

---

# THE MARKERS OF QUALITY OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN MODERN REALITIES: THE 'IDEOLOGICAL TRIAD' OF THE STUDY OF THE VALUE EXPERIENCE FORMATION

---



**Alla Semenova, Dr. Sc., Prof.**

Director, Educational and Research Centre  
“Pedagogical Skills of a High School Teacher”,  
State University of Intellectual Technologies  
and Communications  
Odesa, Ukraine

[semenova.alla.vasilivna@gmail.com](mailto:semenova.alla.vasilivna@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8077-3385>

**Oleh Hrabovskyi, PhD, Assoc. Prof.**

Vice-Rector for Educational Work,  
State University of Intellectual Technologies  
and Communications  
Odesa, Ukraine

[gelond737@gmail.com](mailto:gelond737@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7134-3682>

**Valerij Yani, Specialist-Engineer (Radio Engineering  
and Telecommunications)**

Senior Lecturer, Department of Radio-Electronic  
and Telecommunication Systems,  
Odessa Polytechnic National University  
Odesa, Ukraine

[yani.valerij1951@gmail.com](mailto:yani.valerij1951@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3928-101X>

**To cite this article:**

Semenova, A., Hrabovskyi, O., & Yani, V. (2021). The markers of quality of the educational process of higher education institutions in modern realities: the ‘ideological triad’ of the study of the value experience formation. *Education: Modern Discourses*, (4), 122-134.

<https://doi.org/10.37472/2617-3107-2021-4-12>

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the paper is to specify the quality markers of the educational process of higher education on the basis of scientific theoretical, methodological and practical research as the most important element of the internal quality assurance system of higher education. The results obtained: The paper proves that the urgent task in terms of improving the quality of higher education is necessity to study and specify the markers of assessing the quality of higher education*

---

*in the modern realities of professional development of research and teaching staff. Within the framework of the Centre for Pedagogical Skills of a Higher School Teacher in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, markers of the quality of the higher school educational process in modern realities have been identified and specified from the positions of student, teacher and quality expert. The result of this work was an understanding of the need for a methodological audit of educational components. A questionnaire was compiled, which helps to verify specific data for analysis and further evaluation, providing recommendations. Evaluating the effectiveness of the educational process is a comprehensive procedure in which the teacher must be clear about the relationship between the predicted learning outcomes and ways to set goals to achieve them at the time of course development.*

**Keywords:** *learning outcomes; markers for assessing the quality of the educational process; methodical audit of educational components; pedagogical skills; quality of higher education.*

## INTRODUCTION

It is important today for methodological services, teachers, scientists and developers of educational standards, experts in the field of public education policy to find answers to the question: what are or should be objective criteria for assessing the quality of higher education in modern blended learning? The answer to this question will help identify and ensure high educational outcomes and demand from employers' stakeholders. Within modern approaches to the quality of higher education the traditional ask questions are the following: *Who teaches? Who is taught? How do they teach?* And the main question – *What are the results?* In these matters, the core aspects of scientific reflection determine the most important tasks of higher education: flexibility, the ability to adapt to it in a rapidly changing environment. This applies to both the educational system and its product, i.e. a qualified specialist, with a fairly high level of professional standardized competencies and a “set” of soft-skills in the form of learning outcomes. Therefore, usually when it comes to the quality of higher education or in-service teacher training, the focus is on learning outcomes. And declaring slogan such in higher education there has been a “transition from the assimilation of information to the formation of qualities necessary for creative activity and constant acquisition of new information and the development of flexible, hybrid skills”; that “the main guideline of education is the formation of a creative thinking personality that is capable of self-development” remains largely just a slogan. Therefore, the urgent task in terms of improving the quality of higher education is the need to study and specify the markers of evaluation of the educational process of higher education in the modern realities of professional development of research and teaching staff.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Currently, based on the results of systematic research on educational quality in Ukraine and the world, Vice President of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine V. Luhovyi formulated strategically important proposals to ensure and improve the quality of higher education, i.e. “The development of education quality monitoring and evaluation” for the years 2021–2031. The reasons of insufficient educational quality are identified, i.e. imperfection of university networks, system of mechanisms of monitoring and evaluation of quality; argued the need to practically ensure and improve the quality of higher education to distinguish and take into account the duality of the quality category (the minimum sufficient and the most perfect), as well as the motivation of quality educational activities (commitment and

encouragement to achieve quality) (Luhovyi, 2020). In practice, there are no ideal evaluation systems, and each one in use has its own strengths and weaknesses.

From November 7 to December 10, 2021, the organizers of the Learning Together Project together with the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, the Institute for Modernization of Educational Content, the Ukrainian Institute for Educational Development, the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine conducted a practice-oriented pilot training course “Autumn School of Creators of Modern Educational Materials” for authors, developers of educational materials, including digital, for general secondary education institutions, editors of educational content, designers of educational literature. The main purpose of this course was to highlight modern approaches to the development of effective educational materials with a rethinking of their didactic functions, content, forms and stages of creating effective modern digital educational content; general principles of textbook architecture.

On November 16, 2021 the Academician-Secretary of the Department of General Secondary Education of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine O. Lyashenko within the 4<sup>th</sup> Module of the course: “Modern scientific and pedagogical approaches to the development of educational materials (including textbooks, manuals, digital educational resources)” analysed the issues of transformation of the content of education under conditions of different paradigms in the report “Modern textbook: content carrier or content manager?”. He stressed the existence of the “ideological triad of the modern paradigm of education” as an integration of three well-known in pedagogy and tested in educational practice approaches – personality-oriented, activity and competence (Liashenko, 2021). Note that the existing approaches are directly related to the assessment of the quality of education, which are represented by three models, but they consider differently the mechanisms for determining its effectiveness. Thus, for the approach in terms of **content**, the main question is “*What is planned to teach?*” within the educational component – the discipline of the educational programme: what educational topics, tasks and criteria for their evaluation outline the list of competencies stated in the standard and, accordingly, in the educational programme of the appropriate level.

The approach in terms of the **results** is aimed at the procedure of diagnosis and evaluation of the declared competencies (a dynamic combination of knowledge, skills, abilities, ways of thinking, views, values, other personal qualities, which determines a person’s ability to successfully socialize, conduct professional and / or further educational activities (Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy, 2017) that are already formed in applicants for higher education who have completed the course, i.e. the educational component of the programme. This approach should answer the question: “*What did you get?*”

In the same movement, systemic changes in the content of education are introduced (Ovcharuk, 2003). The set of requirements for the content and results of educational activities at all levels of higher education within each specialty is set by the relevant standard. Standards are used to determine and evaluate the results of educational activities of these institutions (Bondarenko et al., 2021). Standardization of education at all levels is concretized in the thesis that: the transformation of educational content is primarily determined by a fundamentally different approach to its selection and structuring, which should be subject to the end result of the educational process – mastering certain competencies (Sysoeva, 2008). The difference between learning outcomes and competencies is that the former are formulated by teachers at the level of the educational programme, as well as at the level of a particular discipline, and competencies are acquired by learners (Rashkevich, 2018). Another feature of learning outcomes is that, in contrast to competencies, they must be clearly measurable.

According to the methodology of the international project “Tuning educational structures

in Europe” (TUNING), which was initiated in 2000 by the European universities with the active support of the European Commission to combine the political goals of the Bologna Process and the Lisbon Strategy for the European Education: what a student is expected to know, understand, be able to demonstrate after graduation; the results can be related to a separate module or also to the period of study (educational program of the first, second or third cycles) (Cedefop, 2011).

The Law of Ukraine “On Higher Education” states that learning outcomes are a set of knowledge, skills, abilities and other competencies acquired by a person in the process of learning a certain educational, professional, educational and scientific programme that can be identified, quantified and measured (Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy, 2017a). The National Educational and Scientific Glossary contains the following interpretation: learning outcome is a set of competencies that express knowledge, understanding, skills, values and other personal qualities acquired by a student after completing an educational programme or its separate component (Natsionalnyi osvithno-naukovyi hlosarii, 2018). These definitions are very close, they do not contradict the classical European interpretation, but do not emphasize the element of expectation (learning outcomes are planned by teachers) and the need to demonstrate (mandatory full and comprehensive assessment of the fact and quality of student achievement), do not reveal the essence of the educational process their formation.

The approach from the point of view of the **educational process**, i.e. the direct learning process should provide an answer to another question: *What really happens during pedagogical interaction?* Here, the “actual” cognitive-psychological, physiological phenomena and processes that take place in communication are subject to analysis, when those who study, together with the teacher carry out cognitive activities in the classroom (real or virtual) or outside it independently. If the task of re-awareness and scientific and methodological explanation of modern features of the algorithm for designing work programs of disciplines, in particular their design with forecasting criteria for measuring specific learning outcomes more or less already studied by scientists (Bondarenko et al., 2021), the aspect of the quality of the educational process of higher education in modern realities in the categories of educational dimensions in terms of the educational process requires urgent research.

This approach is the approach from the point of view of the **process** and seems to us the least obvious, but quite significant in terms of assessing the quality of higher education. Although the “additional effects” of the process of direct higher education, the organization of effective pedagogical action, its consequences are not always directly related to the criteria for diagnosing the declared projected learning outcomes.

It is considered a difficult task for us to formulate an exhaustive list of issues within this approach, even for a specialist in the field of educational measurements. Here are just a few questions: “*Did the student feel comfortable while studying the course?*”, “*Did the student feel insightful?*”, “*Has a new value life experience been formed?*”, “*Are there any behavioural patterns that are not directly related to the educational program and are not included in the planned individual educational trajectory?*”, “*Has an active community been created in the academic group?*”.

It should be noted that the study of methodology, theory and practice of pedagogical interaction is thoroughly studied by teachers-researchers of the scientific school of the founder of pedagogical skills, Academician I. Zyazyun (1930 – 2014) (Zyazyun, 2008). Within this concept, the manifestation of pedagogical skills in the organization of pedagogical action depends on the extent to which the teacher’s chosen didactic, psychological, communicative support of the educational process contributes to the solution of relevant tasks.

## METHODOLOGY

The methodological basis of the study is determined by: provisions on the general connection, interdependence and integrity of the phenomena and processes of development of society, a holistic approach to the social essence of the individual as a subject of development; principles of interrelation of theory and practice, pedagogical skill.

The study was based on the philosophical principles of the theory of scientific knowledge as a social, multidimensional, dynamic phenomenon, defined by a unified format in the form of a standard of educational competence; scientific works of researchers and practitioners on innovative transformations in the higher education system.

The theoretical basis of the study was a multidisciplinary multifaceted characterization, analysis and evaluation of basic concepts of educational policy, ideas, positions and conclusions in the scientific literature in the following areas: methodological approaches of comparative pedagogy to the study of educational phenomena abroad in connection with the social and cultural context, in the dimension of national and world transformations; design of educational systems and pedagogical design.

Criteria evaluation that provides an opportunity to form an idea of the standard result and is based on the provisions of criterion analysis, i.e. the method of similarity theory and mathematical programming. This means that this standard should be described in detail in the work program of the discipline, i.e. the educational component.

## MAIN RESULTS

Adhering to the ideas of Pedagogy of Good, based on the principles of Pedagogical Skills, the authors of this article, as well as 100% of educators in a pandemic, tried to rethink and transform their own teaching activities as well as within the work of the centre “Pedagogical Skills of Higher Education Teachers” to help colleagues to do so. After all, the traditional components (didactic, psychological, communicative support) were supplemented by digital support: mandatory Internet connection, appropriate gadgets and practical skills of participants to interact in new remote conditions. As a result of almost two years of methodological and theoretical research, professional and methodological work with teachers, practical teaching experience in freelance and «mixed format», pedagogical self-reflection, it became possible to identify and specify markers of quality of higher education in modern realities.

In the first months of the lockdown, it seemed obvious to us that qualitatively, quantitatively and impartially objectively measuring these markers would be a daunting task. Therefore, at the beginning of scientific, psychological and pedagogical research and work with teachers, we first tried to justify the answers to a number of questions: “*Should we specify and evaluate markers of educational process quality in terms of value experience, not results?*”; “*How to do it?*”; “*Why is it necessary to intensify feedback in the dyads “teacher-teacher”, “student-teacher”, “student-student”?*”; “*Should we even try to measure the quality of pedagogical interaction and teach teachers this?*”.

The first step in the research was a creative rethinking of the components of the ideal model of pedagogical interaction from the standpoint of theory and methodology of pedagogical skills in terms of assessing the quality of the educational process from the perspectives: “student”, “teacher”, “quality expert-specialist in educational measurements”. For ease of analysis and further work, the established lists of markers were structured in the Table 1:

Table 1

**Markers for assessing the quality of pedagogical interaction in higher education from the standpoint of the subjects “student”, “teacher”, “quality expert”**

A Student markers 1	A Teacher markers 2	An Expert markers 3
1.1) High level of student motivation.	2.1) The teacher and his subject	3.1) Purpose and objectives of the course / lesson, target orientation.
1.2) Mutual understanding between teacher and students. Trust in the teacher as a specialist.	2.2) Didactic and communicative support of the course - educational component.	3.2) Professional position of the teacher.
1.3) High level of cognitive activity of students.	2.3) Personal orientation of the student.	3.3) Technologies of pedagogical management of the educational process (teaching and learning).
1.4) Mutual satisfaction of teachers and students with joint activities.	2.4) The personal component of the teacher.	3.4) Evaluation of the educational process based on learning outcomes.

Organization and holding of classes with students of the second degree of higher education “Master” of the Educational Programme “011: Educational Measurements” within the course “Professional Pedagogy” of the State University of Intellectual Technologies and Communications; classes with students of III degree of higher education, candidate of sciences of all specialties of the National University “Odessa Polytechnic” within the course “Psychology and pedagogy of higher school”; classes with students of advanced training courses for research and teaching staff “Pedagogical skills of teachers of higher educational institutions” with subsequent reflection and systematic feedback (Kolomiets & Semenova, 2020) it became possible to rethink and specify these markers for assessment of the quality of pedagogical interaction from the position of subjects “student”, “teacher”, “quality expert”.

Note that in the process of such work, study participants changed roles. Thus, students conducted “mini-lectures” (Semenova, 2015) for graduate students and teachers with the preparation of presentations-summaries and the development of practical tasks for assessing learning outcomes, i.e. competencies; graduate students acted as “quality experts”, “teachers” and “students”. This form of work allowed calibrating the expectations of the participants of the educational process and the actual results obtained in comparison with traditional ones. Let’s explain the essential content of these markers for assessing the quality of pedagogical interaction in higher education from the standpoint of the subjects “student”, “teacher”, “quality expert” in their manifestations in the modern realities of the educational process:

**1. A Student’s markers**

In the reflective surveys we conducted after each Viber class, both students and graduate students on the content as well as before the introduction of quarantine restrictions (Semenova, 2014) stated that:

**1.1) High level of student motivation.** “It is interesting to learn when you feel that it is just as interesting for a teacher to teach. Our classes, although in Zoom, are a time of joint work, creative atmosphere of knowledge and joint search, joint life activities.

**1.2) Mutual understanding between teacher and students. Trust in the teacher as a**

*specialist*. “Trust in a teacher is when he is a competent specialist, an outstanding person who understands and respects students” sees a person. “When the teacher’s demands are fair, then there is a desire to work together.

1.3) *High level of cognitive activity of students*. “A teacher is really interested in students’ answers, reflections, conclusions, responds quickly to questions in the chat, explains”.

1.4) *Mutual satisfaction of teachers and students with joint activities*. Satisfaction of teachers and students with joint activities was determined after each lesson by writing two traditional reflective sentences in the chat by each participant: “It was useful for me today to learn / do, etc.”, “I was interested today...”. If students are enriched with new attractive information, discovered and demonstrated their abilities, received recognition in the audience, the teacher is also satisfied with the cooperation with students; satisfied with the fact that he passed on to them a share of his professional value experience, he was convinced that his work had yielded positive results.

The negative points about the identification of student profiles: Anime instead of a photo on the Avatar, or funny Nicky instead of his name, “camera does not turn on”, etc., which took place at the beginning of the pandemic, later students themselves were perceived as negative. Students’ views on their own confidence in the classroom, comfort in communication have not changed. Except for those objective cases when there was no connection with the teacher.

A modern student now, as well as before quarantine restrictions, feels confident in class if:

- “my teacher is my mentor, advisor, I trust him, I accept his help”;
- “I feel my personal equivalence in communication with the teacher, show activity, initiative, realize the need for self-expression”;
- “I believe in myself, I look for reserves in myself to achieve success, I overcome difficulties in learning”;
- “I feel the teacher’s interest in myself as a person, his interest in the results of my studies, I get in touch with the teacher”;
- “I find personal meaning in my studies, I feel involved in the collective work, I have the opportunity to experience the joy of success”.

Components / “markers” of building classes in distance pedagogical interaction, as a general social creativity of teachers and students, which takes place in the form of “meeting through the screen” in line with real dialogue and prevents formalization of relations forced teachers to change attitudes to their professional teaching.

## 2. A Teacher’s markers

2.1) *A teacher and his subject*. Of course, if the teacher sees in the course that teaches not a set of information and tasks for the formation and verification of standard competencies and projected tasks for their diagnosis and evaluation, and a means of harmonious development of the future professional – then before meeting with those you teach, it is important not just “know the content of the topic”, but to understand its practical essence, to determine their own personal attitude to what will be discussed, to look at the usual topic as the subject of future problematic discussion with students. It was not uncommon for teachers to be confused by the fact that they were forced to change the structure of their own classes from monotonous-mentoring reading to dialogue and discussion. Again and again they had to rethink the answers to the question: *What attracts me to this topic? What can I do to make tomorrow’s lesson useful for students? What will be the conversation with students, i.a. about “concepts”, “rules”, “images”, “formulas” or about what awakens in them certain thoughts, emotions, attitudes, forms skills?*

2.2) *Didactic and communicative support of the course, i.e. educational component*. The communicative support of the educational component is a system of ways to organize

productive interaction between teacher and students in the educational process, becomes possible through professional and pedagogical communicative training of teachers (Zyazyun, 2008, p. 25), which includes:

- Definition of communicative tasks for each type / form of occupation;
- The use of relevant methods of emotional impact on the student's personality;
- Achieving emotional unity of teachers and students, mutual understanding between them by determining their own psychological position in the classroom (*I – Informant? Caregiver? Assistant? Administrator? Psychotherapist? Counsellor?*);
- Ensuring the emotional security of the student (the student feels psychological comfort, is not afraid to make mistakes in the answer, trusts the teacher) by demonstrating “wise strength”, confidence, openness in communication, aesthetic taste;
- The choice of model of appearance as an element of non-verbal influence (clothing, hairstyle, facial expressions, and pantomime) has changed somewhat: before the camcorder should take into account shadows and glare on the face from the effects of additional lighting. As with television, purple colours in clothing are not recommended (they vary the most depending on the image settings in gadgets), small images in clothing (especially cells) on screens usually tend to “flicker” and negatively affect visual perception;
- The direction of the organization of the space of the “virtual” audience will be the placement of the screen and the board – on the background of which there will be a teacher. It is desirable not to «merge» with the background colour. It is just as important for students to see the expression on the teacher's face, because facial expressions, looks (directly into the video camera) as a channel of communication become more significant than in “live” communication in the audience. It is advisable to check the design of presentations in screen demonstration modes in advance. The ability to videotape classes with subsequent viewing by the teacher will quickly correct the identified errors.

**2.3) Personal orientation of the student.** The teacher's satisfaction of students' needs in personalization, public recognition of their success is achieved by helping those who are taught by the teacher to find personal meaning in the classroom, feel the need for self-development, see the prospects of individual educational trajectory of personal self-development. Students' efforts should be encouraged, positively approved, which will allow the student to more comfortably express their individuality.

**2.4) The personal component of the teacher.** The teacher's attention as a leader of students' cognitive activity through the prism of their own practice will allow the teacher to transmit / share their own valuable experience. Defining value experience, in the aspect of I. Zyazyun's Concept of pedagogical skill, continuing to develop ideas of scientific school, we interpret this concept as dynamic change of relations of the Person with the World, transition from social and normative (“adult”) level to spiritual and value relations. , as the highest form of activity of the subject, the manifestation of the ability of the individual to rise above the level of regulatory requirements; it is a process of conscious, creative, value-transforming activity (Semenova, 2016).

The constant reliance on students' experience, which they can already relay as their own value and true dialogue becomes possible only when it is organized by a strong, creative, active person and a competent professional, a person who can lead, “infect” their subject, to stimulate by their own example to active actions and search for those they teach (Semenova, 2018). Today's teacher should teach not only the discipline of the specialty - he teaches professional communication, both in the real world and in the virtual: he teaches understanding and perception of himself as a future professional and the perception of others (Semenova, 2019).

A productive pedagogical interaction is the result of the work of thought, heart, mobilization of will, skilful use of pedagogical techniques by the teacher.

As noted by the founder of Pedagogical Skills, Academician I. Zyazyun (Zyazyun, 2009), the assessment of the quality of teaching has always been one of the most difficult and controversial issues in the assessment of teaching skills. In the conditions of commercial educational service (training programs, seminars, courses, etc.), when the consumer pays for it, this assessment is quite simple – the “bad” teacher students “do not go”; distance, virtual courses do not pay.

In the state education system, the situation is more complicated: on the one hand, a student in the classroom does not feel like those who control the situation (“If I leave the lecture, nothing will change”), and on the other – he/she may not be interested in information, which he/she receives (“I came here to” be present”; for a diploma; I do not care what you say there; I’ll see later in the presentation”). In this case, the requirements for tools for assessing and self-assessment of teachers’ skills in organizing pedagogical interaction with its main actors increase, as they can easily become an instrument of abuse, as by those taught (empty flattery or shame for feeling helpless student), and teachers themselves (Semenova, 2016).

The importance of emotional awareness as a recognition of one’s own emotions and their impact on pedagogical activities was emphasized by Zinchenko (Zinchenko, 1995), Zyazyun (Zyazyun, 2008), Stones (Stones, 1984) and others. D. Goleman (Goleman, 2010) quite clearly characterized professionals who have the skills of emotional awareness, as people who know what emotions they feel and why; imagine the connection between their own feelings and what they think, do and say; enjoy guiding emotional awareness of their own values and goals (Semenova, 2014). This awareness supports the motivation for their own actions, aligning them with the feelings of others and promotes the development of useful social skills that are very important for leadership and teamwork.

### **3. Expert markers**

These markers of the quality of the educational process of higher education should not be compared with the criteria for evaluating educational programs in the accreditation procedure NAME. After all, the purpose of such procedures is different, although it has common ground.

**3.1) *The purpose and objectives of the course / lesson, target orientation.*** The goals and objectives of the educational component, its focus on achieving the overall goal of the educational program, compliance with training standards are complemented by provisions: on the student as a subject of study, equal to the teacher involved in the educational process; about the development of the student’s personality in its entirety (and not only the formation of specific competencies) in the educational process, the development of his creative potential.

**3.2) *Professional position of the teacher.*** A teacher’s professional position and pedagogical skills correspond to the provisions of the Professional Standard for the group of professors “Teachers of Higher Education”, approved by the order of the Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine as of 23.03.2021 № 610. The aspects of the development of the emotional and volitional sphere of students in the list of criteria for evaluating educational programmes by experts of the National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance in the accreditation procedure is not paid special attention. After all, it is logical that such issues are not the task of accreditation of the educational programmes.

**3.3) *Technologies of pedagogical management of the educational process (teaching and learning).*** The main mechanism of pedagogical management of the educational process (teaching and learning) should determine the nature of cognitive activity and the position of students in the study of the educational component – the course / discipline. Note that even experienced

teachers with many years of scientific and pedagogical experience and author's "years-old" teaching methods, in the new environment, realizing that established approaches do not work, it was difficult to answer the question "What and how I need to change in organization of the educational process under new circumstances?"

The choice of the leading methodical system of the teacher, mechanisms of pedagogical management of educational process is very individual and variable (Semenova, 2020). Even the presence of a teacher-developed **educational and methodological complex (EMC)** to provide an educational component (a set of normative and educational materials needed to teach the subject (working program of the discipline; textbook; textbooks; manuals) guidelines for all types of practical and laboratory work, all types of practices and writing calculation and graphic works, course projects and qualification work, collections of exercises and tasks, modular control tests, exam tickets, etc.) is a necessary but insufficient condition for determining the productive mechanisms of pedagogical management of the educational process by the teacher.

We consider the educational and methodical complex (**EMC**) as a mandatory normative set, which only under the conditions of practical integration with the **technologies of pedagogical management (TPM)** of the educational process creates a **didactic complex (DC)**.

**Didactic Complex (DC)** – didactic and methodological support of the educational process of a specific educational component – course / discipline, which creates an information and educational environment for mastering a particular subject area.

**DC = EMC + TPM**, it is the integration of information and technological support for teaching the subject.

From such positions, the understanding and role of **EMC** in the educational process in the new conditions of "blended learning" is changing. These changes primarily concern textbooks. After all, the textbook in the DC is the most important part of technological support for the implementation of all 3 approaches to learning (practical tasks of a motivating nature, organization of project activities, differentiation by level according to Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956) and educational needs, etc.).

**3.4) Evaluation of the educational process based on learning outcomes.** Evaluating the effectiveness of the educational process based on learning outcomes – diagnosing qualitative and quantitative indicators of relevant competencies is currently a key issue in ensuring the quality of higher education. The development of the European Higher Education Area has resulted in significant progress in this area. As evidenced by the adoption of "Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area" (ESG – "Standards and Guidelines") – the first version of which was adopted in 2005. A new version of this document was approved at the International Ministerial Conference in Yerevan in May 2015.

One of the main differences between the 2015 edition and the 2005 edition is the existence of standard 1.3 "Student-centered learning, teaching and assessment", which defines the requirements (standard) that educational institutions must meet in order to recognize their student-centered learning model – «educational institutions should provide such teaching of programs that encourages students to actively participate in the creation of the educational process, and such an assessment of students that reflects this approach" (ENQA, 2015, p. 11).

Thus, the quality of student learning depends on how the assessment complex is formed, and that is why assessment is considered by the academic community as perhaps the most important element of the internal quality assurance system of higher education. Note that evaluation, as part of the quality assurance system of education, aims to:

- support in providing the student with the opportunity to achieve the desired learning outcomes (Support learning);

- quantitative assessment of the degree of student achievement of the desired learning outcomes (Generate grades);
- development of students' self-assessment skills – to ensure their effective further learning (Future judgments).

Thus, the authors continued their practical research to specify the markers of the quality of the higher education process in modern realities, their structural characteristics that can be assessed and which mistakes should be avoided. The result of this work was an understanding of the need for a methodological audit of educational components. A questionnaire was compiled, which helps to verify specific data for analysis and further evaluation, providing recommendations. The questionnaire is structured by blocks:

1. Understanding of the target audience of the course by the organizers of the training.
2. Methodical concept of the course and logic of teaching.
3. Educational environment of the course.
4. Quality of educational content.
5. Quality of practical classes.
6. Data obtained during the training of previous streams.
7. Training support.
8. Distribution of roles accompanying the course.
9. Sufficiency of resources for launching new streams, simultaneous training of several streams of students.

## CONCLUSIONS

Summing up, we emphasize that evaluating the effectiveness of the educational process based on learning outcomes is a comprehensive procedure in which the teacher must be aware of the relationship between projected learning outcomes and ways to set goals to achieve them at the time of course development. Thus, the technological cycle of design, development, implementation and evaluation of the educational component is closed.

Noting that the integrated goals of the educational component - the course, which must be clearly articulated by the teacher combine 3 approaches (content, internal and external learning processes, i.e. learning, results), they are the basis of the didactic complex of the course. Asking the questions “*What should be the educational experience in the new reality? How do these circumstances affect the educational experience of teachers and students, and what can the administration and methodological services do to improve the situation?*” The authors at the next stage of the work, realizing that for almost two years we have been living in a world with the COVID-19 pandemic and forced restrictions, in an atmosphere of uncertainty and anxiety, continued research to find answers to these questions.

Ways of setting goals: 1) Formulation of goals through the content of the discipline; 2) Formulation of goals through the activities of teachers and students; 3) Setting goals through the internal processes of intellectual, personal, emotional, etc. aspects of student development.

Thus, the logical starting point of scientific and pedagogical research was a clear understanding that the markers of the quality of the higher education process in modern realities should be considered in its entirety: from implementation strategy to content development and performance evaluation. Teachers-developers of educational components, along with technical support for online courses, sought to make learning useful and exciting. But “*How to understand that the desired result has been achieved?*” This is not always obvious, and it is impossible to make an informed decision without specific markers. “*Should we leave*

*everything as it is, work on improving the course or close it altogether and not waste resources?»* And often the fate of both the course and the entire educational program will depend on the answer to these questions. It turns out that without evaluating the effectiveness, analysis and research of markers cannot do.

The results of scientific research of theoretical concretization and methodological and practical implementation of markers for assessing the quality of higher education in modern realities have shown that methodological audit can identify shortcomings that are easy to eliminate, but can identify errors that require time and other resources. After the teaching expert has voiced his / her recommendations, the teacher, together with the educational program support team, and the administration of the higher education institution usually decide on the fate of the course. If you choose to refine the educational product, the teacher can make changes yourself or re-engage an expert. It is important to note that the work on improving the course is a separate task, which should not be «confused» with the audit of the quality of the educational process.

## REFERENCES

- Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. & Krathwohl, D. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. Volume I: The cognitive domain*. McKay.
- Bondarenko, V. D., Savielieva, O. S., Semenova, A. V. (2021). Vymiry yakosti vyshchoi osvity: neobkhdnist ta suchasni trendy abo proektuvannya robochykh program navchalnykh dystsyplin. *Vyshcha shkola: nauково-praktychne vydannia, 1-2 (198)*, 75–96. [https://www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/2021\\_1\\_2.pdf](https://www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/2021_1_2.pdf)
- Cedefop. (2011). *Glossary: Quality in education and training*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/publications/4106>
- ENQA. (2015). Standarty i rekomendatsii shchodo zabezpechennia yakosti v Yevropeiskomu prostori vyshchoi osvity (ESG). CS Ltd. [http://www.britishcouncil.org.ua/sites/default/files/standards-and-guidelines\\_for\\_qa\\_in\\_the\\_ehea\\_2015.pdf](http://www.britishcouncil.org.ua/sites/default/files/standards-and-guidelines_for_qa_in_the_ehea_2015.pdf)
- Goleman, D. (2010). *Emocional'nyj intellekt na rabote*. ACT.
- Kolomiets, L. V., Semenova, A. V. (2020). Dystantsiine navchannia ta yakist osvity: paradyhmalna kryza liudynotsentryzmu osvitnoi polityky abo pro rol osobystosti pedahoha. *Vyshcha shkola : nauково-praktychne vydannia, 11-12 (196)*, 7–29. [https://www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/sbornik\\_2020\\_11\\_12.pdf](https://www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/sbornik_2020_11_12.pdf)
- Liashenko, Oleksandr (2021, November, 16). «Suchasnyi pidruchnyk: nosii zmistu chy kontent-menedzher?» vystup na Vebinari «Suchasni nauково-pedahohichni pidkhody do rozroblennia osvitnikh materialiv (zokrema pidruchnykiv, posibnykiv, tsyfrovyykh osvitnikh resursiv)» Retrieved 2021 from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XLIYe8xYCV8>
- Luhovi, V. I. (2020). Problema osvitnoi yakosti v stratehii rozvytku vyshchoi osvity v Ukraini. *Visnyk Natsionalnoi akademii pedahohichnykh nauk Ukrainy, 2(2)*, 2–4.
- Natsionalnyi osvitno-naukovyi hlosarii*. (2018). TOV «KO NVI PRINT».
- Ovcharuk, O. (2003). Kompetentnosti yak kliuch do onovlennia zmistu osvity. In *Stratehiia reformuvannia osvity v Ukraini: rekomendatsii z osvitnoi polityky* (pp. 13–37). K.I.S.
- Rashkevych, Yu. M. (2017). Metodychni rekomendatsii shchodo opysu osvitnoi prohramy v konteksti novykh standartiv vyshchoi osvity. Natsionalnyi Erasmus+ ofis v Ukraini. <http://erasmusplus.org.ua/novyny/1514-ceminar-metodychni-rekomendatsii-shchodo-opysu-osvitnoi-prohramy-v-konteksti-novykh-standartiv-vyshchoi-osvity-24-03-2017.html>

- Semenova, A. V. (2014). Emotsiine usvidomlennia yak konstrukt otsiniuvannia dynamiky rozvytku pedahohichnoi maisternosti vykladachiv vyshchyykh tekhnichnykh navchalnykh zakladiv: psykhopedahohichni pidkhyd. *Teoriia i praktyka upravlinnia sotsialnyimi systemamy Shchokvartalnyi naukovo-praktychnyi zhurnal*, 4, 58–68. <http://repo.uipa.edu.ua/jspui/bitstream/123456789/4089/1/Semenova.pdf>
- Semenova, A. V. (2015). Profesiina pidhotovka interaktyvnoho mini-zaniattia z vykorystanniam multymediinoi prezentatsii dlia vykladachiv – slukhachiv seminaru «Pedahohichna maisternist» na osnovi praktychnykh navychok i tsinnisnoho dosvidu. *Informatsiini tekhnologii i zasoby navchannia*, 2(46), 139–152. <https://journal.iitta.gov.ua/index.php/itlt/article/view/1209>
- Semenova, A. V. (2016). Tsinnisnyi vymir dosvidu subiektiv pedahohichnoi dii: monohrafiia. Bondarenko M. O. [https://www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/semenova/tsinnisnyi\\_vymir.pdf](https://www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/semenova/tsinnisnyi_vymir.pdf)
- Semenova, A. V. (2018). Postneklasychnyi period metodolohichnoho vymiru yednosti neliniinoho syntezu znan v aspekti rozvytku teorii liderstva. «*Lider. Elita. Suspilstvo*». *Shchokvartalnyi naukovo-praktychnyi zhurnal*, 1, 109–123. <http://les.khpi.edu.ua/article/view/2616-3241.2018.1.10>
- Semenova, A. V. (2019). Pedahohichna maisternist vykladacha vyshchoi shkoly XXI stolittia: synerhiia virtualnoho i realnoho v osvithnomu prostori. *ScienceRise: Pedagogical Education*, 2 (29), 40–48. [http://journals.uran.ua/sr\\_edu/article/view/164524](http://journals.uran.ua/sr_edu/article/view/164524)
- Semenova, A. V. (2020). *Profesiina pedahohika: Pidruchnyk*. Bondarenko M. O.
- Stones, E. (1984). *Psihopedagogika: psihologicheskaya teoriya i praktika obucheniya*. Pedagogika. Pedahohyka.
- Sysoieva, S. (2008). Napriamy realizatsii standartiv profesiinykh kvalifikatsii: dosvid Respubliky Polshchi. *Shliakh osvity*. 1(47), 19–22.
- Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. (2017). Zakon Ukrainy «Pro osvitu». *Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady*, 38–39, 380. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19#Text>
- Verkhovna Rada Ukrainy. (2017a). Zakon Ukrainy «Pro vyshchu osvitu» v redaktsii, zatverdzenii postanovoiu KM Ukrainy vid 28.09.2017 r. № 1556-18. *Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady*, 38–39, 380.
- Ziazun, I. A. (2009). *Pedahohichna maisternist: pidruchnyk*. Bohdanova A. M. [http://www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/PM\\_Zyazyun.pdf](http://www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/PM_Zyazyun.pdf)
- Zinchenko, V. P. (1995). *Affekt i intelekt v obrazovanii*. Tryvola.
- Zyazyun, I. A. (2008). *Filosofia pedahohichnoi dii: monohrafiia*. ChNU im. B. Khmelnytskoho. [www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/filosofiya\\_pedagogichnoy\\_dii.pdf](http://www.pedagogic-master.com.ua/public/filosofiya_pedagogichnoy_dii.pdf)