Accreditation Report

General Medicine Program

Provided by:
Sechenov University, Faculty of Medicine

Version: 17 September 2020

Introduction

This pilot accreditation procedure conducted at the Faculty of Medicine at Sechenov University from April 15th to 18th 2019 is one of altogether 6 pilot procedures in various European countries, organised in cooperation between The Association of Medical Schools in Europe (AMSE) and the internationally recognized German Accreditation Agency ASIIN in 2019.

AMSE und ASIIN in this context have entered into an agreement in the wake of a decision by the Education Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates (ECFMG) in the United States of America regarding the exercise of the medical doctor profession in the country. ECFMG therein stipulates that as of the year 2023, only those graduates emanating from international medical programmes which have been accredited against the standards of the World Federation of Medical Education (WFME) for basic medical education are entitled to take the United States Medical Licencing Examination (USMLE). Only upon successful completion of this three-step examination, international doctors, who comprise 25% of all medical doctors in the U.S., are entitled to practice their profession within the U.S.

Against this background, ASIIN has been commissioned by AMSE to conduct this and another five pilot accreditation procedures in Europe, testing the WFME Standards in the process. WFME uses altogether nine criteria in its standards for basic medical education. The rubrics of fulfilment of these criteria foresee so-called “basic standards” as a minimum requirement as well as more challenging “quality development standards” signalling best practice. The experts, who were jointly selected by AMSE and ASIIN, decide after the onsite visit whether and at which level these nine criteria (and their subsets) have been attained by the applicant Higher Education Institution (HEI). After completion of this procedure, ASIIN will hand over this accreditation report to AMSE. Its outcomes will be discussed by AMSE and a final decision reached, whether the basic and quality development standards of WFME have been met.

Table of Content

A About the Accreditation Process

General Data

Website of the Medical School	https://www.sechenov.ru/eng/
Faculty/Department offering the Degree Programme	Faculty of Medicine
Name of the degree programme (in original language	
(Official) English translation of the name	General Medicine Program

Certification Subjects	
Submission of the final version of the self-assessment report: 21.03.2019 **Date of the onsite visit:** 15. – 18.04.2019 **at:** Sechenov University, Moscow	
Peer panel: Antje Kula, MA, MSc, Hannover Medical School Prof. Dr. Dr. Oliver Müller, University of Applied Sciences Kaiserslautern Prof. Dr. Jose M. Peinado, University of Granada Samin Sedghi Zadeh, student, University of Turin	
Representative of the ASIIN headquarter: Arne Thielenhaus	
Responsible decision-making committee: AMSE Executive Committee	
Criteria used: European Standards and Guidelines as of 15.05.2015 WFME Global Standards for Quality Improvement: Basic Medical Education 2015	

B Characteristics of the Degree Programme

a) Name	Final degree (original/English translation)	b) Areas of Specialization	c) Corresponding level of the EQF[1]	d) Mode of Study	e) Double/Joint Degree	f) Duration	g) Credit points/unit	h) Intake rhythm & First time of offer
General Medicine	Specialist's degree	Medicine	Level 6	Full-time	No	12 semesters	360 credit units* / ECTS * One credit unit in the programme established in accordance with the Federal State Education Standard is equivalent to 36 academic hours (1 hour = 45 minutes) or to 27 hours (1 hour = 60 minutes).	Annually The 1st intake – September 01 The 2nd intake – November 01

For the Specialist's degree programme General Medicine, the institution has presented the following profile on the University website

„The specialist's degree programme in General Medicine (hereinafter "the Programme") is designed to prepare a qualified physician, M.D. possessing a system of universal professional competencies, capable and ready for independent occupational practice.

An objective and qualification tasks of the Programme are based on the Federal State Education Standard of Higher Education for the specialty General Medicine and the Professional Standard for a Physician, M.D. The Federal State Education Standard of Higher Education for the specialty General Medicine (hereinafter "the Standard") is developed with due regard to the results of international medical research and current trends in global healthcare. It states that the field of professional activity of graduates who have mastered the Pro-

[1] EQF = The European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning

gramme includes the protection of health of citizens by ensuring the provision of medical care in accordance with the established requirements and standards in the field of health care. The Standard is a complex of requirements imposed on the relevant educational level – specialist's degree. The Standard provides equality of educational system in Russia, the continuity and variability of the main education programmes. It ensures the possession of a set of competencies established by the state as a result of education.

Following the Standard, the Programme's objective is to develop general cultural, general professional and professional competencies, which will allow a graduate to carry out independent practice as a physician, M.D."

C Analysis and Findings of Peers

1. Mission and Outcomes

Criterion 1.1 Statements of purpose and outcome

Evidence:

- Federal State Education Standard of Higher Education for the Speciality 31.05.01 Medical Business
- Professional Standard for General Practitioners, as established by the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection of the Russian Federation
- Webpage of the GM program: https://www.sechenov.ru/eng/education-study/undergraduate/general-medicine/
- Webpage of the University Mission and Brand Strategy: https://www.sechenov.ru/eng/msmu-worldwide/brand/
- Self-Assessment Report
- Sociological survey
- Discussions during audit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The University's mission and strategy are published in the "About us" section of the University's website:

> *"Sechenov University's mission lies in thoroughly and continually improving the lives of individuals through achieving differentiated excellence in the fields of multidisciplinary translational biomedical research and cutting-edge research-based education with a focus on innovation, development, and implementation.*
>
> *The University strategy is to specialize and concentrate resources on the breakthrough research in personalized life-long health management aimed at increase of human life duration and quality.*
>
> *The strategic goal of Sechenov University consists in joining the international research and educational community, to become an international reference #1 in Life Sciences in Russia."*

During the audit, the peers ask the University Management how the medical school has changed over the years, and whether the objectives and mission have changed. The Man-

agement explains that the mission has indeed changed: modern doctors should be entrepreneurial in achieving their goals. Students should be able to participate in and adapt to a competitive environment and should think globally. Research is a priority. The University considers the transmission of these various skills its primary mission.

The University has published the General Medicine program's objective on the program's dedicated webpage. As stated on the webpage, "the Programme's objective is to develop general cultural, general professional and professional competencies, which will allow a graduate to carry out independent practice as a physician, M.D."

The objective is clearly anchored in the Federal State Education Standard of Higher Education for the Speciality 31.05.01 Medical Business (FSES GM), and the Professional Standard for General Practitioners, as established by the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection of the Russian Federation. Both standards are available for download from the University website describing the General Medicine program. A list of all the general cultural, general professional and professional competencies referred to in the program's objective statement is provided in the FSES GM. This standard must be upheld by all medical schools in the Russian Federation and outlines a general competence profile including 41 competencies, each of which complies with one or multiple areas of the medical profession.

The FSES GM lists eight "General cultural competencies", such as readiness for self-education and self-development, abstract thinking, ability to work in a team and to tolerantly perceive social, ethnic, confessional and cultural differences. The standard also lists 11 "General professional competencies", such as oral and written communication skills, ability to use the basics of economic and legal knowledge in professional activities, readiness to use medical devices for providing medical care, and the ability to assess morphofunctional, physiological states and pathological processes in the human body to solve professional problems.

Finally, the standard lists 22 "Professional competencies", such as readiness to participate in the provision of emergency medical care in conditions requiring urgent medical intervention, the ability to apply basic principles of organization and management in medical organizations and their structural subdivisions, the readiness for analysis and presentation of evidence-based medical information, and the willingness to introduce new methods and techniques aimed at protecting health.

The University has provided survey results showing that the majority of faculty and students are familiar with and support the goals and objectives of the University in the field of education, research and innovation activities. The auditors find that the stated objective of the medical programme is presented in a concise manner and outlines the aims and the educational strategy resulting in a medical doctor who is competent at a basic level. The desired learning outcomes include a commitment to life-long learning in the form of analysis

of evidence-based research and the willingness to introduce new methods and techniques aimed at promoting health.

However, the auditors recommend that the University formulate a program-specific mission statement that does not simply state that the medical school upholds federal standards; rather, the program's mission and strategy should serve to differentiate it from other programmes in- and outside Russia.

The peers find that the medical school has published its mission, and that the mission adequately encompasses the health needs of the community, the needs of the health care system, and other aspects of social accountability. Furthermore, it takes medical research and aspects of global health into account.

Criterion 1.2 Participation in the formulation of mission and outcomes

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
From the SAR and during audit discussions, the peers learn that feedback from various stakeholders, including students, professional associations and employers, flow into the continuous development of the program. The Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation, the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Russian Federation and the Russian Academy of Sciences also make curriculum recommendations.

The peers learn during audit discussions that within the University, the Academic Council possesses top decision-making power. Strategy plans, for instance, must be approved by the Council. After the Academic Council approves, the administration develops a roadmap to implement the strategy throughout all departments and institutes and reports interim results back to the Council. The Council has 149 members, elected by majority. New members are proposed by existing Council members.

Below the Academic Council, there are also councils for the individual faculties. The School of General Medicine has a council composed of 53 members, of whom some are fixed and others are elected. All rights and responsibilities of the members of the Academic Council and individual faculty councils are fixed in formal documents. For instance, members may be ejected from the council if they do not attend three council meetings in a row unexcused. The councils are entirely composed of faculty members, including deans.

While the auditors see that various groups are involved in shaping the curriculum content, the auditors do not clearly see that they (for example students) are involved in the formulation of the program's mission and objectives, since these are focused on upholding the federal standard. The peers therefore require that the University define a process for formulating the mission statement which involves various stakeholder groups.

Criterion 1.3 Institutional autonomy and academic freedom

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Website of the International Center for Academic Mobility and Continuing Professional Development: https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/administration/upravlenie-po-mezhdunarodnoy-deyatelnosti/otdel-mezhdunarodnykh-svyazey/mcaminpr/
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

During audit discussions, the peers inquire about the relationship between the government and the University. The University management responds that the government is responsible for the funding; the amount of funding is linked to the number of students at the University. As the highest executive institution within the University, the Academic Council determines how these funds are allocated.

On a managerial level, the Ministry of Health sets the educational standards for different medical specialties, defining the goals and learning outcomes. The University must meet these standards but is free to develop and deliver their programmes within them.

As stated in the SAR, programme administration, staff are free with regards to research and dissertation topics, mobility, participation at scientific events, development of ideas and the support of research interests. Staff can attend all University events free-of-charge.

In addition, the administration supports and encourages the freedom of academic exchange and participation in international events among both staff and students. For this purpose, the University established the International Center for Academic Mobility and Continuing Professional Development (MCAMINPR).

The peers are satisfied that the medical school has institutional autonomy to formulate and implement policies for which its faculty/academic staff and administration are responsible, including with regards to the design of the curriculum and use of the allocated resources necessary for implementation of the curriculum.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 1:

In its response to the auditors' requirement that the University defines a process for formulating the mission statement which involves various stakeholder groups, the University mentions that the programme mission was approved together and in accordance with the University strategy in 2016. According to the University, the key body approving education programmes including their missions is the Academic Council of the University. Representatives from the faculty, student council, and employers participate in monthly meetings of the Council and are allowed to suggest topics for the meetings' agenda, including reconsideration of the programme's mission. The University agrees to reconsider the mission in line with the auditor's recommendations in 2020, when the University will announce its new 5-year strategy.

In conclusion, the auditors consider criterion 1 fulfilled.

2. Educational Programme

Criterion 2.1 Curriculum model and instructional methods

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment report
- Website of the General Medicine program: https://www.sechenov.ru/eng/education-study/undergraduate/general-medicine/
- Course descriptions
- Curriculum
- Audit discussions
- "Additional information in response to ASIIN-AMSE request", provided after the audit visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

Interested parties can download the curriculum and course descriptions from the website of the General Medicine program. The course descriptions provide information about the course contents and objectives. The curriculum follows the FSES GM structure requirements, explained in greater detail under criterion 2.6.

According to the SAR, employed didactical methods include lectures, seminars, practical classes, clinical practical classes and practices. Each discipline involves theoretical components and practical skills training. The faculty also uses forms of training that develops students' skills in teamwork, interpersonal communication, decision-making and leadership,

including, for example, group discussions, role-playing games and simulated patients (actors). The University has also heavily invested in e-learning, including opening an e-learning institute in 2018. The institute supports academic departments in developing online e-learning content, including for Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs). More information about the e-learning resources is provided under criterion 6.3.

During the audit discussions, the peers ask the students about the didactical methods applied during the program. The students inform them that lectures take place in large halls with up to 150 people, whereas seminars and practical courses have groups of up to 15 students. The smaller formats allow for more discussions. Attendance is checked in 90% of the lectures. Beginning in the fourth year, courses require that the students go to hospitals and interact with patients. During these visits, 1-2 students might be assigned per patient, except when teachers wish to demonstrate a particularly interesting case to the entire group. In general, teachers try to find patients related to the teaching material. The students approve of the didactical methods, which they say force them to think, not "go by the book".

The students report that teachers can be strict. For instance, teachers may prematurely end a class if they feel the students have not sufficiently prepared. Great marks can only be achieved if the student follows all the rules. In Anatomy, for instance, teachers require the students to use the Latin terms for body parts rather than Russian or English terms.

The peers ask if the students have witnessed any innovative teaching approaches. The students respond that they are able to conduct research in wide variety of emerging fields, for example regenerative medicine in cardiology. They also consider the e-learning profiles to be innovative.

The peers ask the teachers how the curriculum ensures a commitment to life-long learning and how students are motivated. The teachers explain that a shift has taken place from a previous focus on practical skills 5-7 years ago, to the importance of research and continuous learning. Now, students as well as faculty are learning about new fields such as personalized medicine. Students are taught evidence-based medicine and the research process, thereby learning that the medical field as well as recommendations and guidelines are constantly changing and that they need to be aware of changes. Information in textbooks can be considered outdated after three years; students are therefore taught to conduct independent research. The peers are satisfied that the commitment to life-long learning is effectively ensured.

The University Management explains that federal standards require courses such as philosophy, political science and cultural science in the core curriculum. The peers inquire whether the staff members consider the inclusion of such subjects in the General Medicine programme as useful. Some members of the University staff respond that it would perhaps

be more useful to cover subjects such as medical humanities and issues of globalization, as these are highly relevant issues for future doctors. On the other hand, students benefit because they are able to devote time to these subjects and are, as a result, well-rounded and open-minded. The auditors accept this point of view.

During the audit, the auditors ask about a statement in the SAR, which states that the University adapts the curriculum every year. The University confirms this: the core curriculum generally remains intact, but electives are added or eliminated based on developments in the market. The peers consider this acceptable.

The auditors are satisfied that the medical school has defined a study plan and the instructional and learning methods employed, that the curriculum ensures that students are prepared for lifelong learning and that it is delivered in accordance with principles of equality.

Criterion 2.2 Scientific method

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Module descriptions
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

As explained in the SAR, the scientific approach and principles of evidence-based medicine underlie the teaching of each discipline, including lectures, seminars and practical classes. Within the individual disciplines, the teachers discuss results of modern research conducted via the evidence-based approach. The curriculum also includes a dedicated course: Evidence-Based Medicine: Principles and Methodology. The courses Informatics, Medical Informatics, Written Professional Communication in a Foreign Language and Oral Professional Communication in a Foreign Language also provide students with instruments that assist them in conducting research.

As discussed in criteria 2.1, during discussions with the peers the teachers explain that teaching evidence-based medicine raises students' awareness of continuous change and development in the medical world, thereby increasing their commitment to life-long learning.

A number of extra-curricular options provide students with additional opportunities to practice research methods. Starting from their first year, students can participate in Student Scientific Clubs (SSC), the Center for Research Career (CRC), and the Student Research Society (SRS). Students present their research results in the forms of reports and publica-

tions at meetings of the SSC, the SRS, the CRC, as well as at scientific conferences and symposia of professional and student levels. Students choose topics for their research projects independently, based on the ongoing research in the University. Research projects are carried out jointly with teachers who perform functions of their academic supervisors. It is also possible to perform research work with the assistance of specialists from research organizations (i.e. Research Institutes).

During the audit, the peers ask whether the students are required to write a thesis as part of the curriculum. Both the University and the students respond that this is not the case. As a thesis is not common in medical study programs, the peers acknowledge that the students gain research experience through other means. However, the peers recommend that the University include a research project in the curriculum to further strengthen students' grasp of the scientific method and evidence-based medicine.

The peers are satisfied overall that the curriculum includes principles of scientific methods, promotes analytical and critical thinking, introduces medical research methods, and encompass evidence-based medicine.

Criterion 2.3 Basic Biomedical Sciences

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Curriculum
- Course descriptions
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

As mentioned in the SAR, the first year in the specialty General Medicine includes disciplines providing understanding of fundamental medical and biological scientific knowledge and mastery of concepts and methods necessary for clinical disciplines. Examples include Biology, Physics, Mathematics, Chemistry of Biopolymers, Human Physiology, Biochemistry, Molecular Medicine, Medical and Biological Foundations of Ecology, and a number of others. The study of medical and biological sciences is focused on medical applications.

According to the SAR, the curriculum is updated annually, based on the labor market requirements, industry development, changes in the requirements for graduates, as well as latest research in the field of science, engineering, culture, economics and technology. Teachers regularly update their course contents with recent findings and developments in the medical world.

During the audit, the peers ask for more information about annual updates to the curriculum. The University Management respond that the core curriculum generally remains the

same, but that electives are regularly added or removed based on developments in the medical world.

The peers are satisfied that the curriculum adequately incorporates the contributions of the basic biomedical sciences to create understanding of scientific knowledge and introduce concepts and methods fundamental to acquiring and applying clinical science. In addition, scientific, technological, and clinical developments in the area of biomedical sciences as well as the current and anticipated needs of the society and the health care system are taken into account.

Criterion 2.4 Behavioural and social sciences and medical ethics

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Course descriptions
- Curriculum

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
As shown in the curriculum, the General Medicine Programme includes many disciplines related to behavioral and social sciences. Many of these disciplines are covered in the core curriculum in the first three semesters, including for instance History, Foreign Language, Latin Language, Philosophy, Economics and Law, and Psychology and Pedagogy. The high number of disciplines in these areas is in part due to requirements stipulated in the FSES GM.

Additional courses in the social and behavioral sciences are offered as electives, including for example Management, Business Administration, Philosophy of Medicine and Philosophy of Culture. Social, ethical, legal and environmental implications are discussed in disciplines such as Hygiene, Public Health and Public Safety.

The University encourages civil engagement among its students, thereby also encouraging them to develop a greater sense of responsibility. Students participate in activities of the Volunteer Center, which evolved from a medical and social student team “A Little Prince” established in 2009. The work is carried out through sports volunteering, social engagement and in health care, including blood donation (in collaboration with the University’s Blood Center).

The peers are satisfied that the curriculum includes an adequate introduction to behavioural and social sciences, medical ethics, and medical jurisprudence. The peers furthermore agree that it is reflected in the curriculum how these areas contribute to scientific, technological and clinical developments, to changing demographic and cultural contexts, and to current and anticipated needs of the society and the health care system.

Criterion 2.5 Clinical sciences and skills

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Webpage of the GM program: https://www.sechenov.ru/eng/education-study/undergraduate/general-medicine/
- Module descriptions
- Audit discussions
- "Additional information in response to ASIIN-AMSE request", provided after the audit visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The curriculum available on the General Medicine website specifies the amount of time spent in training in major clinical disciplines, in the section "Clinical Practical Training". According to a statement provided by the University after the audit, 60% of this time is devoted to work with patients and 40% to training on simulation equipment.

According to the SAR and audit discussions, student's exposure to real patients may begin right from the first year. However, this generally takes place through summer internships and therefore not all students participate. The first clinical courses (Nursing and General Surgery) as well as practical training in clinical disciplines begin in the second year and include the use of simulation technologies and "bedside" training. During audit discussions, the peers learn that students begin directly working with patients in the third year.

The study of clinical disciplines begins with theory, then moves on to the acquisition of practical skills, first in simulated conditions, then on clinical sites under the supervision of teachers. Theoretical analysis of the material is carried out in groups of 10-12 students, while follow-up of individual patients takes place in groups of up to 3 students. In the course of clinical disciplines, students attend medical conferences, clinical discussions of diagnostically complex cases, as well as operations. The students complete a clinical discipline by writing an educational clinical record.

Sechenov University has 12 teaching hospitals and clinics for in- and outpatient healthcare services which are used to provide students with different types of patients and the ability to learn under supervision. Furthermore, the University has contracts with 93 city hospitals, clinics and medical centres of the state healthcare system of Moscow city, permitting the University to use them for clinical studies for its students. These include, for instance, the Clinic of Infectious Diseases, the Clinic of Psychiatry and the National Medical Research Centre of Transpantology and Artificial Organs.

According to the SAR, "the total volume of clinical practical studies is 2,789 academic hours, excluding clinical demonstrations during lectures and clinical and training practices (30

ECTS).” The auditors note that 2,789 academic hours is significantly more than 30 ECTS and ask the University to provide clarification.

Students learn about health promotion and preventive medicine in courses such as Hygiene, Public Health and Infectious Diseases. The work programmes of various clinical disciplines have sections devoted to the study of risk factors and prevention of diseases.

The peers discuss with the students the amount of practical experience they gain during their studies. The students explain that in some courses they are required to conduct interviews with patients and are subsequently quizzed on the patients’ history by the teachers. During discussions with the teachers, the auditors learn that foreign students partake in Russian courses in order to communicate with local patients by the third year of their studies. This remains a challenge, however, because not all foreign students wish to become fluent in Russian (the majority of foreign students leaves the country upon graduation). For this reason, the staff also tries to collect English-speaking patients who can communicate with the students. This can prove difficult due to the limited number of English-speakers among the patients in local clinics. Sometimes, Russian-speaking students translate for their fellow students. Additionally, if there are not enough “real” English-speaking patients, the staff sometimes uses simulated patients.

The auditors note that the curriculum covers complicated manipulations such as pleural punctures, and ask whether the students perform these. The students say that they perform these in simulations, or in rare cases in the course of extra-curricular internships.

The students inform the auditors that after the third year, they can pass an exam giving them the right to work as a nurse. Students may then work in the hospital, for example conduct blood tests, and check blood groups. Students are also eligible to receive payment for these sorts of activities. Malaysian students are required to do summer internships if they wish to subsequently continue their medical education in Malaysia. While they have the option to do these internships in Russia, most choose Malaysia.

From the audit discussions with employers, the peers learn that the employers are satisfied with Sechenov graduates’ skills. Linkages with the health sector are described in more detail under criterion 8.5.

The auditors are satisfied that students acquire sufficient knowledge and clinical and professional skills to assume appropriate responsibility after graduation. They spend a reasonable part of the programme in planned contact with patients in relevant clinical settings and gain experience in health promotion and preventive medicine. The curriculum specifies the amount of time spent in training in major clinical disciplines and includes organized clinical training with appropriate attention to patient safety. The curriculum ensures that every student has early patient contact gradually including participation in patient care. Clinical skills training is structured according to the stage of the study program.

Criterion 2.6 Curriculum structure composition and duration

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Curriculum
- Course Descriptions
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The curriculum and course descriptions can be downloaded from the General Medicine programme website and describe the content, extent and sequencing of courses and other curricular elements. The curriculum duration is six years and includes 360 ECTS. Statistics provided by the University suggest that over 95% of the students who begin the programme also graduate from the programme within 6 years.

In accordance with the FSES standard, the General Medicine programme is divided into three blocks. The first block, Unit 1, covers the bulk of the curriculum and includes courses in biomedical, behavioral and social sciences, with a total of 324 credits. Unit 1 can be further broken down into the "basic" component, which is required by law and includes the majority of courses in this section, as well as the "variable" component. The "variable" component is freely determined and annually reviewed by the University and consists of 36 ECTS. Half of the "variable" component courses are mandatory for students and half are electives that the students must choose. Students who fail to choose electives are allocated electives. During audit discussions, the students inform the peers that they have one elective per semester.

The second block of the curriculum, Unit 2, consists of practical experience, including research work, and consists of 33 ECTS. The final block (Unit 3) is the State Final Certification, worth 3 ECTS.

The curriculum is described by the University staff as a "traditional" curriculum and is characterized by a large number of disciplines with a small number of ECTS. For example, in the first semester students have seven courses. Of these, one is awarded 6 ECTS, five are awarded 3 ECTS, and one is awarded 2 ECTS. Overall, there are 77 courses listed in Units 1 and 2 of the curriculum. A number of courses span two semesters, although the course time is not necessarily evenly split among the semesters. For instance, while the course Latin Language spans two semesters, students have 40 seminars and practice trainings in the first semester and only 16 in the second semester. The University therefore awards 2 ECTS for Latin in the first semester and 1 ECTS in the second.

The courses are designed to provide students with the competencies outlined by the FSES

GM, and to prepare students for the official state accreditation exam that allows them to practice as medical doctors in the Russian Federation. The learning outcomes are therefore in line with the program's mission.

During audit discussions, the peers ask how the curriculum is organized. The University explains that basic disciplines such as chemistry, anatomy, physiology, hygiene and microbiology are covered during the first two years. The third year of studies is a transition period. At this point, the curriculum employs a module system and includes, for instance, clinical disciplines and pathology. During the fourth year, learning is shifted to hospitals and bedside teaching. The University considers bedside teaching one of its strengths.

The peers inquire how overlapping of subjects is avoided – from the provided documentation, it appears that topics are repeated. For instance, the contents of the courses "Ambulatory Medicine" and "Hospital Medicine" may overlap with other courses. The University responds that it applies the "spiral" principle, by which topics are revisited, but progressively more difficult material is covered. To avoid overlap, the chairs of the faculties and the teaching staff meet and discuss the teaching programs. Furthermore, the Educational and Methodological Committee (EMC) works to coordinate the activities of teaching departments and thereby prevent overlap.

The auditors are satisfied that the University has designed a study plan featuring appropriate coordination between basic biomedical, behavioural, social, and clinical subjects and that elective content is defined and appropriately balanced. However, to augment transparency for foreign applicants, the auditors require that the University provide a clear explanation of the curriculum structure and its components, especially the elective components, on the English-language General Medicine programme website. The auditors also recommend that the University reduce to the extent possible the fragmentation of the curriculum and examine the integration of subjects to avoid overlap.

Criterion 2.7 Programme management

Evidence:

- Order of Organization of Methodological Support of Educational Activities
- Work Plan of the Educational and Methodological Council committee
- Self-Assessment Report
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The curriculum is verified through a multi-step process. According to the SAR, the General Medicine programme curriculum is supervised by the Educational and Methodological Council (EMC) of the Faculty of Medicine. As explained in the Order of Organization of

Methodological Support of Educational Activities, the EMC is as a rule chaired by the head of the faculty and includes faculty members, employer representatives and other external specialists and scientists. The EMC studies modern trends in the development of health care and medical education, adjusts programme objectives, plans and implements new educational approaches dictated by the current challenges, and if necessary, modifies assessment systems. Proposals of the EMC are discussed at meetings of the Central Methodological Council and the Inter-Faculty Academic Council, and, if approved, are submitted for final approval to the University's Academic Council.

During its regular meetings, the EMC of the Faculty of Medicine examines formative, interim and state assessment results of students, as well as students' performance at scientific conferences and olympiads. Based on the results, the EMC identifies areas of possible improvement. Results from surveys, including student feedback, are also taken into account. During discussions, the peers are informed that draft curricula are submitted to the departments for revision, and may also be reviewed by other medical schools and professional communities.

The curriculum must also meet federal standards (FSES GM and Professional Standard). During the audit, the peers learn that these standards are reviewed by employers and professional associations, such as the Russian Board of Cardiologists, the Therapeutic Society, and the Russian Board of Surgeons. The introduction of Professional standards is a fairly recent phenomenon, and changes to the standards occur quite frequently. As a result, the curriculum must also be adjusted.

Regarding the involvement of students, as stated in the SAR, the University's Student Council includes a Committee on Quality of Education, which also participates in discussions concerning curricula. During discussions with the University Management, the peers learn that student representatives are also present at weekly meetings with the administration, including deans and rectors.

The University informs the peers that students can also provide immediate feedback via online forms. A center within the University is responsible for managing this feedback. Students evaluate lecture contents according to a procedure developed by the students themselves and also participate in setting assessment deadlines and rules.

The programme coordinators inform the peers that students also impact the types of electives provided. After participating in job fairs, for instance, students may discover topics not covered by the current curriculum and may suggest that these be added as new electives.

After the discussions, the auditors are satisfied that the University panels responsible for developing the curriculum take into account feedback from staff members, students and representatives of other stakeholder groups.

Criterion 2.8 Linkage with medical practise and the health sector

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Regulations on Primary Accreditations of Specialists
- List of Clinical Bases for Studies
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

As discussed in criteria 2.7, a variety of stakeholder groups is involved in creating the curriculum, including government institutions, professional associations and employers from the medical sector. During the discussions with representatives from local employers, the auditors learn that employers receive questionnaires from the University, asking whether the employers are satisfied with the graduates' skills. The employers also have agreements with the University, providing students with internship opportunities. According to formal state examination regulations, representatives from employers also participate in student assessments as independent examiners.

More recently, feedback from various external stakeholders have led the University to add courses in Information Technologies and E-Health, in Molecular and Biological Basis of Regenerative Medicine, in Plastic Reconstructive Surgery and Microsurgery, in International Humanitarian Law in Medicine, and Surgical Assistance in Armed Conflicts.

Department chairs and faculty at the University are frequently also members or even heads of professional medical associations and receive input through their related activities.

An additional related strength is the University's partnership with the Moscow public health authorities, enabling students to visit a large number of public clinics in the Moscow area (see criterion 2.5).

The auditors consider the close ties with medical practice and the health sector to be a particular strength of Sechenov University.

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

In response to the auditors recommendation to include a research project in the curriculum (criterion 2.2), the University announces that it is including a Research Project Module in

the draft proposal for the new curriculum for the academic year 2019-2020. The addition will be further discussed within relevant council meetings and be finally approved or disapproved by the University's Academic Council. The University provides an official corresponding module description as well as the draft of the curriculum proposal in which the Research Project module is included in the variable component of the curriculum. The auditors approve the University's actions.

The University provides clarification with regards to the number of hours dedicated to clinical practical studies. The correct figures, in fact, are 2,606 hours and 33 ECTS.

The 2,606 hours refer to clinical practical training within Unit 1 of the curriculum. These hours are spent in any given section of a certain discipline at a patient's bedside with participation and under supervision of teaching staff.

The 33 ECTS refer to the clinical and training "practices" in Unit 2. The University defines a "practice" as a form of studies which aims to enhance, expand and reinforce knowledge, and develop clinical, research thinking and speech abilities in students. It furthermore allows the University to test and assess the level of competences development in students.

In response to the auditors' requirement that a description of the curriculum structure be provided on the programme's English-language website (criterion 2.6), the University provides a link to the updated website featuring a comprehensive description.

In conclusion, the auditors consider criterion 2 to be fulfilled.

3. Assessment of Students

Criterion 3.1 Assessment methods

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Regulations on Formative and Interim Assessment of Students at Sechenov University
- Regulations on Primary Accreditation of Specialists
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

Assessment rules and practices are covered in the Regulations on Formative and Interim Assessment of Students at Sechenov University. They provide details on requirements for the provision of information during assessments, assessment criteria, passing scores, the

allowed number and procedure for re-takes, and other relevant information. The document is published in the public domain on the University's website.

Assessment methods include pass/fail exams, graded exams, and assessment of practical skills. Multiple Choice Questions (MCQ) assessments are held in the disciplines of three or less credit units resulting in "pass" or "fail". In order to promote objective assessment of theoretical knowledge, the University conducts centralized testing. During the tour of facilities, the peers visit the centralized testing rooms and get a very positive impression. Centralized MCQ tests are evaluated on a 100-point scale, where students must score a minimum of 60% in order to pass. Marked exams are held in disciplines with a scope of more than three credits and Practical Exams in practice-oriented subjects, resulting in "excellent", "good", "satisfactory", or "unsatisfactory". Students who receive the marks "unsatisfactory" or "fail" must retake the exams.

The specific forms and frequency of interim assessment of students are established by the academic calendar. Exam dates are published no later than one month in advance, on the information boards of the relevant departments and the Faculty of Medicine dean's office, and the official website of the University. The form and time of an exam is established by the Academic Department and is available to students in the personal account at the University website and the "University - Student" platform. MCQ exams take place, as a rule, on the date of the last class in the respective discipline, in the respective semester. Re-sit dates are approved by a decree of the vice-rector for academic affairs and take place, as a rule, on the first and third Fridays of each month. Exam re-sit dates are set at least twice a month.

During the audit, the peers request more information about assessment methods. The coordinators inform the peers that, among other methods, Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) are used for interim as well as final assessment. OSCEs are introduced in the third year of the study program.

Members of the University staff explain that the final exam consists of three parts – central testing, practical exams and oral exams. Central testing covers theoretical knowledge and utilizes MCQs assessments. Practical exams are conducted by independent experts not involved in teaching the students, thereby avoiding conflicts of interest. During the practical exams, students are given a clinical case and must demonstrate their skills on mannequins and simulated patients. For this purpose, OSCE stations are used. To the peers' inquiry regarding the number of OSCE stations, the University responds that there are a total of 32 stations. For the final examination, students have to pass through five stations.

During the audit discussions, the University staff and students explain that the specific set of questions is individual for each student and is determined by an electronic randomized system. The performance at each station is graded individually.

From the students, the auditors learn that students are required to pass all exams in a semester in order to move on to the next semester. The students say they are well informed about assessment rules and are regularly reminded by teachers.

Student e-profiles contain all online assessments relevant for the student. Online assessments feature MCQs, where students must select the correct answer among four possible answers. The peers inquire whether four possible responses are too few. The programme coordinators respond that most online assessments feature MCQs with five possible responses. The peers are satisfied with this response.

For assessments, special dates are fixed in the schedule for the first attempt. Students must get at least 60% of the responses correct in order to pass. If students fail on their first attempt, they have the opportunity to retake the exam. Per three months, students are provided with two opportunities to retake assessments.

After exams, the teachers examine questions incorrectly answered by a large number of students. This allows them, for instance, to identify questions that are problematic, i.e. that need to be altered or removed. The same goes for entire exams: if most students fail an exam, the teachers review the exam questions. Annually, 20% of the question pool is renewed. In order to prevent students from “selling” exam questions to other students, the question pool is made public.

The peers ask the students how many exams are required for them to practice as doctors. The students inform the peers that there are two exams. The first is the final assessment, which they must pass in order to graduate. The second is the accreditation exam, which they must pass to legally work as a doctor in the Russian Federation. Malaysian students pass the accreditation exams in Malaysia.

After the discussions, the peers are satisfied that the medical school has made accessible all relevant assessment information to students and has ensured a suitable variety of assessment methods to cover knowledge, skills and attitudes. The peers are furthermore satisfied that assessment methods avoid conflicts of interest, that they are evaluated and continuously improved, and that an appropriate appeal system is in place. To further improve the University’s MCQ examinations, the peers suggest that MCQs could feature five rather than four responses, to reduce the chance that students accidentally guess the answer correctly.

Criterion 3.2 Relation between assessment and learning

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Regulations on Formative and Interim Assessment of Students at Sechenov University

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

As mentioned in the SAR, the University applies a set of assessment tools (FOS) for assessing the training outcomes. The FOS includes a list of the competencies to be mastered by the students to understand individual disciplines, as well as the curriculum as a whole. It also includes a description of the indicators and criteria for assessing competencies at various stages during the curriculum, as well as the testing tasks and teaching materials to conduct these assessments.

Continuous testing throughout the curriculum ensures that the students receive regular feedback regarding their progress. Schedules are drawn up to ensure timely and regular assessment of students' knowledge and understanding of course contents. The University furthermore analyzes the average academic performance and the number of re-sits within a discipline. Depending on analysis results, the University can optimize the fit between curriculum and schedule.

During assessments of practical skills, students furthermore receive direct feedback from examiners, who point out inaccuracies and errors in their responses. Students may also receive feedback in class discussions, particularly those involving smaller groups, as well as in the course of pre-examination consultations.

Within the framework of its Quality Guide, the University also gathers student feedback regarding assessment methods via questionnaires.

After reviewing the assessment methods, principles and practices discussed in criteria 3.1, the peers consider them compatible with the intended educational outcomes and instructional methods. There is an appropriate balance of formative and summative assessment to guide both learning and decisions about academic progress. Number and nature of examinations encourage both acquisition of the knowledge base and integrated learning. In addition, the University provides students with adequate feedback regarding assessment results.

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

In response to the auditors' recommendation to include 5 rather than 4 response options in the MCQ exams (criterion 3.1), the University states that 5 response options are the University standard. It furthermore provides a list of sample MCQ questions used at the University.

In conclusion, the auditors consider criterion 3 to be fulfilled.

4. Students

Criterion 4.1 Admission policy and selection

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Regulations on Admission to the FSAEI HE I.M Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation (Sechenov University) for training in education programmes of higher education – bachelor's and specialist's programmes in the academic year 2019/2020
- University website covering admissions: https://www.sechenov.ru/eng/education-study/admission/
- Admissions Guide: https://www.sechenov.ru/eng/education-study/undergraduate/pharmacy/2019-2020_admission.pdf
- University Charter
- Audit Discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The University's admission policy is provided in the Regulations on Admission and University Charter, which can be downloaded from the University's website.

The University's admission policy must follow a number of Russian laws, which strictly regulate admissions procedures, including number of students admitted, appeal processes and acceptance of students with disabilities. A special quota of spots is reserved for people with disabilities, orphans, veterans and other socially vulnerable groups. The Academic Council annually reviews admission procedures to ensure they adhere to legal requirements. During discussions, the auditors are informed that admissions are supervised by the Admission Committee, which is headed by the rector and reports directly to the Russian Ministry of Health.

The Sechenov University website provides an English-language overview of admission periods, required documents, relevant contacts and admission criteria for the General Medicine programme and other University programs. The website includes the dates for the two annual intakes as well as the date until which applicants can take entry exams. According to the Admissions Regulations and the General Medicine program's website, applicants are required to pass entrance exams for Chemistry and the Russian language, with minimum scores of 55 for each. The website does not explain whether this means a score of 55%, or 55 points out of a specified total number. A detailed overview of the topics covered by the entrance exams can be downloaded from the website. Entrance exams can be taken in Russian or English, and the assessment conditions are clearly defined in the Regulations on Admission.

The University Management informs the auditors that the number of available spots is restricted and students are accepted on the basis of Unified State Exam results. Applicants can also receive points for individual achievements, such as prizes won in scientific Olympiads. The Management also mentions that international applicants must pass a written exam in Biology in addition to Chemistry and Russian.

Many of the required application documents apply to foreign students and include visas, education certificates, medical forms, as well as a certificate of absence of HIV-1 infection (required by Russian law for foreigners staying longer than 3 months) and, if applicable, corresponding notarized translations into Russian. An admissions guide with a summary of the website contents and additional details is available for download from the admissions website.

The auditors also ask the students about the admissions process. The students explain that, in the case of foreign students, the parents provide financial support. Tuition fees change on an annual basis and are currently around 8000 USD. Russian students, who do not have a scholarship, pay 300,000 Russian Rubles (approx. 4650 USD at the time of writing). Low-income Russian students have the option to pay tuition fees in installments to ease the financial burden. Russian Students who do not begin their studies on a scholarship can still earn scholarships in the course of their studies through hard work. The peers ask the students if they receive support with regard to housing. The students respond that the University offers different housing options for both Russian and foreign students. The students explain that the housing is free for Russian students and, while not free, also very affordable for foreign students.

The auditors are satisfied that the medical school formulates and implements an admission policy based on principles of objectivity. There is a relationship between student selection, mission of the school, the educational program, and desired qualities of graduates. The

University periodically reviews the admission policy, based on relevant societal and professional data, to comply with the health needs of the community and society. A system for appeal of admission decisions and an implemented policy for admitting disabled students are in place.

The auditors note that information regarding the admissions process is partially missing. For instance, the General Medicine English-language program's website lacks information regarding when, where and how applicants can take entrance examinations. The auditors furthermore notice a discrepancy between the information provided during audit discussions and the information on the English-language admissions website: the website does not list entrance exams for Biology as a requirement for General Medicine and does not mention that the number of available spots is restricted. The auditors ask the University for clarification of these matters. The auditors also recommend that the University clarify on the admissions website if the minimum score of "55" is a percentage score or out of a specific number of points.

Furthermore, the auditors note that the content of the website seems to focus entirely on foreign applicants, and fails to list information relevant for Russian students interested in the English-language program. For instance, while the auditors know that a quota of Russian students in the General Medicine programme is funded by the government, the website does not clarify if these students can participate in the English-language programme or only the Russian-language program. The University therefore should clarify the entrance conditions for both Russian and foreign applicants interested in the English-language General Medicine program.

The website and the Regulations on Admission are also unclear about whether and how students from other programmes and institutions – for example from other universities – can transfer. The University must formulate and publish a transparent process.

Criterion 4.2 Student intake

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Audit discussions
- "Additional information in response to ASIIN-AMSE request", provided after the audit visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The size of the student intake is related to quotas established by the Russian government. According to the University Management, for the General Medicine program, there are 36

applicants per available spot, amounting to around 24,000 applications per year. According to figures delivered after the audit, the annual intake for both the Russian- and English-language General Medicine programme lies between 1500 and 1700 students. The number of government-funded Russian students in the programme has been capped at 700 for the past years. In the same time period, the programme has also accepted 800-1000 paying students, of which more than half are foreign students.

The peers ask the Management whether they believe Sechenov University is the most demanded medical school in Russia. The Management responds that this is presumably the case. The test scores required for enrollment are the highest in the country: 94/100. One reason why there are many applicants is because Sechenov University graduates rank very highly in the national employability rankings published by the Ministry of Health. The University Management says the University also presumably draws applicants because it enjoys a good reputation on social media. The University's marketing highlights the opportunities enjoyed by its graduates as well as the multi-cultural student environment.

The peers inquire about the origins of the students. The University responds that 50% of the Russian students are from the Moscow region, the rest from outside Moscow. Around 20% of students are from Malaysia, others from Iran, India, China, Kazakhstan and other countries. According to the University, over 80 nationalities are taking or have taken part in the General Medicine program. The programme draws many Malaysian applicants because it is accredited in Malaysia – graduates can return to their home country and seamlessly continue their education.

The peers inquire about the balance of male and female students. The University explains that among Russian students, approximately 60% are women, whereas among foreign students, 30% are women.

The auditors are satisfied that the University defines the size of student intake and relates it to its capacity at all stages of the program. In addition, size and nature of student intake are reviewed periodically in consultation with other relevant stakeholders and regulated to meet the health needs of the community and society.

Criterion 4.3 Student counselling and support

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Decree about Psychological Services (29.12.2018)
- Decree about Providing Psychological Assistance (29.12.2018)

- Website of the Professional Union of Students: https://www.sechenov.ru/learners/studencheskie-organizatsii/professionalnyy-soyuz-obuchayush-chikhsya/?sphrase_id=795946
- Administrative Directive for Support of Individuals with Disabilities
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
From the SAR and audit discussions, the auditors learn that Sechenov University provides a variety of support services to students, including health services, services for students with disabilities, career services and services for international students.

With regard to health services, all students receive free medical services at the University facilities and can undergo an annual medical examination. In emergencies involving a student, a vice-rector is immediately informed who then organizes support for the student. Psychological support is also provided: students can come to consultation hours twice a week.

In accordance with Russian law, the University has a support service for students with disabilities which provides telephone support, on-site counseling, and coordinates University staff for the preparation of individual training (if necessary). The University also provides students with disabilities with special barrier-free dorms.

Starting in the 3rd year, students can participate in job fairs, which take place twice per month from February to June every year. These events allow students to meet employers and learn about different employment options. An online career platform and job site allows employers to upload vacancies and employer information and students to submit their portfolios.

During the audit, the auditors inquire whether there are structures to support students in case of racism or discrimination. The University responds that the University's Center for International Education monitors issues of discrimination – the Center's staff meets with members of the national communities every two weeks. In this manner, issues are reported to the administration. In addition to reacting to discrimination cases, the Center actively works to bring people from different backgrounds together, through for example extracurricular activities. Due to the University's location in Moscow, there is a proximity to many different national communities, and in some cases, the Center invites representatives from these communities to help with problems at the University. The Center for International Education also provides international students with migration, housing, insurance and legal guidance.

The auditors also ask if there are counseling options for students with academic problems. The University Management informs them that students can discuss academic problems with the dean directly. If a large number of students face the same issue, this will generally result in changes being implemented. This can include changing a teacher, but this is rarely the case. In cases where students have personal conflicts with a teacher, the University may decide to move the student to a different teacher.

The students inform the auditors that students' concerns are also communicated to the administration and deans via "Tutor" students, who are elected by the students. Student organizations such as the Student Council and Professional Union of Students provide services such as conflict counseling, legal support and informational services regarding student rights.

The students confirm that in some cases they requested different instructors, and these requests were granted. The students describe a situation in which anonymous complaints were received from Malaysian students about a teaching assistant (TA) who was acting racist towards women wearing hijabs in one of the training hospitals. The students collected complaints and contacted the vice-dean. The TA was immediately removed and the department in which the TA was active placed under investigation. In another example, the students contacted the dean because they felt the staff at one of the teaching hospitals was being too lenient, and as a result the students were not learning anything. In this case, the dean responded by organizing an unannounced evaluation visit of the training hospital.

The students describe another situation where they faced scheduling problems, due to classes taking place in different University buildings spread across the city, requiring extensive travel. The students discussed these issues with members of the administration, who were able to eliminate the scheduling problems. In another example, the international students requested the creation of an English-language Center for Scientific Career. Until then, this extracurricular club focused on teaching research had only existed for Russian students. Subsequently, the administration helped them to create an English-language version. The students inform the peers that they cannot think of a situation in which problems could not be solved.

The auditors inquire whether the students receive enough support if they wish to do research. The students report that the dean and staff ask students on an individual basis about their research interests. The students inform the auditors that related support is also provided by student organizations. For instance, senior students tutor junior students with regards to research methods and scientific work.

Students can also accumulate points through extra-curricular activities, such as volunteering and completing organizational tasks. The University's administration is ready to accommodate students' special circumstances – for example, if students wish to do an internship during their studies, or take a gap year.

From the teachers, the auditors learn that students who are highly motivated to collect experience in a particular area are provided with support through the provision of interesting assignments. This may include referring them to particularly interesting patients, or giving them the chance to do publications or oral presentations on particularly interesting clinical cases.

During audit discussions with the students, the auditors learn that two years previously the staff of the international office was replaced due to corruption issues, and that the situation for international students has significantly improved since then. The students inform the auditors that they are generally content, but wish there were more scholarship opportunities for foreign students. Furthermore, the students wish that more students, including foreign students, had access to the Faculty of Future Medicine (a special programme reserved for a restricted number of high-performing students) and that courses taught in this faculty be provided in English.

Survey results provided by the University indicate that a majority of survey respondents was satisfied with the social and legal support for students and the openness of the University administration.

The auditors are impressed by the level of engagement of the students and see that the communication between students and administration is very good. The auditors also see that a number of student support services are provided by student organizations and that students and staff are sometimes unsure about counseling options and procedures. The auditors recommend that the University establish a formal policy with clear responsibilities and a defined „path" for students seeking counseling, and provide an overview of these counseling options on a dedicated website.

Criterion 4.4 Student representation

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Provision about the Student Council of Sechenov University
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

As suggested in the SAR, the Student Council is a self-governed body of students that participates in managing the educational process and solving important issues affecting student life, developing social activities and implementing student initiatives and events. Events include large-scale scientific, cultural, patriotic, and sporting events. The Council is elected every 2 years and is made up of representatives of all levels and fields of training. As suggested in the Provision about the Student Council of Sechenov University, the council has the right to participate in evaluating the quality of the educational services, can elaborate suggestions for the University governance bodies concerning their development, for the optimization of examinations, the lessons schedule, and practical training. The Council representatives interact closely with the rectorate, various subdivisions of the University as well as the Academic Council. Council members can also be elected to the Academic Council and other University commissions. The Council includes students with disabilities.

Apart from the Student Council, a number of student groups are active on campus and organize a variety of student events. During audit discussions, the students confirm that the University provides support to student organizations. Students can submit proposals to the deans, requesting financial support for events such as sports activities or international food fests. In one example, the University agreed to financially support a trip for the University's Malaysian student organization to another Russian city so that it could participate in a sports competition. The international students report that the University also supported them in creating an English-language version of a scientific research club that until that point had only been available to Russian speakers.

The students also report that student organizations distribute questionnaires on a monthly basis. Each student in the organization is responsible for getting answers from a certain group of students, which ensures a high return rate. The auditors are furthermore informed that student organizations offer conflict counselling and undertake efforts to inform the general student population about their rights. For this purpose, the students created a "I am Sechenov" comic book which explains the students' rights in simple terms.

The auditors are satisfied that adequate student representation exists in the design, management, and evaluation of the curriculum, and in other matters relevant to students. In addition, the auditors praise the University's encouragement and facilitation of student activities and promotion of student organisations.

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

Regarding the auditors transparency concerns mentioned under criterion 4.1, the University clarifies that there was presumably some misunderstanding during the audit discussions: as indicated in the official documentation, a Biology exam is not required for entrance to the English-language General Medicine programme. The University also has updated the website to reflect that the number of spots in the programme is limited and that the minimum score of "55" is out of 100 possible points. The University notes that the University website for English-language degree programmes states that all English-language programmes are fee-based. In this manner, applicants are supposedly made aware of the fact that the Russian government's scholarship programme does not apply to the English-language degree programmes. The auditors believe that this statement still leaves room for doubt, since the Russian-language General Medicine programme is also fee-based for those who do not meet the government quota. To remove all doubts for Russian applicants, the auditors suggest that the University explicitly states on the website that the Russian government scholarships are not available for the English-language programmes.

The University notes that information about entrance examinations is provided with the Admission Regulations document. However, after re-examining the document the auditors are still unable to find information about when and where applicants can take entrance exams. The auditors therefore maintain their previous recommendation, that the University makes this information clearly visible on the respective websites.

In response to the auditors' recommendation regarding the establishment of a formal and transparent counselling process for students (see criterion 4.3), the University refers the auditors to a part of its website, which lists the contact information of various departments and people the international students can contact if they require support. These include the Center for International Education, the Preparatory Department, the Course Supervisors and the Department for Migration Services. According to the University, the Center for International Studies is responsible for international students during their studies at Sechenov and may refer students to other departments depending on the issue at hand.

The auditors see that the University provides a system of academic and non-academic counselling services with defined responsibilities, and that an overview of some of these services has been provided on the University website. However, they still do not see that a "path" has been communicated to the stakeholders. As the auditors learned during the audit discussions, both students and teachers are uncertain whom they should contact when students are experiencing academic, psychological or other problems. The auditors therefore encourage the University to eliminate this uncertainty by providing the students

with specific contacts for specific types of problems. This information could be communicated to students via the website as well as when they begin their studies at the University.

The University provides a link to a part of the University website covering transfer regulations, which were approved on May 17th, 2019. The peers can see that these enable students to transfer credits for academic achievements at other institutions.

In conclusion, the auditors see criterion 4 as fulfilled.

Criterion 5.1 Recruitment and selection policy

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Regulation on recruiting and strategic professional development of research and teaching staff at FSAEI HE I. M. Sechenov First MSMU of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation
- Provisions on the procedure for filling the positions of teachers
- International online recruitment platform: http://ir-sechenov.ru/en/

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The policy for staff recruitment and selection is described in the "Regulation on recruiting and strategic professional development of research and teaching staff" and the "Provisions on the procedure for filling the positions of teachers related to the teaching staff". Admission to teaching positions is carried out according to the results of competitive selection – the responsibility for organizing the competition lies with the head of the University's HR department. In the case of upcoming vacancies, the competition is announced no later than two months before the expiration of an employment contract of the current position holder. Announcements are made on the University website and in a monthly newsletter. Candidates are evaluated based on higher medical education, work experience, certification courses in English and pedagogy, publication activity and "fit" with regards to the University's strategic goals. Candidates may also be required to read trial lectures or perform other trial tasks.

The department to which a candidate is applying must first decide whether or not to recommend the candidate. This decision is made by all department members via a simple-majority vote, based on initial meetings, references and documents. The candidate's information is subsequently submitted to a Competition Commission. The Commission comprises a chairman, deputy chairman, a secretary, department heads, heads of research and other subdivisions, highly qualified academic staff, representatives of the HR department, the legal department and an elective body of the relevant labour union. The Commission is formed in such a way as to exclude the possibility of a conflict of interest. The Commission may meet with the candidate and will, based on the meeting and available documents and

references, decide whether the candidate is submitted to the final competition involving the Academic Council. The Commission may also provide recommendations with regards to length of contract, training, etc. The Academic Council makes a final decision via secret ballot. Candidates must be approved by a majority of the Council members. These regulations count for all teaching staff except for department heads and faculty deans.

The University maintains a balance between medical and non-medical staff, with full and part-time work, academic and non-academic staff and freelancers. The faculty of the University complies with the Section 7 requirements of the FSES GM.

The auditors are satisfied that the medical school has formulated and implemented a staff recruitment and selection policy, and that this policy addresses criteria for scientific, educational and clinical merit, including a balance between teaching, research, and service activities. The auditors see that the policy also takes into account other criteria, including its mission.

The University provides the auditors with a spreadsheet including the names and departments of all teaching staff in the English-speaking programme. The spreadsheet lists several hundred staff members, but provides very limited information regarding the staff members' individual qualifications. The University must provide an English-language overview of the primary teaching staff members' (e.g. professors) individual qualifications (e.g. mini-CV). Furthermore, the University should send statistics regarding the ratio of teachers to students.

Criterion 5.2 Staff activity and development policy

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Regulation on recruiting and strategic professional development of research and teaching staff at FSAEI HE I. M. Sechenov First MSMU of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation
- Website of the International Center for Professional Development: https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/administration/upravlenie-po-mezhdunarodnoy-deyatelnosti/otdel-mezhdunarodnykh-svyazey/mcaminpr/
- Article about opening of International Institute for Professional Development at Sechenov University from the University's website: https://www.sechenov.ru/pressroom/news/sechenov-University-opens-the-international-institute-of-employee-professional-development/?sphrase_id=757304
- Article about opening of AMEE office at Sechenov University from the University's website: https://www.sechenov.ru/pressroom/news/amee-opens-the-first-overseas-representative-office-at-sechenov-University-/?sphrase_id=757302

- Article about Medical Writing Symposium held at Sechenov University from the University's website: https://www.sechenov.ru/pressroom/news/1st-international-sechenov-medical-writing-symposium-took-place-at-sechenov-University-april-4-2018/?sphrase_id=757304
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The policy for staff development is described in the "Regulation on recruiting and strategic professional development of research and teaching staff". The Regulation has clear and ambitious objectives to achieve international best practices in the management and continuous professional development of staff.

As described in the SAR, in March 2018, Sechenov University established the International Institute for Professional Development (IIPD) aimed to increase professionalism of the University academic staff members and improve their skills. The IIPD focuses on five key areas, including English-language skills, professional qualification development, promotion of publication activities, international academic mobility, and long-term HR planning. The IIPD conducts annual monitoring of professional needs among teachers through questionnaires, and subsequently organizes training courses based on the survey results. In 2018, this resulted in 11 specially developed education programmes with over 300 participants among the faculty.

The Association of Medical Education in Europe (AMEE) actively participates in the above programmes. AMEE's first foreign representative office in Central and Eastern Europe was established at Sechenov University in 2018. During the audit, the teachers explain that AMEE has already provided courses in basic medical education methods in the previous year and is scheduled to provide additional courses covering medical education assessment methods. A recent course involved motivating students to develop problem-solving skills, which the teachers considered particularly helpful. Other major topics in the past included OSCE and MCQs. Since the courses are conducted in English, only English-speaking staff can participate, but they spread their knowledge to the non-English-speaking staff.

As part of a programme to promote publication activity, each teaching department forms a publication team, which must conduct a master-class on a selected research topic for department colleagues.

Regarding long-term HR planning, the IIPD aims to form a pool of employees with the potential to be appointed heads of teaching departments. For this purpose, the university assesses professors and associate professors and elaborates individual professional development plans.

Other staff development measures include providing faculty members with financial incentives to attain certain targets (ex: a certain number of publications). These are regulated within employee contracts. There are also non-financial incentives: for example, recognizing employees for length of service or significant achievements.

The teachers inform the auditors that there are individual and departmental assessments every 3-5 years, resulting in a ranking that promotes competition. Staff are rated according to key performance indicators such as the Hirsch Index, number of publications, service on councils, etc. More recently, the University has placed a greater emphasis on promoting research activities. The auditors inquire if teachers who publish more are more likely to be promoted. The teachers respond that, regardless of promotion opportunities, there is a general interest among both the University's staff and students to be involved in research activities.

The auditors are satisfied that the medical school has formulated a staff development policy and ensures recognition of meritorious academic activities, with appropriate emphasis on teaching, research and service qualifications. The auditors are of the opinion that the medical school has implemented ambitious and professional measures to further develop the skills of its staff. The auditors are furthermore satisfied that clinical service functions are used in teaching and learning, while taking into account teacher-student ratios relevant to the various curricular components.

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

In response to the auditors' request for additional information regarding the academic staff members' professional qualifications, the University provides CVs for 50 of the programme's 440 teachers.

The peers note that the staff members described in the provided CVs do not cover the entire spectrum of subjects. For instance, no teaching staff members are provided for the courses Biology, Basics of patients care, IT and e-health, Internal medicine, Pathophysiology, Hygiene and Public Health, Ophthalmology, etc. The peers therefore assume that information concerning the primary teaching staff is incomplete. Furthermore, the peers note that some of the CVs lack important information, such as the person's degree, institution and year of graduation (ex: Irina V. Vysotskaya). For some CVs, it is unclear which subjects the faculty members are teaching (Ex: Prof. Anna E. Bragina). The peers therefore require the completed CVs of the primary teaching staff in all modules.

In conclusion, the peers see criterion 5 as partially fulfilled.

6. Educational Resources

Criterion 6.1 Physical facilities

Evidence:

- List of Equipment of the Departments of the Faculty of Medicine
- List of Sechenov University Teaching Hospitals
- List of Clinical Bases of Sechenov Students
- Extract from the Survey
- Website of the Institute of Electronic Medical Education: https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/institute/institut-elektronnogo-meditsinskogo-obrazovaniya/
- Tour during audit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The material and technical resources of the University must meet Russian federal standards, particularly section 7.3 of the FSES GM. The University has provided an overview of the equipment of the Faculty of Medicine departments as well as an overview of the University's 12 teaching hospitals and clinics.

The University regularly carries out renovations in academic buildings to maintain safety standards. The administration and Academic Council make decisions on the distribution of material and resources.

Survey results provided by the University indicate that a majority of the respondents were satisfied with the material and technical base of the University.

After the tour of the University's facilities, the auditors are satisfied that the facilities are suitable for providing the students with adequate training and assessment. Due to its scale, application of best practices and variety of training rooms the auditors furthermore find the Institute of Electronic Medical Education to be particularly impressive.

Criterion 6.2 Clinical training resources

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- List of Sechenov University Teaching Hospitals
- List of Clinical Bases of Sechenov Students
- Application for Procurement
- Tour during audit
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The clinical facilities, partnerships and resources of the University are described under criterion 2.5.

The list of pathological conditions the students must master is evaluated annually – changes to the list are followed by adjustments to relevant clinical bases. Teachers of clinical disciplines are required to have a valid specialist certificate for the taught discipline. Staff members who require new or additional learning material can submit procurement applications. Survey results show a high satisfaction of students and staff with the available clinical training resources.

Following the discussions and the tour, the auditors are satisfied that the clinical training resources are adequate.

Criterion 6.3 Information technology

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Regulations on the Institute for Electronic Medical Education
- Website of the Institute of Electronic Medical Education: https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/institute/institut-elektronnogo-meditsinskogo-obrazovaniya/
- Website of the Unified Educational Portal (UEP) for students and teachers: http://do.sechenov.ru/
- Website of the Student Information System: https://student.sechenov.ru/
- Website of the Fundamental Medical Library: https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/library/fundamentalnaya-uchebnaya-biblioteka/
- Website of the Central Scientific Medical Library: https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/library/tsentralnaya-nauchnaya-meditsinskaya-biblioteka/rules/
- Website of the Federal Medical e-Library https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/library/federalnaya-elektronnaya-meditsinskaya-biblioteka/
- Audit discussions
- Tour of facilities

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The University's IT development policy and strategy are managed by the University's Institute for Electronic Medical Education and defined in the Institute's regulations. The University launched the Institute in 2018 with the mission to develop a strategy for the implementation of the educational programme with the use of e-learning and distance learning technologies.

During discussions, the auditors are informed by the University Management that the Institute for Electronic Medical Education, launched in 2018, is the first of its kind in Russia, contains best practices gathered from many foreign universities over several years, and is a point of special pride for the University. On the one hand, the Institute features modern facilities to train students in different types of skills, such as robotic surgery simulation. The facilities are also visited by local schools on the weekends, and used by external medical specialists for training and accreditation purposes. On the other hand, the Institute produces and manages digital content: a special unit develops content, another develops tools for digital accreditation, and another is responsible for the quality assurance of all e-learning content. The Institute facilitates blended learning and provides content in a variety of formats, including as Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs), published on platforms such as Coursera. The Institute's efforts thus far have allowed for 40% of the University's lectures to be made available online.

E-learning content produced by the Institute is also made available on the Unified Educational Portal (UEP), an e-learning platform accessible to students via individual accounts. The UEP serves to provide students with course material and conduct online assessments (discussed in greater detail under criterion 3.1). During discussions, the auditors inquire how the e-learning platform has developed over the years. The University Management responds that it is actively developing the platform and that in one year, the number of students registered on the platform rose from a few hundred users to 19000. 6000 users have begun one or more online courses.

There is also a University Student Information System, where students can log-in and obtain regularly updated organizational information. Students also have a personal account on the University website, which contains relevant personalized information on schedules, academic progress, tuition fees, etc. The information on these websites is provided in Russian but can be translated using the translation functions of internet browsers.

The University's staff members have access to databases such as Scopus, SciVal (Elsevier), and Web of Science. Access is available from all computers connected to the University's network.

Sechenov University's Information and Technology Centre provides students and teachers with instructions and technical support for access to and appropriate use of the electronic information resources of the University.

The auditors are satisfied that the University has formulated an ambitious policy that addresses effective use and evaluation of information and communication technology in the

educational program. After a demonstration of the e-learning platform and tour of the Institute, the auditors consider the IT resources provided to the students to be very good and well suited to provide students with independent learning opportunities.

Criterion 6.4 Medical research and scholarship

Evidence:

- Curriculum
- Course descriptions
- Regulation on recruiting and strategic professional development of research and teaching staff at FSAEI HE I. M. Sechenov First MSMU of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation
- List of Research Projects involving Students
- Website of Center for Scientific Career: https://www.sechenov.ru/eng/students/student-communities-/
- Sample research project being conducted at the University: https://www.sechenov.ru/eng/news/140711/
- Overview of Russian research support funds on the Sechenov University Website: https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/department/otdel-upravleniya-innovatsionnoy-deyatelnostyu/fonds/rossiyskie.php?sphrase_id=695283
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The University clarifies the relationship between education and medical research in its Mission Statement (discussed under criterion 1.1) as well as in the "Regulation on recruiting and strategic professional development of research and teaching staff". The latter identifies Research as a key component of the University's staff development policy.

Courses in the curriculum covering research methods are discussed under criterion 2.2.

During discussions, the University Management informs the auditors that students who are very interested in research can also get involved in extra-curricular research projects. For instance, every year 50 students are involved in a special research program. The Center for Scientific Careers also gives students an opportunity to improve their skills in writing and performing research activities. The Student Research Society annually conducts a large number of clinical and experimental research projects, which are subsequently presented at international events and published. The teachers inform the auditors that not many students, but the most talented ones participate in scientific research circles. The circles include students who have recently begun their studies and want to develop their research

skills as well as more senior students, who take over additional roles. A page on the University's website also provides students and faculty with an overview of Russian research funds that they can apply to.

In accordance with the criteria, the University has formulated policies to foster the relationship between education and medical research, and provides an extensive list of medical research projects with student involvement. The auditors are satisfied that the University uses medical research and science as a basis for delivering the educational curriculum. In addition, medical research influences current teaching and students are encouraged and prepared to engage in medical research activities.

Criterion 6.5 Educational expertise

Evidence:

- Relevant results from internal surveys and evaluations with respect to educational expertise
- Description of didactical training opportunities (possibly link to the webpage) and of measures that support the teaching staff in its use

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
Measures to develop staff members' expertise and didactical training are discussed under criterion 5.2.

As discussed in Criteria 5.1, the auditors lack an overview of the current staff and are therefore unable to judge the level of educational expertise. The University should provide the auditors with a comprehensive overview of the teaching staff involved in the program.

Criterion 6.6 Educational exchanges

Evidence:

- Website of the International Center for Academic Mobility and Continuous Professional Development (Russian): https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/administration/upravlenie-po-mezhdunarodnoy-deyatelnosti/otdel-mezhdunarodnykh-svyazey/mcaminpr/
- List of partnerships with universities: https://www.sechenov.ru/upload/medialibrary/oms/partners_10.2015.pdf
- Extract from the Report 2018 on international and local academic mobility of the University academic staff members
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

Sechenov University provides students and faculty with a wide range of possibilities for international experiences. An overview of these can be found on the University's Russian-language website of the International Center for Academic Mobility and Continuous Professional Development (MCAMINPR). The website provides a list of more than 100 partner universities as well an overview of internship and work experience opportunities, the Erasmus+ program, scholarships for studying abroad, and more. According to the University, around 140 of the University's medical students annually participate in exchange programs. The length of exchange programmes ranges from two weeks to one year.

Eligibility for exchange programmes is determined via competitions held by the University. Applicants must demonstrate excellent academic performance in all disciplines, and a B2 level of English. If a student is not accepted for a particular program, the University may propose alternative programmes where the quota has not been filled yet.

During the audit, the auditors ask the students if they believe that there are enough opportunities for academic exchange. The students respond that, in addition to grades and language skills, students' opportunities depend on their individual budget. In some cases, for instance, students pay for the travel costs while the University covers costs for housing and meals. In other cases, students must pay for all costs. There are some scholarships available, and two University associations help students organize international exchange experiences. The auditors understand that exchange opportunities are limited by quotas.

As stated in the SAR, the University furthermore provides organizational and financial support for faculty members wishing to participate in international conferences, exchange programs, etc. The University has provided statistics showing academic mobility in 2018. According to the statistics, slightly more than 4% of all academic staff members participated in scientific events and other forms of academic mobility.

The auditors are satisfied that regional and international exchange of staff and students are facilitated by providing appropriate resources. In addition, the medical school ensures that the exchanges are purposefully organised, taking into account the needs of staff and students. However, the auditors request that the University provide evidence of a formulated policy for establishing national and international collaboration with other educational institutions and regulations for the transfer of educational credits.

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

In response to the auditors' requirement that the University must formulate a policy for establishing national and international collaboration with other educational institutions (see criterion 6.6), the University provides a translated version of the policy. While the auditors approve of the contents of the policy, the policy document does not contain any date

or other evidence reflecting that it has been officially implemented. The auditors therefore require the University to provide evidence of this.

With regards to the transfer of educational credits, the University provides a document with its transfer regulations, implemented in May 2019, which is also published on the University's website. The peers see that students can obtain credits for academic achievements at other institutions, both within the Russian Federation and abroad.

In conclusion, the auditors consider criterion 6 to be mostly fulfilled.

7. Programme Evaluation

Criterion 7.1 Mechanisms for programme monitoring and evaluation

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- University Quality Policy 2017-2018
- Objectives in the Field of Quality of Educational, Research, Innovation and Medical Activities of the University for 2017-2018
- Quality indicators of the processes in 2017-2018
- Action Plan to Achieve the Goals in the Field of Quality of Educational, Research, Innovation and Medical Activities of the University for 2017-2018
- Quality Guide

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

As mentioned in the SAR, University departments at least once a semester conduct sociological surveys of relevant stakeholders. The survey also covers the program's suitability with regards to current requirements of the labor market and employers. The University has also introduced a Quality Management System (QMS) with regards to educational activities. Since 2007, the University has repeatedly passed the external audit procedure. In 2016, the University received the re-confirmed and re-issued QMS Certificate of Conformity to the requirements of the international standard ISO 9001:2008 – "Quality Management System".

The University has formulated a number of quality objectives indicating its desire to attract the most talented students from all over the world, to become a leader in medical education, to meet students' individual development needs and to continuously improve its processes and resources.

The University's QMS defines binding responsibilities and mechanisms for the purposes of continuous development. Since 2006, the structural divisions of the University annually

submit reports on the work completed in the area of quality. The results are examined during rector's meetings dedicated to QMS review.

In 2016, Sechenov University implemented a multi-level independent monitoring system for assessing the quality of education, consisting of tools and systems to evaluate individual learning outcomes, staff activities and University-wide educational achievements. Student results are monitored at the individual and group level, and teacher results at the individual and department level.

As stated in the SAR, over the past few years, improvements to the General Medicine curriculum included increases in the share of practical training and self-training, and the introduction of remote monitoring and training methods as well as OSCE assessments. The University considers monitoring (polling) the most effective method for continuous improvement, including the timely introduction of changes and curriculum updates.

The auditors are satisfied that there is a programme to monitor the curriculum, processes and outcomes and an established and implemented mechanism for programme evaluation, which considers stakeholder input and allows for evaluation results to influence the curriculum. The programme is evaluated periodically by comprehensively addressing the context of the educational process, the specific components of the curriculum, the overall outcomes, and its social accountability.

Criterion 7.2 Teacher and student feedback

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Quality Guide
- Sociological Survey

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

In accordance with the requirements of the Quality Guide, the University monitors the quality of the educational, research, medical services and research activities of the University through surveys. A survey is conducted at least once a semester and covers topics such as educational trajectory, career path, satisfaction with programme infrastructure (management, website), and satisfaction with the curriculum.

A sample of survey results provided by the University indicates that foreign students highly rank the University's programmes for components such as "possibility to conduct research", "level and quality of seminars" and "laboratory studies". The auditors do not have information concerning which specific groups are surveyed but learn from the Sociological Survey sample and during audit discussions that students, faculty as well as employers are

among the groups. The survey furthermore differentiates between Russian and foreign students.

Following the auditors' request for additional survey results, the University indicates that the complete results are over 350 pages and that the translation time and effort is too high. However, the University readily agrees to provide results relevant to specific queries.

During audit discussions, the students inform the auditors that they can also rate teachers via an app and can use the University's e-platform to anonymously rate teachers' performance.

The auditors are satisfied that there is an established and implemented system for systematically seeking, analysing, and responding to teachers and students feedback, and that feedback is used for programme development. However, the University should provide more information regarding survey methods to provide a context for the presented results (ex: number of survey participants, surveyed groups, etc.).

Criterion 7.3 Performance of students and graduates

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Sociological Survey

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
As discussed under criterion 7.1, the QMS examines the performance of students, both on the individual and group level.

The results of students' progress and performance are recorded in the information system of the University and on paper (student's record books, progress journals, statements of interim certification). They are available online within the "University-Student" platform and personal accounts of students at the University website.

The University has an Alumni Association that accumulates alumni views on the educational programme and offers ways and methods to improve the education of future generations of students.

The auditors are satisfied that the University analyses the performance of cohorts of students and graduates in relation to its mission and intended educational outcomes, the curriculum, and provision of resources. The analysis of student performance is used to provide feedback to relevant committees.

Criterion 7.4 Involvement of stakeholders

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Sociological Survey
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

The University regularly undergoes external audit in the process of receiving its ISO 9001:2008 certification, which is directly related to the University's QM system.

As discussed in criterion 7.2, the University conducts surveys on a regular basis, which involve students as well as faculty. The Rector presents survey results at regular meetings of the University management with students and staff and at Alumni Association meetings.

As discussed in criterion 2.8, a variety of stakeholders from the medical sector are involved in evaluating students' performance, including independent examiners during final assessments. The University sends questionnaires to employers and also meets with them to discuss students' performance.

As discussed in criterion 4.4, student council representatives are involved in evaluating curricula and formulating recommendations.

The auditors are satisfied that academic staff and students are adequately involved in programme monitoring, governance and management, and evaluation activities.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 7:

In response to the auditors' request for additional information regarding survey methods, the University provides a document describing the survey methods (see criterion 7.2), the surveyed groups as well as the number of survey participants during the previous two academic years. The auditors can see that the survey methods are appropriate.

The auditors consider criterion 7 to be fulfilled.

8. Governance and Administration

Criterion 8.1 Governance

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Order of Organization of Methodological Support of Educational Activities
- Website of University governing bodies: https://www.sechenov.ru/univers/structure/organs/

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The management structure of Sechenov University as a whole is described on the University's official website. The governing bodies include the Rectorate, the Academic Council, the Supervisory Board, the Board of Trustees, the International Expert Council, Administration of the Clinical Center, the Local Ethics Committee and several public organizations. The rector's decree "Concerning Distribution of Responsibilities" regulates the distribution of functional responsibilities within the University's administration.

The auditors are satisfied that the University has defined its governance structures and functions including their relationships within the University. To ensure transparency for external stakeholders, the auditors recommend that the University provide a more comprehensive overview of its governance structures on its website, particularly of the relationships between them (for example a diagram of the organization structure).

Criterion 8.2 Academic leadership

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Head of Department Service Instructions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
As stated in the SAR, the duties of the dean are determined by an employment contract and a job description. Each year at the Rector's Meeting, as well as during the election (re-election) by the Academic Council, the dean reports the results of implementation of the General Medicine Programme plans for its development. The duties of department heads and deans are defined in the Head of Department Service Instructions.

The auditors are satisfied that the University has described the responsibilities of its academic leadership for defining and managing the medical educational programme. The auditors are furthermore satisfied that the academic leadership is periodically evaluated with respect to achieving its mission and intended educational outcomes.

Criterion 8.3 Educational budget and resource allocation

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- FSES GM
- University Charter
- "Additional information in response to ASIIN-AMSE request", provided after the audit visit

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The budget of the University depends to a significant extent on federal grants, in accordance with Russian law (Section 7.4.1 of the FSES GM). The size of the federal support is directly linked to the number of students at the University: the University is awarded a certain amount per student.

During the audit, the auditors learn from the University Management that the University is public and reports to the Ministry of Health. The Ministry covers expenses for Russian students. International students are required by Russian law to pay tuition fees. The tuition fees for foreign students are around 8000 USD per year and therefore significantly higher than tuition fees for Russian students. These additional funds are used to introduce new programmes and teaching methods.

The University has financial planning and accounting departments, which work to ensure the most efficient use of resources.

The auditors inquire as to whether patients obtaining treatment at the University's hospitals serve as an additional source of income. The University responds that the hospitals are funded by the government and that treatment is free and covered by mandatory health insurance. Some additional services are available for fees. The auditors inquire as to the size of the University's budget. The University management responds that the budget is approximately 15 billion Russian Rubles. In a document provided to the peers after the audit, the University provides an overview of funding sources, including both government-funded students as well as paying students, with a total funding of around 5.3 billion Russian Rubles. The peers ask the University to clarify the discrepancy between the statements during the audit and the information provided.

During audit discussions, the auditors inquire whether teachers with English-language skills receive higher compensation. The teachers confirm that the payment is slightly better. As suggested in the SAR, the University also provides financial incentives to employees to encourage scientific publication.

The auditors are satisfied that the University has a clear line of responsibility and authority for resourcing the curriculum and that there are sufficient educational resources for the implementation of the curriculum, distributed in relation to educational needs. The University has sufficient autonomy to direct resources, including teaching staff remuneration, in an appropriate manner in order to achieve its intended educational outcomes. The distribution of resources takes into account the developments in medical sciences and the health needs of the society.

Criterion 8.4 Administrative staff and management

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment Report
- Application for Procurement of Office Consumables and Supplies
- Quality Guide

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The University's Quality Guide covers management and efficient resource deployment. The dean's office of the medical faculty prepares requests for the purchase of equipment, consumables, etc., necessary for the successful implementation of the General Medicine Program. After discussion and approval by the University administration, the implementation of the procurement plan is carried out by the relevant University departments.

The auditors are satisfied that the administrative and professional staff is appropriate to support the implementation of the educational programme and related activities. The medical school formulates and implements an internal programme for quality assurance of the management including regular reviews.

Criterion 8.5 Interaction with health sector

Evidence:

- "Additional information in response to ASIIN-AMSE request", provided after the audit visit
- Self-Assessment Report

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:
The University cooperates closely with the health sector, particularly with regard to training the next generation of medical experts. As mentioned under criteria 4.3, the University provides a career portal where students can view open positions posted by employers.

According to the SAR, several medical institutions of the Moscow Department of Health serve as bases for the University clinics headed by leading professors.

During the audit, the auditors ask about the relationship between the University and the professional communities. The University informs the auditors that the communities often choose the SU facilities to hold their meetings and conferences. Department chairs are often active in these organizations.

The auditors are informed that most of the University's graduates are employed by the public health care system. The University also has contracts with different regions of Russia to train students relative to the regions' needs. Those regions pay the University for the training.

The auditors speak with two representatives of local employers who have partnership agreements with the University. The private-sector employer explains that the company provides internship opportunities to Sechenov students and hires Sechenov graduates. When Sechenov graduates begin working at the company, they are initially supervised by more experienced colleagues. If the colleagues notice regular problems with the hires from Sechenov University, they communicate these to the HR department, which reports them to the dean or faculty of the department. In this manner, the company communicates missing skills to the University. The employer reports that it was difficult to find suitable candidates in 2012, but that the skills gap has been closed since then.

The public-sector employer reports that there is close cooperation between SU and his institution, due to the quality of the graduates. Some of the employer's staff participate in assessing students. Additionally, students can do internships with the clinic and, depending on their performance, may subsequently be hired after graduation. The institution is also active at the University's job fairs. The institute only has this type of cooperation with SU. The employer also reports that SU sends questionnaires, asking about his institution's satisfaction with graduates and his institution's expectations of graduates.

The auditors ask what type of criteria the employers look for in applicants, and if the Sechenov graduates meet these criteria. The employers respond that they look for professional skills and field-specific knowledge as well as soft skills, such as ability to work in a team, or English proficiency. The employers report that the Sechenov graduates they hire are motivated, successful and strong in soft skills and do not have any problems integrating into their teams.

After the audit discussions, the auditors are satisfied that there is very constructive interaction between the medical school and the health and health related sectors of society and government and that the collaborations are sufficiently formalized.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 8:

In response to the auditors' suggestion that the University should make its governance structure more transparent for external stakeholders (see criterion 8.1), the University shows that it has updated the General Medicine programme website to contain an organizational diagram of the interaction between the General Medicine programme and other departments. The University furthermore states that the information will be further structured and updated before the end of the year.

The auditors applaud the University's desire to provide students with a better overview of the organizational structure. They agree that the University should make additional improvements to the organizational diagram posted on the website.

In conclusion, the auditors consider criterion 8 fulfilled.

9. Continuous Renewal

Evidence:

- Self-Assessment report
- General Medicine programme website
- University Website
- FSES GM
- Audit discussions

Preliminary assessment and analysis of the peers:

As described in the previous chapters, the University pursues continuous improvement through a variety of measures, notably its QMS and related activities such as surveys, which include a variety of stakeholder groups. There is also significant interaction with various stakeholder groups, resulting in additional renewal measures. The auditors believe that the programme organizers should formulate a mission and objectives that do not simply uphold federal standards but should also take into account other stakeholder groups and should differentiate the programme from others.

The desired learning outcomes to a large extent reflect federal standards. The curriculum has a "classical" structure and follows the fairly rigid requirements of the federal standards. The auditors understand that these federal standards are reviewed by various stakeholder groups and change in accordance with current labor-market and industry needs.

The University demonstrates that its close connections to stakeholders in the health sector provide it with continuous and valuable feedback with regards to curriculum contents. Furthermore, the auditors see that the University continuously introduces new content into the variable part of the curriculum, enabling students to deepen their knowledge of the most current medical topics. The auditors are satisfied that assessment methods are regularly reviewed by the teaching staff and have been improved with the introduction of new methods, including OSCE. The peers consider the University's achievements in evaluation procedures and practice-related simulations to be significant.

The University's selection and intake policy is to a significant extent governed by federal regulations but also is increasingly focused on recruiting foreign students. In this regard the University demonstrates a willingness and ability to continuously improve educational and support services for foreign students. The auditors are convinced that the staff recruitment and development measures are in line with the changing needs of the University and that

the University similarly introduces new educational resources to meet changing needs, exemplified by its new e-learning institute and the development of e-learning profiles. The auditors are furthermore satisfied that organizational structures are regularly reviewed and improved.

Final assessment of the peers after the comment of the Higher Education Institution regarding criterion 9:

The auditors consider criterion 9 to be fulfilled.

Sechenov University – AMSE

D Additional Documents

Before preparing their final assessment, the panel ask that the following missing or unclear information be provided together with the comment of the Higher Education Institution on the previous chapters of this report:

- English-language overview of teaching staff in the English-language General Medicine programme and their individual qualifications
- Statistics on the teacher-to-student ratio
- Formulated policy for establishing national and international collaboration with other educational institutions
- Regulations for the transfer of educational credits
- Information regarding survey methods

E Comment of the Higher Education Institution (08.07.2019)

The institution provided a extensive statement as well as the following additional documents:

- 50 English-language CVs of primary teaching staff in the English-language General Medicine programme
- Formulated policy for establishing national and international collaboration with other educational institutions
- Regulations for the transfer of educational credits and screenshots of related parts of the University Website
- Regulations on International Collaborations
- Information regarding survey methods
- Curriculum draft for upcoming academic year
- Annotation of the Research Project
- Roadmap Summary: Competitive Enhancement Program 2016-2020
- Examples of Multiple Choice Questions
- Admission Regulations

F Summary: Peer Recommendations

Taking into account the additional information and the comments given by 08.07.2019 the peers summarize their analysis and **final assessment** for the award of the seals as follows:

Degree Programme	ASIIN seal	Subject-specific Label	Maximum duration of accreditation
General Medicine (MD)	With require-ments for one year	AMSE	30.09.2024

Requirements

A 1. (WFME 5.1) The University must provide evidence of the qualifications of the primary teaching staff in each module in the curriculum.

A 2. (WFME 6.6) The University must provide evidence that the policy for establishing national and international collaboration with other educational institutions has been put into force.

Recommendations

E 1. (WFME 1.1) It is recommended to formulate a mission statement and objectives that differentiate the General Medicine study programme from others.

E 2. (WFME 2.6) It is recommended to improve the integration of subjects and reduce the fragmentation of the curriculum.

E 3. (WFME 4.1) It is recommended to better communicate when and where admissions exams take place.

E 4. (WFME 4.3) It is recommended to establish a counseling “path” for students and better communicate the academic and non-academic counselling system to stakeholders.

E 5. (WFME 8.1) It is recommended that the University provides an English-language explanation of governance structures on its website

G Decision of the AMSE Executive Committee (27.08.2019)

The AMSE Executive Committee decides to award the following seals:

Degree Programme	AMSE seal	Maximum duration of accreditation
General Medicine (MD)	With requirements for one year	30.09.2024

H Comment of the Technical Committee 14 – Medicine (03.09.2019)

Assessment and analysis for the award of the ASIIN seal:

The Technical Committee notes that the documents submitted by the University prior to the audit were not complete and some of them were only available in Russian. This has made it much more difficult to carry out the procedure. The expert committee supports the conditions and recommendations proposed by the reviewers, but some editorial changes have been made.

The Technical Committee 14 – Medicine recommends the award of the seal as follows:

Degree Programme	**ASIIN seal**	**Subject-specific labels**	**Maximum duration of accreditation**
General Medicine (MD)	With requirements for one year	AMSE	30.09.2024

I Decision of the Accreditation Commission (20.09.2019)

Assessment and analysis for the award of the subject-specific ASIIN seal:

The Commission discusses the procedure and agrees with the evaluation of the Technical Committee.

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

Degree Programme	ASIIN seal	Subject-specific labels	Maximum duration of accreditation
General Medicine (MD)	With requirements for one year	AMSE	30.09.2024

Requirements

A 1. (WFME 5.1) Provide evidence of qualified teaching staff.

A 2. (WFME 6.6) Implement a policy for establishing national and international collaboration with other educational institutions.

Recommendations

E 1. (WFME 1.1) It is recommended to formulate a mission statement and objectives that differentiate the General Medicine study programme from others.

E 2. (WFME 2.6) It is recommended to improve the integration of subjects and reduce the fragmentation of the curriculum.

E 3. (WFME 4.1) It is recommended to better communicate when and where admissions exams take place.

E 4. (WFME 4.3) It is recommended to establish a counseling “path” for students and better communicate the academic and non-academic counselling system to stakeholders.

E 5. (WFME 8.1) It is recommended that the University provides an English-language explanation of governance structures on its website

J Fulfilment of Requirements (17.09.2020)

Analysis of the peers and the Technical Committee (01.09.2020)

Requirements

For all degree programmes

A 1. (WFME 5.1) The University must provide evidence of the qualifications of the primary teaching staff in each module in the curriculum.

Initial Treatment	
Peers	Fulfilled. Justification: The University provided a list of teaching staff in the programme as well as the respective CVs.
TC 14	fulfilled Vote: unanimous Justification: The Tc follows the assessment of the peers.

A 2. (WFME 6.6) The University must provide evidence that the policy for establishing national and international collaboration with other educational institutions has been put into force.

Initial Treatment	
Peers	Fulfilled Justification: The University has provided a signed and stamped order indicating the policy was put into force.
TC 14	fulfilled Vote: unanimous Justification: The Tc follows the assessment of the peers.

Decision of the Accreditation Commission (17.09.2020)

The Accreditation Commission discusses the procedure.

The Accreditation Commission decides to follow the recommendations of the peers and Technical Committee without any changes.

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

Degree programme	**ASIIN-label**	**Subject-specific label**	**Accreditation until max.**
General Medicine	All requirements fulfilled	AMSE	30.09.2024

Appendix: Programme Learning Outcomes and Curricula

According to the Federal State Educational Standard of Higher Education for the specialty 31.05.01 “Medical Business”, referenced on the General Medicine program’s website, the following **objectives** and **learning outcomes (intended qualifications profile)** shall be achieved by the General Medicine program:

V. Requirements for the results of mastering a specialist’s program

5.1. As a result of mastering a specialist’s program, general cultural, general professional and professional competencies should be formed at the graduate.

5.2. A graduate who has mastered a specialist’s programme should have the following general cultural competencies:

the ability to abstract thinking, analysis, synthesis (general cultural competencies - 1);

the ability to use the basics of philosophical knowledge to form the ideological position (general cultural competencies - 2);

the ability to analyze the main stages and patterns of the society historical development for the formation of citizenship (general cultural competencies - 3);

the ability to act in non-standard situations, to bear social and ethical responsibility for the decisions made (general cultural competencies - 4);

readiness for self-development, self-realization, self-education, the use of creative potential (general cultural competencies - 5);

the ability to use methods and means of physical education to ensure full social and professional activities (general cultural competencies - 6);

readiness to use first aid techniques, methods of protection in emergency situations (general cultural competencies - 7);

readiness to work in a team, tolerantly perceive social, ethnic, confessional and cultural differences (general cultural competencies - 8).

5.3. A graduate who has mastered a specialist’s programme should have the following general professional competencies:

readiness to solve standard tasks of professional activity using information, bibliographic resources, biomedical terminology, information and communication technologies and taking into account the basic requirements of information security (general professional competencies - 1);

readiness for communication in oral and written forms in Russian and foreign languages for solving the tasks of professional activity (general professional competencies - 2);

the ability to use the basics of economic and legal knowledge in professional activities (general professional competencies - 3);

the ability and readiness to implement ethical and deontological principles in professional activities (general professional competencies - 4);

the ability and readiness to analyze the results of their own activities to prevent professional errors (general professional competencies - 5);

readiness to keep medical records (general professional competencies - 6);

readiness to use basic physicochemical, mathematical and other natural science concepts and methods in solving professional problems (general professional competencies - 7);

readiness for medical use of drugs and other substances and their combinations in solving professional problems (general professional competencies - 8);

the ability to assess morphofunctional, physiological states and pathological processes in the human body to solve professional problems (general professional competencies - 9);

readiness to ensure the organization of patient care and the provision of primary premedical health care (general professional competencies - 10);

readiness for the use of medical devices provided for by the procedures for providing medical care (general professional competencies - 11).

5.4. A graduate who has mastered a specialist's programme must have professional competencies corresponding to the type (types) of professional activity to which the specialist's programme is oriented:

Medical activity:

ability and readiness to implement a set of measures aimed at preserving and promotion of health and including the formation of a healthy lifestyle, preventing the occurrence and (or) spread of diseases, their early diagnosis, identifying the causes and conditions of their occurrence and development, as well as aimed at eliminating harmful effects on human health of environmental factors (professional competencies - 1);

ability and readiness to conduct preventive medical examinations, periodic health examination and implementation of dispensary observation (professional competencies- 2);

the ability and readiness to conduct anti-epidemic measures, organization of protection of the population in the nidus of especially dangerous infections, with a deterioration of the radiation situation, natural disasters and other emergency situations (professional competencies - 3);

the ability and readiness to use social hygienic methods of collecting and medical statistical analysis of information on health indicators of the population (professional competencies - 4);

readiness to collect and analyze patients complaints, their medical history, examination results, laboratory, instrumental, pathological and other studies in order to recognize the condition or establish whether the disease is present or not (professional competencies - 5);

the ability to determine in a patient the main pathological conditions, symptoms, disease syndromes, nosological forms in accordance with the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Health Problems, X revision (professional competencies- 6);

readiness for the examination of temporary disability, participation in the conduct of medical and social expertise, ascertaining the biological death of a person (professional competencies - 7);

the ability to determine the tactics of managing patients with various nosological forms (professional competencies - 8);

readiness for management and treatment of patients with various nosological forms in outpatient and day hospital conditions (professional competencies - 9);

readiness to provide medical care in case of sudden acute diseases, conditions, exacerbation of chronic diseases that are not accompanied by a threat to the patient's life and do not require emergency medical care (professional competencies - 10);

readiness to participate in the provision of emergency medical care in conditions requiring urgent medical intervention (professional competencies - 11);

readiness to maintain a physiological pregnancy, childbirth (professional competencies - 12);

readiness to participate in the provision of medical assistance in emergency situations, including participation in medical evacuation (professional competencies - 13);

readiness to determine the need for the use of natural therapeutic factors, drug, nondrug therapy and other methods in patients in need of medical rehabilitation and sanatorium-resort treatment (professional competencies - 14);

readiness to teach patients and their relatives basic hygiene measures of a health improving nature, skills of self-monitoring of basic physiological indicators that contribute to the preservation and promotion of health, and the prevention of diseases (professional competencies - 15);

readiness to educate on the elimination of risk factors and the formation of skills for a healthy lifestyle (professional competencies - 16);

Organizational and management activities:

the ability to apply basic principles of organization and management in the field of public health, in medical organizations and their structural subdivisions (professional competencies - 17),

readiness to participate in assessing the quality of care with the use of basic medical and statistical indicators (professional competencies - 18);

ability to organize medical assistance in emergency situations, including medical evacuation (professional competencies - 19);

Research activities:

readiness for analysis and public presentation of medical information based on evidence-based medicine (professional competencies - 20);

ability to participate in research (professional competencies - 21);

readiness to participate in the introduction of new methods and techniques aimed at protecting the health of citizens (professional competencies - 22).

The following **curriculum** is presented:

№	Division by Semesters	Division by Semesters		Credits	HOURS								
						Classroom							
		Examinations	Pass-Fail Examinations		GRAND TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL	Examinations	Lectures	Laboratory courses	Practical Training	Clinical Practical Training	Seminars	Independent Study Work
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Unit 1. Disciplines (Modules)													
1 B Basic Component													
1.	B.1 History		1	3	90	60	4	20				36	30
2.	B.2 Physics, Mathematics		1	3	90	60	4	14	18	24			30
3.	B.3 Biology		1	3	90	60	4	14		42			30
4.	B.4 Basics of patients care		1	3	90	60	4	4			52		30
5.	B.5 Human Anatomy	2		12	360	240	8	48		184			120
6.	B.6 Histology, Embriology, Cytology	2		6	180	120	8	24		88			60
7.	B.7 Latin Language		2	3	90	60	4			56			30
8.	B.8 Foreign language		2	3	90	60	4			56			30
9.	B.9 Public safety		2	3	90	60	4	12		44			30
10.	B.10 Physiology	3		9	270	180	8	52		120			90
11.	B.11 Biological Chemistry	3		9	270	180	8	48		124			90
12.	B.12 Philosophy		3	3	90	60	4	20				36	30
13.	B.13 Psychology and pedagogy		3	3	90	60	4	12		44			30
14.	B.14 Economics and Law		3	3	90	60	4	16		40			30
15.	B.15 Microbiology	4		9	270	180	8	44		128			90
16.	B.16 Topographic anatomy and operative surgery	4		6	180	120	8	24		88			60
17.	B.17 Nursing		4	3	90	60	4	4			52		30
18.	B.18 Pathological anatomy	5		9	270	180	8	52		120			90
19.	B.19 Pathophysiology	5		9	270	180	8	40		132			90
20.	B.20 Propedeutics of internal diseases	5		9	270	180	8	24			148		90
21.	B.21 General surgery	5		6	180	120	8	24			88		60
22.	B.22 Pharmacology	6		9	270	180	8	52		120			90
23.	B.23 Radiodiagnostics		6	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
24.	B.24 IT and e-health		6	3	90	60	4	8		48			30
25.	B.25 Internal medicine	7		9	270	180	8	30			142		90
26.	B.26 Fundamental surgery	7		6	180	120	8	24			88		60
27.	B.27 Hygiene	7		6	180	120	8	24		88			60
28.	B.28 Public Health	7		6	180	120	8	24		88			60
29.	B.29 Otorhinolaryngology		7	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
30.	B.30 Ophthalmology		7	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
31.	B.31 Anesthesiology, Reanimation		7	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
32.	B.32 Neurology, Neurosurgery	8		6	180	120	8	24			88		60
33.	B.33 Medical genetics		8	2	60	40	4	8			28		20
34.	B.34 Obstetrics and Gynecology	8,11		15	450	300	16	60			224		150
35.	B.35 Dermavenerology		8	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
36.	B.36 Urology		8	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
37.	B.37 Medical rehabilitation		8	3	90	60	4	8			48		30

38.	B.38 Surgery	10		9	270	180	8	36			136		90
39.	B.39 Hospital medicine	11		12	360	240	8	50			182		120
40.	B.40 Psychiatry, Medical Phsychology	9		6	180	120	8	18			94		60
41.	B.41 Pediatrics	10		9	270	180	8	36			136		90
42.	B.42 Infectious diseases	10		9	270	180	8	30			142		90
43.	B.43 Traumatology, Orthopedics	10		6	180	120	8	24			88		60
44.	B.44 Endocrinology		10	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
45.	B.45 Phthisiology		10	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
46.	B.46 Oral surgery		11	2	60	40	4	4			32		20
47.	B.47 Medical emergencies		11	3	90	60	4	6		22	28		30
48.	B.48 Epidemiology		11	3	90	60	4	8		48			30
49.	B.49 Clinical Pharmacology	12		6	180	120	8	24			88		60
50.	B.50 Outpatient service	12		9	270	180	8	30			142		90
51.	B.51 Oncology, Radiotherapy		12	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
52.	B.52 Forensic medicine		12	3	90	60	4	8		48			30
53.	B.53 Physical culture and Sports		2	2	60	40	4	16		20			20
	TOTAL			**288**	**8 640**	**5 760**	**320**	**1 120**	**18**	**1 772**	**2 458**	**72**	**2 880**
2 V Variable Component													
Disciplines of the Variable Component													
54.	V.1 Chemistry		1	3	90	60	4	8	24	24			30
55.	V.2 Embryology		2	2	60	40	4	10		26			20
56.	V.3 Genetics		2	3	90	60	4	8		48			30
57.	V.4 Medical-biological conceptual apparatus		4	3	90	60	4			56			30
58.	V.5 Evidence-based medicine: Principles and methodology		6	2	60	40	4	8		28			20
59.	V.6 Transplantation		11	3	90	60	4	8			48		30
60.	V.7 Emergency Cardiology		12	2	60	40	4	4			32		20
	TOTAL			**18**	**540**	**360**	**28**	**46**	**24**	**182**	**80**		**180**
Elective Disciplines of the Variable Component													
61.	V.1 Business Russian / Communication with patients in Russuan-speaking environment		3	2	60	40	4	12		24			20
62.	V.2 Oral Professional Communication in a Foreign Language / Multimedia Technology		5	3	90	60	4	12		44			30
63.	V.3 Written Professional Communication in a Foreign Language / Basics of medical translation		6	3	90	60	4	12		44			30
64.	V.4 Clinical genetics / Ultrasound diagnostics		8	2	60	40	4	12			24		20
65.	V.5 Computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging / Plastic reconstructive surgery and microsurgery / Clinical parasitology		9	3	90	60	4	12		44			30
66.	V.6 HIV infections / Neurogenic pain syndromes / Tropical Medicine		11	3	90	60	4	12			44		30
67.	V.7 International humanitarian law in medicine / Surgical care in armed conflicts		12	2	60	40	4	8		10		18	20
68.	V.8 Applied Physical culture and Sports / Applied Physical culture and Sports (Exercise therapy)		9		328	328	4			324			
	TOTAL			**18**	**868**	**688**	**32**	**80**		**490**	**68**	**18**	**180**
	TOTAL			**36**	**1 408**	**1 048**	**60**	**126**	**24**	**672**	**148**	**18**	**360**
	TOTAL for Unit 1			**324**	**#####**	**6 808**	**380**	**1 246**	**42**	**2 444**	**2 606**	**90**	**3 240**
								19,4%					
Unit 2. Practices, including Research activities													
1 B Basic Component													
Educational practice													
69.	B.1 Practice for obtaining primary professional skills "Nursing"	1		3	90	60	6						30
70.	B.2 Practice to obtain primary professional skills "Diagnostic"	5		3	90	60	6						30
	TOTAL			**6**	**180**	**120**	**12**						**60**
Practices for obtaining professional skills and experience													
71.	B.1 Practice for obta-ining professional skills and experience in professional activi-ties of "Nursing"	4		3	90	60	6						30

72.	B.2 Practical training to obtain professional skills and experience in professional activity: Diagnosis	6		3	90	60	6						30
73.	B.3 Clinical training in internal medicine	8		3	90	60	6						30
74.	B.4 Urgent medical manipulations	8		3	90	60	6						30
75.	B.5 Clinical training in surgery	10		3	90	60	6						30
76.	B.6 Clinical training in obstetrics and gynecology	11		3	90	60	6						30
77.	B.7 Clinical training in general medicine	12		9	270	180	6						90
TOTAL				**27**	**810**	**540**	**42**						**270**
TOTAL				**33**	**990**	**660**	**54**						**330**
TOTAL for Unit 2				**33**	**990**	**660**	**54**						**330**

Unit 3. State Final Certification (credits)

1 B Basic Component

78.	B.1 State Examination			3	90	12	6						78
TOTAL				**3**	**90**	**12**	**6**						**78**
TOTAL for Unit 3				**3**	**90**	**12**	**6**						**78**
GRAND TOTAL, HOURS				**360**	**####**	**####**	**440**	**1 246**	**42**	**2 444**	**2 606**	**90**	**3 648**

OD.00 Optional discipline

79.	1 Russian Language and culture of speech		2	2	60	40	4			36			20
TOTAL				**2**	**60**	**40**	**4**			**36**			**20**

Semesters													
Examinations	**26**												
Credits		**44**											
Certification practices	**9**												
Classroom hours per week													
Hours per week													

Director Center for international education Dmitrii Morozov
Dean Marina Kinkulkina