



Agencia Andaluza del Conocimiento  
**CONSEJERÍA DE ECONOMÍA, CONOCIMIENTO, EMPRESAS Y UNIVERSIDAD**

**Dirección de Evaluación y Acreditación**

# **Assessment report for implementation of an Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS)**

**Psychology Faculty**

**Saint Petersburg State University (SPbSU)**



## **1. INFORMATION ON ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE**

### **Subject of the assessment procedure**

This procedure is designed to assess the implementation of an IQAS at the Psychology Faculty, Saint Petersburg State University (SPbSU), according to IMPLANTA program criteria.

**Date of on-site visit:** November 07-09, 2018.

### **Panel members:**

#### **DEVA's Experts:**

**Carmen García Galera, PhD**, Full professor. Universidad Rey Juan Carlos I. Madrid (Spain)

**Belén Floriano Pardal. PhD**, Full professor. Universidad Pablo de Olavide. Sevilla (Spain)

#### **AKKORK's Experts:**

**Dmitriy Zhifinevich.** PhD in Law, assistant professor, Director of the Educational Programs and Educational Policy Department, Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University.

**Alexandra Vorobeva.** PhD in Psychology, assistant professor, Department of Social Psychology, Director of the Educational Programs Quality Assurance Department, RUDN university (People's Friendship University of Russia).

## **2. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

AAC-DEVA (Andalusian Knowledge Agency-Department of Evaluation and Accreditation, Córdoba, Spain) and AKKORK (Autonomous Non-Profit Organization Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance and Career Development, Moscow, Russia) are agencies for assessment and accreditation of Higher Education programmes and institutions. They have signed a cooperation agreement to assess the implementation of Internal Quality Assurance System according to IMPLANTA criteria, with the appropriate adjustments to the Russian Federation, on request of the Saint Petersburg State University (SPbSU, Russia). To this end, a reviewer panel was created, consisting of two Spanish reviewers with the assistance of two Russian reviewers. The Psychology Faculty provided the reviewers' committee with a self-report (English written) which includes the necessary evidences and additional documents (not all of them translated to English).



All members of the review panel participated in a two-day visit to the University in November 2018. The visit agenda was planned in advance, in which meetings and interviews with representatives of different stakeholders (University's management board representatives, Dean, students and graduates of all educational programs under evaluation, employers, and administrative and teaching staff) and a tour to visit the resource facilities for educational programs were included. The visit took place as accorded without any remarkable incident except the participation of the same people in different meetings. This evaluation is based on the self-report, written evidences, additional documents provided on request and during the allegation process, and the testimonies collected during the site-visit.

### **3. ASSESSMENT**

This report includes the assessment of the panel of experts on the implementation of an IQAS at the Faculty of Psychology of the Saint Petersburg State University (SPbSU). To perform this evaluation, the panel of experts has determined the grade of accomplishment of the IQAS to the criteria established in the IMPLANTA Program Guide provided by AAC-DEVA making the appropriate adjustments to the Russian Higher Education system.

This final report results from the analysis of the "Self-evaluation report\_Implanta programme" and all associated evidences, plus all a vast range of internal documents provided by the Saint-Petersburg State University and the testimonies obtained from extensive on-site meetings with the direction board, the academic and administrative staff, the students, the graduates, and the employers. Saint-Petersburg State University allegations to the preliminary report have also been taken into account.

#### **CRITERION 1. PUBLIC INFORMATION AVAILABLE**

<b>CRITERION 1. PUBLIC INFORMATION</b>	<b>Fully Implemented</b>	<b>Substantially Implemented</b>	<b>Not Implemented</b>
The Centre has implemented the processes that guarantee the publication of updated information on its activities and programmes		X	

According to the information provided at the self-report, the publication of the information on the official website seems to be highly regulated by several orders and internal regulations at University level which are fully implemented. The Public Relations Department is responsible for the implementation of the unified public information at University level and periodically monitors that information. However, as IMPLANTA



Program requests, no procedures have been found about how the Faculty makes decisions about the publication of information on its official website, how the effectiveness and satisfaction of the different stakeholders with that information is assessed in a proactive way and how the public information is improved taking into account the stakeholders' feedback. The expert panel is aware that final decisions are taken at the university level. Even though, the IQAs should contain procedures explaining how areas of improvement of public information are identified and how the different stakeholders participate. In the information provided by the Faculty, it has not been possible to find the decision-making structure about public information and how the stakeholders are involved.

The access to the IMPLANTA requested topics such as (i) The Structure, Quality Policy and Strategy of the HEI, (ii) Education Programmes, schedule for the teaching period and the exams, (iii) Teaching staff, applicable regulations, (iv) Administrative Services staff, (v) Student Support Services, (vi) complaints, claims and suggestions system and its results, (vii) stakeholders' satisfaction (education and administrative staff, students, and employers) and (viii) the main results of the educational programs (graduation rate, student drop-out rate, employment rate, etc.) is difficult and requires more than 5 steps in most cases if the direct web link is unknown. Moreover, some important information is located in Blackboard platform which is organized in an unfriendly way for inexperienced users. More importantly, the English version of the official website is different from the Russian one making difficult to foreign students to have access to the results of the IQAS implementation, for example.

There are some issues related to the IMPLANTA requested topics included in this criterion. For instance, there is not clear public information about the Structure, the Quality Policy and the Strategy of the Higher Education Institution (HEI) distinguishing at University and Faculty level. No manual of the IQAS implemented at the Centre has been found on its web page. There is a public Strategic plan until 2020 whose implementation is being monitored by the achievement of 31 targeted indicators at University level. However, is unclear how the Faculty is involved in this plan and no public results at Faculty level have been found. A strategic plan, or similar, at Faculty level has not been found in the provided documentation.

The absence of a unique webpage with all the information related to the IQAS at University and at Faculty level has made very difficult the access of inexperienced users to important information such as IQAS organization (differentiating responsibilities at University and at Faculty levels), stakeholders satisfaction with public information, programmes, orientation and assistance systems, resources, staff, etc. and the improvement plans and their monitoring.



No information about the main results of the educational programmes has been easily found on the website although information on the number of students enrolled, and graduation and employment rates do appear in the accreditation self-report of the bachelor and master degree programmes. Information about employment comes from different sources since *“the system of data collection on the employment of graduates of SPbSU is in the process of formation”* (from bachelor degree self-report). However, no information about student drop-out rate (global data in percentage for each student cohort) and its analysis has been found.

Therefore, although there are ways of acting in the publication of information, they do not seem to respond to a systematic procedure (who makes decisions, what decisions have been made, what information has been considered to make those decisions, what evidence can be found) related to the IQAS.

In accordance with the Rosobrnadzor Order No. 785 dated May 29, 2014 “On approving the requirements for the structure of the official website of the educational organization in the information and telecommunications network “Internet” and the format for presenting information on it, universities must fill the section “Information about the educational organization”. However, it does not contain indications on the program mastering results, as well as the graduate employment data. The information about the quality management system organization is also not included in the required information list, but it is rather positive that SPbSU has included it in the sections list specified in the “Details”.

The Open University policy and the SPbSU virtual reception are identified as very good practices that support the engagement of the University with public information to all the stakeholders.

During the site visit, the different interest groups expressed their satisfaction with the published information. Employers stated that the website is very useful and that they find everything they need (although they do not use it very often). The students know how to find the information they need. For instance, they recognized that they knew the “SPbU Virtual Reception”, and one of them used once and got an answer in less than 48 hours.

**Recommendations:**

RECOMMENDATION 1.- It is highly recommended to make the English web version more similar to the Russian official one. The IQAS information should be included on the English web version.

RECOMMENDATION 2.- The evolution of the main quality assurance (QA) indicators that



apply to the programmes and other indicators from the IQAS or the Strategic Plan should be more visible in all web versions in different languages.

RECOMMENDATION 3.- It is recommended to clarify in the IQAS the level of freedom of the Faculty of Psychology to propose and implement improvements on its public information.

MANDATORY RECOMMENDATION 1.- Include the mechanisms to collect the stakeholders satisfaction with the public information and how this information is used to improve it in the specific procedure of the IQAS to manage public information. The utility of the public information should be evaluated.

## CRITERION 2. POLICY FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE

CRITERION 2. POLICY FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE	Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	Not Implemented
2.1. The Centre has a policy for quality assurance and public strategic goals based on its Quality Assurance System.			
2.2. The Centre has implemented the processes that guarantee the collection, analysis and the use of information (outcomes, data and indicators) for making decisions and teaching quality enhancement.		X	

According to IMPLANTA-DEVA program, the HEIs should have a public policy for quality assurance which is included in their strategic management. It should have a formal status and should be defined by internal and external stakeholders, regularly revised and its achievements publicly analyzed. Quality assurance seems to be highly regulated at the University level by several orders which are published at <https://spbu.ru/sveden/kachestvo-obrazovaniya>. However, all of them are in Russian making very difficult to international stakeholders to understand how the IQAS is organized and implemented, who are the people/commission responsible of each procedure and how each procedure and the whole IQAS is improved. Only the Appendix to the Order of February 08th, 2013 No 400/1 *Fundamentals of Saint-Petersburg State University policy in the field of education quality assurance* has been provided translated to English to the reviewer panel. According to this document, the St





Petersburg State University policy in the field of education quality assurance is based on seven criteria that cover students' quality, quality of educational programs' development, educational and organizational support, information support, quality of the academic staff, control of the academic staff functions and participation of academic staff and students in educational programs improvement. These principles are general for the entire University and seem to be a statement of intentions regarding what needs to be done to ensure quality and how. Moreover, the provision on the internal independent assessment of the quality education (order of July 20th, 2018, No. 7222/1) includes the system description and assessment indicators for educational programmes. However, a procedure explaining how these fundamentals are revised and improved has not been found. During the site-visit, the Faculty stated that there is a process to update the Education Quality Assurance System in which all stakeholders are involved. This system includes a collection of regulations and orders in which the different processes and procedures that ensure quality in education and in which the participation of the different interest groups seems to be substantiated.

As it has been stated above, SPbSU has developed a strategic plan until 2020 whose implementation is being monitored by the achievement of 31 targeted indicators at the University level. However, a strategic plan, or similar, at Faculty level has not been found in the provided documentation and the involvement of the Psychology Faculty in the St Petersburg State University's strategic plan it is not clearly defined.

As it has been already noted, in the information provided by the Faculty of Psychology, a document defined as the IQAS manual could not be found. This basic document usually includes a process map as well as a control panel that shows the functional structure in terms of quality assurance (who makes the decisions), and the procedures (what, who and when) and indicators (with specific definitions and the formula for their calculation) and evidences (results of IQAS implementation) that provide information for improvement. However, it is unknown whether the IQAS implementation at the Faculty level results on the **definition of an improvement plan**, the periodicity of it and the responsible people of its revision and whether the revision of the improvement plan is presented to the stakeholders to get their feedback. More importantly, the reviewer team has found no evidence of an analysis and enhancement procedure about the functioning of the quality assurance system itself.

Related to the mechanisms to obtain information about the satisfaction of the different stakeholders, the review panel verified the existence of several surveys. For instance, it seems that the Faculty conducts three surveys to collect the student feedback: one anonymous carried out 2 times per year about the training process and whose results are discussed at the meetings of the Teaching Commission, meetings with



heads and managers of educational programs, and recommendations on changes to the educational programs are given (Minutes of Meetings of the Teaching Commission); one non-anonymous via Blackboard and analyzed by the staff of the SPbSU Rector's Office, and the "Level Up" survey made by the student council since 2014 to know what issues or topics of university life need improvement. As reported during the site visit, the student council has taken action from these results and, for example, the events organized for the students have been improved.

The Faculty of Psychology presents evidence about conducting student surveys (Master Questionnaire for Students of the Study Program CB.5028 \* "Psychology" in the field 37.03.01 "Psychology"), although no evidence has been found of decisions adopted from the feedback obtained with those surveys. For example, decisions from the complaints and suggestions box or about the practical training session and internship work organization, in which the percentage of discontented students is quite high.

Employers' satisfaction is also measured using individual questionnaires sent by e-mail. Organization, collection and analysis of the data are carried out by the Teaching Commission of the Department of Psychology. According to the information provided by employers, their opinion has been taken into account. For example, PhD Theses have focused on more practical topics, based on their suggestions.

A survey is carried out to the administration staff, although the self-report does not include the main characteristics of the survey (periodicity, to whom is addressed, or whether it is anonymous or not) and results. Internal monitoring of the administrative staff activities is carried out by the heads of the respective divisions (offices, departments), who analyze the actual indicators and performance of employees according to individual and group job performance reports that are submitted to them on a yearly basis but no evidences or indicators related to that have been found.

Nowadays, the system of data collection on the employment of graduates of SPbSU is in the process of formation although other ways to obtain information are used.

Unfortunately, in the Russian Federation there is no standard act regulating the procedure for creating, implementing and realizing, as well as the structure and form of the internal university quality system, and the main focus is made on carrying out independent assessments - federal testing of the student educational achievements, state and public and professional accreditation. Probably the closest documents are the methodical recommendations on the standard model implementation of the educational institution quality system ("Methodical recommendations on the implementation of the quality system standard model of an educational institution". SPb.: Publisher. St. Petersburg State Electrotechnical University, 2006. 408 p.), in which





the system of education quality is recommended to build on the TQM model and ISO 9000:2000. Other regulatory documents of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (previously the Ministry of Education and Science) and Rosobrnadzor are mainly devoted to licensing and state accreditation procedures, which also do not require the compulsive list of documents regulating the system of the education quality. In connection with the specified positions the quality system of education of different universities can be built according to different principles.

During the site visit a document showing the Quality management diagram (SPBU) was provided and, on request, a document named "Explanations on the SPBU internal system of quality assurance management and control" was delivered to the review panel. Those documents reflect the high implication of all sectors of the University in QA. However, it is necessary to clarify the decision-making process and the hierarchy related to the IQAS at both, University and Faculty levels.

#### **Recommendations:**

MANDATORY RECOMMENDATION 2.- To revise all the documentation related to internal quality assurance to define and publish an unique Manual explaining the IQAS structure, the QA policy and how it is connected to the strategic plan, the specific procedures, the responsible bodies of each procedure, how each procedure is revised and improved, how the stakeholders are involved, the specific indicators to monitor improvement and how and when to be held accountable. This document should be published in English as well.

MANDATORY RECOMMENDATION 3.- To include a procedure to review the IQAS itself and the utility of the different procedures and indicators to improve educational programs.

RECOMMENDATION 4.- To define a specific platform for QA clarifying those QA procedures carried out at University level and those implemented at Faculty level.

RECOMMENDATION 5.- To organize the IQAS information in an easily-finding and more visible web link on the University main web page and in each Faculty.



### CRITERION 3. DESIGN, FOLLOW-UP AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMME

CRITERION 3. DESIGN, FOLLOW-UP AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES	Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	No Implemented
The Centre has implemented the processes to ensure the continuous enhancement of its educational programmes.		X	

The staff of Educational-Methodological Division of the Department of Psychology twice a year, at the end of the academic semester — in December and May — conducts an anonymous paper survey of students in order to obtain their satisfaction with the contents, organization and teaching of subjects of the programmes. According to the self-report, the questions related to the satisfaction of students with the programmes and subjects of Psychology is one of the tools for the improvement of the programmes. Likewise, according to the self-report, the procedure of analysis of the programmes, diagnosis and correction of the identified deficiencies is based on the results of monitoring activities conducted within the framework of the Education Quality Assurance System and on the reports on the implementation of the SPbU Strategic Plan. It is discussed at the Educational Programme Council, at the meetings of the Teaching Commission, and by the representatives of the administrative apparatus. The results obtained in the discussion are secured by the system of local regulatory documents on the introduction of changes to the curricula, descriptions, syllabi of disciplines and practices, and to the State Final Examination programmes.

During the visit, the Educational and Methodological Commission (EMC)'s way of working was reported. The agenda of the meetings is published on the web, it seems that all interest groups can assist and participate (parents included) and sometimes experts are invited to help them making decisions. The description of the function of this commission can be found at <https://spbu.ru/universitet/podrazdeleniya-i-rukovodstvo/uchebno-metodicheskie-komissii>.

The procedure for updating the programmes in Psychology is governed by the SPbSU local regulation "On the academic documentation examination procedure" approved by Order No. 2471/1 dd 05.07.2013 (as amended by Order No. 12146/1 dd 08.12.2017). In case of necessary significant changes to the educational programme, proposals are made on the amendments to the educational standard of the SPbSU. After the examination of suggestions by the Programme Department and through their approval by the local regulatory document of the SPbSU, the changes are made to the



educational standard. For example, when comparing curricula of 2015, 2016 and subsequent years, we observe an increase in the opportunities of students to choose individual paths within the courses of the specialities, which can serve as a basis for professional development of the psychologist at the stage of training already. In fact, according to the self-report, there have been changes in the contents of the subjects in the 2017/2018 academic year, changes that are based on the work of the Commission for Quality Control on the specialty of Psychology.

SPbSU has the right to implement its own educational standards, so the procedure of updating these standards and educational programs is also regulated by the university. The main requirement for standards is to comply with the same demands that are presented on federal state educational standards (FSES), which is regulated by part 10 of art. 11 of the Federal Law dated December 29, 2012 N 273-F3 "On Education in the Russian Federation".

There is a high commitment of the decanal team with the quality of the training programmes and their functioning.

According to the self-report, the only possibility for program withdrawal seems to be its replacement for a new program in the specified direction. However, an specific QA procedure including responsibilities and criteria for program withdrawal has not been found.

**Recommendations:**

RECOMMENDATION 6.- QA procedures for continuous enhancement of the programs should clearly state how, who, and when the collected information is analyzed. Detailed indicators that measure the good health of the program and satisfaction of all stakeholders should be clearly defined and the formula for their calculation published.

RECOMMENDATION 7.- The improvement plan for each educational programme should be annually revised. The result of this revision should be publicly available.

MANDATORY RECOMMENDATION 4.- A QA procedure for program withdrawal is necessary.



#### CRITERION 4. RESEARCH AND TEACHING STAFF

CRITERION 4. RESEARCH AND TEACHING STAFF.	Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	No Implemented
The Centre has implemented the procedures which guarantee the teaching staff training, competence and qualification.		X	

Internal Regulations, that govern the work of the teaching staff at the Saint Petersburg State University, define the procedure of hiring and firing employees, the legal status of the parties of the labour contract, mode of work, recreation, incentives and penalties, as well as other issues of labour relations.

The quality of the teaching staff is a key element on programmes improvement. From the site visit and the self-report, it seems that the quality of the teacher staff related to the Psychology Faculty is very high. According to the self-report, the institution is highly motivated to recruit the best staff and uses several tools to motivate, support and improve the teaching staff. However, no evidences have been found of the existence of QA procedures describing how are those tools designed, implemented and how their effectiveness is evaluated.

The teaching activity is evaluated by students twice a year and the results analysed by the Teaching Commission. However, it seems that teachers with scores higher than 4 (up to 5) are not informed about the results. Evidences of teaching staff improvement taking into account the student feedback has not been found. During the site visit professors said that "depending on the problem, this is solved: it could be speaking with other colleagues, with the head of the department...". When they receive a grade lower than 4, it seems that professors do not know how to proceed.

The possibility of conducting refreshing or training courses seems to be available for teaching staff. However, a planned offer of courses as not been found nor information about the staff satisfaction with that offer of training. According to the self-report, a survey is carried out among the teachers. The survey includes indicators such as satisfaction with materials and equipment of the program, classrooms, library, information support of the educational process, personnel policies, or employee incentive program. No indicator is included on the demands of training made by the teaching staff. Data is automatically used in the BlackBoard platform and allows stakeholders to see the generalised statistics of answers. However, it has not been possible to find the trend of the different indicators studied (2015, 2016, 2017) nor the proposed improvements based on the analysis of the results.



The university has a system of "effective contract", which allows you to evaluate the quality of each teacher. This document is an employment contract, which is concluded with the teacher for a certain period of time and contains performance evaluation indicators (publication activity, completion of advanced training courses, etc.). On the basis of these indicators an individual development plan is drawn up for the teachers every year. Following the academic year results the report of the individual plan implementation is presented to the management. The achievement of the indicators is the basis for the payment of the salary bonus part.

Also, the procedure for the programs opening (licensing) provides the exact correspondence of the university teaching staff to the basic quality criteria specified in the FSES and professional standards. The minimal personal requirements formation is based on the scrupulous observance of these requirements (they are quite strict). Any refusal of the requirements established at the state level is the basis for the suspension or even disposition of the right to conduct educational activities.

At the same time, the information on the teaching staff degree can be also obtained from the federal monitoring data of the higher institutions in the part of university teaching staff, among them Federal Statistical Observation VPO-1. The information about the university teaching staff is also included in the compulsive requirements list for state accreditation.

**Recommendations:**

RECOMMENDATION 8.- We recommend to perform a SWOT analysis of the teaching staff to highlight its strengths, detect its weaknesses, analyze the threats and identify the improvement opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION 9.- Based on the SWOT analysis, design an improvement plan for the teaching staff which should include their satisfaction with the available training plan.

**CRITERION 5. RESOURCES FOR THE STUDENTS' LEARNING AND SUPPORT**

<b>CRITERION 5. RESOURCES FOR THE STUDENTS' LEARNING AND SUPPORT</b>	<b>Fully Implemented</b>	<b>Substantially Implemented</b>	<b>No Implemented</b>
The Centre has implemented the procedures which guarantee the offer of activities, material resources and enough services which contribute to the student body learning.		X	



According to the self-report and the information obtained during the site visit, the panel verified that the institution is highly committed to offer the best possible learning resources to students. During the site visit, it was possible to verify the material resources provided by the Psychology Faculty for the students' learning and competences acquisition. There were well-equipped classrooms, offices for teachers and laboratories for student practical activities. Some of them quite renovated and with very updated equipment. This is a strength of the Faculty. Satisfaction of teachers and students with those resources seem to be very high according to oral testimonies. There is also a high commitment to provide the best possible material support to disable students. However, at the self-report or during the visit was not possible to identify a procedure linked to the IQAS to monitor and improve the material resources although some indications were found in section 4 of the document *On the implementation of the procedure for independent quality assessment at St. Petersburg State University* (order dated July 20, 2018 No. 7244/1). The panel failed in finding the implemented system to detect needs of new material and to use the feedback from teachers, students and administrative staff with these resources to enhance them by developing an annual improvement plan.

Related to the administrative staff, as stated in the self-report, internal monitoring of the administrative staff activities is carried out by heads of the respective divisions (offices, departments), who analyze the current indicators and performance of employees according to individual and group job performance reports that are submitted to them on monthly and annually basis. However, it has not been possible to find examples of decisions taken from the information provided by this monitoring to improve the administrative staff behaviour and skills. On the information provided by the Faculty, the results of a survey carried out on administrative workers were found. However, the periodicity of this survey is unknown, no previous data to know the trend in the results were found nor the decisions made from them or the existence of an improvement plan.

**Recommendations:**

RECOMMENDATION 10.- To design and implement an specific QA procedure to systematically evaluate the resources for students learning and support using specific indicators whose calculation should be clearly defined and whose results should be published and the tendencies analysed.

RECOMMENDATION 11.- The implementation of the QA procedure should result on an plan that contains the proposals for enhancement of the resources for students' learning and support and whose implementation and achievements are annually reviewed.





## CRITERION 6. MANAGEMENT AND ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESSES

CRITERION 6. MANAGEMENT OF LEARNING-TEACHING PROCESSES	Fully Implemented	Substantially Implemented	No Implemented
The Centre has implemented the procedures which guarantee that the actions undertaken contribute to favor the student body learning.		X	

According to the self-report, *“the leading role in planning, implementation and determination of the programme development strategy belongs to the Councils for Programmes and Academic Commissions”*. The latter is described as the responsible body that approves the modified syllabi of academic disciplines which includes the updating of methodological developments for classes, guidelines for students and lecturers, test and exam materials, etc. However, no mention to the management of Bachelor’s Final Thesis/Master Final Thesis, external practices and student mobility has been found. No QA procedures that measure, revise and improve those key aspects of the learning-teaching process have been found and, as consequence, no improvement plan periodically reviewed has been defined. In the information provided, programme modifications that contribute to improve the learning process of the students have not been highlighted.

It is worth pointing out that in the regulatory framework of the Russian Federation the graduate qualification work supervision, the practices organization and conduct are carried out primarily on the basis of the Federal Law dated December 29, 2012. N 273-F3 “On Education in the Russian Federation” (Art. 59 and Art. 2, 13 consequently), therefore, these aspects may not be perceived by the university as components of the education quality system, but rather as an obligatory part of the educational process. Practice, defense of the graduate qualification work are part of the educational process, they have to satisfy all the requirements which also refer to the academic disciplines implementation. Due to the development of the practice-oriented approach in the Psychological Faculty program implementation, the graduate qualification works defense is the final stage in the demonstration of knowledge and skills obtained in the process of training. Due to the fact that the academic disciplines content is constantly reviewed at the meetings of these commissions, the processes of practices organization and the graduate qualification works defense are considered as part of the educational process and do not require a separate assessment procedure.



It is a strength that students can get the European Certificate in psychology EuroPsy.

**Recommendations:**

RECOMMENDATION 12.- To highlight in the annual report those aspects that have been improved in each programme.

#### **4. OVERALL ASSESSMENT**

The panel has performed an exhaustive review of all the provided information sources to assess the implementation of the IQAS at the Psychology Faculty. We have identified as strengths:

1. The existence of an Open University policy (virtual reception).
2. The employers' engagement with the Faculty and University.
3. The high satisfaction of employers and graduates.
4. The commitment of the teaching and administrative staff with the improvement of the Faculty/University activities.
5. The high quality of the Resources
6. The prestige and global recognition of the Saint Petersburg State University.

However, the IQAS seems to be organized in a very complicated way and it is difficult to understand who makes the decisions at each step, which are the procedures followed, and how the whole system is improved taking into account the internal and external stakeholders' feedback. The Faculty/University should identify the key processes and elaborate QA procedures which include well defined indicators and clear evidences. The implementation of those QA procedures should result in annual improvement plans for educational programmes and the IQAS itself. System simplification, making it more systematic, logical and standardized, is highly recommended. The final certification proposal is based on the confidence that SPBSU and the Psychology Faculty will implement all recommendations (with special emphasis those that are defined as mandatory) within a period of 18 months.

**FINAL CERTIFICATION PROPOSAL:**



**IQAS IMPLEMENTATION CERTIFIED**



**IQAS IMPLEMENTATION NON CERTIFIED**