

забезпеченні необхідних умов для польських школярів для складання інших іспитів англійською мовою, у той час як в Україні такі можливості відсутні.

Ключові слова: оцінювання знань, учні, які вивчають англійську мову, оцінювання знань учнів з англійської мови, загальноосвітні школи, Україна, Польща.

УДК 37.012 [373.5+316.35] (73)

Наталія Голубкова

Сумський державний педагогічний
університет імені А. С. Макаренка

ORCID ID 0000-0001-9880-7862

DOI 10.24139/2312-5993/2018.05/025-036

FORMS OF SCHOOL-COMMUNITY PARTNESHIP IN THE CONTEXT OF STUDYING ORGANIZATIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF AMERICAN SCHOOL, FAMILY AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

The article focuses on the forms of American school and community partnership as since the adoption of the Education Act "Goals 2000: Educate Act America" (1994) a partnership of school, family and community has been recognized as one of the principal objectives for all schools in the country at the legislative level. Moreover, the vast majority of American scholars, educators, practitioners and parents are aware that effective cooperation with families of school students and local communities can be an effective means of reforming schools and improving the quality of student education.

The aim of the study is to analyze forms of school and community collaboration which are given by American researchers, as success of partnership of school, family and community much depends on their activities and results.

In the article a complex of interrelated and complementary research methods have been used. In particular: general scientific – analysis, synthesis, comparison and generalization; component-structural, system-structural, system-functional, which give the opportunity to study and identify the main trends in developing school and community partnership and define efficient forms of community involvement.

As the majority of school administrators and teachers realize that intensive involvement of communities into school activities is an essential condition for effective management of the educational process, they have started their work to build stronger partnership relations believing that these strategies will help to increase academic skills, create safer school environment and improve the well-being of families and communities.

American researchers claim that the school and community partnership (SCP) takes a variety of forms and they give a classification of potential partners of schools, namely: 1) business structures; 2) universities and education institutions; 3) institutions of public health and child protection; 4) government and military institutions; 5) national services and volunteer organizations; 6) religious institutions; 7) senior citizens organizations; 8) cultural and recreational institutions; 9) other community organizations; 10) community individuals.

Summarizing American experience, it should be emphasized that collaboration of school and community as a component of partnership of American school, family and community has a long history, but it becomes especially significant at the end of the XX – the beginning of the XXI centuries, when more complex conditions for the work of the school and the need for workers, whose professional competence is higher than the basic level appeared in the country.

Nevertheless, this study does not fully cover the above mentioned issues. We believe that the following forms of cooperation should be further thoroughly studied and analyzed: a) cooperation with government and military agencies; b) religious organizations, as these institutions may considerably help schools solve their burning problems especially when they experience a lack of financial, materiel and social resources.

Key words: *school, family and community partnership, community involvement, forms of cooperation, establishing collaboration, business community, school-based health clinics, full partners in educating, coordinating services for children and young people, building and supporting school-family-communities partnerships.*

Introduction. Integration of Ukraine into the European and worldwide educational space requires studying, analyzing and applying positive effective practices in development of school education taking place in the highly developed countries. Specifically, the USA has gained some valuable experience related to the implementation of school, family and community partnership in the educational sphere which is worth analyzing particularly in the context of the current reform “New Ukrainian School”, the main goal of which is to create a new school in which it will be pleasant and comfortable to study and which will give its pupils not only knowledge, but also the ability to apply it in life. It should be mentioned that one of the principles of the “New Ukrainian School” is a partnership, including the partnership between school and parents.

Consequently, an important aspect of modern comparative educational research is to study the international experience of building and supporting school-family-communities partnerships in the process of educating children around the world. In this context, an analysis of the US educational experience is tremendously beneficial and relevant because, firstly, since the adoption of the Education Act “Goals 2000: Educate Act America” (1994) [9], partnership of American school, family and community has been recognized as one of the principal objectives for all schools in the country at the legislative level; and, secondly, the vast majority of American scholars, educators, practitioners and parents are aware that effective cooperation with families of school students and local communities can be an effective means of reforming schools and improving the quality of student education.

Analysis of relevant research. The problems of community involvement in school activities and the development of partnerships between school and community have become the subject of research of such American scholars as Mary Richardson Boo, Carl Vogel, Frances L. Van Voorhis, Don Davies, Larry E. Decker, Virginia A. Decker, Natalie Rodriguez Jansorn, Joyce L. Epstein, Beth S. Simon, Karen C. Salinas, Mavis G. Sanders, Calvin R. Stone, and others. The researchers have come to the conclusion that school, family and community partnership is useful for schoolchildren, all parts of the educational process, families and communities in particular.

The research works devoted to the forms of cooperation between schools and business enterprises, their impact on student achievements, on learning motivation and discipline in school are of great significance. These questions were studied by such researchers as Carol Ascher, F. S. Frederick C. Wendel, Susan Kranberg, Carol Nasworthy, Susan D. Otterbourg, Albert Pautler, Magdalena Rood, Michael Timpane, Barbara J. Hopkins and some others.

The aim of the study. In the context of studying the organizational and pedagogical foundations of the American school, family and community partnership, we consider analyzing forms of school and community collaboration which are given by American researchers of great importance as success of partnership much depends on their activities and the results.

Research methods. In accordance with the subject, goals and objectives of the research a complex of interrelated and complementary research methods have been used, in particular: *general scientific* – analysis, synthesis, comparison and generalization, which are necessary for studying works of Ukrainian and foreign scientists, official and normative documents; *component-structural, system-structural, system-functional*, which give the opportunity to study and identify the main trends in developing school, family and community partnership and define efficient forms of community involvement.

Results. The majority of school administrators and teachers realize that intensive involvement of parents of their students and communities into school activities is an essential condition for: a) effective management of the educational process; b) students' high academic achievements; c) creation and maintaining safe schools; d) and even students' trust to their teachers. So they have started their work to build stronger partnership relations believing that these strategies will help to increase academic skills, create safer school environments and improve the well-being of families and communities.

M. G. Sanders, whose research activity focuses on improving schools and educational outcomes for underserved youth through school, family, and community partnerships, devoted a series of studies to the development of the American school, family and community partnership (SFCP). In her study "Community Involvement in School Improvement: a Small Important Feature" the scholar states that school and community partnership (SCP) takes a variety of forms, and provides a classification of potential partners, namely: 1) business structures; 2) universities and education institutions; 3) institutions of public health and child protection; 4) government and military institutions; 5) national services and volunteer organizations; 6) religious institutions; 7) senior citizens organizations; 8) cultural and recreational institutions; 9) other community organizations; 10) community individuals [19, 32]. Potential community partners and examples of institutions and organizations open to partnership with the school are systematized in table 1.

Table 1

Potential community partners and examples of institutions and organizations

Types of Partnership	List of subjects
Businesses/Corporations	Local businesses, national corporations, and franchises
Universities and Education Institutions	Colleges and universities, high schools, and other education institutions
Health Care and Child Protection Organizations	Hospitals, health care centers, mental health facilities, health departments, health foundations, and associations
Government and Military Agencies	Fire departments, police departments, chambers of commerce, city councils, and other local and state government agencies and departments
National Services and Volunteer Organizations	Rotary Club, Lions Club, Kiwanis Club, VISTA, Concerned Black Men, Inc., Shriners, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA, United Way, AmeriCorps, Urban League
Religious Organizations	Churches, mosques, synagogues, other religious organizations, and charities
Senior Citizens Organizations	Nursing homes and senior volunteer and service organizations
Cultural and Recreational Institutions	Zoos, museums, libraries, and recreational centers
Other Community Organizations	Fraternities, sororities, foundations, neighborhood associations, and political, alumni, and local service organizations
Community Individuals	Individual volunteers from the surrounding school community

Analyzing the role of communities in improving the educational process at school, M. G. Sanders emphasizes that the partnership of the above-mentioned social institutions can acquire a variety of forms of cooperation, among which cooperation with the business community (business enterprises, companies of the local level and national corporations) is the most widespread in the USA [19, 31].

Recognizing the great significance of school partnership with business enterprises, such researchers as K. Ascher, B. Hopkins, F. S. Wendel, S. Kranberg, C. Nasvorthy, M. Rood, S. D. Otterbourg, M. Timpane, and some others analyzed and clarified the importance of school-business collaboration as a form of partnership between the American school and community in the context of historical development of schooling in the country. Furthermore, they identified and analyzed forms and methods of cooperation between schools and business enterprises, their impact on student achievements, on learning motivation and school discipline.

The above mentioned researchers argue that at the present stage of the development of American society, one of the objectives of the school is to prepare the country's high-quality workforce, since workers with good education can play an important role in its economic development. As a rule, this view of the role of school is typical in the United States and has been dominant for national educational legislation and policies for several decades [1; 11; 13; 16; 17].

The analysis of the studies of the above cited researchers suggests that, firstly, at the present stage of development of society, when newest technological equipment is intensively and rapidly introduced at industrial workplaces, comprehensive secondary schools bear a great responsibility, in particular, developing and implementing effective training programs, which will be able to prepare students for college and university entrance and receiving qualitative professional training. Secondly, school administrators often turn to business enterprises with proposals for cooperation, as there is a lack of financing education institutions in the country, and schools should be inventive in terms of material and technical support of the educational process, the purpose of which is to provide students with high-quality educational services. Consequently, employers are interested in the success of schools that supply them with workforce, and therefore, they are usually willing to provide assistance to schools and are open to establishing partnerships.

An American researcher C. Ascher in her work "Urban School-Community Alliances", analyzing the forms and types of school and community partnerships, states that school collaboration with business is the most common form of partnership, which is characterized by a tendency for growth and expansion, and which is useful for students, parents, communities and business itself [1, 4].

S. D. Otterbourg and M. Timpane are sure that an important aspect of the school business partnerships is active participation of its representatives in school advisory boards. The researchers claim that "to realize the country's hopes for the improvement of school curricula and the intensification of vocational training, educational establishments must have strong partnerships with business not only for a year, but for many years" [17, 73]. Therefore, it is obvious that teachers need the support and assistance of those who have certain knowledge about the needs of modern production, the actual achievements of modern science and the experience in developing effective curricula. It is the business partners who are members of the advisory councils that should provide educators with such assistance.

M. G. Sanders, analyzing the content of the American school partnership, believes that American universities and colleges rank among potential partners and are actively involved in co-operation with schools in the country [20, 32].

As a partner that represents the community, universities and colleges can play a unique role in the development of partnerships because they have the potential:

- a) to improve student achievements;
- b) to increase the participation of community members and schoolchildren’s parents in the educational process of the school;
- c) to intensify vocational guidance work in education institutions;
- d) to promote professional development and improvement of both school teachers and their university students.

Analysis of works of such researchers as L. Darling-Hammond and M. Levin shows that a significant proportion of U.S. universities intensively cooperate with school administrations and teachers in establishing Professional Development Schools, which, in their turn, contribute to the organization of innovative networks, that include universities, pedagogical colleges and secondary schools. The country’s pedagogical colleges also offer various professional development courses for teachers of those schools with which they collaborate and are more actively engaged in co-operation. This kind of partnership contributes to improving the quality of academic training of secondary school students, future enrollees who may become their potential students [2, 14].

Therefore, higher education institutions are keen to ensure that teaching at schools and curricula should provide students with habits and skills that meet modern requirements for high secondary school, and that’s why they not only offer professional development courses for school teachers but also help schools in working with new technologies. Moreover, lecturers and university professors are actively involved in the development of school programs and provide guidance both to members of school pedagogical staffs and senior students.

Having analyzed the activities of school-university alliances C. Ascher structured the activities according to whether they directly or indirectly affect school students, as shown in Table 2 [1, 7].

Table 2

Activities of the University within School-Community Partnership

Direct Student Services	Indirect Student Services
college study in high school	teacher revitalization and improvement
counseling and advising	curriculum development
financial aid	district policy change
skills building	curriculum delivery
access to information	research

And finally, it should be emphasized that in cases when the number of applicants to higher education institutions is declining but high market capacity and competitiveness are required from universities and colleges, co-operation with schools is one of the means to motivate, to interest and to prepare senior pupils for entering higher educational establishments, in other words, to pursue a broad professional orientation.

In their works, such American researchers as J. G. Drayfoos and N. Fruchter precisely point out that, as schools often cannot know the needs of all students who attend them, administrators and teachers should establish co-operation with those institutions that will help them solve these problems, and who, in their turn, are also interested in implementing partnerships. Hence, another effective form of school, family and community partnership is collaboration with Health Care and Child Protection Organizations. For example, clinics, whose employees are more and more often invited to provide medical services for adolescents, viz. conducting medical examinations of students, immunization, conducting healthy lifestyle discussions, preventing the use of drugs, alcohol, smoking and adolescent pregnancies, are aware of the importance of this work, because schools are those institutions that take care of health of the younger generation and make their attending doctors compulsory [6; 7].

It is worth mentioning that the adoption of such legislative acts as Drug Free Schools and Community Act (1986), Drug Free Schools and Community Act Amendments (1989) and Healthy Youth Act (2009) has become a driving force for finding efficient ways of collaboration and partnership between school and medical institutions [4; 5; 10].

In this regard it seems appropriate to refer to the American researcher L. G. Dolan's ideas who, in our opinion, has demonstrated a profound understanding of the development of partnership between school and health care institutions and focused some of his research works on this issue, specifically organization and activities of health clinics at schools. Studying the models of integrating social services to the work of schools, L. G. Dolan emphasizes that joint activities between schools and health care institutions aimed at developing school-based health clinics is one of the most effective forms of partnership, because the issue of providing quality medical services to the younger generation of the country became a priority for health workers at the end of the twentieth century [3, 3].

In this context, the experience of Baltimore City Health Department is of great interest, because they were among the first in the country that allocated funds for the organization of school-based health clinics in secondary schools:

- 1) to provide children with high-quality preventive and primary health-care measures;
- 2) to provide medical services to the category of adolescents who did not receive them or received partly;
- 3) to develop mechanisms for improving the provision of quality medical services.

The task of school-based health clinics is:

- 1) to intensify the early identifying of problem teens and reduce their number;

2) to improve adolescent teens' knowledge of a healthy lifestyle and develop their decision-making skills.

In order to realize these tasks each school based clinic has its own staff, namely, a paramedic, a health-care worker, a registrar and a medical service coordinator. Many clinics have additional mental health personnel, counseling on substance misuse, nutrition and health education. School clinics can help to solve problems of adolescent pregnancy by providing counseling and conducting lessons on sexual education and reproductive health for both students and their parents.

Half of all students in the schools in which Baltimore school based clinics are located are involved in health activities. In order to participate in the activities of these health institutions schoolchildren need to have their parents' consent. An interesting fact is that almost 50 % of the children who are provided with the services offered by the staff of the school clinics do not have an insurance policy.

Analyzing the activities of Baltimore school-based clinics, L. G. Dolan states that their activities go beyond mere medical and preventive measures [3, 3]. This researcher assumes that the important role in establishing partnership relations is given to directors of education institutions, who pay much attention to the involvement of families in the educational process of schools, and advise the staff of school clinics to involve students' parents into discussing plans of activities and their joint implementation. An important condition for the effective functioning of school-based health clinics is the degree of their integration or vice versa their isolation from the school curriculum. It is worth mentioning that the school teaching staff's attitude and their participation in planning activities have a significant effect on the results as well. So, Baltimore school-based health clinics have collected a database of students who seek help and the services they provided, but their base does not reflect their impact on school life, in particular on school attendance, school lateness and drop-outs. To overcome these shortcomings it is important:

1) to expand the database of schoolchildren, namely to include information about those children who did not apply to school clinics regarding their medical needs;

2) to coordinate the plans of activities with families of schoolchildren and to involve not only pupils' parents who are members of the clinics but also others;

3) to monitor and have information on duplication of services provided by other school partners.

L. G. Dolan claims that school administrators consider that one of the main benefits of school-based health clinics is their positive impact on students' attendance [3, 4].

According to S. L. Kagan, co-director of the National Center for Children and Families of the United States, the first of the six national tasks that were set before American educators by the “Goals 2000: Educate Act America” i.e. “by the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn” implies involvement of many organizations and services to implement it, including families, churches, health care institutions and social security agencies [12, 277]. Moreover, the implementation of the sixth goal for 2000, which says that “every school will be free from drugs and violence”, also requires joint efforts of the entire community. Consequently, the involvement of health care institutions, social services, and law enforcement services, which become full partners in educating a healthy generation of Americans, has become of vital importance.

W. J. Kritek claims that US schools have long been coordinating services for children and young people. Diagnosing and providing services for students with special academic needs is precisely an example of coordinating the work of various professionals in medical and social services [14, xv]. Many primary school teachers are trying to coordinate their actions not only with families of their schoolchildren, but also with social protection institutions. In case of need, schools provide students with the opportunity to apply to social agencies and child protection services. It should be pointed out that in the framework of the strategy for strengthening relationships school-family, school-community, coordinating services for schoolchildren takes an important place.

In her study “Community Involvement In Schools: From Concept to Practice”, M. G. Sanders concludes that firstly, initiatives aimed at the integration of school services contribute to improving the behavior and academic performance of students who receive these services intensively. Secondly, the introduction of coordinated programs for providing services to students contributes to increasing participation of schoolchildren’s parents in the educational process of the school [19, 171].

Analyzing the alliances of schools and communities of major industrial cities in the United States, K. Ascher states that cultural and recreational institutions such as museums, theaters and concert halls have their reasons for establishing links with schools: most often it is a desire to expand their audience to cultivate aesthetic tastes, to promote respect and love for the achievements of mankind [1, 5].

C. B. Fowler points out that the renewal of attention and interest in art as one of the main components of education, as well as the government agencies’ support of arts establishments’ initiatives to establish cooperation with schools contributed to the financial stability of the institutions of the arts itself [7, 7].

Conclusions. Summarizing American experience, it should be emphasized that collaboration of school and community as a component of partnership of American school, family and community has a long history, but it becomes

especially relevant at the end of the XX – the beginning of the XXI centuries, when more complex conditions for work of school and the need for workers, whose professional competence is higher than the basic level appeared in the country.

Thus, defining and analyzing the forms and methods of partnership of American school, family and community suggests that, in the U.S. teachers representing school, government officials, political leaders, business leaders, civil society organizations representing community and parents are interested in establishing effective partnership of school, family and community, which can take on a variety of forms of co-operation. It is worthwhile mentioning that partnership of school, family and community allows solving problems as common to all its participants, and for each of them.

This study does not fully cover the above mentioned problem. We believe that the following forms of co-operation should be further thoroughly studied and analyzed: a) cooperation with government and military agencies such as fire departments, police departments, chambers of commerce, city councils, and other local and state government agencies and departments; b) religious organizations such as churches, mosques, synagogues, other religious organizations, and charities, as these institutions may considerably help schools solve their burning problems especially when they experience a lack of financial, materiel and social resources.

REFERENCES

1. Ascher, C. (1988) *Urban school-community alliances*. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED306339.pdf>
2. Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). *Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession*. New York: Teachers College Press.
3. Dolan, L. (1992, March). *Models for integrating human services into the schools*. (Report No. 30). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED347244.pdf>
4. *Drug-free schools and communities act of 1986*. (1986). Public Law 99 -570, Subtitle B of Title IV. Washington, DC: United States Congress.
5. *Drug-free schools and communities act amendments* (1989). Retrieved from: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/101st-congress/house-bill/3614/text>
6. Dryfoos, J. G. (1988). School-based health clinics: three years of experience. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 20 (4), 193–200.
7. Fowler, C. B. (1984). Who owns arts education? *Design*, 86 (2), 4–7.
8. Fruchter, N. (1987). *School-community collaboration: Dilemmas and opportunities*. New York: Academy for Educational Development.
9. *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* (1994). Retrieved from: <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/103/hr1804/text>
10. *Healthy Youth Act* (2009). Retrieved from: <http://www.shiftnc.org/resources/for-schools/healthy-youth-act-faqs>
11. Hopkins, B., Wendel, F. (1997). *Creating school-community-business partnerships*. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation.
12. Kagan, S. L. (1990). Readiness 2000: Rethinking rhetoric and responsibility. *Phi delta Kappan*, 72 (4), 272–279.

13. Kranberg, S. (1993) *50 Important things you can do to improve education*. New York: The Book Industry Study Group Inc.
14. Kritek, J. W. (1996). Introduction. In J. G. Cibulka, W. J. Kritek (Eds.), *Coordination among schools, families, and communities: prospects for educational reform* (pp. ix – xxv). State University of New York Press.
15. Levine, M. (1997). Can professional development schools help us achieve what matters most? *Action in Teacher Education*, 19 (2), 63–73.
16. Nasworthy, C., Rood, M. (1990). *Bridging the gap between business and education: Reconciling expectations for student achievement*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
17. Otterbourg, S. D. Timpane, M. (1986). Partnerships and Schools. Public-Private Partnerships: Improving Urban Life. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36 (2), 60–73.
18. Pautler, A. J. (1999). *Workforce education: issues for the new century*. Ann Arbor, MI: Prakken Publications.
19. Sanders, M. G. (2002). Community involvement in school improvement: The little extra that makes a big difference. In J. Epstein, M. G. Sanders, B. S. Simon (Eds), *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*, (pp. 30–39). Thousand Oaks, CA (USA): Sage.
20. Sanders, M. G. (2001). The role of community in comprehensive school, family and community partnership programs. *The Elementary School Journal*, 102 (1), 19–35.
21. Sanders, M. G. (2003). Community Involvement In Schools: From Concept to Practice. *Education and Urban Society*, 35 (2), 161–180.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Голубкова Наталия. Формы партнерства школы и общины в контексте анализа организационно-педагогических основ партнерства школы, семьи и общины в США.

В статье охарактеризованы особенности сотрудничества школы и общины как составляющей партнерства американской школы, семьи и общины. Проанализированы формы сотрудничества и потенциальные партнеры, которые открыты для партнерства со школами. Доказано, что партнерство социальных институтов может приобретать различные формы сотрудничества, среди которых сотрудничество с бизнес общиной (бизнес предприятиями, компаниями местного уровня и национальными корпорациями) является наиболее распространенным в США. Определены роль и место сотрудничества школы с университетами, которые имеют определенное влияние на качество обучения, воспитания и профессиональную подготовку школьников, которые являются их потенциальными студентами. Рассмотрены проблемы развития партнерства школы с учреждениями здравоохранения, которое предусматривает внедрение школьных клиник здоровья, потому что вопросы обеспечения качественного медицинского обслуживания подрастающего поколения страны стали приоритетными для работников здравоохранения еще в конце XX ст.

Ключевые слова: партнерство школы, семьи и общины, формы сотрудничества, налаживание сотрудничества, бизнес община, школьные клиники здоровья, полноправные партнеры в образовании, координирование услуг для детей и молодежи, внедрение и поддержка партнерских отношений между школами, семьями и общинами.

АНОТАЦІЯ

Голубкова Наталія. *Форми партнерства школи та громади в контексті аналізу організаційно-педагогічних основ партнерства школи, сім'ї та громади у США.*

У статті схарактеризовано особливості співпраці школи з громадою як складової партнерства американської школи, сім'ї та громади. Проаналізовано форми співпраці та потенційні партнери, що є відкритими до партнерства зі школою. Доведено, що партнерство соціальних інститутів може набувати різноманітних форм співпраці, серед яких співпраця з бізнесовою громадою (бізнес-підприємствами, компаніями місцевого рівня та національними корпораціями) є найбільш поширеною у США. Визначено роль і місце співпраці школи з університетами, що мають певний вплив на якість навчання, виховання та професійну підготовку школярів, які є їхніми потенційними студентами. Розглянуті проблеми розвитку партнерства між школою та закладами охорони здоров'я, що передбачає запровадження шкільних клінік здоров'я, оскільки питання надання якісного медичного обслуговування підростаючому поколінню країни стали пріоритетними для працівників охорони здоров'я ще в кінці ХХ ст.

Ключові слова: *партнерство школи, сім'ї та громади, залучення громади, форми співпраці, установа співпраці, бізнесова громада, шкільні клініки здоров'я, повноправні партнери в освіті, координування послуг для дітей та молоді, запровадження та підтримка партнерських відносин між школами, сім'ями та громадами.*

UDC 378:37.014.25

Inna Yeremenko

Sumy State Pedagogical University
named after A. S. Makarenko

ORCID ID 0000-0001-6323-8444

DOI 10.24139/2312-5993/2018.05/036-046

PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF QUALITY ASSURANCE INTERNATIONALIZATION IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA

The article focuses on a specific nature of the activities of international quality assurance agencies introduced in the European Higher Education Area and the involvement of foreign experts in independent review panels.

The role of the Institutional Evaluation Program (IEP) in the integration of an international dimension into the process of quality assurance in higher education is defined. The peculiarities of quality assessment under the IEP program are determined. The evaluation methodology used under the Institutional Evaluation Program which provides for the four strategic questions shaping the self-evaluation process is analyzed.

The forms of cross-border activities of agencies that ensure internationalization of quality assurance in higher education in EHEA are described. The challenges a plenty of European higher education institutions face in developing joint study programs are identified and analyzed.

Key words: *quality assurance, European Higher Education Area, procedural aspects, internationalization, cross-border higher education, joint programs, the Institutional Evaluation Program.*