# Competencies, Learning Outcomes and Forms of Assessment: the Use of Tuning Methodology in Russia

Artur Demchuk, Yevgeniya Karavaeva, Yelena Kovtun, and Svetlana Rodionova*

doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185

**Abstract:** The article is focused on the correlation of competencies, learning outcomes and the methods of their assessment in the course of current, interim (end-of-module) and final assessment. It provides a general idea of the background and difficulties associated with the use of competence based learning in the Russian context. We propose an algorithm developed by the experts of Association of Classical Universities of Russia based on the methodology of the Tuning Educational Structures in Europe (TUNING) international project with special emphasis on assessing achievement of learning outcomes. By way of illustration, the undergraduate programmes in Philology and Psychology are discussed.

**Keywords:** Competencies; learning outcomes; assessment of learning outcomes; Tuning methodology.

## I. **Problem overview**

### I.1. *Integration of Russia in the European Higher Education Area*

Russia's higher education is being integrated into the global learning environment. This process is a major feature underlying the development of Russia's academic community. In 2003, Russia signed the Bologna Declaration and joined the efforts to create a common educational space in Europe. The cornerstones of this space include mobility, transparency,

* **Artur Demchuk** (arthur@leadnet.ru), Associate professor, Lomonossov Moscow State University (Russia). **Yevgeniya Karavaeva** (karavaeva@rector.msu.ru), Deputy Vice-Rector of Lomonossov Moscow State University (Russia). **Yelena Kovtun** (kovelen@mail.ru), Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Philology, Lomonossov Moscow State University (Russia). **Svetlana Rodionova** (rse14@mail.ru) is Associate Professor of the Chair for Contemporary Russian Linguistics, Bashkir State University (Ufa).

university-business cooperation, and adjustment of educational models to students' needs.

The recent decade saw Russia adopt a multi-level system of higher education. There emerge the links between employers and universities. Furthermore, the professional standards are introduced. The European experience have influenced both the new Federal Law 'On Education in the Russian Federation' and the new generation of federal educational standards. The new standards employ the competency-based approach which requires institutions of higher education to clearly define the professional activities the graduates are fit for, their personal qualities, and potential employment areas.

The federal standards prompt universities to create a new design of educational programmes comparable to that in Europe. The underlying approach here is based on the methodology of the Tuning Educational Structures in Europe project (Tuning). The approach was tailored to Russia's conditions within the Tuning Russia international initiative (2010-2013).[1]

The Tuning Russia project developed methods to redesign Russia's educational programmes in the credit/module fashion. The regulatory framework of Russia's education was also analysed in terms of its compliance with the Bologna principles.[2] The analysis was carried out within two projects: Tuning Russia and 'Expert and analytical support of enhancing the quality of educational programmes of primary, secondary and higher education based on the efficiency monitoring of introducing federal educational standards in regional systems of vocational and higher education'.[3]

The concept of 'competency' is, in itself, a significant challenge to implementing the Tuning methods in Russia. The definition of 'competency' in the country's regulatory framework is somewhat blurred, while the academic community lacks thorough understanding of how the competencies are shaped in the learning process. Moreover, there is uncertainty as to how we can assess whether the competencies have been actually developed by the students and to what extent. Specifically, a 'competency' is largely a term from employers' world. That is, it describes a graduate's professional activity after degree. Therefore, it is complicated to link the competencies

---

[1] The Tuning Russia, http://www.tuningrussia.org

[2] See: E.N. Kovtun and E.V. Karavaeva, "Adapting the Tuning Programme Profiles to the Needs of Russian Higher Education," *Tuning Journal for Higher Education*, no. 1 (November 2013): 187-202, http://www.tuningjournal.org

[3] State Contract No. 12.P20.11.0019 of 28 October 2011, the grant recipient (2011-2013) – the Association of Classical Universities of Russia, http://www.acur.msu.ru/monitoring.php


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

listed in federal educational standards to particular components of a degree programme's curriculum.

By way of illustration, let us consider a set of professional competencies related to creating, analysing and disseminating various types of texts. The example is taken from the federal educational standards on an undergraduate philology degree.[4] In Russia's universities, philological faculties have hardly any learning activities directly linked to this kind of competencies. Does it follow that their curricula do not allow students to develop these competences? The answer is certainly negative, because philology graduates have a long record of landing jobs in such spheres as mass media, advertising, and public relations, not to mention research and teaching positions. Remarkably, these are activities directly linked to creation and processing of various types of texts.

The challenge here consists in the competencies being shaped gradually in a number of stages: separate academic subjects (or sets of subjects), internships, student research, and other learning activities. This implies that the development of the competencies set forth in federal standards can be assessed only at the point of degree ('final assessment').

Therefore, the current (within subjects) and interim (end-of-subject/module) assessment of competencies presents the greatest problem in terms of monitoring student performance. In the example above, a philology student is not really focused on producing texts of various genres or styles. In essence, all of the texts he/she writes are research papers: reports, articles, term papers, and a thesis. Rather, a philology student attends lectures, gets prepared for seminars, and takes tests and examinations: by doing so, he/she demonstrates the acquired body of knowledge and skills. That is why institutions of higher education, while transferring to the competency-based model, often fail to heed the calls to alter their assessment activities in order to comply with this model. With regard to examinations in fundamental subjects, it turned out nearly impossible to 'relate assessment activities to the future professional requirements' (which is a cornerstone of this approach). For philology students, such subjects include the grammar of the languages they study or the history of Russian and foreign literature.

---

[4] The detailed description of the competencies is as follows: 'mastery of the basic skills in creating various types of texts using standard techniques and effective rules (PC-12); mastery of the basic skills of processing and post-processing (e.g., proofreading, editing, annotating, abstracting, lexicographic description) of various types of texts (PC-13); mastery of translation skills with regards to various types of texts (mainly scientific/journalistic texts as well as official documents) from and into foreign languages; annotating and abstracting of documents, research papers and fiction works in foreign languages (PC-14),' http://www.edu.ru/db-mon/mo/Data/d_10/prm34-1.pdf).


© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

## I.2. *Using TUNING methodology in Russia*

In other words, the competency-based model contained in federal standards and university's degree programmes does contradict the syllabi of individual subjects. Meanwhile, the list of these subjects cannot be abandoned without ruining the entire learning content. The TUNING methodology can prove incredibly helpful in resolving this kind of predicament. It allows to use competencies in order to draw up the learning outcomes which, in contrast to competencies, can be effectively monitored during both current and end-of-subject/module assessment. In this context, the learning outcomes are treated as those parts of competencies that correspond to particular curriculum components (subjects, internships, research work, self-study, etc.).

This methodology is being gradually incorporated in Russia's regulatory framework governing higher education. The 'competencies' and 'learning outcomes' were for the first time clearly distinguished in 2013, when 'The procedure for organising learning activities on undergraduate, specialist-degree, and master's programmes' was adopted.[5] The paper sets forth that a degree programme specification shall include 1. the students' competencies viewed as 'the intended results upon completion of a degree programme' *in general*, and 2. 'the intended learning outcomes for *each particular subject (module) or internship* — that is, the body of knowledge, skills, abilities and/or practical experience characterizing different stages of competencies development and ensuring achievement of the intended results upon completion of a degree programme'. The same idea is contained in another section specifying the structure of subject, module or internship syllabi: 'A subject (or module) syllabus shall include a list of learning outcomes for this subject (module) linked to the intended results upon completion of a degree programme.'

This approach allows various types of current and interim assessment to remain an effective tool of monitoring the learning outcomes (and, eventually, competencies) developed by the students. In this context, both traditional (classical examinations assessing knowledge) and more innovative (tests, projects, portfolio, etc.) assessment activities will become, or simply continue to be, understandable to all participants of the learning process.

---

[5] Decree of Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation No. 1367 of 19 December 2013 "*On Approval of the Procedure of Organization and Implementation of Learning Activity of Higher Education Programs – Bachelor, Specialist and Master Degree Programs*".


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

The difference between 'competencies' and 'learning outcomes' also underlies the principles of interim assessment (examinations and pass/fail tests) and assessment at the point of degree (final examinations, thesis defence). In other words, the interim and, to a certain extent, final assessment activities do not monitor the achievement of competencies as such, the competencies being a very broad and comprehensive notion. Rather, they are focused on more specific learning outcomes that do correspond to competencies but are also linked to certain parts of the curriculum.

For two years, the Association of Classical Universities of Russia (the ACUR) have developed methodology guidelines based on the TUNING materials and aimed to assist institutions of higher education in mastering this approach. The ACUR also designed a number of templates, including the so-called Competency Maps and Subject Syllabus. These expert-driven efforts were thoroughly discussed in 2014-2015 at meetings and consultations with officials of Russia's Ministry of Education and Science, employers, and representatives of the academic community. Below in this paper, we discuss the ACUR's major recommendations and provide examples of completing the templates.

## II. **Competencies and learning outcomes: Ensuring correlation**

### II.1. *Decomposition of competencies*

In order to deliver a degree programme, an educational institution shall define the following:

— what measurable learning outcomes comprise a particular generic or professional (subject-specific) competency;
— what educational technology (subjects, modules, internships) ensures the achievement of these learning outcomes by the students;
— what are the best forms and methods to assess the learning outcomes achieved;
— what are the criteria and grading scales used to assess the learning outcomes.

The first task requires to identify the main components of a competency — that is, to single out the body of knowledge, abilities and skills which will eventually form this competency. In other words, the educators developing a degree programme as well as subject, module or internship syllabi should


 ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

break down the competency in smaller items. The process includes the following steps:

Step 1. Breakdown in 'mastery' items. To have a 'mastery' means to comprehensively apply (make use of) the acquired knowledge, abilities, and skills for solving complex tasks, including in non-typical circumstances.

Step 2. Breakdown of 'mastery' into 'abilities' and 'skills' (where necessary). 'An ability' implies solution of typical tasks based on standard solution algorithms. 'A skill' is an ability perfected to an automatic action.

Step 3. Defining the necessary and sufficient scope of theoretical and applied knowledge required to build the abilities, skills, and mastery isolated at the previous steps.

This procedure implies that the competencies are decomposed in a top-down fashion (from mastery to abilities and then to knowledge). Conversely, a student develops competencies in a bottom-up manner (from knowledge to ability and then to mastery). That is why the Competency Map presents learning outcomes in reverse order — that is, from knowledge to mastery.

### II.2. *Singling out degrees of proficiency*

When breaking down a competency, we can single out several degrees of proficiency. The ACUR recommends that the number of degrees should not exceed three. They can be designated as 'threshold (minimal)', 'intermediate', and 'advanced'. There are various ways to distinguish such degrees.

As a rule, multiple degrees of proficiency are singled out in complex and multilevel competencies that are developed by the students at different stages of a degree programme or at different education levels. In this paper, we provide a map of a generic language/communicative competence for three levels of education (undergraduate, master's, doctoral). It is a good example of an all-embracing multilevel competence. In this map, three degrees of proficiency correspond to three levels of higher education.

In other cases, the degrees can be singled out depending on the following:

— A degree programme's profile / field of study; below we provide a decomposition of the professional competence *PC*-9 of an undergraduate programme in the 'Philology' field of study: 'possession of the basic skills in processing and post-processing (e.g., proofreading,


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

editing, annotating, abstracting, lexicographic description) of various types of texts'.
— Type of a degree programme: academic or applied (applied programmes provide for development of applied professional competencies at a higher level).
— Particular type of professional activity (an intermediate or/and advanced level of proficiency is attained by a student majoring in a certain field; while a threshold level are attained by those who have this field as their minor).

Certainly, programme developers should clearly specify the degree of proficiency required with respect to each multilevel competence obtained on this programme.

### II.3. *Structure of a competency map*

A competency decomposition results in a competency map. The map has a number of mandatory sections. The '*Competency Overview*' section includes the following details:

— The competency's code and name.
— The type of competency (generic, general professional, professional, or specialized professional).
— The description of the competency's links to other competencies or the substantiation of the need to acquire competencies in certain order (where applicable).
— The description of the required entry level of knowledge, abilities and practical experience needed to develop the competency (where necessary).
— A reference to a professional standard (if available) and job functions contained therein (and/or job functions related to the competency under consideration).
— Further directions and comments of the competency map developers (where necessary).

The '*Intended learning outcomes characterizing the stages of competency development and their assessment criteria*' section contains the following:

— The description of proficiency degrees for the competency (where necessary).

— The description of the intended learning outcomes (mastery, abilities, knowledge) and their codes for each degree of proficiency.
— The grading scale for learning outcomes with assessment criteria.

## III. **Examples of competency maps**

Below in this paper we demonstrate how the approach of TUNING and the ACUR can be put to practice. We provide an example of formulating the learning outcomes based on competencies description in two fields of study (subject areas) of Russia's higher education: 'Philology' and 'Psychology'.

By way of illustration, we selected three competencies. The first one is 'general cultural' competence (*GCC*) — it is a generic competence for all fields of study at a particular level of higher education (in this case, we consider the undergraduate level). The second competence is 'general professional' one (*GPC*) — it is mandatory for a particular field of study, regardless of an educational programme's profile. The third competency is 'professional' (*PC*) — it correlates with a particular type of a graduate's intended professional activity (defined in federal educational standards) and/or a degree programme's profile.

### III.1. *General cultural competence*

**MULTILEVEL MAP OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCIES OF GRADUATES AT UNDERGRAUATE, MASTER'S AND DOCTORAL LEVELS**

THE COMPETNCY'S NAME AND CODE

The general cultural competence of a graduate of a higher educational programme at the undergraduate level.

U-GCC-5: The capacity to communicate verbally and in writing, in Russian and foreign languages in order to ensure interpersonal and intercultural interaction.

The general professional competency of a graduate of a higher educational programme at the master's level.

M-GPC-3: The capacity to communicate verbally and in writing, in Russian and foreign languages in order to solve professional tasks.


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

The generic competence of a graduate of a higher educational programme at the doctoral level (training of research and teaching staff):

D-GC-4: The capacity to use modern methods and technology of research communication in national and foreign languages.

## THE COMPETENCY'S OVERVIEW

This map describes related and successive competencies that define the language (communicative) capabilities of graduates at three levels of higher education (undergraduate, master's, doctoral). The experts suggest that these competencies should be developed based on the same principles throughout different levels of education in a continuous fashion.

For all higher education levels, three main facets of a graduate's language (communicative) expertize are described:

— The capability to create verbal and written texts in the professional sphere.
— The capability to correctly express oneself both verbally and in writing; the capability to edit verbal and written materials.
— The capability to use methods and technology of effective communication.

For each level, we describe only those mastery items, abilities and knowledge which are new compared to the previous levels.

Sublevel 1 (index[1]) of the learning outcomes is a recommended sublevel for subject areas 1-4, 9; sublevel 2 (index [2]), for subject areas 5-8.[6]

The degrees of foreign language proficiency are cited in compliance with the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) used in the European Union.

The entry level of knowledge, abilities and practical experience that is a prerequisite for the competencies under consideration corresponds to the general education programme requirements set forth by the Federal Educational Standards of General Education.

[6] According to the List of Main Fields of Study in Higher Education approved by Decree of Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation No. 1061 of 12 September 2013 "*On the Approval of the Lists of Higher Education Fields of Study*".

**Table 1**

Intended learning outcomes charecterizing stages of competence development and assessment criteria

| **Intended learning outcomes** (indicators of a competency development) | **Assessment criteria for learning outcomes** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **First level (threshold) (U-GCC-5)**<br>**The capacity to communicate verbally and in writing, in Russian and foreign languages in order to ensure interpersonal and intercultural interaction.** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge:**<br>Student knows the major rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy) and the system of genres/ styles of the Russian language.<br>**Code K1 (U-GCC-5)**[1] | Displays no knowledge of the major rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses no knowledge of the system of genres/ styles in the Russian language. | Displays a weak and fragmented knowledge of the major rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses a weak and fragmented knowledge of the system of genres/ styles in the Russian language. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory knowledge of the major rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses a general knowledge of the system of genres/ styles in the Russian language. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a good knowledge of the major rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses a rather comprehensive knowledge of the system of genres/ styles in the Russian language. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid knowledge of the major rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses a full and proficient knowledge of the system of genres/styles in the Russian language. Makes no mistakes. |


doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Knowledge:** Student knows the system of rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy); the system of genres/ styles of the Russian language in its dynamics. **Code K2 (U-Gcc-5)**[2] | Displays no knowledge of the system of rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses no knowledge of the system of genres/ styles in the Russian language and its dynamics. | Displays a weak and fragmented knowledge of the system of rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses a weak and fragmented knowledge of the system of genres/ styles in the Russian language in its dynamics. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory knowledge of the system of rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses a general knowledge of the system of genres/styles in the Russian language in its dynamics. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a good knowledge of the system of rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses a rather comprehensive knowledge of the system of genres/ styles in the Russian language in its dynamics. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid knowledge of the system of rules of the modern Russian language (orthography, punctuation, grammar, style, orthoepy). Possesses a full and proficient knowledge of the system of genres/styles in the Russian language in its dynamics. Makes no mistakes. |


© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Abilities:** Student can use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language. **Code A1 (U-GCC-5)**[1] | Displays inability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language. | Displays a partial ability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory ability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a fairly stable ability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid ability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language. Makes no mistakes. |
| **Abilities:** Student can use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language; the major grammar reference web-sites in the Internet. **Code A2 (U-GCC-5)**[2] | Displays inability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language; the major grammar reference web-sites in the Internet. | Displays a partial ability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language; the major grammar reference web-sites in the Internet. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory ability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language; the major grammar reference web-sites in the Internet. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a fairly stable ability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language; the major grammar reference web-sites in the Internet. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid ability to use the major reference literature, explanatory dictionaries, and prescriptive dictionaries of the Russian language; the major grammar reference web-sites in the Internet. Makes no mistakes. |


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Mastery:** Student is skilled in producing, both verbally and in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. **Code M1 (U-GCC-5)**[1] Student has a foreign language proficiency at the A2 level. | Displays inability to produce, either verbally or in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. Does not have foreign language proficiency at the A2 level. | Displays a low ability to produce, both verbally or in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. Has a low foreign language proficiency at the A2 level. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory ability to produce, both verbally and in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. However, makes rather serious mistakes. Has a satisfactory foreign language proficiency at the A2 level. | Displays a good ability to produce, both verbally and in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. Has a good foreign language proficiency at the A2 level. | Displays a solid ability to produce, both verbally and in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. Makes no mistakes. Has a high foreign language proficiency at the A2 level (is fluent and confident in using the language). |


© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Mastery:** Student is skilled in producing, both verbally and in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis as well as research texts) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. **Code M2 (U-GCC-5)2** Student has a foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | Displays inability to produce, either verbally or in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis as well research texts) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. Does not have foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | Displays a low ability to produce, both verbally or in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis as well as research texts) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. Makes numerous and serious mistakes Has a low foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory ability to produce, both verbally and in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis as well as research texts) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. However, makes rather serious mistakes. Has a satisfactory foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | Displays a good ability to produce, both verbally and in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis as well as research texts) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. Has a good foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | Displays a solid ability to produce, both verbally and in writing, grammatically correct and logically coherent texts (abstracts, summaries, précis as well as research texts) in Russian on academic and research topics related to a particular field of study. Makes no mistakes. Has a high foreign language proficiency at the B1 level (is fluent and confident in using the language). |


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **The second level (intermediate) (M-GPC-3)**<br>**The capacity to communicate verbally and in writing, in Russian and foreign languages in order to solve professional tasks** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge:**<br>Student knows the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Knows the standards and features of good Russian language.<br>**Code K1 (M-GPC-3)**[1] | Displays no knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses no knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language. | Displays a weak and fragmented knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses a weak and fragmented knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses a satisfactory knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language. Makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a good knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses a fairly comprehensive knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses a full and proficient knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language. Makes no mistakes. |


 ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Knowledge:** Student knows the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Knows the standards and features of good Russian language. Knows linguistic persuasion techniques in the Russian language. **Code K2 (M-GPC-3)**[2] | Displays no knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses no knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language; no knowledge of linguistic persuasion techniques. | Displays a weak and fragmented knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses a weak and fragmented knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language; a weak and fragmented knowledge of linguistic persuasion techniques in the Russian language. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses a general knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language; a satisfactory knowledge of linguistic persuasion techniques in the Russian language. Makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a good knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses a fairly comprehensive knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language; a fairly comprehensive knowledge of linguistic persuasion techniques in the Russian language. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid knowledge of the rhetoric dimension of verbal and written communication in the Russian language. Possesses a full and proficient knowledge of the standards and features of good Russian language; a full an proficient knowledge of linguistic persuasion techniques in the Russian language. Makes no mistakes. |


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Abilities:** Student can analyse linguistic elements in Russian texts against language standards and make the necessary corrections. **Code A1 (M-GPC-3)**[1] | Displays inability to analyse linguistic elements in Russian texts against of language standards and make the necessary corrections. | Displays a partial ability to analyse linguistic elements in Russian texts against language standards and make the necessary corrections. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory ability to analyse linguistic elements in Russian texts against language standards and make the necessary corrections. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a fairly stable ability to analyse linguistic elements in Russian texts against language standards and make the necessary corrections. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid ability to analyse linguistic elements in Russian texts against language standards and make the necessary corrections. Makes no mistakes. |
| **Abilities:** Student can edit texts in scientific and formal styles of the Russian language. **Code A2 (M-GPC-3)**[2] | Displays inability to edit texts in scientific and formal styles of the Russian language. | Displays a partial ability to edit texts in scientific and formal styles of the Russian language. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory ability to edit texts in scientific and formal Russian. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a fairly stable ability to edit texts in scientific and formal styles of the Russian language. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid ability to edit texts in scientific and formal styles of the Russian language. Makes no mistakes. |

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Mastery:** Student is skilled in producing written and oral texts in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. **Code M1 (M-GPC-3)**[1] Student has a foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | No skill in producing written and oral texts in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. Does not have foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | Displays a low level of skill in producing written and oral texts in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. Has a low foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory level of skill in producing written and oral texts in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. However, makes rather serious mistakes. Has a satisfactory foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | Displays a good level of skill in producing written and oral texts in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. Has a good foreign language proficiency at the B1 level. | Displays a solid level of skill in producing written and oral texts in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. Makes no mistakes. Has a high foreign language proficiency at the B1 level (is fluent and confident in using the language). |


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Mastery:** Student is skilled in producing written and oral texts with the use of figures of speech in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. **Code M2 (M-GPC-3)**[2] Student has a foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | No skill in producing written and oral texts with the use of figures of speech in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. Does not have foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | Displays a low level of skill in producing written and oral texts with the use of figures of speech in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. Has a low foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory level of skill in producing written and oral texts with the use of figures of speech in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. However, makes rather serious mistakes. Has a satisfactory foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | Displays a good level of skill in producing written and oral texts with the use of figures of speech in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. Has a good foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | Displays a solid level of skill in producing written and oral texts with the use of figures of speech in scientific and formal Russian for solving professional tasks. Makes no mistakes. Has a high foreign language proficiency at the B2 level (is fluent and confident in using the language). |


© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **The third level (advanced) (D-GC-4)**<br>**The capacity to use modern methods and technology of research communication in national and foreign languages** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge:**<br>Student knows rhetoric rules and techniques of preparing and delivering verbal presentations for the purposes of scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in the Russian language.<br>**Code 31 (D-GC-4)**[1] | No knowledge about rhetoric rules and techniques of preparing and delivering verbal presentations for the purposes of scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in the Russian language. | Displays a weak, fragmentary knowledge about rhetoric rules and techniques of preparing and delivering verbal presentations for the purposes of scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in the Russian language. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory knowledge about rhetoric rules and techniques of preparing and delivering verbal presentations for the purposes of scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in the Russian language. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a good knowledge about rhetoric rules and techniques of preparing and delivering verbal presentations for the purposes of scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in the Russian language. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid knowledge about rhetoric rules and techniques of preparing and delivering verbal presentations for the purposes of scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in the Russian language. Makes no mistakes. |


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Knowledge:** Student knows the theory of linguistic persuasion and its major methods, as well as the techniques of successful scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in Russian. **Code 32 (D-GC-4)**[2] | No knowledge about the theory of linguistic persuasion and its major methods, as well as about the techniques of successful scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in Russian. | Displays a weak, fragmentary knowledge about the theory of linguistic persuasion and its major methods, as well as about the techniques of successful scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in Russian. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory knowledge about the theory of linguistic persuasion and its major methods, as well as about the techniques of successful scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in Russian. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a good knowledge about the theory of linguistic persuasion and its major methods, as well as about the techniques of successful scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in Russian. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid knowledge about the theory of linguistic persuasion and its major methods, as well as about the techniques of successful scientific, professional, and sociocultural communication in Russian. Makes no mistakes. |
| **Abilities:** Student can use major up-to-date technologies and methods of scientific communication, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. **Code U1 (D-GC-4)**[1] | Displays inability to use major up-to-date technologies and methods of scientific communication, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. | Displays some ability to use major up-to-date technologies and methods of scientific communication, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory ability to use major up-to-date technologies and methods of scientific communication, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a fairly stable ability to use major up-to-date technologies and methods of scientific communication, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a stable ability to use major up-to-date technologies and methods of scientific communication, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. Makes no mistakes. |


© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Abilities:** Student can comprehensively use the system of up-to-date scientific communication technologies and methods, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. **Code U2 (D-GC-4)²** | Displays inability to comprehensively use the system of up-to-date scientific communication technologies and methods, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. | Displays some ability to comprehensively use the system of up-to-date scientific communication technologies and methods, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory ability to comprehensively use the system of up-to-date scientific communication technologies and methods, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. However, makes rather serious mistakes. | Displays a fairly stable ability to comprehensively use the system of up-to-date scientific communication technologies and methods, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a stable ability to comprehensively use the system of up-to-date scientific communication technologies and methods, including informational ones, in national and foreign languages. Makes no mistakes. |


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Mastery:** Student is skilled in making accurate, consistent, clear, expressive and appropriate verbal presentations as well as texts of various genres in scientific and formal Russian. **Code M1 (D-GC-4)**[1] Student has a foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | No skill in making an accurate, consistent, clear, expressive and appropriate verbal presentations as well as texts of various genres in scientific and formal Russian. Does not have foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | Displays a low level of skill in making accurate, consistent, clear, expressive and appropriate verbal presentations as well as texts of various genres in scientific and formal Russian. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. Has a low foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory level of skill in making accurate, consistent, clear, expressive and appropriate verbal presentations as well as texts of various genres in scientific and formal Russian. However, makes rather serious mistakes. Has a satisfactory foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | Displays a good level of skill in making accurate, consistent, clear, expressive and appropriate verbal presentations as well as texts of various genres in scientific and formal Russian. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. Has a good foreign language proficiency at the B2 level. | Displays a solid level of skill in making an accurate, consistent, clear, expressive and appropriate verbal presentations as well as texts of various genres in scientific and formal Russian. Makes no mistakes. Has a high foreign language proficiency at the B2 level (is fluent and confident in using the language). |


 ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of a competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Mastery:** Student is skilled in public speaking, reasoning, and polemicizing in scientific, professional, and sociocultural contexts in Russian. **Code M2 (D-GC-4)**[2] Student has a foreign language proficiency at the C1 level. | No skill in public speaking, reasoning, and polemicizing in scientific, professional, and sociocultural contexts in Russian. Does not have foreign language proficiency at the C1 level. | Displays a low level of skill in public speaking, reasoning, and polemicizing in scientific, professional, and sociocultural contexts in Russian. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. Has a low foreign language proficiency at the C1 level. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory level of skill in public speaking, reasoning, and polemicizing in scientific, professional, and sociocultural contexts in Russian. However, makes rather serious mistakes. Has a satisfactory foreign language proficiency at the C1 level. | Displays a good level of skill in public speaking, reasoning, and polemicizing in scientific, professional, and sociocultural contexts in Russian. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. Has a good foreign language proficiency at the C1 level. | Displays a solid level of skill in public speaking, reasoning, and polemicizing in scientific, professional, and sociocultural contexts in Russian. Makes no mistakes. Has a high foreign language proficiency at the C1 level (is fluent and confident in using the language) |


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

III.2. *General Professional Competency*

## THE MAP OF GENERAL PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY OF GRADUATES AT UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL (PSYCHOLOGY)

### THE COMPETENCY'S NAME AND CODE

GPC-2 — a capability to find, substantiate and be responsible for solutions to professional tasks in non-standard circumstances.

### THE COMPETENCY'S OVERVIEW

The general professional competency of graduates at the undergraduate level, 'Psychological Sciences', Code 37.00.00 in *UGNS* (Classification of Extended Groups of Main Fields of Study)


 ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

**Table 2**

Intended learning outcomes charecterizing stages of competency development and assessment criteria

| **Intended learning outcomes*** (indicators of competency development) | **Assessment criteria for learning outcomes** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Knowledge:** Student knows the scope and requirements of the profession; knows professional techniques to be used in standard and non-standard situations; knows professional ethics. **Code K (GPC-2)** | No knowledge. | Fragmentary, unorganised knowledge. | Displays some knowledge. While solving professional tasks, cannot distinguish between standard and non-standard situations. | Displays knowledge about the scope of the profession. Knows techniques to be used in non-standard conditions. However, cannot explain the connection between professional ethics and the techniques used. | Possesses the required system of knowledge and abilities; realizes the peculiarities and ethics of their professional application in different conditions. |
| **Abilities:** Student can substantiate his/her choice of a professional technique in non-standard conditions, taking into account professional ethics. **Code A (GPC-2)** | No ability. | Considerable mistakes in implementing professional techniques in non-standard conditions. | Cannot fully substantiate his/her choice of a professional technique to be used in non-standard conditions. | Can substantiate his/her choice of a professional technique to be used in non-standard conditions. However, there are some inaccuracies in implementing the technique. | Full and well-reasoned substantiation of his/her choice of a professional technique to be used in non-standard conditions. |

**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, November 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes* (indicators of competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Mastery:** Mastery of professional techniques in non-standard conditions **Code M (GPC-2)** | No mastery. | Considerable mistakes in implementing a professional technique in non-standard conditions. | Successfully applies professional techniques. However, does not fully considers the non-standard nature of the given conditions. | Successfully applies professional techniques in non-standard conditions. However, occasionally fails to consider alternative solutions and their ethical consequences. | Reasonably complies with professional ethics when choosing and implementing professional techniques in non-standard conditions. |

III.3. *Professional competency*

## THE MAP OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCY OF GRADUATES AT UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL (PHILOLOGY)

### THE COMPETENCY'S NAME AND CODE

PC-9 — possession of the basic skills in processing and post-processing (e.g., proofreading, editing, annotating, abstracting, lexicographic description) of various types of texts.

### THE COMPETENCY'S OVERVIEW

The professional competency is acquired by graduates who have Philology as their main field of study (major) at the undergraduate level.

PC-9's links to other competencies. PC-9 comprises a defined set of abilities and skills. It builds on knowledge-based competencies. PC-9 belongs to applied competencies and presumes the ability to: (1) collect and analyse (i.e., systematize, process, archive, alter, and summarize) linguistic and literary facts using traditional methods and up-to-date information technologies; (2) produce texts of various types using standard methods and according to the existing standards/rules: for example, verbal presentations, reviews, annotations, abstracts, memos, and reports, as well as formal, journalistic, or advertising texts; (3) manage an organization's documents; (4) perform processing and post-processing of texts of various types: specifically, to proofread, to edit, to annotate, to systematize, to summarize, and to abstract texts; (5) do reviews; and (6) participate in: compiling dictionaries and encyclopaedias; creating linguistic and literary reference books; issuing periodicals; processing and describing archive materials; and performing literary analysis. The development of PC-9 is based on general cultural and general professional competencies, such as GCC-5, GPC-2, GPC-4, GPC-5 and GPC-6. PC-9 is most closely connected with PC-8. The latter implies mastery of basic skills in creating texts of various types based on standard methods and according to the existing standards/rules.

Depending on the main field of study, PC-9 can be developed at two levels. Russian Philology or Foreign Language Philology as the main field of study requires only the first level of competency development. Meanwhile, Applied Philology requires the second one.


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

**Table 3**

Intended learning outcomes characterizing stages of competency development and assessment criteria

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **First level/stage (PC-8)-I** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge:** Student knows basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; spelling and punctuation rules. | No knowledge of basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; spelling and punctuation rules. | Displays a weak, fragmentary knowledge of basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; spelling and punctuation rules. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory knowledge of basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; spelling and punctuation rules. | Displays a fairly good knowledge of basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; spelling and punctuation rules. | Displays a well-organized and confident knowledge of basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; spelling and punctuation rules. |
| **Abilities:** Student can do proofreading, abstract all types of texts, annotate literary and scientific texts. | Displays inability to do proofreading, abstract all types of texts, annotate literary and scientific texts. | Makes serious mistakes in proofreading, abstracting all types of texts, annotating literary and scientific texts. | Makes numerous mistakes in proofreading, abstracting all types of texts, annotating literary and scientific texts. | Displays ability to correctly do proofreading, abstract all types of texts, annotate literary and scientific texts. Makes occasional mistakes. | Displays a solid and confident ability to do proofreading, abstract all types of texts, annotate literary and scientific texts. |


© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Mastery:** Student is skilled in basic types of editing, in methods of abstracting and annotating texts. | Displays no skills in basic types of editing, in methods of abstracting and annotating texts. | Displays poor skills in basic types of editing, in methods of abstracting and annotating texts. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays satisfactory skills in basic types of editing, in methods of abstracting and annotating texts. | Displays good skills in basic types of editing, in methods of abstracting and annotating texts. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a confident mastery of skills in basic types of editing, in methods of abstracting and annotating texts. |
| **Second level/stage (PC-8)-II** | | | | | |
| **Knowledge:** Student knows the basics of text theory and textual criticism; basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; fundamentals of lexicography; practical stylistics of the first foreign language (B language). | No knowledge of the basics of text theory and textual criticism; basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; fundamentals of lexicography; practical stylistics of the first foreign language (B language). | Displays a weak, fragmentary knowledge of the basics of text theory and textual criticism; basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; fundamentals of lexicography; practical stylistics of the first foreign language (B language). | Displays a minimal, satisfactory knowledge of the basics of text theory and textual criticism; basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; fundamentals of lexicography; practical stylistics of the first foreign language (B language). | Displays a fairly good knowledge about of the basics of text theory and textual criticism; basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; fundamentals of lexicography; practical stylistics of the first foreign language (B language). | Displays a well-organized, confident knowledge of the basics of text theory and textual criticism; basic methods and techniques of text processing and post-processing; proof-reader's marks; fundamentals of lexicography; practical stylistics of the first foreign language (B language). |



doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

| Intended learning outcomes (indicators of competency development) | Assessment criteria for learning outcomes | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Abilities:** Student can edit journalistic and formal texts; assist in preparing materials for linguistic and other types of dictionaries. | Displays no ability to edit journalistic and formal texts; assist in preparing materials for linguistic and other types of dictionaries. | Makes serious mistakes in editing journalistic and formal texts; preparing materials for linguistic and other types of dictionaries. | Makes numerous mistakes in editing journalistic and formal texts; preparing materials for linguistic and other types of dictionaries. | Displays the ability to correctly edit journalistic and formal texts; assist in preparing materials for linguistic and other types of dictionaries. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a solid ability to edit journalistic and formal texts; assist in preparing materials for linguistic and other types of dictionaries. |
| **Mastery:** Student is skilled in basic types of editing; basic methods of lexicographic description; searching the Russian National Corpus. | No mastery of the basic types of editing; basic methods of lexicographic description; searching the Russian National Corpus. | Displays poor mastery of basic types of editing; basic methods of lexicographic description; searching the Russian National Corpus. Makes numerous and serious mistakes. | Displays a minimal, satisfactory mastery of basic types of editing; basic methods of lexicographic description; searching the Russian National Corpus. | Displays a good mastery of the basic types of editing; basic methods of lexicographic description; searching the Russian National Corpus. Makes some occasional mistakes that are not serious. | Displays a confident mastery of the basic types of editing; basic methods of lexicographic description; searching the Russian National Corpus. |


 ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

These competency maps were prepared by different groups of experts. Therefore, they illustrate different approaches to formulating learning outcomes. For example, philology experts describe a graduate's professional activity in sufficient detail. Conversely, experts in psychological sciences only confine themselves to general definitions. Obviously, their map has practically no relation to psychology per se. This refers to both learning outcomes and the definition of the competency outlined in the corresponding federal educational standard. Such competency map hardly discloses any concrete peculiarities of studying psychology.

## IV. **Assessing achievement of learning outcomes**

### IV.1. *Forms of controlling/assessing the achievement of learning outcomes*

As is shown above, a competency map is not confined to the description of learning outcomes. In line with the TUNING recommendations, it also provides criteria for their achievement as well as assessment scales. Thus, it offers an instrument for evaluating the level of competency acquisition at each stage of competency development.

The assessment scale presented in the competency maps is not identical to Russia's traditional five-mark grading system which, in fact, includes only four marks: 'unsatisfactory', 'satisfactory', 'good', and 'excellent'. However, the two scales overlap according to a number of parameters. The five-mark scale used in the competency maps is convenient for rank- and standards-based grading systems and is intentionally approximated to the European grading model.

Using competency maps, developers of a degree programme independently choose the necessary ways and methods of assessing learning outcomes in the course of current, end-of-module and final assessment.

For example, the following ways and methods of assessing learning outcomes can be used to evaluate the development of the PC-9 competency in Philology as the main field of study (major):

- **PC-9–I (mastery):** practical tasks of annotating and abstracting texts;
- **PC-9–I (abilities):** abstracting and annotating texts;
- **PC-9–I (knowledge):** practical tasks on rules of spelling and punctuation, and on proof-reader's marks; tests; dictations;
- **PC-9-II (mastery):** practical tasks on various types of editing and methods of lexicographic description; assignments based on searching the Russian National Corpus;


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

— **PC-9-II (abilities):** term paper or thesis;
— **PC-9-II (knowledge):** practical tasks on text theory, lexicography, basics of editing, and applied stylistics; tests.

IV.2. *Controlling/assessing the achievement of learning outcomes in subjects/modules and internships*

At least two sections of a degree programme must outline the ways and methods of learning outcomes assessment.

Firstly, the template of a competency map is supposed to be further supplemented by section *Final Assessment of Student's Competency Development*. The section is intended to describe the following:

— The ways of final assessment of competency development: for example, a report on practical training, a project defence, a complex practical assignment, etc.
— The place of final assessment in a degree programme: for example, work placement, end-of-module assessment, state final examination.

Secondly, this information must be specified in syllabi of subjects/modules and internships (according to 'The procedure for organizing learning activities on undergraduate, specialist-degree, and master's programmes').

For this purpose, it is recommended that the following sections are introduced to the template of a subject syllabus:

1. A subject's/module's intended learning outcomes in correlation with a degree programme's intended learning outcomes (graduates' competencies)

The section must be filled out in accordance with competency maps. Authors of a degree programme should in particular discuss cases where a competency is fully developed within a single subject/module or a subject/module completes its development. This enables to combine summative assessment of a competency acquisition with the end-of-module assessment of learning outcomes.


 ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

For example:

| Competency's code (specify the level of competency acquisition, if available in a competency map) | A subject's prospected learning outcomes |
|---|---|
| GC-1 | A1 (GC-1) Student can _____ |
| GPC-2 | K1 (GPC-2) Student knows _____ |
| PC-1<br>Final stage of competency development | A1 (PC-1) Student can _____<br>M1 (PC-1) Student is skilled in _____<br>Final assessment of the PC-1competency development |

2. Interim assessment tools

This section includes lists of test questions, possible topics of reports, and examples of test assignments for a subject. It also contains the following table:

| A subject's learning outcome | Scale and criteria for assessing a learning outcome (in accordance with the competency map) | | | | | Assessment procedures |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| A1 (GC-1) Student can _____ | | | | | | e.g., a practical assignment |
| K1 (GPC-2) Student knows _____ | | | | | | e.g., an oral interview, or tests |
| Final assessment of the PC-1 competency development | | | | | | e.g., a complex practical task, project defence, or portfolio defence |

Learning outcomes and ways of assessing their achievement can also be correlated in a special document, The Plan for Staged Competency Development.


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

## V. **Improving the Algorithm**

The proposed algorithm is still being enhanced. The academic community is currently discussing a few additions to it. Here we will only consider one debatable issue.

The algorithm implies that teachers use a competency map to specify a number of parameters for each component of a degree programme (subject, module, practical training, etc.) depending on the intended learning outcomes. These parameters include: technologies and methods of teaching and learning; the sequence, teaching workload and forms of taught classes and of self-study.

For this reason, it is, perhaps, sensible to introduce a special section to competency maps that would determine the correlation between the learning outcomes and the approximate number of subjects (or, in a broader sense, types of learning and teaching activity) required to achieve them. Alternatively, this section can be drawn up as a separate paper included in a degree programme's specification.

For example, a Bachelor of Philology must acquire the PC-9 competency that presumes mastery of basic skills in processing and post-processing of various types of texts: proofreading, editing, annotating, abstracting, and lexicographic description. The related learning outcomes can be achieved within such subjects as 'Practical Course of First Foreign Language (B language)', 'Practical Training in Spelling and Punctuation', 'Modern Foreign Language (B language): Theoretical course', 'Stylistics of First Foreign Language', 'Practical Stylistics', 'Basics of Editing', 'Literary Editing', 'Textual Criticism', 'Linguistic Analysis', 'Theory and Practice of Linguistic Persuasion', 'Communicative Practical Training', 'Practical Training in Creative Writing', etc.

Thus, a degree programme would become logically complete where it comprises: (1) the competency; (2) learning outcomes; (3) learning and teaching activities ensuring achievement of learning outcomes; (4) ways and methods to assess achievement of learning outcomes; and (5) assessment scales and criteria. All these components should be presented in one single table. This would be helpful in terms of linking the documents that are so different in form — namely, a competency map, a standard subject syllabus, a subject syllabus, and assessment materials (i.e., all those documents that an educational institution shall submit for expert examination in order to obtain state accreditation for a degree programme).

The competency-based algorithm we have proposed allows to handle learning outcomes, assessment methods and education technologies in a highly effective way. However, the benefits of this approach become tangible

only on condition of a *responsible team work of all faculty members* involved in development and delivery a degree programme. Importantly, all faculty members share responsibility for students developing the competencies (learning outcomes) specified in a degree programme. Therefore, all faculty members should clearly understand the place and role of their subjects (modules) in the overall structure of a degree programme.

Regrettably, such team work still makes an exception in Russia's academic community. Thus, a considerable methodological effort and a long time are required for the majority of Russian teachers to master and actively use the competency-based approach and its implementation algorithm we have proposed.

## Bibliography

Decree of Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation No. 1367 of 19 December 2013: On Approval of the Procedure of Organization and Implementation of Learning Activity of Higher Education Programs – Bachelor, Specialist and Master Degree Programs".

Decree of Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation No. 1061 of 12 September 2013: "On the Approval of the Lists of Higher Education Fields of Study".

E.N. Kovtun and E.V. Karavaeva, "Adapting the Tuning Programme Profiles to the Needs of Russian Higher Education." *Tuning Journal for Higher Education* 1, no. 1 (November 2013): 187-202, http://www.tuningjournal.org

State Contract No. 12.P20.11.0019 of 28 October 2011, the grant recipient (2011-2013) – the Association of Classical Universities of Russia. http://www.acur.msu.ru/monitoring.php

The Tuning Russia. http://www.tuningrussia.org

## About the Authors

ARTUR DEMCHUK (arthur@leadnet.ru) is Associate professor and Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Political Science at the Lomonossov Moscow State University (Russia). His research activities focus on comparative politics, conflict management, and methodological approaches to the modernization of Russian higher education. He has more than 15 years of experience in working with the Curriculum Development Association in classical university education. He participates in a number of international projects in the field of higher education, including TEMPUS projects. He is the Coordinator of the Centre for Networking and Academic Mobility of the Association of Classical Universities of Russia (ACUR). Mr. Demchuk holds a PhD in Philosophy (Lomonossov Moscow State University, Russia).


**Tuning Journal for Higher Education**
© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/

YEVGENIYA KARAVAEVA (karavaeva@rector.msu.ru) is Deputy Vice-Rector of Lomonossov Moscow State University (Russia), Executive Director of the Association of the Classical Universities of Russia (ACUR). She has a PhD degree in Physics and Mathematics (Lomonosov Moscow State University). Her research interests focus on the modernization of Higher Professional Education, including the adaptation of the European methodological approaches to the Russian educational environment, and University Management and Quality Control. Between 2005 and 2015 she coordinated more than 10 research projects on innovation in education (funded by the Russian Ministry of Science and Education). From 2006 to 2007, Dr. Karavaeva was a member of the Task Force of the Russian Ministry of Science and Education that designed and developed a new model 'Federal Educational Standard'. She participates in a number of international projects in the field of higher education and has published more than 50 articles on the development of higher education and innovation in education in Russia and abroad.

YELENA KOVTUN (kovelen@mail.ru) is Deputy Dean of the Faculty of Philology at the Lomonossov Moscow State University (Russia) and Chair of Slavic and Central European Studies at the Russian State University for the Humanities. Her research activities focus on Slavic culture and literature, theory and history of science fiction, and methodological approaches to the modernization of Russian higher education. She has more than 20 years of experience in working with the Curriculum Development Association in classical university education as the Secretary and Deputy Chair of the Council on Curriculum Development in Philology. Since 2000 she participates in a number of international projects in the field of higher education, including adaptation of the European teaching methods in Russia (TUNING RUSSIA project included). She is an expert of the Association of Classical Universities of Russia (ACUR). Dr. Kovtun holds a PhD in Philology (Lomonossov Moscow State University, Russia).

SVETLANA RODIONOVA (rse14@mail.ru) is Associate professor of the Chair for Contemporary Russian Linguistics and Head of Curriculum Development Department at Bashkir State University (Ufa). She graduated from Lomonossov Moscow State University, Russia and has a PhD degree in Philology. Her research interests focus on Russian language semantics. She authored more than 100 publications including articles on teaching philological disciplines and on the modernization of higher education in Russia. From 1992 to 2015 she used to be a member of the Presidium of the Council on Curriculum Development in Philology of the Curriculum Development Association in classical university education. She is currently an expert of the Association of Classical Universities of Russia (ACUR). Dr. Rodionova was a member of the Task Force of the Russian Ministry of Science and Education that designed and developed a new 'Federal Educational Standard' in Philology. Between 2005 and 2013 she coordinated 3 and participated in 7 projects on innovation in education (funded by the Russian Ministry of Science and Education).


© University of Deusto. ISSN: 2340-8170 • ISSN-e: 2386-3137. Volume 3, Issue No. 1, Novenber 2015, 149-185
doi: 10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp149-185 • http://www.tuningjournal.org/