

PRELIMINARY DRAFT  
NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UKRAINE: EDUCATION SECTOR OVERVIEW  
(1990 - 2014)  
Georgiy Kasianov  
Institute for Development of Education, Kyiv, Ukraine  
([iro.org.ua](http://iro.org.ua))

## CONTENT

I. STRUCTURE OF EDUCATION .....	2 - 3
II. GOVERNANCE .....	3 - 6
III. FINANCING.....	6 – 9
IV. PRESCHOOL EDUCATION.....	10 – 12
V. SECONDARY EDUCATION .....	12 – 17
VI. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION .....	17 – 18
VII. HIGHER EDUCATION .....	18 – 20
VIII. SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	20 – 24
ANNEXES .....	25 - 27

This report provides general overview of the system of education in Ukraine and description of the major problems of the sector. Sections I and II are devoted to the structure, governance and financing of education. Sections III – VII provide description of different sectors of the system – from pre-school to higher and post-diploma education. Section VIII summarizes major problems and outlines possible areas of intervention.

### I. STRUCTURE OF EDUCATION

(i) Legislation The structure of education is stipulated by the general *Law on Education* (1991, edition of 1996, 40 amendments) and further regulated by the *Law on Vocational Education* (1998, 12 amendments), *Law on General Secondary Education* (1999, 16 amendments), *Law on Pre-School Education* (2001, 17 amendments), *Law on Out of School Education* (2005, 10 amendments), *Law on Higher Education* (2014)

This legislation outlines the **structure** of education, educational and educational-qualification **levels, tiers** of education.

(ii) Levels of education Accordingly, educational **levels** include: **pre-school education** (up to 6/7 years), **general secondary education** (6/7 – 17/18 years). **Vocational education** (15/16 years and on, starts upon graduating from 9th grade of basic secondary school, also provides full secondary education). **Higher education** (starts after completing full secondary education). **Post-diploma education** (provides specialized learning/training, re-training and in-service training programs for university graduates). **Out of school**

**education** (provides different forms of learning/training aimed in developing specialized knowledge and skills in arts, sciences etc.)<sup>1</sup> (See Table 1)

(iii) *Attempts of changes* In 1999 the Law on General Secondary Education, Ukraine has stipulated transition to 12-years full secondary education. In 2001 the process started from primary schools (entrants of 2001)<sup>2</sup>. According to sociological survey (Razumkov Center, 2006) 65,9% of respondents expressed negative attitude towards this innovation, 25,3% were positive about it<sup>3</sup>. In 2010 the Ukrainian parliament has introduced a bill on 11-years full secondary education and compulsory pre-school education for children of the age of 5. In 2014 MOES has declared its intention to re-introduce 12-years general secondary education structure: 5 – years primary school, 4 – years basic secondary school, 3 – years high secondary (profile) school.

(iv) *Debates* Major arguments of proponents of 12-years general secondary education (experts, part of teachers and parents) are: a) it will allow to distribute the content more evenly and to avoid overload of teaching/learning programs, b) it fits European practices, c) 12-years cycle will provide more opportunities for elevation of a quality of education, particularly at primary and high schools. Opponents mostly refer to the costs of the enterprise (in 2010 extra costs were estimated as 4 billion UAH or \$500 million) as well as to ‘delayed socialization’ of pupils. No systemic research on opportunities and threats of introduction of 12-years secondary education system was undertaken.

## II. GOVERNANCE

(i) *Context* The system of governance in the sector was tailored in 1990s over Soviet model which in turn served the needs of centralized economy. System of Ukrainian education governance based on the principles of vertical hierarchy where every lower level reproduces organizational schemes and modes of action of upper level. At the same time the nature of relationship between different tiers of the hierarchy is vague and in many occasions contingent on informal ties and relations between representatives of different constituencies. In the absence of indicators of quality of governance the effectiveness and efficiency of governing institutions usually assessed through their competence in organization of paper flows and reporting.

The sector suffers from continuous struggle for redistribution of competencies and responsibilities between different branches of power. Changes in Constitution (2004, 2010, 2014) and permanent controversies between presidential office, government and parliament provoke instability in the system of governance of education. Appointments at all level of governance hierarchy are often contingent rather on political reasoning than on administrative rationality.

<sup>1</sup> For more detailed description see Table 1 in Amendments section

<sup>2</sup> <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1717-2000-п>

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/poll.php?poll\\_id=258](http://www.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/poll.php?poll_id=258)

(ii) *Central level* According to Law on Education (1991) governance in education conducted by central state governance bodies (executive power) and by the bodies of local self-governance. At *central level* governance is executed by the *Cabinet of Ministers (CM)*. Government is responsible for *formulation/formation* as well as for regulation of the state policies in the field of education.

*Ministry of Education and Sciences (MOES)* serves as an executive body that *implements* these policies, controls implementation and performs a number of regulative functions. Additionally, 11 other central governmental bodies (ministries and other central agencies) also implement educational policies within their sectors (from agriculture to state security) – mostly through higher educational institutions owned by or subordinated to them. 321 higher/professional educational establishments (out of 628) functioned in 2013/14 under jurisdiction of 11 central governmental bodies<sup>4</sup>. Nominally they coordinate their activities in education field with MOES, however, in practice this multi-hierarchy system brings bureaucratic overload and corruption risks.

*Presidential office* (Administration of President, AP) has also been involved in the formation of education policy (through Head Administration of Humanitarian and Social Policies). President may rule educational sector directly by approving the CM regulative documents. For instance, MOES functions and responsibilities outlined by the governmental regulation, were approved by the Presidential decree from 25 April 2013.

(iii) *Local level* At local level (oblasts, raions, cities, city raions) the governance functions are unevenly distributed between *two groups of institutions*:

a) **Local education administrations.** Local education administrations are a part of local branches of presidential power vertical: *oblast*, *rayon*, *city* state administrations<sup>5</sup>. *Oblast* educational administrations control lower bodies (*city* and *rayon*), prepares state order for qualified cadres (*derzhzhamovlennia*) for their region, collect data for state order on textbooks, organize competency testing/review (*atestatsia*) for teaching and administrative staff.

b) **Educational departments of local bodies of self-governance** (Councils of Peoples Deputies). Local councils are responsible for distribution of local budgets (based on local revenues) providing financing for pre-school education and for secondary education institutions.

The nature of relationship between a) and b) is vague. According to expert analysis, 21% of their functions overlap<sup>6</sup>. In 2012 heads of oblast educational administrations were asked to rank 10 major problems of education. The problem of clear distribution of responsibilities between governing/administrative bodies was ranked as the top issue<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> O. Gorunenko et al. Modernizatsiia systemy upravlinnia osvitoiu v Ukraini: dorozhnia karta reform, Kyiv, 2014, p.15.

<sup>5</sup> President personally appoints heads of these units..

<sup>6</sup> O. Gorunenko et al., p. 32.

<sup>7</sup> Desiat' najhostrishykh problem ukrains'koi shkoly

*(iv) Legislative bodies and local-self-governance* At central level the Committee on Science and Education of the *Supreme Council* (Verkhovna Rada) of Ukraine is responsible for providing legislation in education sector. At local level *oblast, city and raion councils* as bodies of local self-governance create permanent commissions on education (and science), however, they have limited executive influence. At the same time local governance bodies (councils) take part in budgeting education at their regions through formation of local budgets. For instance, pre-school education establishments are fully dependent on local budgets. Local self-governance bodies can provide governance at local (*oblast, city, raion*) level either through their own executive bodies (departments of education) or through delegating these functions to the respective departments of local state administrations.

*(v) State inspection of education establishments* (SIEE) was created in 2011 as a central body of executive power. SIEE is a part of the Cabinet of Ministers and formally subordinated to the minister of education. SIEE performs 14 functions aimed mostly at control and supervision of all educational establishments in terms of compliance of their activity to Constitution, laws, standards, state regulations etc.<sup>8</sup>

*(vi) Public self-governance bodies* Formally, accordingly to the *Law on Education* public self-governance bodies (teachers' conferences, forums, boards, conventions, congresses, unions, public advisory and supervisory boards etc.) may play a role in governance. In fact, their role is minimal. In the last decade bureaucratic structures have managed to develop an imitative communicative strategies in their relationship with NGOs: they create or control public self-governance bodies that formally represent 'public' but in fact serve as a proxy for state bureaucracy. Recently communication between governmental structures and third sector became more extensive and intensive Law on Higher Education was prepared with active participation of public self-governance bodies. Concept of the Development of Education of Ukraine for 2015 – 2025 was drawn in close co-operation with MOES. Strategy advisory group created in July 2014 at the MOES composed of representatives of the 'third sector'.

*(vii) Distribution of powers and responsibilities* The nature of relationship between bodies of central executive bodies and local state administrations is complicated. The distribution of power and responsibilities is not clearly outlined. Legislation provides general rules and principles that can be biased by civil servants. Further norms and regulations stipulated by bylaws can be and often are contradictory.

In formal terms the system of governance in education looks like a hierarchical centralized system. However, (over)centralization mostly refers to a number of bureaucratic procedures, reporting and producing/reproducing of an excessive quantity of regulations and normative documentation. In all other terms the system provides numerous opportunities for dispersed responsibility For instance, MOES which produces a number of regulations, orders, directives does not have direct power over *oblast* educational

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://zakon4.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/438/2011>

departments/administrations, however, the latter have to follow orders and regulations issued by the MOES. In real life this means that ‘supreme’ body is empowered to regulate an excessive number of activities and to establish enormous volume of rules and regulations but unable to control and to enforce their implementation. In turn *oblast* educational administrations formally rule *raion* educational departments/administrations, however heads of the latter appointed by *raion* executive power bodies. The same applies to the *cities* level. For instance *oblast* city may have *city* educational administration and *oblast* educational administration.

*(vii) Distribution of functions* The distribution of functions at all levels of hierarchy is not clearly defined. Usually governing bodies combine four basic functions: statutory and legal regulations (56%), oversight and control (11%), services delivery (26%), and property management (7%)<sup>9</sup>. As a rule, these functions are performed by all institutions at all levels of hierarchy. Combination of them within every single governing institution provokes function parallelism: 21% of functions are repeated and reproduced at all levels – from MOES to local administrations. Additionally, combination of service delivery with oversight and control within one institution inevitably turns the latter into formality and provokes conflict of interest.

*(viii) Lack of efficiency and effectiveness* As a result the whole system of governance proves to be ineffective. Duplication and overlap of functions is the most common problem. For instance, regulation and control of the content of education performed by the whole vertical: from MOES to *raion* administration. Property management belongs to responsibility of all bodies of hierarchy. All levels are overloaded with non-relevant functions. For instance, school principals have listed nineteen non-relevant functions they are obliged to perform at the school level: from accounting the number of children in local areas to assistance to the military commissariats, from provisioning of social benefits to organization of numerous public events (festivals, competitions), from food-service providing to excessive reporting to different unrelated institutions (annual number of written requests to school principals varied in 2013 from 274 in Khersonska *oblast* to 1137 in Kirovohradska)<sup>10</sup> The most recent semi-anecdotal case – letters of *oblast* educational administrations to school with request to provide data on pupils’ activities in support for armed forces of Ukraine.

*(ix) Attempts of change* Some attempts were undertaken by different governments mostly at the level of intentions. Some governments discussed the idea of establishing educational districts (*osvitni okruhy*), however, the idea was not implemented. In 2010 Y. Tymoshenko government has tried to introduce ‘school financial autonomy’ with no visible effect. In 2011 M. Azarov government has introduced Integrated state electronic database in education – an interactive inventory of educational institutions. MOES has developed and introduced electronic system ‘Competition’ (*Konkurs*) – the database of entrance examination results. In 2010 – 2011 under ‘administrative reform’ slogans the Ministry of Education and Science, Highest State Attestation Commission and the Ministry of Youth

---

<sup>9</sup> O. Gorunenko et al., p.21.

<sup>10</sup> Parashchenko L. (ed) *Upravlinnia osvitoju ta shkil`na avtonomija: pohliad zi shkoly*, Kyiv, 2013, p. 21, 26.

and Sports were merged within Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and Sports. In 2013 Ministry of Youth and Sports was re-established.

In 2014 MOES issued several by-law acts aimed in reducing reporting and paper-work at schools.

### III. FINANCING

*(i) Context* General state expenditures on education grew since the beginning of 2000s. The growth of budget expenditures on education was probably caused by two major factors: rise of teachers'/teaching staff salaries and expansion of higher education sector (See Table 2)

This data includes all expenditures: funding from central government, local budgets, private and households expenditures.

*(ii) Structure of expenditures.* In 2010 a new system of accounting and analysis of educational expenditures (satellite accounts) was introduced by the State Statistics Service of Ukraine (SSSU). According to satellite national educational accounts structure of budget expenditures has been divided on three major categories: *service delivery*; *subsidiary expenditures I (for activities within educational establishments)*; *subsidiary expenditures II (for education activities)*. *Service delivery* expenditures cover mostly salaries. *Subsidiary expenditures I* cover medical services, capital renovation, meal services, financial and administrative services, public utilities. *Subsidiary expenditures II* include purchase of equipment and textbooks, transfers to population, stipends. In 2012, for instance, almost 79% of budget expenditures accounted for service delivery (salaries of personnel), about 16% - on subsidiary expenses I and the rest – for subsidiary expenses II. This structure of expenditures proves that it provides virtually no basis and incentives for development.

*(iii) Efficiency* Until 2013 public expenditures on education grew while student population gradually decreased (with exception of pre-school education where number of entrants started to grow in 2005). As a result the efficiency of public education expenditures has also downgraded: growing expenditures did not ensure higher quality of services, growing salaries remain low, infrastructure is growingly outdated, performance indicators either not improving or decreasing. In 2000 – 2012 per-sectors expenditures increased in all sectors with exception of vocational education (see Table 3). 2013 marked decrease in all sectors.

In 2007 – 2012 according to satellite accounts per-student expenditures grew from 5,794 UAH (1,147 USD) to 13,513 UAH (1,691 USD).

Vocational education shows highest per student ratio 11,644 UAH (with near the absence of private/households spending in the sector), higher education – 10,528 UAH (almost half of which accounts to private payments), secondary education – 7,605 UAH (with hardly accountable share of private/households payments), pre-school education – 7,583 UAH.

(iv) Intra-sector distribution The distribution of public funds between educational sectors shows that secondary education consumes a largest share of educational budget (36,2% in 2000 and 42,1% in 2013) – a significant increase despite the decline of student population Higher education is on the second place (32,3% in 2000 and 28,4% in 2013). Pre-school education is the third major consumer of public funds (11,1% and 14,7% respectively). Share of vocational education remains relatively stable (6,% and 6,0%).

(v) Sources of funding Legislation allows following sources of funding: state central budget (formed by the government), state local budgets (formed by local councils), funds provided by legal entities, private entrepreneurs and bodies, charitable donations, grants, development loans, credits, payments and fees from private persons, etc. In fact the system allows numerous variant readings and inconsistencies in interpretation of a number of regulations. For instance, private funding of schools through school funds proves to be a nightmare for schools principals and parents: school, formally being a legal entity has no right to have separate account beyond treasury. Trying to bypass this, schools and parents create non-governmental charitable funds, however, this also provoke numerous suggestions and debates about transparency and accountability of these institutions. Amounts that flow beyond any accounting through pocket-to-pocket operations can not be calculated: it is a common practice that parents pay extra-money for facilities, textbooks, informal tuition and even for direct extra-payment for teachers.

Changes in higher education legislation now allow universities to have separate accounts in banks (for funds obtained through providing services, grants etc. – all non-governmental funds), previously everything had to go through treasury. However, this norm is still suspended until a set of by-law acts and regulations will be developed and approved.

State remains a major supplier of funding for education: its share in financing of education increased from 75% in 2007 to 85% in 2012, while share of private companies decreased from 1,1% to 0,7% and share of households from 24% to 15%.

(vi) Financial management The distribution of functions and responsibilities between different constituents is regulated by different laws, however, major documents that enact all money flows are Budget Code and Law on State Budget (the latter approved annually, as a rule at the Fall of previous year). Accordingly, no budget expenditures can be activated until Law on State Budget approved by the Parliament, signed by President and enacted by the Government. However, to secure certain socially sensitive segments of the budget (mostly salaries) it is allowed to use temporary budget allocations based on average monthly spending of previous year. Normally government has a right to propose and parliament to approve changes into the current state budget (as it happened, for instance, in March 2015)

At central level MOES since 2015 manages major share of the central state budget funds . It includes categorical grants (subventions) to local budgets, funds for universities for state order, subventions to local budgets for vocational education

Some other central ministries also have their share in the central budget (Ministry of Agrarian Policy, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Finances, Ministry



of Social Policy, Ministry of Health Protection) – mostly for funding their specialized higher education institutions.

All these institutions take part in composing the budget, submitting their requests based on calculations of needs. Ministry of Economic Development and Trade is involved into budget administration (calculations of state contracts for higher education institutions). State Committee of Statistics provides data for calculation of expenditures. Ministry of Finances provides calculations needed for distribution of state budget transfers (subventions)

At local level funding is provided by *local self-governance bodies* (councils) through local budgets. They cover expenditures on pre-school education and partly funds for secondary education institutions. It is planned that vocational education institutions should also be funded from local budgets.

*(vii) New trends* In 2014 the Government has initiated changes in education sector funding under de-centralization strategy. Changes were introduced into the Budget Code, accordingly state budget for 2015 was based on these changes. Major change is aimed in delegating the function of distribution of central budget funds to MOES. The educational categorical grant (subvention) operated by MOES (43,4 bln UAH) will be directly transferred to local budgets to cover government guaranteed services. Separate line is reserved for subvention to vocational education institutions (5.8 bln UAH) also to be distributed through local budgets. The calculation of the subvention is based on previous year budgeting.

Insiders from the MOES comment this effort as an attempt to shift responsibility for inadequate funding from Ministry of Finance to MOES ('they do not want demonstrations of educators at Government premises, they want them at the MOES walls'). It is also acknowledged, that MOES at the moment does not have institutional capacity to perform this function. In fact, current budget-2015 was calculated in the Ministry of Finances while it is expected, that budget 2016 should be calculated and then distributed at MOES. It is not clear how institutional capacities of MOES will be developed. It is also problematic to foresee how calculations based on previous year revenues will work under current situation of economic crisis. It might be predicted that regions who perform well economically might have surplus funds while regions who would suffer from recession might be unable to satisfy needs of the sector. It is expected that stabilization grants (1% of total subvention) would be reserved for levelling purposes.

At the moment the system of financing of education is being debated in different pro-reformist groups both within the sector and beyond. Major idea behind these debates – decentralization of financing and introduction of the principle 'money follows the student'. Those who profess this idea argue, that current per-student calculations<sup>11</sup> are ineffective, they allow huge over-expenditures. They propose to introduce pupils' vouchers that will

---

<sup>11</sup> Current calculation based on per-student formula, which includes average amount for 5 categories of schools depending on their location: from large urban to small rural school in remote area. The amount includes all projected expenditures from teachers salary to food and medical services.

allow parents to choose any school they want. This in turn, as they believe, will rationalize expenditures and will enact competition between schools. Their opponents argue that this scheme might work in big cities but it will be ineffective in small cities and in villages, moreover, it will endanger education in rural areas.

#### IV. PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

(i) *Context* Total number of pre-school education establishments has decreased from 24,500 in 1990 to the lowest 14,900 in 2004. Since 2005 this indicator it gradually increasing: in 2013 the number of pre-school education establishments has reached 16,700<sup>12</sup>. Accordingly, number of attendants dropped from 2,428,000 in 1990 to the lowest 968,000 in 2001. Since then the number of children in pre-school education establishments is growing. In 2013 it has reached 1,471,000<sup>13</sup> (More detailed data see in Table 4)

Until 2005 the number of vacancies in kindergartens was higher then the demand: 1,056,000 to 1,032,000. After 2005 a growing deficit of vacancies became more and more pressing due to growing excess of demand over supply caused by the positive trends (growth) in the birth rate which was in turn to a great extend determined by economic growth of 2003 – 2008 as well as by demographic politics of the state (targeted financial support for childbirth): in 2003 – 2008 special childbearing rate has increased for 30% - predominantly in urban areas<sup>14</sup>

(ii) *Enrollment rates and availability of services* Average *net enrollment rate* has decreased from 57% in 1990 to the lowest of 38% in 1998. Since then it increases and has reached its highest point of 72% in cities and 42% in rural areas in 2013. In 2005 – 2013 the number of attendants has increased from 1,032,000 to 1,471,000 while number of vacancies – from 1,056,000 to 1,236,000. This has resulted in growing disproportion between demand and supply

It is reflected in the following proportions: 119 attendants to 100 vacancies (average, 2013)

The highest disproportion was evident in in Kyiv and Kyivska oblast (122 and 129 respectively) and in Western regions: Lvivska (145), Volynska (141), Rivnenska (137), Zakarpatska (134), Ivano-Frankivs`ka (131), Chernivetska (126) oblasts. In other regions the biggest disproportion was registered in Poltavaska (130), Zaporizhska (122) oblasts<sup>15</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Doshkil`ni navchal`ni zaklady (na kinec` 2013 roku) Unpublished data from the Ministry of Education and Science; State committee for statistics data; Doshkil`ni navchal`ni zaklady [http://ukrstat.org/uk/operativ/operativ2005/osv\\_rik/osv\\_u/dz\\_u.html](http://ukrstat.org/uk/operativ/operativ2005/osv_rik/osv_u/dz_u.html)

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.,

<sup>14</sup> Klochan I.A. Rehional`ni aspekty narodzhuvanosti v Ukraini. In: Demohrafija ta social`na ekonomika, 2010, №1(13), p.99

<sup>15</sup> Doshkil`ni navchal`ni zaklady (na kinec` 2013 roku), p. Unpublished data from the Ministry of Education and Science; State committee for statistics data; Doshkil`ni navchal`ni zaklady Ukrainy u 2013 rotsi [www.ukrstat.gov.ua](http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua) (accessed 20 November 2014)

This disproportion prevails in urban areas. On the contrary in rural areas the disproportion is reversed: the number of vacancies exceeds the number of attendants. This balance changed from 56 attendants per 100 vacancies in 2000 to 92 per 100 in 2013 – the demand for services in rural areas is also growing.

(iii) *Corruption risks* Growing demand on pre-school education services has enhanced social pressures. Access to the state-owned kindergartens and likewise establishments became a matter of social concern. Enrollment/entrance has been growingly discussed in the context of corruption.

Major *corruption risk zones*:

- 1) entrance (bribing for getting a vacancy)
- 2) provision of services (maintaining of the premises, unofficial payments to the staff)<sup>16</sup>.

Improper use of pre-school establishments' premises is also considered as a part of corruption practices: in 1990s – beginning of 2000s a number of kindergarten buildings were rented by commercial firms, state institutions (tax inspection for instance) and other non-profile establishments. The return of these premises to the 'natural owners' proves to be extremely complicated and corruption-provoking procedure.

(iv) *Quality and availability of qualified staff* In 2013 the number of staff vacancies in pre-school education establishments was 360,540 while 351,289 positions were staffed. The deficit relates to the high-qualified teaching staff (teachers, tutors, kindergartners) – 2/3 of the vacant positions. 31% of teaching staff in 2013 belonged to the age under 35, while 63% - to the age between 35 – 60. Most respondents from administration complain about three major problems: low professional level of new staff (recent graduates), aging of experienced pedagogues and lack of profile specialists (psychologists, speech pathologists)<sup>17</sup>.

Majority of experts comment problems with staffing mostly in terms of low social benefits (insufficient salary, low social status) this also pre-determines critical gender imbalance in the sector: 98% of women among teaching/administrative staff

(v) *Quality of service* Systematic monitoring of the quality of pre-school education and the system of indicators are problematic. The only systematic effort in the field (cohort of 6/7 years was covered) was undertaken in 2010 – 2013 by the Institute of Innovative Technologies and Content of Education. Independent experts have evaluated this research as of a low quality due to its formal character and questionable methodology<sup>18</sup>. The

---

<sup>16</sup> [http://tvi.ua/new/2013/10/21/rozsliduvannya\\_tvi\\_tinova\\_bukhhalteriya\\_dytyachykh\\_sadochkiv](http://tvi.ua/new/2013/10/21/rozsliduvannya_tvi_tinova_bukhhalteriya_dytyachykh_sadochkiv);  
<http://www.dw.de/корупція-докотилась-вже-й-до-дитсадків/a-16904611>;  
<http://nikorupciji.org/2013/05/21/yak-vlashtuvaty-dytnu-v-sadochok-u-najkraschomu-misti-ukrajiny/>

<sup>17</sup> Kompleksne doslidzhennia stanu systemy doshkil'noi osvity Ukrainy. Analitychnyi zvit, p.41.

<sup>18</sup> Kompleksne doslidzhennia stanu systemy doshkil'noi osvity Ukrainy. Analitychnyi zvit., Kyiv, 2013, p.63.

monitoring results, presented at the official WEB-site of this institution confirm this conclusion<sup>19</sup>

Inquiries undertaken by independent expert groups provide that certain parameters of quality (nutrition, supply of teaching/learning materials and tools, medical service, quality of staff) are lowering<sup>20</sup>. In some cases the decline of quality (sanitary control) causes extreme situations (group food poisoning, children deaths)

(vi) *Attempts of change* In April 2011 the Government has approved a National Targeted Social Program of the Development of Pre-School Education for the period up to 2017<sup>21</sup>. According to experts' evaluation, the program focused mostly on physical increase of funding of the sector without real care about quality of services<sup>22</sup>. In March 2014, under the politics of budget sequester the Program was halted<sup>23</sup> by the Cabinet of Ministers.

## V. SECONDARY EDUCATION

(i) *Context* The sector has experienced gradual decline and growing discrepancy in access to quality education between rural and urban areas, as well as between elitist urban establishments and ordinary/suburb schools. The number of institutions has decreased from 21 825 in 1990 to 19 294 in 2013/14. Number of pupils – from 7,131,791 to 4,203 978(42% drop) Number of teachers has decreased from 537,067 in 1990 to 508,235 in 2013/14 (6% drop) – this caused disproportion in students-per-teacher ratio which in turn led to growing surplus of teaching vacancies and ineffective spending.

Private sector in secondary education is microscopic – 199 schools, 19,501 pupil, 4,360 teaching staff. The private schools segment boosted in 1995 – 2005, since 2006 it gradually diminishing in terms of numbers – mostly due to the demographic reasons.. As a rule private secondary schools provide better conditions and learning environment, however there is no data based on systemic research that would provide proof for better learning outcomes in private schools.

---

<sup>19</sup> See: <http://iitzo.gov.ua/monitorynhove-doslidzhennya-stanu-i-rozvytku-systemy-osvity-ditej-starshoho-doshkilnoho-viku/>

<sup>20</sup> Diahnostyka sektoru doshkil'noi osvity v Ukraini. Zvit za rezul'tatami kompleksnoho doslidzhennia. January 2013, p. 24.

<sup>21</sup> <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/629-2011-п>

<sup>22</sup> See: Diahnostyka sektoru doshkil'noi osvity v Ukraini. Zvit za rezul'tatami kompleksnoho doslidzhennia. January 2013, p. 33.

<sup>23</sup> <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/71-2014-п>

(ii) *Enrollment and ratio* In 2013/14 the ratio of pupils/schools located in urban areas was 2,915,065 to 6,827 or average 427 per school, in rural areas: 1,288,913 to 12,467<sup>24</sup> or average 103 per school.

In 2013/2014 274 318 (1 teacher per 11 pupils) of teachers were located in urban areas (day schools) and 230,064 (1 teacher per 6 pupils) – in rural areas<sup>25</sup>. Average student/teacher ratio in 2014/15 is 1 teacher per 8 students that signals persistent inefficiency of the system.

Presenting national education system Ukrainian Government states that enrollment rate at secondary education has never been less than about 99% in secondary education. This statistical data has never been questioned by national analytics. Further investigation is of need.

(iii) *State of infrastructure, equipment* In 2014 no less than 1,510 schools required capital renovation, 191 school buildings were in a critical (accidental) condition<sup>26</sup>. 1600 rural schools did not have central heating or local boiler houses, 1651 lacked water delivery (water pipes) in 2013/14. Under current conditions (economical crisis and war at the east of the country) the chances for improvement in this field are minimal. Additional expenditures on capital renovations will be incurred by the need for reconstruction of educational infrastructure of Donbass regions inflicted by the war.

*Computers and IT.* In 2014 17,379 schools were equipped with 296 334 computers, 15% of them were used for administrative purposes, about 2% - for libraries. 57% of school computers were purchased more than 5 years ago, 12% were in inoperable condition<sup>27</sup>. According to the monitoring research (interviews with teachers)<sup>28</sup> undertaken in 2012-2013 by the Institute of Innovative Technologies and Content of Education (IITCE) share of teachers who used computer technologies in teaching on permanent basis varied from 25% to 35%<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Unpublished data from the MOES: Report: *Zahal`noosvitni navchalni zaklady Ukrainy na pochatok 2013/2014 roku*, p. 9.

<sup>25</sup> According to the Law on General Secondary Education minimal number of pupils in the class should be no less than 5. In 2012- 2013 several attempts were undertaken to reduce this figure to 3. See law drafts: [http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4\\_2?pf3516=0906&skl=8](http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_2?pf3516=0906&skl=8); [http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4\\_2?pf3516=2768&skl=8](http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_2?pf3516=2768&skl=8)

<sup>26</sup> Unpublished data from the MOES: Report: *Zahal`noosvitni navchalni zaklady Ukrainy na pochatok 2013/2014 roku*, p. 58

<sup>27</sup> Calculated on: Unpublished data from the MOES: Report: *Zahal`noosvitni navchalni zaklady Ukrainy na pochatok 2013/2014 roku*, p.60.

<sup>28</sup> 11760 teachers and school administrators were interviewed

<sup>29</sup> Monitorynhove doslidzhennia stanu vprovadzhennia informacijno-kumunikatyvnyx tekhnolohii u zahal`noosviynikh navchal`nykh zakladakh u 2012 – 2015 rokakh <http://iitzo.gov.ua/monitorynhove-doslidzhennya-stanu-vprovadzhennya-informatsijno-komunikatsijnyh-tehnolohij-u-zahalnoosvitnih-navchalnyh-zakladah-u-2012-2015-rokah/>

*Science labs and specialized classrooms* Secondary schools equipped with: 11,163 math classrooms, 11, 830 physics classrooms, 9,995 chemistry classrooms, 10, 147 biology classrooms, 9,956 foreign language classrooms. In 2013 *only quarter of school specialized classrooms and laboratory class-rooms* (biology, chemistry, physics) were equipped with contemporary learning tools and equipment for science. Only 788 foreign language classrooms were equipped with specialized audio tools. The monitoring research (interviews) undertaken in 2012-2013<sup>30</sup> by the ITCE 70% of the school directors stated that renovation/repair of specialized class-rooms and laboratories is an urgent need. The supply of school chemistry laboratories by the basic tools varies between 10% to 39% (fully equipped) and from 19 to 27% (partly equipped), physics laboratories – from 2% (protective glasses) to 38% (electric supply) – fully equipped and from 6% to 36% (same parameters) – partly equipped. In biology classrooms 6% were fully equipped by multimedia by interactive boards, 10% by media projectors and 32% by the desks for experiments<sup>31</sup>

(iv) *Discrepancy in the quality of education between rural and urban areas* Traditionally rural schools lag behind urban in terms of infrastructure and quality of service (premises, equipment, supply of learning tools, accessibility, quality of teaching staff)

Apart from certain input indicators (number of computers, equipped classrooms etc.) no direct quality output indicators exist that could prove inequality in access to educational services between rural and urban areas. However, some indirect quality indicators can be used. For instance, according to the analysis of the results of external independent testing (entrance exams to the higher education institutions in 2009 - 2013) school graduates from rural areas have permanently represented majority among those who passed tests with less than 150 points (out of 200), while school graduates from urban areas predominate among those who pass tests with 150 and more points<sup>32</sup>.

In 2008 – 2014 share of rural and small cities school graduates who passed tests above 175 points (good and excellent results) – the cohort with highest grades - either declined or remained unchanged<sup>33</sup> (while level of tests in terms of content and sophistication downgraded)

---

<sup>30</sup> 1470 school directors and administrators, and the same numbers of teachers of biology, chemistry and physics were interviewed

<sup>31</sup> Monitorynhove doslidzhennia stanu navchal`no-metodychnoho ta material`no-tekhnichnoho zabezpechennia vykladannia predmetiv pryrodnycho-matematychnoho tsyklu u 2012 – 2015 rokakh <http://iitzo.gov.ua/monitorynhove-doslidzhennya-stanu-navchalno-metodychnoho-ta-materialno-tehnichnoho-zabezpechennya-predmetiv-pryrodnycho-matematychnoho-tyklu-u-2012-2015-rokah-2/>

<sup>32</sup> [http://kno.rada.gov.ua/komosviti/control/uk/publish/article?art\\_id=57498&cat\\_id=44731#](http://kno.rada.gov.ua/komosviti/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=57498&cat_id=44731#) нерівність освітніх результатів

<sup>33</sup> A. Zabulionis, report 2014.

## Share of pupils who passed entrance tests with highest score

Subject	2008		2014	
	Urban settlements	Villages	Urban settlements	Villages
Math	10%	6%	9%	5%
History of Ukraine	12%	10%	12%	7%
Ukrainian language and literature	13%	9%	10%	6%
English	6%	3%	6%	3,5%

(v) Low incomes In 2014 average teacher's salary was 2,542 UAH. According to legislation it should be no less than average salary in industry, which was 4,034 UAH in 2014. Teachers salary is even lower than average in the country (3,455 UAH) The salary varies depending on segment (lowest in pre-school education), duration of employment, qualifications. In 2014 inflation index has reached 124,9%<sup>34</sup> while teachers' average salary were slightly less of the level of 2013. Low salary and social standards imply lower influx of motivated staff and causes further decline in quality of services. In the end of 2014 government attempt to introduce salary cuts and freeze of extra-payments in education provoked a widespread discontent including strike warnings.

(vi) Aging of teaching staff, gender imbalance In 2004 – 2011 total number of persons working in the secondary education segment in the age of 50 – 54 increased from 112,491 (11,7%) to 130, 581 (13,5%). Those of the age of 55-59 – from 85,321 (8,8%) to 101,544 (10,5%)<sup>35</sup>. In 2013 according to the governmental data, 80,000 teachers working in schools (about 17%) were of pension age<sup>36</sup>. The tendency to keep teacher of pension age in schools prove to be persistent due to two major reasons: low intake of new younger staff to schools and low pensions that urge aged staff to remain at their positions.

(vii) Outdates system of teachers training and in-service training Ukraine has 25 higher education institutions of III and IV accreditation level specializing in teachers training (pedagogical universities). Majority of them aimed to supply pedagogical staff to their region.

---

<sup>34</sup> <http://index.minfin.com.ua/index/infl/?2014>

<sup>35</sup> Calculated on the basis of unpublished MOES data.

<sup>36</sup> [http://24tv.ua/news/showNews.do?80\\_tisyach\\_vchiteliv\\_v\\_ukrayinskih\\_shkolah\\_\\_pensiynogo\\_viku&objec tId=373481](http://24tv.ua/news/showNews.do?80_tisyach_vchiteliv_v_ukrayinskih_shkolah__pensiynogo_viku&objec tId=373481)

Additionally, every *oblast* center has its own Institute for Post-Diploma Pedagogical Education (IPDPE) which retrains 3000 – 5000 thousand teachers annually.

(viii) *Overloaded and outdated curriculum (programs, textbooks)* The problem of overload of school programs and textbooks became a matter of public debates since beginning of 2000s. The transfer to 12-years secondary school was initially justified, apart from other reasons, by the necessity to lessen the load. However, the 12-years programs and textbooks still were overloaded with data, in a number of cases programs and textbooks were prepared without serious consideration of age specifics of pupils. To a great extent the problem was provoked by the lack of professional expertise as well as by monopoly of groups of interest in state-commissioned text-book publishing system (which was also inflicted by corruption).

(ix) *Lack of the system of quality monitoring* System of quality monitoring in secondary education is insufficient and ineffective. School exams in the form of the ‘state final assessment’ (exams after completion of 9 years and at graduation - after 11 years of schooling) in fact do not provide any coherent data which might be used for quality monitoring. Independent testing system (test exams at the entrance to higher education institutions) which provides massive data collected in 2008 – 2014 for analysis is not in use for this purpose. Ukraine does not take part in international student assessment programs (PISA, PIRLS). In 2007 and 2011 Ukraine took part in TIMSS, however, results were not properly analyzed and assessed. The 2011 results demonstrated moderate improvement comparing to 2007, however, no further analysis and discussion were undertaken<sup>37</sup>. Ukraine is absent in OECD ‘Education at a glance’ annuals.

By all means current system of monitoring of quality based rather on input/output scheme with few reference to performance and quality indicators.

(x) *Children with special needs* Total population of children with special need in 2013 equated to 167,000. In 2012 the Government has approved the State Targeted Program ‘National Action Plan to implement the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities’ for the period till 2020’. The plan proves to be more a kind of wishful thinking than realistic program. According to ‘Step by Step’ report ‘ensuring the rights to education for children with disabilities has not yet become a key focus for national and local executive authorities and local government bodies’. Ukraine does not have inter-sectoral statistics on the numbers of children with special educational needs (SEN), no arrangements provided that would enable a multidisciplinary approach to provide comprehensive medical, psychological and pedagogical services to children with impairments in psychological and/or physical development at an early stage. Ukraine lacks clinical psychologists that specialize in child psychology, qualified pedagogical and medical professionals, social workers, special psychology professionals to work with children with disabilities. The level of funding allocated to programs intended to provide children with disabilities with technical and other rehabilitation means is insufficient. Inclusive education in various forms is still underdeveloped, it lacks qualified staff.

---

<sup>37</sup> TIMSS 2007 encompassed pupils of 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades. TIMSS 2011 – 8<sup>th</sup> grades only.



*(xi) Attempts of change* Almost all of previous reform attempts were either imitative or lacked systemic approach (introduction of 12-years secondary education cycle, 12-grades marking system, changes in schools textbooks publishing). The most successful reform attempt was undertaken in 2001 – 2008 – the state system of entrance external examination based on tests was introduced. It was loaded mostly with anti-corruption ideology (and to a great extent was successful in eliminating or reducing corruption at the entrance to higher education institutions). However, its other important component – monitoring of quality of education in schools - was neglected. Moreover, no visible attempt to introduce coherent and transparent system of quality of education compatible with international systems was ever undertaken.

Recently government has declared its commitment to the reform of the sector. A new Law on Education which has to replace the law of 1991 is under preparation. Since March 2014 MOES has introduced a number of changes aimed in de-bureaucratization of governance and administration (cancelling orders and regulations that overburden schools administration with paperwork). New system of state-contracted textbooks competition is being introduced. The MOES has created an Internet resource where teachers can review textbooks (and layouts) and rank them (<http://ua.lokando.com/login.php>). It is proposed to provide state funding for top-ranked books. However, this system needs further technical and organizational improvement (teachers training, technical upgrade of the platform etc.) In 2015 it is planned to merge state final assessment in schools (graduation exams) with external independent testing (on Ukrainian language and literature).

In November 2014 MOES has discussed a draft of the Concept of Development of Education for 2015 – 2025: particular emphasis in the concept is made on secondary education. Currently the Concept is turned into broader document: The Road-Map of Education Reform. Major Concept points are included into the Draft Law on Education.

## VI. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

*(i) Context* Total number of vocational education establishments has dropped from 1,246 in 1990 to 968 in 2013. Accordingly, number of students diminished from 643,400 to 391,200<sup>38</sup>. The vocational education considered by public as a second-rate form of education while certain sectors of economics critically lack qualified workers. Prospective entrants prefer to attend higher education institutions. In 2011 about 34% of students at state-owned vocational schools belonged to socially marginalized or handicapped groups<sup>39</sup>, in 2013/14 the share of these groups was 28%. According to the MOES data in 2013/14 ratio of students in higher education institutions to vocational education establishments students was 5.2 to 1.

*(ii) Ineffective management.* Majority of observers agree that sector needs a deep restructuring – in terms of management, decentralization and deregulation. System of state commissioning and contracting of specialists does not correspond to real needs of labor market. According to

<sup>38</sup> State Committee of Statistics, <http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/>

<sup>39</sup> Calculated on the basis of: [http://kno.rada.gov.ua/komosviti/control/uk/publish/article?art\\_id=51092](http://kno.rada.gov.ua/komosviti/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=51092)

the Parliamentary Committee on Science and Education data (2011), more than 50% of graduates of vocational schools leave their work places after one year of working experience, while IITCE reports (2013) that 86% of students plan to work according to their specialty<sup>40</sup>.

(iii) *Infrastructure* The infrastructure and learning tools are critically outdated – in 2011 about 60% of mechanisms used in learning process, worked for more than 20 years, 36% - up to 20 years, 4% less than 10 years<sup>41</sup>.

(iv) *Attempts of changes* At the moment MOES has prepared changes to the Law on Vocational Education and plans to submit them to the parliament. Changes are mostly aimed at decentralization and deregulation of the sector, involvement of employers into the sector development.

## VII. HIGHER EDUCATION

(i) *Context* In 1990s – 2000s the sector expanded enormously<sup>42</sup>. Rapid expansion of the sector was determined by three major reasons: growing demand for cadres of all professions (previously part of them were trained both in and beyond Ukraine), growing need in professionals for a new sectors of economics (IT, trade, marketing etc.) and by a new societal factors (job opportunities, prestige). Ukraine was affected by ‘diploma disease’, in the middle of 1990s a number of technical schools and colleges simply rearranged/renamed themselves into ‘higher education institutions’ of I and II accreditation level being in fact closer to vocational education area.

Number of HE institutions and students

	1995/96	2000/01	2005/06	2010/11	2013/14
Total number of HE institutions	1037	979	951	854	803
Number of private HE institutions	111	163	202	188	167
Number of students	1,540,498	1,930,945	2,709,161	2,491,300	2,052,678

<sup>40</sup> Uzahal`neni staystychni materialy monitorynhovoho doslidzhennia 'Stan ta rozvytok profesiino-tekhnicnoi osvity IV etap <http://proftekhosvita.org.ua/uk/news/details/6789/>

<sup>41</sup> [http://kno.rada.gov.ua/komosviti/control/uk/publish/article.jsessionid=F133D67402E8924253AC91B33E334DCA?art\\_id=49950&cat\\_id=44731](http://kno.rada.gov.ua/komosviti/control/uk/publish/article.jsessionid=F133D67402E8924253AC91B33E334DCA?art_id=49950&cat_id=44731)

<sup>42</sup> Osnovni pokaznyky dial`nosti vyshykh navchal`nykh zakladiv Ukrainy na pochatok 2013/14 navchal`noho roku ukrstat.gov.ua

(ii) Major problems The sector demonstrated impressive dynamics in terms of physical expansion as well as in terms of flexibility and ability to meet market challenges. However, physical expansion did not ensure quality growth, while adjustment to market needs in majority cases resulted in simple money-pumping (through so-called contract form of learning, based on private payments).

The list of the most common problems of higher education that is being discussed publicly in recent decade can be presented as follows: decrease of quality; outdated infrastructure; over-centralization of governance and weak self-governance; insufficient and non-transparent use of public funds (state contract system); aging of teaching personnel; low salaries; overload of teaching staff with in-class work; lack of academic mobility and academic freedoms; low level of foreign languages proficiency; corruption; lack of academic integrity (plagiarism, cheating).

(iii) Attempts of change Higher education sector has attracted most of reformist effort in 2000s. In 2005 Ukraine has joined Bologna process, however rather formally and imitatively. In 2008 a new entrance examination system based on external testing was introduced with major aim to prevent and combat corruption at the entrance to universities. It was effective in combatting corruption at the entrance, however, bribery and other forms of corruption has moved into the sphere of mid-term and graduate exams.

In 2010 a new draft Law on Higher Education was initiated and after prolonged heated and politically driven debates it was approved in September 2014. The new law creates favorable preconditions for radical changes in the sector (decentralization, universities autonomy, approximation to European higher education area, introduction of more sophisticated quality control). At the same time the reform in the sector at the moment in some cases perceived as a rather mechanical change of rules, regulations and conditions.

For instance, reduction of a number of HE institutions through ‘downgrading’ their formal status represented as a reform. Introduction of three cycles of higher education which requires total reform of curricula and massive effort in retraining staff, redesign of programs and introduction of new methods of teaching - is also (rather contextually) perceived and implemented as a formal or imitative process.

In other terms, introduction of a new law creates framework, but its implementation requires continuous effort for many years – there is a sense that decision and policy makers are not fully aware of it.

It is also obvious, that reform in the sector is not properly communicated. Moreover certain groups will definitely either openly oppose reform or will try to imitate it (majority of rectors and top administration at universities, part of teaching staff, part of students).

Recently MOES has cancelled by-law acts that obliged universities to teach certain humanities disciplines, delegating the right of providing these courses to universities. In response, public campaign was launched by instructors of these courses with demand to re-

introduce them at central level, as obligatory: this episode proves that university autonomy and self-governance might not be attractive for considerable part of academic community.

Another alarming episode: continuous attempts to validate/legalize certificates (External Independent Testing) of 2008 – 2014 for entrance campaign of 2015: in fact democratic institutions and procedures being used for lobbying of corporate interest (rectors lobby). Recently the relevant law draft has been prepared and promoted through Parliamentary Committee on education and Science.

## VIII. SUMMARY OF PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- (i) Educational sector does not satisfy current needs of economical and social development of Ukraine. In many respects it exemplifies ‘path dependency’ pattern in which institutional design, modes of thinking and acting of previous system is being permanently reproduced by contemporary actors. Discrepancy between societal expectations and system deliveries result in growing discontent, and mistrust in education.
- (ii) Majority of problems can not be attributed to the sector as such, most of them are caused by and interconnected with other areas of economics and social life. Low salaries and poor social status of educators are basically dependent on economic performance of the country. Problem of ineffective governance and management could not be solved beyond changes in administrative system and decentralization of power. Ineffective financing system can not be cured without changes in basic budget legislation (budget code).
- (iii) The system itself suffers from combination of over-centralization and dispersion of responsibilities, from excessive regulation and functional overload of its constituents combined with lack of effective control and low implementation standards.
- (iv) All previous reform attempts were either imitative in nature (introduction of 12-point grade system, introduction of Bologna system) or were aimed in rather technical adjustment of existing institutions, institutional and educational practices to changing conditions. In 2000s only one systemic effort was undertaken: system of independent testing for entrance examination was developed and introduced.
- (v) Current reform attempt lack systemic approach. At top political level four major agents have presented their vision of reform: President, Government, Parliament and Ministry of Education and Science.

In the program of the *President of Ukraine* ‘Strategy 2020’ education issues mentioned in the package named ‘Responsibility’ as ‘education reform’. It is specified in the benchmark section under two indicators: 1) 75% of school

graduates speak two foreign languages by 2020 (that should be confirmed by international certificates); 2) Ukraine is ranked within top-50 by the PISA results<sup>43</sup>.

*Government of Ukraine* presented its version of education reform in the program approved by the Parliament in December 2014. Education reform located within the social package under ‘improvement of quality’ slogan. The program includes: establishment of a new rules and procedures of accreditation and licensing of educational establishments, creation of a new independent system of quality assessment in higher education, introduction of financial autonomy of higher education institutions, congruence of state orders to the real needs of labor market, reform of pre-school, secondary, vocational and out-of-school education through: introduction of a new general Law on education and law on Vocational Education, integration of education and science (creation of techno- and science parks), adoption of a new version of the Law on Scientific and Technological Research<sup>44</sup>.

*The Parliamentary Committee on Science and Education* focuses mostly on law-making activities: at the moment two law drafts are under preparation (general Law on Education and Law on Scientific and Technological Research. At the level of political declarations parties that formed coalition government in December 2014 have signed *Coalition Agreement*. The agreement contains several important split-level points about education: adoption of a new Law on Education, decentralization of governance, introduction of 12-years secondary education, changes in the system of teachers salaries (based on attestation), extension of independent testing to different levels of education, supply of broad-band Internet to all schools, diversification of forms of pre-school education, changes in state standards of secondary education, greater autonomy of universities, reform of vocational education, development of education for adults<sup>45</sup>.

*Ministry of Education and Sciences* has proclaimed its devotion to reform by approving the Concept of the Development of Education of Ukraine prepared by the group of public experts<sup>46</sup>. The Concept proves to be the only document which proposes systemic comprehensive approach do the sector reform. Concurrently MOES undertakes numerous efforts aimed in overcoming legacies of previous sector leadership: cancels orders and regulations aimed in corruption schemes building, improves bureaucratic procedures, reduces number of reporting, introduces greater autonomy for grass-root institutions.

- (vi) At least four major obstacles are foreseen in further promotion of the concept and the road-map based on it.

<sup>43</sup> <http://reforms.in.ua/Content/download/Strategy2020updEN.pdf>

<sup>44</sup> <http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/26-19#n7>

<sup>45</sup> <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/n0001001-15/paran2#n2>

<sup>46</sup> <http://education-ua.org/ru/draft-regulations/319-proekt-kontseptsiya-rozvitku-osviti-ukrajini-na-period-2015-2025-rokiv>

*First*, the reform is almost completely based on top-down approach. MOES acts as a major commissioner and implementer. The reform program (concept) is being prepared by local expert team, however, it lacks certain expertise and capacities (particularly in the fields of economics of education and finances).

*Second*, financial support for the reform is poor. At the moment the experts team Strategy Advisory Group (SAG) is supported solely by International Renaissance Foundation and by Education Support Program (Budapest) – the latter also belongs to Soros network. This limits expertise capacities, particularly due to the lack of external expertise. The reform needs *continuous focused expertise and policy analysis support*. Reform itself requires additional funding which is hardly imaginable under current economical and financial conditions.

*Third*, initial discussions and attempts prove that certain part of educational milieu at all levels either do not understand or do not want reform. Therefore, additional effort and resources needed to organize awareness and advocacy campaign.

*Fourth*, the reform requires continuous dedicated effort, it would last for at least 10 years to reach its major goals. Under current conditions when society urges power ‘to do something’ it is important to identify and to implement some reform components that could bring an immediate effect, however, some of them will not receive favorable considerations in society (optimization of schools network, reduction of a number of teaching staff).

(vii) It is possible, however, to identify certain areas of *immediate intervention* which could bring immediate systemic effect and will not meet a systemic opposition:

a) optimization of functions of governing and managing institutions at all levels, clear delineation of their competencies, powers and responsibilities. Liquidation of certain institutions (methodical cabinets) and re-organization of the others (*raion* education administrations) Part of these changes can be introduced by simple cancellation of different by-law acts and internal regulation of different institutions. Some others require changes in laws.

b) re-organization of the MOES in terms of reduction and revision of some of its control and supervisory functions, development of analytical and policy analysis capacities of MOES and its institutions

c) radical reduction of regulations and reporting documentation, minimization of paper-flows

d) inclusion of Ukraine into international assessment systems: TIMSS-2019, PISA-2018, and, particularly in PIRLS-2017 (ETLS). The former are important because TIMSS would give valuable data comparable to 2007 and 2011 studies (2015 is

missed), while PISA will be first time study necessary for outside assessment (despite growing criticism about PISA). PIRLS-2017 will provide Ukraine with unique opportunity to assess the state of affairs in the field which might become a terrain for impressive break-through effort: development of nation-wide program of foreign languages learning.

e) national assessment study of the system of pedagogical education: effectiveness, efficiency, methods of training

d) de-monopolization of teachers post-diploma and in-service training

e) start-up of the National Agency on Quality of Higher Education

(viii) In terms of more continuous effort with long-term effect (however with need for immediate start) the sector needs:

- curricular reform: creation of a National Curriculum, changes in textbooks and teaching programs, broad changes in the content
- profound changes in the system of financing: changes in per-student formula (methodology of calculation), complete change of the system of state order in higher education
- stimulation of private investments into education and science (through taxation policies)
- optimization of the school network
- increase student/teacher ratio to 1/15
- decentralization and optimization of the system of governance in connection with broader policies of decentralization and administrative reform
- transition to the system of education districts and reduction of a number of *raion* school administrations
- deregulation of governance and introduction of a broad institutional/financial/academic autonomy of schools
- introduction of e-governance at all level of the system
- introduction of a new, integrated, unified system of data gathering and processing, changes of methodology of data gathering and processing, approximation of this system to OSCE criteria, or introduction of EMIS
- creation of a new system of quality monitoring based on outcomes/output criteria
- full rearrangement of the system of teachers training and re-training
- introduction of a new system of teachers assessment and certification