

# Support to strengthening the higher education system in Azerbaijan



Twinning project ENI/2018/395-401

## Mission Report

Short-Term Mission on Activity 1.5. Provide recommendations for improvement of education standards for qualification for programmes in the priority areas (incl. legislative arrangements) with a view to describing achievements based on competences and skills, considering the AzQF

(October 14 - 18, 2019)

1. Name and Function of the Expert:

Full name of expert

Ms. Françoise Robin-Le Guen, France

Signature

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Françoise Robin-Le Guen". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial letter.

## **2. Objective and Tasks of the Mission:**

The mission is carried out within the framework of:

**COMPONENT 1: SELECTED NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS ARE ALIGNED TO INCLUDE A COMPETENCE-BASED FOCUS**

Activity 1.5. Provide recommendations for improvement of education standards for qualification for programmes in the priority areas (incl. legislative arrangements) with a view to describing achievements based on competences and skills, considering the AzQF

Benchmarks for this activity are:

- **State standards for selected study programmes (Oil and Gas Engineering state standard) are revised**, with a view to describing achievements based on competences and learning outcomes, considering AzQF;
- **Other relevant documents/ methodology materials are prepared.**

**3. Time schedule of the mission:**

<b>Date and Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>
Monday 14 <sup>th</sup> of October 2019	<p><b>10:00-13:00</b> Meeting with RTA Ms. Elizaveta Bydanova and Ms. Vusala Gurbanova, Component Leader I, Senior Advisor at Higher Education Department, Ministry of Education.</p> <p><b>14:30-17:30</b> Deskwork</p>
Tuesday 15 <sup>th</sup> of October 2019	<p><b>9:00-12:00</b> Deskwork</p> <p><b>14:00-17:00</b> Meeting with Working Group on Oil and Gas Engineering.</p> <p><b>17:00-18:00</b> Debriefing of the Meeting</p>
Wednesday 16 <sup>th</sup> of October 2019	<p><b>9:00-12:00</b> Deskwork</p> <p><b>14:00-18:00</b> Deskwork</p>
Thursday 17 <sup>th</sup> of October 2019	<p><b>10:00-13:00</b> Visit to relevant universities : <b>Azerbaijan Oil and Industry University</b></p> <p><b>14:00-17:00</b> Deskwork</p>
Friday 18 <sup>th</sup> of October 2019	<p><b>9:00-12:00</b> Deskwork (report writing)</p> <p><b>14:00-17:00</b> Meeting with MoE Higher Education Department to debrief about the results of the mission (Ms. Vusala Gurbanova, CL I and Mr. Yashar Omarov, RTA Counterpart)</p> <p><b>17:00-18:00</b> Debriefing</p> <p><b>20:00-22:00</b> Finalization of the drafting of the documents</p>

#### **4. Relevant Background Information/State of Affairs regarding the mission**

During the working group, a professor from the **Azerbaijan Oil and Industry University** inform me that they are getting ready for international accreditation of programs in Oil&Gas; Chemical Engineering; Geology now. Evaluation is also considered in this document. They have adjusted their documents to syllabus from international practices.

They update their program from time to time. Last time they made approved/legally recognised their teaching program by a notary office, so that their program could not be copied. The reason why they used the notary office, is because they want to protect themselves from private universities. It is not clear for me why the need of notary office. The professor explains me that the syllabus needs to get approved by the MoE in AZB, which is also surprising.

During the working group the professor mentioned the existence of Ufaz and its consequences. When UFAZ was established, 22 classrooms were given to UFAZ. During the visit of ASOIU the teacher tells me the same thing and that they have no laboratory or no practical work room yet. She is aware of UFAZ's equipment and regrets that she cannot use it for their students.

It could also be noticed during the visits that the students of ASOIU have a very limited practice, that there is no equipment to train students in autonomy and that researchers do not have a laboratory to conduct experiments.

As regards the internship, the explanations obtained with the working group were very clear, but during the visit the teacher seemed more confused on the subject.

#### **5. Achievement of the Expected Results**

Planned action was achieved, a new state standard for the programme of Bachelor in Oil and Gas Engineering was proposed.

#### **6. Unexpected Results**

It could be mentioned that the visit to the university was difficult, we were not welcome. It was difficult to meet someone. I met a professor from the working group, but who had no time for me. The teacher who was asked to make the visit at the last minute was very voluntary but had little to show. The professor of ASOIU awaits a feedback on the mission.

#### **7. Issues Left Open After the Mission**

The feedback on the mission shall be shared with the ASOIU relevant representatives.

## 8. Recommendations (including recommendation for future missions)

### Some remarks:

- The state standard is difficult to read, especially the one corresponding to the table with the list of subjects.
- The proposed program is correct but the approach to working independently for students must be made more dynamic (see in the annex the new State Standard).
- It would have been good to have access to the following information (however, the study plans could not be checked during the mission): a summary table with the hours is missing within credits ECTS, the face to face student time and student work time; the face-to-face hours of the module or subject taught are to be divided into class hours, exercises and practical work; information on assessment.
- It could also be good to have information on the validation of the current year N and the conditions for moving up to the next year N+1.

### Recommendations:

- It could be recommended to **leave some flexibility in the state standards**, so that universities could add some subjects depending on the profile of their teaching staff, their research activities and available infrastructure. So, the same study programme could differ from one university to another across the country, which could provide more diversity within the national system of higher education.

For example in France, in University Technological Institutes (in French “Institut Universitaire de Technologie”; those institutes offer 2-year short cycle university programmes), we have also a national program for the 2-year diploma (University Technological Diploma), although it allows a 20 % local adaptation regarding to the teachers’ profiles and local employment opportunities.

- The format of the new standard state shall be made **more synthetic and better structured**.
- This new standard must be supplemented by an appendix specific to each university indicating the distribution of hours (within ECTS credits, the Face to face student time and student work time). For the face-to-face hours it is necessary to show the distributions in lecture, exercise and practical work.
- In this new standard **assessment shall be more detailed** and various evaluation methods must be used during the study process.

For example, these two aspects (assessment methods and distribution of hours) are voted in university councils every year in France, which permit the university's degree holders to evolve and improve the program.

- The **transition of a student from N level to N+1 level** is not presented because it is discussed within each university. It would be necessary to have a minimum of rules in the standard.

## **9. Acknowledgments**

I thank all the people I have been able to work with during this week. It was a pleasure for me to participate in the project and to bring my expertise.

## **Annexes**

**(If any)**