on learning. This would also imply avoiding the need for students to learn and recall excessive amounts of information and curriculum overload.

Courses in *transferable skills* could include training of PhD candidates in presentation of their research (oral/poster/papers) to academic and non-academic

audiences, in university teaching, in linguistic skills, in project management, in grant application, in critical evaluation of scientific literature, in supervision of technicians and research candidates, and in career development and networking.

Courses in transferable skills are important both for those who may be expected to continue in research, in either public or private institutions, and for those who continue towards careers in other fields.

Standard 7: *ASSESSMENT* includes: assessment committee, oral examination, transferable skills, portfolio

7. ASSESSMENT

7.1 Acceptance of a PhD thesis **must** include acceptance of both the written thesis and a subsequent oral defence.

7.2 PhD degrees **must** be awarded by the institution on the basis of a recommendation from an assessment committee that has evaluated the thesis and the oral defence with respect to the recommendations described in Standard 6.

- *Evaluation of the PhD students**ô** theses is the main component of the assessment of the training effectiveness, which demonstrates the educational environment created by the HEI.*
- *The principles, methods and practices used to evaluate doctoral candidates include the thesis review and defense.*
- *Describe the PhD student assessment policy.*
- *Describe the process of developing and approving documents issued to PhD students after the thesis defense.*
- *Describe the requirements for writing a thesis.*
- *Describe the requirements for the oral defense of the thesis.*
- *Describe the appointment procedure for the thesis reviewer.*
- *How does the HEI assess the quality of the thesis?*
- *How do PhD students correct the deficiencies identified in the thesis? What are the timelines for it?*

7.3 The assessment committee **must** consist of established and active scientists who are without direct connection to the milieu where the PhD was performed, and without any conflict of interest, and including individuals from another institution.

7.4 To avoid conflict of interest the supervisor **must** not be a member of the assessment committee. However, local regulations might include the supervisor as a member of the assessment committee. In these cases it is suggested that the supervisor can take part in the discussions but not have a formal role in making the final decision.

- *Describe the composition of the Assessment Committee.*
- *Describe the procedure for submitting documents to the Assessment Committee when approving the topic of the thesis.*
- *Describe the procedure for submitting documents to the Assessment Committee at the completion of the thesis.*

7.5 In the case of a negative assessment of the written PhD thesis, the PhD candidate **must** normally be given the opportunity to rewrite the thesis. Where there is a negative assessment of the oral defence, the candidate should normally be allowed an additional possibility for defence. In exceptional cases the assessment committee can reject a thesis without offer to reconsider.

- *Describe the cases of negative decision on the theses (information for 5 years) and what the measures to eliminate the comments are.*
- *Provide information on the number of repeated theses defenses and refusals in repeated defense for 5 years (the full name of the PhD student, the topic of the thesis, the full name of the thesis supervisor, the date of the first thesis defense, the reason for the negative decision on the thesis).*

7.6 The oral examination **must** be detailed enough to ensure that the thesis is the candidateôs own work, that the intended training goals have been achieved, and that the candidate is able to put the results into scientific context.

7.7 The oral defence **ought to**/**should** be open to the public, or at least to the faculty.

- *Describe the principle of transparency, openness and accessibility of the results of the thesis, the defense of the thesis for interested parties and the public.*

7.8 To promote internationalisation, the institution **should** where economically and practically possible ensure that the assessment committee includes at least one member from another country.

7.9 Apart from the thesis, the institution **ought to/ should** ensure that sufficient transferable skills have been acquired during the PhD programme.

7.10 The competences developed during the PhD programme **should** be documented in a portfolio. This documentation **should** be evaluated by the assessment committee and form part of their decision concerning the award of the PhD degree.

- *Describe which departments of the HEI carry out training of doctoral students in special skills and how it is evaluated (tests, examinations, testing, etc.).*
- *What kind of doctoral training is conducted: language courses, project management, skills of conducting scientific research, skills of writing articles. Indicate the duration of these courses, and who was involved in teaching.*
- *Describe the portfolio of PhD students.*

STANDART 8: GRADUATE INSTITUTION STRUCTURE

Terms and definitions

Governance means the act and/or the structure of governing the medical school. Governance is primarily concerned with policy making, the processes of establishing general institutional and programme policies and also with control of the implementation of the policies. The institutional and programme policies

would normally encompass decisions on the mission of the medical school, the curriculum, admission policy, staff recruitment and selection policy and decisions on interaction and linkage with medical practice and the health sector as well as other external relations.

Transparency would be obtained by newsletters, web-information or disclosure of minutes.

Academic leadership refers to the positions and persons within the governance and management structures being responsible for decisions on academic matters in teaching, research and service and would include dean, deputy dean, vice deans, provost, heads of departments, course leaders, directors of research institutes and centres as well as chairs of standing committees (e.g. for student selection, curriculum planning and student counselling).

The educational budget would depend on the budgetary practice in each institution and country and would be linked to a transparent budgetary plan for the higher education institution.

Management means the act and/or the structure concerned primarily with the implementation of the institutional and programme policies including the economic and organisational implications i.e. the actual allocation and use of resources within the medical school. Implementation of the institutional and programme policies would involve carrying into effect the policies and plans regarding mission, the curriculum, admission, staff recruitment and external relations.

Constructive interaction would imply exchange of information, collaboration, and organisational initiatives. This would facilitate provision of medical doctors with the qualifications needed by society.

Standard 8: *Graduate institution structure* includes: governance and administration; academic leadership; educational budget for training and resources allocation; administrative staff and management; interaction with health sector.

8. GRADUATE INSTITUTION STRUCTURE

8.1 The graduate school **must** have sufficient resources for proper conduct of PhD programmes. This includes the resources appropriate to support the admission of PhD candidates, implementation of the PhD programmes of the PhD candidates enrolled, assessment of PhD theses, and awarding of PhD degrees.

- *How is the appropriate resource allocation assured to achieve the mission of the higher education institution?*
- *How are decision made about budget allocation including educational budget?*
- *What are the mechanisms to study educational needs, to allocate and distribute educational resources?*
- *What is the autonomy of the higher education institution to allocate educational resources? Describe the existing higher education institutionôs budgetary policy and practice including teaching staff remuneration?*

- ❖ *How is appropriate resource allocation assured to achieve the objectives of the institution and its intended educational outcomes?*
- ❖ *Describe how the higher education institution ensuring that its annual budget considering the developments in medical sciences and the health needs of the society.*

8.2 The graduate school **must** have a website, in the national language and in English, including transparent information about policies concerning:

- the responsibilities of the head of graduate school and the administration;
- quality assurance and regular review to achieve quality improvement;
- admission policy including a clear statement on the process of selection of candidates;
- the structure, duration and content of the PhD programme;
- the methods used for assessment of PhD candidates;
- the formal framework for following the progress of the individual candidate;
- supervisor appointment policy outlining the type, responsibilities and qualifications of supervisors;
- Effective use of information and communication technology.

- ❖ *How can the governance structure, its components and their functions, be described?*
- ❖ *Describe the representation and functions of academic staff, students, principal and other stakeholders in the various governance structures and commissions.*
- ❖ *How are principal and other stakeholders involved in institutional process and decision making?*
- ❖ *What are the roles and responsibilities of the institution's decision-making bodies?*
- ❖ *What are the links between central bodies/offices/staff and those at department/faculty level; how is the cooperation coordinated?*
- ❖ *Who has decision-making power over academic and research activities, funding issues, selection and promotion of staff, admission?*
- ❖ *How are internal (including students) and external stakeholders involved in institutional governance and decision-making?*

8.3 Merit **must** be given for relevant courses taken elsewhere or other relevant experience.

8.4 There ought to/**should** be procedures for regular review and updating of the structure, function and quality of PhD programmes. This will normally include both supervisor and candidate feedback.

8.5 Representatives of the PhD candidates ought to/**should** interact with the leadership of the graduate institution regarding the design, management and evaluation of PhD programmes. Candidate involvement and candidate organizations working to enhance PhD programmes at the institution ought to/**should** be encouraged and facilitated.

- *Describe the academic management structure of the higher education institution indicating the line of responsibility for individual areas of the educational programme.*
- *How is the performance of the academic leadership of the medical education institution evaluated and appraised in relation to the mission and what is the result of such an evaluation?*

8.6 PhD candidates ought to/ **should** have rights and duties commensurate with the value to the institution of the research work performed by the PhD candidate.

- *How does the HEI ensure observance of the rights of PhD students and necessary conditions for training, realization of professional practice, recreation, social and material assistance, safety, health protection?*
- *How does the HEI ensure compliance of doctoral students with duties in relation to studies, the thesis supervisor, colleagues, teachers, etc.?*

8.7 There ought to/ **should** be an appeal mechanism allowing candidates to dispute decisions concerning their programmes and assessment of their theses.

- *Describe the appeal system based on the results of the review and defense of the thesis: the purposes and objectives of the appeal, the composition of the Appeals Commission, the principles of work, the rules for filing an appeal and the procedure for considering appeals.*

8.8 Confidential candidate counselling concerning e.g. the PhD programme, supervision, as well as personal matters ought to/ **should** be offered by the graduate institution (by some referred to as an ómbudsmanô).

- *How does the HEI ensure confidentiality (individual consultations, reception of management on personal matters, secure electronic correspondence of the PhD student with the thesis supervisor, non-disclosure of data on the materials of the thesis)?*

8.9 Graduate schools **should** consider having a thesis committee for each PhD candidate that monitors the progress of the PhD candidate through meetings with the PhD candidate and the supervisors.

- *Who in the HEI tracks the progress of the PhD student (academic management, dean's office, PhD programme department, thesis supervisor, etc.)?*
- *Describe the principles of the work of this unit and the tools for tracking the progress of the PhD student.*

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION DATABASE

I. Higher Education Institution:
Name(in Kazakh, Russian and English):
Address:
Country:
Region:
Post code:
City:
Street:
Phone: (country code/city code/phone number)
Fax: (country code/city code/ fax number)
E-mail:
HEIôs official web-site:
Rector of the Higher Education Institution:
Name:
Title:
Fax:
E-mail:
Institution representative responsible for institutional self-evaluation
Name:
Title:
Tel:
Fax:
E-mail:

II. Mission, Vision and Values
III. Organizational structure and governance
(Standard 8: GRADUATE INSTITUTION STRUCTURE)

IV. Higher Education Institutionôs Brief Description (no more 3 pages)

V. List of HEIôs educational programme (Standard: 4 PhD TRAINING PROGRAMME)					
Educational programme	**duration**	**academic year**	**specialty**	**awarding qualification/ academic degree**	**instruction language**
Total					

VI. Educational programme and Students Intake (Standard: 4 PhD TRAINING PROGRAMME ; Standard: 3 ADMISSION POLICY AND CRITERIA)

Cycles of education	Duration	Beginning of academic year according to the State Compulsory Standards of Education (SCSE)	Number of learners without foreign citizens		Number of international students	Submitted applications		Passed competition		Enrolled on current academic year (without foreign citizens)		Enrolled foreign citizens on current academic year	Cost for academic year
			State grant	Contract		RK citizens	Foreign citizens	RK citizens	Foreign citizens	State grant	Contract		
													-
In Kazakh													
In Russian													
In English													
Total													

VII. Student number (Standard: 3 ADMISSION POLICY AND CRITERIA)

	Programmeôs code specialtyôs code	enrolled students	students on courses		Total number of students	Number of students	Number of students transferred from other institutions	Graduates expected on 200_-200_ year
			1	2				
PhD								
State grant								
Contract								
Total								
From all: women								

VIII. Graduates Perfomance (National Exams)(Standard: 7 ASSESSMENT)

Specialty	Specialty code	In all	Republic of Kazakhstan citizens	Foreign citizens	Among them get			Degree
					Excellence	Good	Satisfactory	
1.								
Admitted to State Exam, Total number								
In Kazakh								
In Russian								
In English								

IX. Internship students perfomance (National /State Exams) (Standard: 7 ASSESSMENT)

Specialty	Specialty code	In all	RK citizens	Foreign citizens				Degree
					Excellence	Good	Satisfactory	
1.								
Admitted to State Exam, Total number								
In Kazakh								
In Russian								
In English								
2.								

X. Graduatesô employability (Standard: 7 ASSESSMENT)

Specialties	Graduates in current year		Employed Graduates		Employment, %	Arrival on place of allocation %	Region
	Total	State grantôs graduates	Total	State grantôs graduates			
Total							

XI. Academic staff (Standard: 5 SUPERVISION)

	Average age	Staff with academic degree and status (%)	Work on			Have academic degree				Have academic status		Members of National Science Academy of the Republic of Kazakhstan	Members of Public science academies	Scholars, laureates of premiums and competitions
			1,0 rate	0,5 rate	0,25 rate	MRes / MSc	Candidate of Science	Doctoral degree	PhD	Professor	Associate Professor			
Full-time academic staff														
Part-time academic staff														
Total Academic staff														
Among them women														

XI. Institutionôs Research capacity (Standard: 1 RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT)

A) Research priorities

Name of theme of Research Projects (funding from State Budget)	Customer and source of financing	Researcher - Leader	Time of accomplishment	Organizations-joint participants, including international partners	Number of publications in RK	Number of publications abroad	Number of author certificates, licenses, diploma on innovation	Number of implemented research products
Total								

Brief description of the higher education institution research facilities

B) Faculty capacity (Standard: 5 SUPERVISION)

Specialty	Specialty code	Scientific degree				Academic status		Members of National Academy of Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan	Members of public science academies	Members of professional associations/ scientific societies	Emeritus Professor of Kazakhstan or other countries universities
		Master	Candidate of science	Doctor of science	PhD	Professor	Associate Professor				

C) Researchers and academic staff: information about fulfilled thesis (Standard: 1 RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT)

Specialty	Specialty code	Number				
		Research (initiative)	Master programmes	Candidate of Science programme (according to ald system)	Doctoral sprogrammes	PhD programmes

D) Scientific and academic staff: information about approved thesis and awarding the degrees (Standard: 1 RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT)

Specialty	Specialty code	Number				
		Research (initiative)	Master programmes	Candidate of Science programme (according to ald system)	Doctoral programmes	PhD programmes

XII. Physical facilities and educational recourses
(Standard: 1 RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT)

Information about institution buildings

No. of building	Total area sq. m	Active area sq. m	Lecture rooms sq. m	Office, administrative locations sq. m	Halls, other paces sq.m
Total					

Information about student campuses/hostels (Standard: 1 RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT)

	No. (name) of campus, address and telephone	Type of campus (sectional/other type)	Built	Year of reconstruction		Total Space	Number of beds	Number of students needed in campus/hostels
				Full	Current			
Total								

XII. Higher Education Institution Library Resources (Standard: 1 RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT)

A) Library

Name of library	Category	Total area of library (sq. m)	Books-stock area, sq. m	Number of seats in Library	Number of booksô distribution centre

B) Library recourses

Total	Among them:			From overall number																			
				Textbooks				Scientific literature				Fiction				Periodical publications				Electronic publications			
	In Kazakh	In Russian	In English	Total	In Kazakh	In Russian	In English	Total	In Kazakh	In Russian	In English	Total	In Kazakh	In Russian	In other languages	Total	In Kazakh	In Russian	In other languages	Total	In Kazakh	In Russian	In other languages

Library activity

Number of readers			Number of attendance per year	Distribution of books per year, number		Getting literature		Libraryôs staff
On unitary library ticket	Including students	On all divisions		total	Including textbooks	total	Including textbooks	

XIV. Information and communication resources (Standard: 1 RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT)

No.	Computers number	Number of students per computer	Number of computers connected to Internet	WI - FI access

XV. Facility for studentsô support (Standard: 3 ADMISSION POLICY AND CRITERIA)

XVI. International cooperation (Standard: 1 RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT)

Information about cooperation with international partners			
Country	Organization	Name of programme/project, cooperation area	Period and Terms for collaboration

REFERENCES

1. Standards for PhD education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in Europe. Organisation for PhD Education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in the European System (ORPHEUS), Association of Medical Schools in Europe (AMSE), World Federation for Medical Education (WFME); 2011. (http://wfme.org/standards/phd/57-standards-for-phd-education-in-biomedicine-and-health-sciences-in-europe/file)
2. Best Practices for PhD Training Based on the ORPHEUS ï AMSE ï WFME Standards for PhD Education in Biomedicine and Health Sciences in Europe, First published 2016 by ORPHEUS/AMSE (http://orpheus-med.org/images/stories/documents/ORPHEUS Best Practices DOCUMENT 2016.pdf)
3. Bologna Process: framework of qualifications of the European Higher Education Area. (www.bologna-bergen-2005.no/EN/BASIC/050520_Framework_qualifications.pdf.)
4. Postgraduate Medical Education. WFME Global Standards for Quality Improvement. World Federation for Medical Education (WFME); New edition. 2015. (http://wfme.org/standards/pgme/97-final-2015-revision-of-postgraduate-medical-education-standards/file, accessed 19 December 2016).
5. WFME Standards for Masterôs Degrees in Medical and Health Professions Education (revision 2016) WFME Office 2016 (http://wfme.org/standards/standards-for-master-s-degrees-in-medical-and-health-professions-education, accessed 29 December 2016)
6. WFME Global Standards for Quality Improvement in Medical Education. European Specifications. The World Federation for Medical Education (WFME) and The Association of Medical Schools in Europe (AMSE); 2007 (http://wfme.org/standards/european-specifications/21-europeanspecifications-english/file, accessed 19 December 2016).
7. WHO-WFME Guidelines for Accreditation of basic medical education. Geneva/Copenhagen: WFME, 2005 (http://wfme.org/accreditation/whowfme-policy/28-2-who-wfme-guidelines-for-accreditation-of-basic-medical-education-english/file, accessed 20 November 2016).
8. Promotion of Accreditation of Basic Medical Education. A Programme within the Framework of the WHOïWFME Strategic Partnership to Improve Medical Education. WFME Office: The Panum Institute, Faculty of Health Sciences University of Copenhagen; November 2005 (http://wfme.org/accreditation/whowfme-policy/30-1-promotion-of-accreditation-of-basic-medical-education-who-wfme-strategic-partnership/file, accessed 20 November 2016).
9. Lindgren S, Karle H. Social accountability of medical education: Aspects on global accreditation. Med Teach. 2011; 33:667-72.
10. Global Standards for Quality Improvement of Medical Education. Status of the WFME Programme Initiated In 1997, WFME Office:University of Copenhagen;2011;Modified on

August 2014 (http://wfme.org/standards/world-standards-programme, accessed 20 November 2016).
11. The WFME Programme for Recognition of Accrediting Agencies for Medical Education. Introduction; March2013, revised June 2016 (http://wfme.org/documents/accreditation/accreditation-agencies/background/70-1-recognition-of-accreditation-agencies-introduction/file, accessed 20 November 2016).
12. ORPHEUS PhD Quality Indicators: The Izmir 2011 Consensus Document. Consensus document from the sixth ORPHEUS Conference, Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir, 27-30 April 2011 **(**http://www.orpheus-med.org/index.php/izmir-consensus-document)