

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE
SUMY NATIONAL AGRARIAN UNIVERSITY**

**Faculty of Economics and Management
Department of Management Named After Professor L.I.Mykhailova**

MODULE SYLLABUS

INTRODUCTION TO TEACHING AND LEARNING

(compulsory/elective)

Implemented in the “Agronomy” Academic Programme

Area of specialization H1 “Agronomy”

at the third (PhD) level of higher education

Sumy-2025

1. MODULE OVERVIEW

1.	Title	Introduction to teaching and learning		
2.	Faculty/Department	Economics and Management / Management		
3.	Type (compulsory or optional)	compulsory		
4.	Program(s) to which module is attached (to be filled in for compulsory types)	Agronomy		
5.	Module can be suggested for (to be filled in for optional types)	-		
6.	Level of the National Qualifications Framework	8 level		
7.	Semester and duration of module	2 semester, 10 weeks		
8.	ECTS credits number	3 ECTS		
9.	Total workload and time allotment	Directed study		Self-directed study
		Lectures	Practical	Labs
		20	20	50
10.	Language of instruction	English		
11.	Module leader	Iryna Skliar, Professor, PhD		
12.	Module leader contact information	educator.cited@gmail.com https://us02web.zoom.us/j/7756311721		
13.	Module description	<p>Module is a compulsory part of the PHD programmes. It is expected to develop your teaching skills. The Module is based on the requirements of Standards and Recommendations for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG, 2015), modern concepts in higher education (student-centered learning, learning outcomes approach). This module is developed taking into consideration the experience of participation in international educational projects (TEMPUS project "ALIGN")</p>		
14.	Module aim	<p>The aim of the module is to develop students' teaching skills for the implementation of effective teaching-learning approaches in accordance with learning outcomes approach and student-centered learning.</p>		
15.	Module Dependencies (prerequisites, co-requisites, incompatible modules)	The module is a prerequisite for "Practice in teaching".		
16.	The policy of academic integrity	<p>If a student submits the work of another author as his own, the work is canceled and a new one is prepared. If she/he cheats, she/he must take the task again. When he/he uses text without proper citation (academic plagiarism) the work is canceled</p>		

2. CORRELATION BETWEEN MODULE LEARNING OUTCOMES (MLOs) AND PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs)

MLOs:	PLOs		How assessed
On successful completion of the module the learner will be able to:	PLO 05. Effectively present and discuss research results, as well as scientific and applied problems in agronomy, with specialists and non-specialists in both native and foreign languages, and to competently present research outcomes in scientific publications in leading international academic journals.	PLO8. Develop and teach programme units (modules/disciplines) related to agronomy in higher education institutions using modern teaching technologies.	
MLOs 1 Design the teaching-learning activities, based on the learning outcomes approach, the principle of constructive agreement, and the research results on problems related to learning, teaching, and assessment in higher education in the context of the field of study.		X	1. Draft of Syllabus 2. Written exam (multiple choice test and short answers)
MLO 2. Conduct student assessment, feedback, and support for students in diverse learning environments, with respect to equality, diversity and inclusion		X	Peer review
MLO 3. Understand the wider context in which higher education operates, in particular society's orientation to the Sustainable Development Goals, recognising its implications for higher education in general and teaching practice in particular	X	X	1. Written exam (multiple choice test and short answers) 2. Draft of Syllabus

3. MODULE INDICATIVE CONTENT

Topics	Time allocation			Self-directed study	Learning resources (from the list of Learning resources)
	Directed study				
	Lectures	Workshops	Labs		
<p>Topic 1. Development of the modern area of higher education: national and international context. Features of learning in the information environment. The process of transformation of the European Higher Education Area. Changing the context of higher education. Qualifications framework and continuity of education. Quality of higher education. Standards and recommendations for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area. Student-centered learning</p>	2	2		6	1, 2, 3
<p>Topic 2 Learning Theories: Behaviorism, Cognitivism, Constructivism, Connectivism. Pedagogy, Andragogy, Heutagogy</p>	2	2		6	17
<p>Topic 3. Learning outcomes approach (competence approach). The concept of learning outcomes and competencies. Bloom's taxonomy. Structured Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO taxonomy).</p>	4	4		8	5, 6, 7, 10, 14
<p>Topic 4. Teaching-learning-assessment: the role of effective learning. Teaching methods, learning: principles of an effective learning strategy design. The concept of learning outcomes assessment. The role of assessment in higher education. ESG requirements for the assessment approaches. Types of assessment: assessment of learning, assessment for learning, assessment as learning (formative, summative, self-assessment). The role of the teacher in assessment. Types of assessment: diagnostic, normative, synoptic, objective, by criteria. Principles of developing an assessment strategy. Program Focused</p>	6	6		10	15, 16

Assessment (PFA). Methods of teaching and learning in different learning environments					
Topic 5. Study programme in higher education: development, delivering, monitoring, periodic review. Concepts and types of study programmes. International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED). The principle of constructive alignment in the design of programme's components. Connection in the chain "teaching - learning - assessment". Monitoring and periodic review of study programmes. Standards of higher education.	2	2		6	8, 10, 14
Topic 6. Sustainable Development Goals and Education for Sustainable Development: The Role and Tasks of Higher Education. Sustainable Development Goals and Experiences in Implementing Them in Learning, Teaching and Assessment. Education for Sustainable Development (ESD)	2	2		8	18-23
Topic 7. Ethical principles of teaching in higher education. Academic integrity and mechanisms for its ensuring. Ethical principles of teaching and research at the university	2	2		6	11, 13
Total	20	20		50	

3.

4. TEACHING AND LEARNING METHODS

MLOs	Teaching methods (directed study)	Hours (approximately)	Learning methods (self-directed study)	Hours (approximately)
<p>MLOs 1. research and discuss issues related to teaching and learning in the context of the specialty, taking into account trends in the European Higher Education Area, mechanisms for implementing the National Qualifications Framework, higher education standards, student-centered learning, continuity of education, lifelong learning</p>	<p>Flipped class, lecture-presentation, group discussion, case study</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>Personalized learning Reading, research, and analytical review of the problem related to teaching and learning (choice of the studentt)</p>	<p>24</p>
<p>MLOs 2. apply the learning outcomes approach to the development of study programmes ir its components in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.</p>	<p>Lecture-presentation, Case study, Learning by doing Teacher's consultations</p>	<p>16</p>	<p>Reading Course (programme) unit development Review of the course (programme) unit development</p>	<p>14</p>
<p>MLOs 3. develop an effective teaching-learning and assessment strategy in accordance with the principle of constructive alignment, combining current research on teaching, learning, assessment with personal experience as a teacher and as a student</p>	<p>Multimedia lecture Teacher's consultations Case study method Teacher's consultations</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>Reading Course (programme) unit development Review of the course (programme) unit development</p>	<p>12</p>

5. ASSESSMENT

5.1. Diagnostic assessment – not required

5.2. Summative assessment

No	Summative assessment methods	Grades	Deadline
1.	Draft of Syllabus	40 grades / 40%	7th ¹ and 10thweek
2.	Peer review	20 grades /20%	8th week
3.	Written exam (multiple choice test and short answers)	40 балів /40 %	11-13 week (according to the schedule)
4.	Total	100	

¹ Students submit a draft syllabus for review by their peers, who provide their review and feedback throughout the week. Students can improve their assignments after reviewing by their peers before submitting them to the teacher for assessment.

5.2.2. Marking criteria

Summative assessment method	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
<i>Draft of Syllabus</i>	<i><24 grades</i>	<i>24-29 grades</i>	<i>30-35 grades</i>	<i>36-40 grades</i>
	Not all components of the syllabus are developed and / or the information is unstructured, there is no understanding of the logical structure of the programme unit, the results are presented in an inappropriate format.	All components are available without detailed justification. Learning outcomes were not always formulated in accordance with the SMART principle, information on teaching methods was not structured, and compliance with the principle of constructive coordination was not demonstrated. The draft syllabus is submitted in the appropriate format.	Learning outcomes are articulated in accordance with the principle of SMART, aligned with the teaching, learning and assessment methods. The results are presented in the appropriate format.	Learning outcomes are articulated in accordance with the principle of SMART, aligned with the teaching, learning and assessment methods. The syllabus is based on benchmarking, contains innovative teaching and learning practices that are the result of the student's research. The results are presented in the appropriate format.
Peer review	<i><12 grades</i>	<i>12-14 grades</i>	<i>15-17 grades</i>	<i>16-20 grades</i>
	Not all components of the syllabus are developed and / or the information is unstructured, there is no understanding of the logical structure of the programme unit, the results are presented in an inappropriate format.	All components are available without detailed justification. Learning outcomes were not always formulated in accordance with the SMART principle, information on teaching methods was not structured, and compliance with the principle of constructive coordination was not demonstrated. The draft syllabus is submitted in the appropriate format.	Learning outcomes are articulated in accordance with the principle of SMART, aligned with the teaching, learning and assessment methods. The results are presented in the appropriate format.	Learning outcomes are articulated in accordance with the principle of SMART, aligned with the teaching, learning and assessment methods. The syllabus is based on benchmarking, contains innovative teaching and learning practices that are the result of the student's research. The results are presented in the appropriate format.

<i>Written exam (multiple choice test and short answers)</i>	<i><24 grades</i>	<i>24-29 grades</i>	<i>30-35 grades</i>	<i>36-40 grades</i>
	60% of correct answers, problem tasks not performed	60-74% of correct answers, problem tasks partially performed	75-89% of correct answers, problem tasks performed with minor inaccuracies.	90-100% of correct answers, problem tasks are completed with full reasoned answers.

5.3. Formative assessment

Formative exercises are designed to enable students to develop aspects of their learning, prior to summative assessments. Formative exercises are designed to help students use feedback and self-reflection to manage and develop their learning so that they can see how to improve their work.

No	Formative Assessment elements	Date
1.	1) Oral feedback from the lecturer while working on the draft syllabus 2) written feedback on the draft of the syllabus from the lecturer and from peers	1) during classes, 2) within 2 weeks after submission
2.	Oral feedback from lecturer and peers after the simulation	during classes
3.	On-line test with essay-based questions	9th week

There is a peer-to-peer assessment as an element of formative assessment (after the presentation of the analytical review, as well as reviewing the syllabus draft) and summative assessment within the module. From 35 points on syllabus draft 25 point are given from teacher and 10 points are given from peer reviewer (student). This approach allows students to develop skills of assessment, self-assessment, and responsibility, which is critical for them as future teachers.

6. LEARNING RESOURCES

1. Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) https://www.britishcouncil.org/ua/sites/default/files/standards-and-guidelines_for_qa_in_the_ehea_2015.pdf
2. Explaining the European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning <https://europa.eu/europass/system/files/2020-05/EQF-Archives-EN.pdf>
3. A Tuning Guide to Formulating Degree Programme Profile: Including Programme Competences and Programme Learning Outcomes, 2010 http://tuningacademy.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/A-Guide-to-Formulating-DPP_EN.pdf
4. The Dublin Descriptors <http://www.promeng.eu/downloads/training-materials/dublin-descriptors/3%20cycle%20descriptors.pdf>
5. Cedefop (2016). Application of learning outcomes approaches across Europe: a comparative study. Luxembourg: Publications Office. Cedefop reference series; No 105. https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/files/3074_en.pdf
6. Guide for Busy Academics Using Learning Outcomes to Design a Course and Assess Learning <http://sweb.cityu.edu.hk/teachingandlearning/new/resources/OBTL%20Action%20Verb.pdf>
7. Bowe Brian and Fitzmaurice Marian Guide to Writing Learning Outcomes <https://www.dit.ie/lttc/media/ditlttc/documents/Microsoft%20Word%20-%20LearningOutcomesGuide.pdf>
8. Using Biggs' Model of Constructive Alignment in Curriculum Design http://www.ucdoer.ie/index.php/Using_Biggs%27_Model_of_Constructive_Alignment_in_Curriculum_Design/Introduction
9. Declan Kennedy, Áine Hyland, Norma Ryan Writing and Using Learning Outcomes: a Practical Guide https://www.fibaa.org/fileadmin/uploads/content_uploads/Writing_and_Using_Learning_Outcomes_02.pdf
10. Accept Jonathan Deller (2019) The Ultimate Guide to Understanding Bloom's Taxonomy. Available at: <https://kodosurvey.com/blog/ultimate-guide-understanding-blooms-taxonomy#:~:text=The%20six%20levels%20of%20the%20original%20Bloom's%20taxonomy%20%2D%20Knowledge%2C%20Comprehension,for%20higher%20levels%20of%20thinking.>
11. Heuser, B. L. & Drake, T. A., 2011. Toward Global Academic Ethics through Accountability Systems. In: Creathing the Ethical Academy. Abingdon: Routledge
12. Mihaylo Milovanovitch, Caroline Macready, Tinde Kovac-Cerovic, Muriel Poisson (2017) OECD Reviews of Integrity in Education: Ukraine 2017.
13. Review of the Education Sector in Ukraine Moving. Toward Effectiveness, Equity and Efficiency (RESUME3) <http://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/884261568662566134/pdf/Review-of-the-Education-Sector-in-Ukraine-Moving-toward-Effectiveness-Equity-and-Efficiency-RESUME3.pdf>
14. Bloom's Taxonomy: The Ultimate Guide <https://tophat.com/blog/blooms-taxonomy/>
15. Guide to the Assessment Design Decisions Framework <http://www.assessmentdecisions.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Guide-to-the-Assessment-Design-Decisions-Framework.pdf>
16. Programme Focused Assessment. A short guide, 2012 <https://www.bradford.ac.uk/pass/resources/short-guide.pdf>

17. Zhou, M., & Brown, D. (Eds.). (2017). Educational learning theories. Retrieved from <https://oer.galileo.usg.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=education-textbooks>
18. Education for Sustainable Development Guidance, AdvanceHE and QAA, March 2021
19. Education for Sustainable Development: Towards achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (ESD for 2030)
20. [Fiselier, E.S.](#), [Longhurst, J.W.S.](#) and [Gough, G.K.](#) (2018), "Exploring the current position of ESD in UK higher education institutions", [International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education](#), Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 393-412
21. Lemarchand P, McKeever M, MacMahon C and Owende P (2022) A computational approach to evaluating curricular alignment to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. *Front. Sustain.* 3:909676. doi: 10.3389/frsus.2022.909676
22. Mapping the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in the University Curriculum Prepared by Sarah Kate Reid. Published April 2020 Available at: https://www.ed.ac.uk/sites/default/files/atoms/files/geosciences_report_aug2020.pdf
23. Ndubuka, N.N.; Rey-Marmonier, E. Capability approach for realising the Sustainable Development Goals through Responsible Management Education: The case of UK business school academics. *Int. J. Manag. Educ.* 2019, 17, 100319
24. Alfieri, L., Brooks, P. J., Aldrich, N. J., & Tenenbaum, H. R. (2011). Does discovery-based instruction enhance learning? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(1), 1–18.
25. Allen, D. O., & Webber, D. J. (2010). Attendance and exam performance at university: a case study. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 15(1), 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596740903565319>
26. Åsa Hirsh, Claes Nilholm, Henrik Roman, Eva Forsberg & Daniel Sundberg (2020): Reviews of teaching methods – which fundamental issues are identified?, *Education Inquiry*, DOI: 10.1080/20004508.2020.1839232
27. Bannigan, K., & Moores, A. (2009). A Model of Professional Thinking: Integrating Reflective Practice and Evidence Based Practice. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 76(5), 342–350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000841740907600505>
28. Barefoot, H., Oliver, M. and Mellar, H. (2016) ‘Informer choice? How the United Kingdom’s key information set fails to represent pedagogy to potential students’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 22(1), 3-19
29. Bennett, R. and Kane, S. (2014) ‘Students’ interpretations of the meanings of questionnaire items in the National Student Survey’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 20(2), 129-164.
30. Biesta, G. (2015) ‘What is Education For? On Good Education, Teacher Judgement, and Educational Professionalism’, *European Journal of Education*, 50(1), 75-87.
31. Bunce, L., Baird, A. and Jones, S. E. (2016) ‘The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance’, *Studies in Higher Education*, 2016, 1-21.
32. Cheng, M. (2011) ‘‘Transforming the learner’ versus ‘passing the exam’: Understanding the gap between academic and student definitions of quality’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 17(1), 3-17.
33. Cheng, M. (2017) ‘Reclaiming quality in higher education: a human factor approach’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 23(2), 153-167.

34. Dean, A. and Gibbs, P. (2015) 'Student satisfaction or happiness? A preliminary rethink of what is important in the student experience', *Quality Assurance in Education*, 23(1), 5-19.
35. Dochy, F., Segers, M., & Sluijsmans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24(3), 331–350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079912331379935>
36. Engstrom, C., & Tinto, V. (2008). Access Without Support is not Opportunity. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(1), 46–50. <https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.40.1.46-50>
37. Gray, C., Swan, J. and Rodway-Dyer, S. (2014) 'Student voice and engagement: connecting through partnership', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 20(1), 57-71.
38. Hirsh, Å., & Nilholm, C. (2019). Reviews of teaching methods – what are the fundamental problems? Paper presented at ECER Conference, Hamburg. Retrieved from <https://eera-ecer.de/ecer-programmes/conference/24/contribution/47337/>
39. Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 75–86.
40. Nair, C. S., Adams, P. and Mertova, P. (2008) 'Student Engagement: The Key to Improving Survey Response Rates', *Quality in Higher Education*, 14(3), 225-232.
41. Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003786559>
42. Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane- Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self- regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
43. Nilholm, C., & Göransson, K. (2017). What is meant by inclusion? An analysis of European and North American journal articles with high impact. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 32(3), 437–451
44. Polanin, J., Maynard, B., & Dell, N. (2017). Overviews in education research: A systematic review and analysis. I. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 172–203.
45. QAA (2015) UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part B: Assuring and Enhancing Academic Quality, Chapter B5: Student Engagement, Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency. QAA (2017) *Taking the long view of the student voice: Analysis of student written submissions to QAA review and audit*, Gloucester: Quality Assurance Agency.
46. Rosa, M. J., Sarrico, C. S. and Amaral, A. (2012) 'Academics' perceptions on the purposes of quality assessment', *Quality in Higher Education*, 18(3), 349-366.
47. Schmidt, H. G., Rotgans, J. I., & Yew, E. H. (2011). The process of problem-based learning: what works and why: What works and why in problem-based learning. *Medical Education*, 45(8), 792–806. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04035.x>
48. Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189.

49. Smetana, L. K., & Bell, R. L. (2012). Computer simulations to support science instruction and learning: A critical review of the literature. *International Journal of Science Education*, 34(9), 1337–1370
50. Tangen, R. (2014) ‘Balancing Ethics and Quality in Educational Research – the Ethical Matrix Method’, *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 58(6), 678-694
51. van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in teacher-student interaction: A decade of Research. *Educational Psychology Review*, 22(3), 271–296.
52. Wolfgramm-Foliaki, E. (2017) ‘The potential of student narratives to enhance quality in higher education’, *Quality in Higher Education*, 23(1), 53-64.