



PEER REVIEW REPORT

Doctoral Degree Programme
Educational Studies F01110101

Provided by
Otgontenger University

Ulaanbaatar
May 2019

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors and contributors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of Content

A About the Accreditation Process ...Error! Bookmark not defined.

B Characteristics of the Degree Programme/sError! Bookmark not defined.

C Peer Report for the MNCEA Seal....Error! Bookmark not defined.

1. Programme objectives, content and implementation 5

2. Student life-cycle:..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

3. Student assessment and achieved programme outcomes**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

4. Teaching staff **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5. Resources and programme management... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6. Quality assurance **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

D Additional Documents 30

E Comment of the Higher Education Institution (xx.xx.20xx)Error! Bookmark not defined.

F Summary: Peer recommendations (xx.xx.20xx)Error! Bookmark not defined.

G Decision of the Accreditation Commission (xx.xx.20xx)..... 32

A. About the Accreditation Process

Name of the degree programme (in original language)	(Official) English translation of the name
Боловсрол судлал	Educational Studies
Date of the contract: Jan 2019 Submission of the final version of the self-assessment report: March 2019 Date of the onsite visit: 2-3 May 2019 at: Otgontenger university campus	
Peer panel: B.Jadamba Head of Education Research Center of MSUE N.Oyuntsteseg Lecturer of Department, HU Alfredo Gardel (UAH) José Luis Lázaro (UAH) Anzhelika Gerasymenko (KNUTE) Ruben Topchyan (ANQA)	
Representative/s of the MNCEA headquarter: B.Myadagmaa	
Responsible decision-making committee: Accreditation Commission for Programme of Educational Studies	
Criteria used: MNCEA Doctoral Programme Accreditation Criteria, as of 02 Apr 2019	

B. Characteristics of the Degree Programme

Final degree (original/English translation)	Areas of Specialization	Mode of Study	Duration	Credit points/unit	Provided unit

B. PEER REPORT FOR THE MNCEA SEAL

Criterion 1. DOCTORAL PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT

The doctoral programme objectives are aligned with the institutional research policy and objectives, taking into account stakeholder expectations.

Programme design

Doctoral program is developed by meeting the common requirements of doctoral programs, and other special requirements by relevant stakeholders. Documentation of a doctoral program clearly states the procedures of plan, implementation and quality assurance of research projects completed during the program.

Evidence:

- The OU defined the curriculum goal and objectives based on its vision and mission and designed the curriculum aligning with the research university, its content, quality assurance, legal and quality requirements of the national educational sector and the order No A370 -General regulations for Masters and Doctorate program- of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Science and Sports (MECSS) and international trends.
- The OU follows the given policy and implementation documents such as syllabus for each subject, foundation program, handbook for doctorate students-2019, Strategic Plan of the OU (2013-2022), Research Development Program for 2017-2022 /30 April 2018, Academic Council/
- The doctoral program was developed in 2014, 2017 and 2018. The manual of the regulating and monitoring either the research work process or cooperation with the supervisors was prepared in 2017 and it started being implemented since the academic year for 2018-2019.
- Internal quality assurance is included in the curriculum framework and in the article 3.6.1 of the rules for organizing doctoral program at the OU.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The doctoral program at the OU fully meets the requirements which are stated in the Criterion 1.1.

The evidences that OU regularly improves the doctoral curriculum documentation accordingly with the general requirements for the doctoral program and needs of the stakeholders are illustrated here:

- Both doctoral research work plan and quality assurance planning are included in the curriculum documentation. The manual of the regulating and monitoring either the research work process or cooperation with the supervisors was prepared in 2017 and it started being implemented since the academic year for 2018-2019.
- In 2014, the curriculum reform was made in terms of the changes in the related documentation, society needs and the university research policy. As

a result of this action, 6 credit hours subjects of the different faculties are included in the curriculum regarding to the students and employers' requests. Additionally, beside the core subjects, the number of the elective subjects was increased and their contents were improved as well in 2018.

Programme objectives

The programme has defined objectives in the form of intended learning outcomes covering knowledge, skills and competences to be acquired by students by the end of the studies. The objectives reflect the national qualifications framework, the institutional research policy and objectives and mission, expectations of the relevant subject community and the relevant stakeholders.

Evidence:

The program objectives have been defined by the intended learning outcomes and the evidences that the objectives meet the OU's are illustrated here:

- The objectives contain the university features and meet the OU's vision, in particular, with the objectives 1 and 2 in the OU's strategic plan /2013-2022/.
- The objectives have been defined regarding the research priorities and research policy of the OU which are included in the Research Development Program /2017-2022/.

Intended learning outcomes have been defined based on the stakeholders' needs and evidences are illustrated here:

- Representatives of the stakeholders are precisely mentioned in the Curriculum committee rules /Compiled book of Legal documentation of the OU in 2017 and 2019/
- It has been proved from the annual report for 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 that the OU conducts a satisfaction survey from the doctorate students and reflect their needs and suggestions in the training in consultation with the departments and sub-committee for curriculum.
- The objectives have been defined based on the features of the Educational studies. ???
- Participating in research projects, dissertation writing, credit hour mechanisms and research methodology are included in the program in order to achieve the program goal.
- Sub-committee for curriculum developed a graduate model aligned with the university mission, vision, research policy and research priorities based on demands of the society. This is the biggest change for last five years.
- The doctoral program was compared with the programs offered by the Mongolian National University of Mongolia, Mongolian National University of Education and Orkhon University.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- The program goal was defined based on own designed graduate model
- The program goal was aligned with the university vision.
- Comparison the curriculum with international universities which offer similar programs was not done.

Programme content

The curricular contents allow scientific scope and students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The curriculum does have a logical sequence, avoids overlaps and contains a balance between theory and practice in line with the programme objectives. Where appropriate, the curriculum contains elective elements for students.

Evidence:

- The ratio of either compulsory and elective subjects or theoretical and practical subjects was clearly stated in the syllabus.
- The OU includes all subjects which are included in the doctoral program as compulsory.
- Regarding the program goal, credit hours increased up to 3 for some subjects namely Educational Law, Educational Management, Qualitative methods in Education, Intellectual Property, Comparison of international Education. Additionally, the syllabus for those subjects were developed and classified as compulsory and elective, the number of elective and specialization subjects increased respectively.
- One of the program concerns is preparing researchers. Considering this point, serial subjects such as Quantitative and qualitative research methods, research work, dissertation, and theory and methodology of Education studies are included in the program.
- The subjects that help students to develop themselves as a researcher and to improve their research writing skill are included in the program. It shows the feature of OU.
- There is a skills matrix in the program illustrating that each subject meets with the learning outcome and contributes to it.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- The OU compared its doctoral program with the Mongolian National University of Education.
- There is no other comparison with other universities because of lack of transparency.
- Elective subjects have been offered since 2017.

Syllabus

The programme documentation, including in particular course descriptions, contains relevant information about learning outcomes, pre-requisites, curriculum structure, teaching and learning method, expected student workload, credit award, assessment methods and criteria, recommended literature. It is regularly updated

Evidence:

- The teachers design and develop the curriculum and syllabus and then the sub-committee for the curriculum evaluates and improves them. Addition to this, the sub-committee compares the curriculum to the other local and international universities.
- Curriculum mapping and operation management bring the positive influence to collaborations between sub-committees for the curriculum and outcome improvements.
- The doctoral program goal and curriculum philosophy meets either the students' needs and demands or international standards. Beside foreign language knowledge and professional competencies, the doctoral program directs to social responsibility of the graduates.
- It should be emphasized that OU is being initiative on local and international standards and accreditation.
- Program evaluation is done based on the cooperative management system. In other words, teachers and department discuss about the curriculum internally and submits their recommendations and findings to the sub-committee for the curriculum.
- There is a foundation training for the students who have no background in education studies. It comprises from 15 credit hours.
- The teachers who work for the doctoral program have Ph.D degrees and each syllabus is designed in accordance with the general requirements of the doctoral program and approved by the OU rector. The syllabus consists of goal, pre-requisite, assessment criteria, and credit hours. The doctoral students are informed by the students' handbook and management information system.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- Each syllabus and information about the curriculum are in the management information system so it is accessible for all students to be informed about the information related to the program and teachers.

- There is a process for curriculum design and it controls the steps from the designing process.

Special requirements for the programme

Intended learning outcomes and content of doctoral programs reflects the special requirements of doctoral programs by professional associations of a particular field.

Evidence:

- This criteria depends on MNCEA and there is no specific criteria in the doctoral program from professional council.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- A graduate model of the doctoral program has 3 main components such as value, basic competencies and academic and pragmatic competencies. In these competencies, scientific knowledge, research skills, academic knowledge, attitude for social importance, researcher competency and pragmatic knowledge in detail.

Criterion 2. DOCTORAL PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

The institution have a structure, organization and legal environment to effectively implement the doctoral programme, aligned with the programme objectives and supports students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes and research activities.

Admission

Admission criteria enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. They are fairly and consistently applied. The procedures adopted (choice of thesis topics and supervisors, type and amount of funding, etc.) are explicitly stated and fair.

Evidence:

-
-
-
- ...

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

From the visit meetings and evidences reviewed, it can be said that the admission criteria fairly and consistently applied.

The conditions for admission are available online on the OU webpage. Current and former students confirm that they had all needed information about enrolling conditions of the Doctoral Program (DP) in Education. In order to increase visibility and internationalization, all this information should be also in English, currently

only the main links and data are translated into English being the different documents in Mongolian language.

There is a commission that evaluates the DP candidates yearly (each September). In the last year 10 students have been pre-enrolled in the DP and 1 student has not been admitted. The admission procedure includes a written exam and an interview; therefore, it is possible to detect students that will not be able to achieve the intended learning outcomes of DP.

The number of offering places should be controlled fulfilling that each supervisor has not been assigned with more than 4 PhD students.

The enrolled PhD students have different master's degree origin. Hence, the DP has included some workshops in the first training phase that are focused in basic common skills required for all the students, e.g. research methodology, citations, etc. It might be to promote the Education PhD on related master's degrees within OU.

The choice of thesis topics and supervisor are not defined in admission. More information about research topics vs supervisor might be included in the DP information.

Additionally, it might be interesting to include a section to value the "research skills" and "English language" in the admission requirements.

Doctoral student workload

Workload of independent and desk research is balanced, preventing from overload or shortcomings.

Evidence:

-
-
-
- ...

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

From the visit meetings the panel board have stated that there is a close relationship among students, teachers and supervisors. The students agree with the evaluation criteria for their research and training work.

Usually, students take 3 years of training, with 4 subjects per semester and a workload of 8 hours per week with on-site classes. The student can attend several workshops that are proposed yearly.

There is no a direct survey or direct mechanism to prevent excessive student workloads. In the periodical meetings of Quality committee, the current program contents and student's workload is analysed.

Each student has a document report with the different training courses (tuition must be paid for the training credits) depending on the type of enrolment. Once

he/she passes the evaluation of a subject, this is annotated in the learning outcomes certificate.

Even they have lecturers from other universities, leading professors, etc. some students stated that might be necessary to have more different teachers to broaden the research scope of their trainings.

Teaching and learning methodology

The instructional methodology is student centered, aligned with the programme objectives and supports students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

Evidence:

-
.....
.....
-

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- The process of research work is discussed in the Open discussion, researchers' time and science café.
- New methodologies related to the student-centered program are reflected in the program.
-

Supervision

The doctorate includes individual and regular follow-up of doctoral students, with clearly defined, coherent and transparent procedures for doctoral students and thesis supervisors.

Evidence:

Information from Self Assessment Report, answers to questions in the on-site visit meetings, information provided in the documents made available to us

.....

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

Supervision procedure and contents are: defined, regulated and structured for general procedures of OU. Responsibilities of institutions, supervisors and doctoral students are clearly defined and coherent. Therefore, each student's individual research plan is approved by a supervisor and work by the plan procedures. The individual plan is approved by a Vice Director, Scientific and Academic affairs of OU.

Individualized and regular monitoring of doctoral students is planned, as well as of their research plan and of their supervisor responsibilities in the development of this plan.

In addition, the PD regulations and national regulations contemplate the requirements to be a supervisor and the procedures for its selection, appointment and coordination. There are no workshops for supervisors or procedures to evaluate their performance.

The thesis selection process is perfectly defined and takes into account issues of scientific importance and the research priorities of the institution and society.. The interests of doctoral students are also taken care of; after having passed a part of the training period, the thesis and supervisor are selected and registered (the thesis proposal and supervisor must be accepted). Selection regulation for research topic and supervisor is met with rules of MECSS.

Each doctoral student, with his or her supervisor, should have a research project, make an appropriate plan, and conduct the research according to the plan. A professors team is responsible for evaluation of research work progress, practice importance and outcomes.

In spite of the cooperation relations with foreign countries referred to in the interviews and SAR, these are not very efficient for the development and improvement of doctoral theses. Point that would be advisable to improve

It is suggested that the criteria be adapted and that a wider panel of supervisors be available((more flexible access to become a supervisor). It is also suggested that the entry of new supervisors with new profiles and supervisors of international institutions be allowed, while at the same time making thesis co-supervisions in collaboration with foreign institutions more relaxed. An openness to international co-operation in the supervision of doctorates would be desirable.

Research link, cooperation

Provisions are made at the level of the programme to increase the collaboration with national and international public and private organizations and higher education institutions. The doctoral programme have established links and partnerships with internal or external research departments and/or organizations. Teachers and doctoral students are involved in research teams.

Evidence:

- Information from Self Assessment Report, answers to questions in the on-site visit meetings, information provided in the documents made available to us

.....

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

They have collaborations with national institutions and try to improve it. They also try to establish and improve international collaborations in research issues.

Provisions are made to increase the collaboration with national and international organizations and higher education institutions. They have links and partnerships with national and international research teams but for now this one is not effective enough (however, we must consider the Mongolian context).

Supervisors and doctoral students try to be involved in international research teams, but it is difficult in their current regional/national context. They are trying with countries like Japan, China, Turkey, Korea and with other partners from projects of the European Union, mainly Erasmus + projects.

The implementation and support of the international programs is currently not very effective for the development of doctoral theses, but it is necessary to consider the restrictions in the regulation of supervision and defence of doctoral theses, and also in budget.

Teachers and students are involved in joint projects and programs according to regulations and this positively influences the PD and the progress of research in which they are involved in the theses.

The regulations allow co-supervision in case of Thesis issues of 2 branches of science, but do not reflect anything to make international co-direction possible, which does not favor the internationalization of the programs

Research stays abroad as a part of doctorate are not planned at the moment because of the context and regulations. They have some strategy to increase in the future the cooperation in research with national and international institutions

As suggestions:

To develop an effective future strategy plan to increase research cooperation with foreign universities, although this requires regulatory evolution.

To seek and increase funding for research.

To seek to increase intensive and cooperative research work.

Thesis defence

Explicit criteria for authorizing thesis defence (producing new knowledge, exploitation of results, validating teaching, mobility, etc.) are communicated to doctoral students and thesis supervisors. Organization rules for thesis defence (composition of the examination board and role of its members, convening notice, manuscript submission, etc.) are communicated to doctoral students and supervisors. These rules are defined in a fair and transparent manner.

Evidence:

- Information from Self Assessment Report, answers to questions in the on-site visit meetings, information provided in the documents made available to us
-

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

. There is a very well detailed procedure.

There are defined rules and criteria for thesis defence in a transparent manner, and explicit criteria for authorizing thesis defence.

Explicit criteria for authorizing thesis defence (contributions and producing new knowledge, exploitation of results, etc.) are public and well known by doctoral students and thesis supervisors. E.g. Ph.D. students must publish some paper in journals or conferences previous to thesis defence.

Preliminary defence must be discussed in the expanded seminars with professional expert scientists of the branch school. The date for an expanded seminar is announced publicly.

Both doctoral students and supervisors state in the interviews that they are satisfied with the procedure established for the defence, although as a suggestion it could be commented that the procedure should be made a little easier.

The doctoral program and the institution have contemplated and implemented a complaint procedure that is perfectly detailed in the program information.

There is no doctoral defence council for private universities, but there is a single national council of public universities; for this reason "students migrate to other universities that do not lack a doctoral defense commission".

Graduation documents

Students are provided with a qualification certificate as well as a programme-specific Diploma Supplement in English. These documents provide information on the student's qualifications profile and individual performance as well as the programme learning outcomes, context, level and status of the degree programme with regard to its applicable education system.

Evidence:

-
-
-
- ...

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- The process of graduation certificate is clear.
- There is no information about their competency in the graduation certificate

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 2:

- **FULLY MET THE CRITERION 2**

Criterion 3. DOCTORAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND ACHIEVED PROGRAMME OUTCOMES

The programme demonstrates the achievement of the intended outcomes. Assessment is fairly and consistently implemented in line with the relevant institutional policies.

Assessment of doctoral students

Student learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and competency) are systematically assessed with various approaches and methods. Assessment procedure and criteria is directed towards assessing in a fair and transparent manner. Assessment resources including test banks in every course is developed and updated to assess students' knowledge, skills and competency.

Evidence:

- According to the list of OU regulations provided there are: evaluation procedure of OU student, re-exam procedure; re-study subject procedure; etc.
- SAR consist the information that there is the part of syllabus , devoted to the evaluation issues. There is pointed that the syllabus reflects the purpose of the evaluation, the form of the evaluation, criteria, topic standard evaluation, assignment topics, and its duration. The criteria for assessment of the courses (breakdown by the knowledge, skills and attitudes) are provided there.
- SAR consists the information about applying of combination of written and oral tests in the course process and final exam.
- According to the SAR, as well as the answers of the respondents during the site-visit, evaluation of the student's doctoral program includes the grades of progress, semester final, skills, and other. Each course is assessed by the instructor who teaches that class. The information of doctoral student's grade, general point, course schedule, curriculum, introduction of the syllabus is available on the MIS.
- The criteria for assessment of the research assignments are provided in the SAR, but the respondents didn't explain who is responsible for such

assessment and point allocation. There is no clear information about the frequency of such an assessment.

- According to the answers of respondents, starting with April of 2019 the new regulation is provided with enhance the control over the research work of PhD students through providing the annual reporting of PhD students and their supervisors about the work done. The criteria of the reporting have not been revealed by respondents.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

Student learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and approaches) obtained by PhD students within training courses are systematically assessed with various approaches and methods. Such an assessment procedure and criteria are directed towards assessing in a fair and transparent manner. Assessment resources including test banks in every course are developed and updated to assess students' knowledge, skills and competency.

PhD students' research competencies assessment is not so strong in OU. There are some criteria of the assessment, but there is no consistent view of the respondents of their applying. According to newly provided regulation, the results of research work must be assessed annually, but the procedure and new set of criteria of assessment are not clear enough for the PhD students and thesis supervisors. They must be acknowledged with them and criteria of the assessment should be reviewed.

Doctoral student progress and recognition of achievements

Criteria for credit award and student progression are transparent for all relevant stakeholders and are consistently applied at programme level.

Rules for the recognition of externally acquired competences and qualifications are applied at programme level.

Evidence:

- The learning outcomes of student outside the program, in other schools and other programs is accepted and calculated the academic and research credit hours based on "Procedure for evaluating student's learning activities", and "Regulation for Student Mobility".
- SAR informs that if a learner need to study the research subject which not taught in OU, learner can study at accredited university or national institute of research and development and able to get 6 credit hours with the permission of supervisor as well as official letter from that university. Assigned evaluation is appointed to the supervisor and payment of credits are paid by MIS.
- SAR also provides some examples of recognition of the competences acquired under mobility programs by the students of the "Educational Science" programme.
- Table 2.2. at p.27 of the SAR shows the credit breakdown between the different groups of study courses, research work, as well as dissertation. The criteria for credits award for the training courses are transparent, being presented in the Syllabus. Answers of respondents shows that they are

acknowledged with them. As for the criteria for credits award for the research work they were not presented clear enough by respondents during the site-visits, while it was stated, that the new regulation was adopted in April 2019, which changes the procedure of PhD student progress assessment and credits awarding for the research work.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

As for the study component of the program, the criteria for credit award and student progression are transparent for all relevant stakeholders and are consistently applied at programme level. As for the research one, such the criteria need for clarification and dissemination within the stakeholders.

Rules for the recognition of externally acquired competences and qualifications are applied at programme level.

Doctoral student support and advice

The doctorate invites doctoral students to take part in supplementary scientific and/or professional events or actions, such as scientific events, conferences or panel discussions, etc. For each type of action, the methods for access, validation and evaluation, particularly by doctoral students, are defined and communicated.

Evidence:

- SAR witnesses that OU doctorate invites doctoral students to take part in scientific conferences, academic workshops, planned seminars, experiments, and research meetings, allocating credits for that (p.p. 27, 43).
- Scientific conference are also organized by OU (p.43 of the SAR and respondents' answers during the site-visit). The participation in those conferences for OU PhD students is free of charge.
- OU established a scientific and research center for the use of doctorates. Among its functions are:
 - ✓ guidance for researchers to use an open source;
 - ✓ consultation of how to apply statistical and econometrical methods of analysis, professional PLS and SPSS programs, etc.
- The interviews reveal the existence of 3-level discussion of the results of thesis research (academic department discussion, seminar for PhD students, discussion with OU professors and council members), which provides the methodological help for PhD students.
- SAR and the interviews witness about the strong financial support of PhD students by OU.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The doctorate invites doctoral students to take part in supplementary scientific events, such as scientific conferences academic workshops, planned seminars, experiments, research meetings, etc. For some of them the methods validation and evaluation are clearly defined, for others are not transparent enough for the stakeholders and there is a need for the clarification.

Research funding

The doctorate is based on a transparent thesis funding policy, which is consistent with its objectives and the institution’s scientific policy. The policy involves controlled management of this funding.

Evidence:

-
.....
.....
-
.....

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

OU has a very limited doctoral thesis funding program, though, it is consistent with the local context.

The OU director and humanities faculty manage the available research funding a transparent manner. Even the DP is not giving benefits the OU managers consider it a social participation that private universities must also do. They have several internal research projects that are supported directly by the university.

As the SWOT analysis of SAR document states, there is a lack of funds, so they might be increased through the participation of OU in research and cooperation projects seeking for more resources from other external institutions. Additionally, OU should participate or promote their participation in research projects at national, regional level.

Scholarship

Specific rules and regulation to specify the financial resource to fund doctoral students' studies and provide scholarships to them.

Evidence:

-
.....
.....
-
.....

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

Students know in advance the specific rules and regulation to obtain some scholarships. There are clear procedures for granting tuition and exemptions.

The board of trustees fix the tuition for DP students. In the meetings there was said that the tuition is rather low, compared with other universities. To obtain a reduction of tuition, the conditions are clearly stated, based mainly in a minimum GPA. There are several documents (handout and manual) for students which detail the process of tuition granting. The discount covers tuition fees up to 50% of tuition in the DP. Another possible discount in tuition fees is the one offered to early-bird students who enrolls the DP in a certain period of time. Additionally, there are some scholarships provided by enterprises and government regional institutions, as a form of some reduction of tuition fees.

However, as the SWOT analysis of SAR document states, there is a lack of scholarships for doctoral students.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 3:

- **FULLY MET THE CRITERION 3**

Criterion 4. TEACHING STAFF

Teaching staff are both sufficient and suitable in accordance with the characteristics of the doctoral programme, the scientific field and the number of students.

Teaching staff
The teaching staff members involved in the programme have the adequate qualifications with regard to the programme content and didactical competences to enable students to achieve the intended programme outcomes.

Evidence:

-
.....
.....
-
.....

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- There is a clear human resource policy and planning to hire skilled teachers
- There is resource for teaching staff
- It is not clear how to attract good teachers and their long-term work in the document.
- There is one teacher with MA degree and that teacher is specialized in intellectual property that is a comparatively new field in Mongolia.
- It is recommended to increase the number of teaching staff, closely work with other research institutions and their researchers, organize a joint discussion and change that one teacher teaches several subjects.

Teaching staff development

Systematic professional development mechanism is in place to improve faculty's teaching and research skills and supervision skills of doctoral students.

Evidence:

-
-
-
-

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- Selection procedures and requirements for teaching staff is clear and there is a mapping for it and it is used for monitoring the process.
- Some skills such as research skills in broad areas and links with research institutions should be added in the qualification requirements for teachers.
- Supervisors' professional development is not clear in the documents.
- The teachers and supervisors who are teaching in the doctoral program should be involved in the Leadership and Capacity building training.

Links with research

Teaching staff members are involved in research relevant to the programme subject area. Results from research are fed into teaching and learning. Where appropriate, students are involved in research activities in the programme subject area.

Evidence:

Information from Self Assessment Report, Answers to questions in the on-site visit meetings, information provided in the documents made available to us.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

In accordance with the process followed for the development of the programme, efforts are being made to ensure that members of the teaching staff are involved in research relevant to the subject matter of the programme.

Both in the documentation provided and in the responses in on-site visit meetings, participants have stated that research results feed back into teaching and learning, where possible. They also state that PhD students are involved in research activities in the subject area of the programme.

Although they have tried to develop initiatives and promote funding plans and support schemes for research, the lack of resources to carry out, publish and disseminate scientific research at an international level means that there is not desired visibility. Moreover, due to socio-economic difficulties, there is a risk of losing good teachers.

They are aware that they must increase international research collaboration, increase the number of articles published in high-profile international journals, establish supervisor evaluation, and improve foreign language skills.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 4:

- **FULLY MET THE CRITERION 4**

ШАЛГУУР 5. НӨӨЦ БА УДИРДЛАГЫН МЭДЭЭЛЛИЙН СИСТЕМ

Суралцахуйн зорилтот үр дүнд хүрэхэд шаардагдах нөөцийг бүрдүүлж, нөөцийн хуваарилалт болон гүйцэтгэлийг хянах, хөтөлбөрийн талаар шийдвэр гаргахад шаардлагатай удирдлага мэдээллийн нэгдсэн системтэй байна

learning and research facilities

Laboratories and their equipments and library resources are suited to the subject area of the programme. Students have access to facilities and software necessary for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, also during self-study periods.

Evidence:

- Site-visit of the OU let witness that the learning and research facilities are suited to the subject area of the programme. The number of PC is enough for PhD students enrolled to the OU Cycle 3 programme “Educational Studies”. There is an open access of PhD students to those PC, as well as to other research and dissemination facilities.
- The speed of the internet at the PCs is rather slow (24MB).
- PhD students of Cycle 3 program “Educational studies” have the access to relevant software (SmartPLS, SSPS, etc.) at OU PCs, i.e, at the PCs that are allocated in the research and development center.

- There is the repository of master and doctoral thesis in OU, with is accessible for PhD students.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

Laboratories and their equipments and library resources are suited to the subject area of the programme. Students have access to facilities and software necessary for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, also during self-study periods. However there is the recommendation to provide the bigger speed of internet for greater involvement of the PhD students into modern international research environment.

Teaching and learning resource materials

Learning environment has necessary facilities and resources including textbooks for all courses, and teaching and learning materials. Hard and soft copies of necessary resource materials for research work are available for immediate accessibility.

Evidence:

-
-
-
-

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- There are enough books, materials and copy of dissertation for the students.
- The university needs to increase open resources and its use.
- Each subject's textbooks and resources are not clear.
- It is not clear whether the students are using open resources that provided by the university
- It is recommended to increase the number of latest books and journals related to educational studies and provide an opportunity to read the articles from higher impact factor journals.

Information management system

The institution has in place an information management system for the collection and analysis of data. Data is collected, analyzed and used for quality improvement of the doctoral programmes

Evidence:

-
-

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

OU has a correct information management system. The enrolment registration, administrative processes and satisfaction surveys are done online, from different links included in the webpage when needed.

From the meetings and evidences, it has been confirmed that this information has been valuable to modify DP courses contents and other different issues.

Anonymous satisfaction surveys are done each year to the students via online/webpage. Interviewed students agree with the method, procedure put in place.

For other stakeholders the surveys are done face-to-face as the number of people is reduced. From the teacher’s survey meetings, the monitoring office organize the teaching trainings to be given for the year.

However, the evidences do not provide separated data about satisfaction surveys for only 3rd cycle studies students and related stakeholders.

Since the involvement of OU in the C3QA project the Quality Committee has developed an enhancement program, a handout about how to assess, get surveys from the students, procedures, and other quality issues. Related to the student assessment it is organized by the DP committee.

The data drawn from statistical analysis might be used to define different KPIs to be used to improve DP.

<p>Transparent programme information Information about the doctoral programme, including objectives intended learning outcomes, qualification awarded, duration, level, requirements, as well as information about the achieved programme outcomes, including graduates’ career paths, are made transparent for all relevant stakeholders. It is regularly updated.</p>
--

Evidence:

-
.....
.....
-
.....

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- Students' information, curriculum, planning and information about teachers are all in the information management system.
- The university website should be dynamic and should be able to provide all necessary information for the students.
- It is required to increase and expand databases.

Financial resources

The doctoral programme possess and maintain reliable financial resources from multiple sources to support the implementation, monitoring and improvement of the programmes.

Evidence:

- The income from the Cycle 3 program covers circa 15% of the program budget.
- OU director assures of the ability to finance the Program through the income redistribution between Cycle 1, 2 (totally more that 90% of OU income) and 3 programs.
- There are many financial rewards and / or discounts to stimulate the PhD students to conduct thesis research, publish articles, etc., which were provided during recent years. As the total value of discount, allowance and incentives for students is 4,5% of the total budget of the Cycle 3 programme "Educational Studies", while within the total OU budget that figure is much less, even negligible, the risk of its discharge on financial reason is quite low.

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The doctoral programme possess and maintain reliable financial resources from multiple sources to support the implementation, monitoring and improvement of the programme. To provide greater efficiency of the financial resources use (greater rate of succeeded graduates), there is a need to provide stricter control over PhD students' performance. The first step of it has been already done by OU in April 2019 by development and approval of the new regulation, which provide the annual reporting of PhD students and supervisors. This step results on graduation / defense rates must be analyzed in some years and the correction activities be provided in case of need.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 5:

- **FULLY MET THE CRITERION 5**

Criterion 6. QUALITY ASSURANCE

The doctoral programme is subject to regular internal and external quality assurance mechanisms directed at continuous development with the involvement of stakeholders.

Internal quality assurance and enhancement

The programme and its components (including teaching material and facilities) as well as the quality of the involved staff members are regularly evaluated. The programme demonstrates that evaluation results are used for continuous improvements. All relevant stakeholders are involved in evaluation mechanisms.

Evidence:

- • University has established internal quality assurance mechanisms ensuring cyclical external evaluation of doctoral program.
- • Institution has established structural unit responsible for implementation of internal quality assurance policy.
- • University has planned widen stakeholder communication organizing workshops.
- • University systematically assess their programs accumulate data for continuous development of program.
- • Twice an year university organize program committee meetings for actions of improvement of programs.
- • IQA unit organize stakeholder satisfaction survey.
- • university strive to stabilize supervisor institution establishing their assessment by published criteria and establishing accountability mechanism for supervisors
- • university strive to institutionalize the assessment system for academic supervisor selection and evaluation of effectiveness of their work.
- • University has accountability system of doctoral student progress
- • University creates doctoral students research evaluation mechanism and has quality assurance mechanism for the process of PhD defense focusing the schedule of doctoral students progress until their defense.
- • University present institutional internal quality assurance system, but not include information specific for doctoral program.
- • It is preferable to have data and structure of subsystem specific doctoral program

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- University present internal quality assurance system, but have not included information specific for doctoral program.
- It is preferable to have data and structure of subsystem specific for doctoral program.
- Big issue of university stressed by expert panel during the site visit is insufficiency of positive PhD awards (not regular) of doctoral students since of establishment of doctoral program.
- It is visible that mechanism of increasing cooperation between stakeholders have to be adapted specific for doctoral program. This mechanism have to take into account the specific goals, number of participants, expecting results and relation to external PhD defense commission (one in a country).
- Stakeholders stress that main expected outcome for doctoral program is preparation of well qualified teaching staff which is very narrow understanding of mission, because good research can attract external resources to the university.
- To have effective evaluation of programs it is better shift from massive survey procedures to workshops, focus group interviews and simple interviews with participants groups (doctoral students, supervisors, heads of university departments) of doctoral programs.
- University concentrate not enough resources to ensure proper level of research in a university.
- Strategy of university have to ensure critical mass of researchers for each of directions of research where participate university doctoral students.
- Theme of research selected have to account mentioned policy and looking for possible cooperation with other universities.
- University does not present specific strategy for research to which could be aligned theme of doctoral students, for now decided by random opinion or narrow vision, not account impossibility to do research isolated. Dissertation theme have to be aligned with strategy of government if such exists.
- Doctoral students randomly decided about their theme of research, one of weakness is ensuring capacity of proper supervisor for students who select narrow field.
- There is not ensured critical mass of researchers in any specific field decided as direction of research.
- University has very long-lasting strategic plan (10 years) which can be more like its vision (better to have 5 years plan). In case of not efficient defense practice (one in a ten year) enhancement strategy have to have more dynamic goals and stronger evaluation of goals (market can have dramatical change during 10 years).

- Supervisors institution have to become subject of special SWOT evaluation with development of special strategy for doctoral program.

External recognition at national and at international level

Where appropriate, the programme is externally evaluated by relevant national or international organization with a view to facilitating the academic or professional recognition of the qualification awarded.

Evidence and Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

- It is needed to have more professional SWOT analyze because “opportunities and threats” used not proper way. Analyze not ensured with data supporting conclusions included into SWOT.
- Program has issues in internationalization dimension, because lack of supervisors with good knowledge of English.
- SER has not supported with clear data of benchmarking evaluation of doctoral program to be in line with international developments.
- Lack of participation of international peers in doctoral program can be an issue for alignment of program with EHEA standards (ESG,..)

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 6:

- **FULLY MET THE CRITERION 6**

Г. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF THE PEERS:

1. The doctoral program is aiming at organizing research-based training and students are provided necessary assistance to do research and write a dissertation. Therefore, the program meets its name, goals, and content.
2. Curriculum committee and its structure was established based on the guideline which was prepared by the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science.
3. It is clearly defined that who teach what subjects and their titles in the Human resource planning.
4. Training resources and environment are well created in terms of the doctoral program. In relation to this, research centers that are equipped with modern technologies have been established for the doctoral students and their research work. It is considered as an advantage.

Based on the below mentioned assessments, Doctoral Program of Educational Studies offered by the Otgontenger University has fully met the requirements of the Doctoral Program Accreditation criterion and requirements that were approved by the National Council for Educational Accreditation' s Board.

No	Criterion	Assessment	Notes
1	Doctoral programme objectives and content	Fully met	
2	Doctoral Programme implementation	Fully met	
3	Doctoral student assessment and achieved programme outcomes	Fully met	
4	Teaching staff	Fully met	
5	Resources and information management System	Fully met	
6	Quality assurance	Fully met	
	Summary Assessment	Fully met the preliminary requirements	

A DECISION OF THE ACCREDITATION COMMISSION (Date)

Assessment and analysis

The Accreditation Commission for Degree Programmes decides to award the following seals:

Degree Programme	Seal	Maximum duration of accreditation

A) Accreditation with or without requirements

Requirements

A 1. (MNCEE x.x)

A 2. (MNCEE x.x)

Recommendations

E 1. (MNCEE x.x)

E 2. (MNCEE

x.x)

