

ACADEMIC YEAR 2026/2027

EU Values in Action

Inclusive Citizenship in Polish Higher Education

EUVIA4PL Jean Monnet Module

Year 1 syllabus for winter and summer schools

This syllabus sets out the teaching programme, staff responsibilities, learning outcomes, assessment and reading for two intensive schools. Students apply EU values to practical decisions in Polish higher education.

This syllabus was prepared within the project "EU Values in Action: Inclusive Citizenship in Polish Higher Education" (EUVIA4PL), an Erasmus+ Jean Monnet Module coordinated by VIZJA University and funded by the European Union under Grant Agreement No. 101321623 (ERASMUS-JMO-2026-HEI-TCH-RSCH-MODULE).

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Form of Classes	Number of Hours		ECTS	Form of Assessment	Weight
	Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study			
lectures	40	–	—	Pass with grade	100
practical classes	80	–			
Total	120	–			
individual work	120	–			
Overall workload	240	–			

WINTER SCHOOL 2027

Shared Heritage Shared Europe

European Cultural Heritage and Identity

Thematic question: Whose heritage is represented, and how can a university make cultural participation more inclusive?

Two weeks • 60 contact hours • 20 lecture hours • 40 practical hours

Learning objectives

- 1 Examine how European cultural identity, pluralism and heritage policy inform responsible decisions about access, representation and publication in Polish higher education.
- 2 Explain Article 2 TEU values and distinguish them from specific Charter rights and their scope.
- 3 Explain EU supporting competence in culture and the purposes of EU heritage and cultural programmes.
- 4 Map a Polish heritage dilemma to relevant values, rights, actors and institutional responsibilities.
- 5 Compare publication options and justify a curation policy covering language, access and representation.
- 6 Communicate a sourced decision through an accessible one-page infographic.
- 7 Negotiate conflicting perspectives respectfully and revise a decision in response to stakeholder feedback.
- 8 Develop an evidence-based individual case analysis and a defensible team output.
- 9 Use stakeholder feedback to improve feasibility, inclusion and public communication.
- 10 Apply the school's learning to a Polish higher-education setting and identify a next learning step.



Funded by
the European Union

Learning outcomes

KNOWLEDGE			
no	Results	Reference to directional results	Verification method
K1	Explain the EU values set out in Article 2 TEU.	—	Source-based post-test and guided discussion.
K2	Distinguish EU values, Charter rights and the Charter's field of application.	—	Applied post-test question and rights-mapping task.
K3	Explain EU supporting competence in culture and the role of national and institutional actors.	—	Short source commentary checked by the teacher.
K4	Describe how heritage narratives shape European and local identities.	—	Case-based question and seminar explanation.
K5	Explain cultural and linguistic diversity in the EU context.	—	Scenario analysis against an instructor checklist.
K6	Describe the objectives of Creative Europe relevant to cultural cooperation.	—	Source-based question and brief justification.
K7	Identify tensions between access, representation, expression and privacy in heritage publication.	—	Case comparison and reasoned explanation.
K8	Explain provenance, attribution and permissions in the use of collection materials.	—	Evidence checklist and post-test question.
K9	Describe stakeholder interests in a Polish university heritage case.	—	Stakeholder map and oral explanation.
K10	Explain criteria for evaluating a transparent and inclusive curation policy.	—	Evaluation plan and applied post-test question.
SKILLS			
no	Results	Reference to directional results	Verification method
S1	Locate and cite relevant EU primary sources.	—	Source record reviewed for accuracy.
S2	Map values and rights to a Polish heritage dilemma.	—	Individual analytical task with teacher feedback.
S3	Map EU, national and university responsibilities.	—	Case worksheet and oral explanation.
S4	Compare alternative descriptions of the same heritage item.	—	Supervised workshop product assessed with a rubric.
S5	Identify excluded voices and barriers to access.	—	Assumptions and limitations checklist.
S6	Create a stakeholder map and prepare consultation questions.	—	Practical output and reasoned justification.

S7	Compare at least two publication options using explicit criteria.	—	Case portfolio assessed against stated criteria.
S8	Draft an inclusive curation policy with responsibilities and a review route.	—	Final written product and individual contribution record.
S9	Produce an accessible infographic with a source record.	—	Checklist review of communication or monitoring output.
S10	Defend the proposed policy and revise it after feedback.	—	Final presentation, individual defence and revision record.

SOCIAL COMPETENCE

no	Results	Reference to directional results	Verification method
SC1	Collaborate responsibly in an interdisciplinary team and document individual contributions.	—	Observation and individual contribution record.
SC2	Listen respectfully to different cultural, social and institutional perspectives.	—	Discussion observation and peer feedback.
SC3	Justify a position with evidence and remain open to reasoned disagreement.	—	Reasoned response during a case debate.
SC4	Recognise the limits of personal expertise and identify issues requiring specialist input.	—	Individual reflection on limitations and referral needs.
SC5	Handle sensitive information responsibly and avoid unnecessary personal disclosures.	—	Privacy checklist and observation of practice.
SC6	Represent affected groups fairly and avoid stereotyping or unsupported generalisations.	—	Review of language, representation and assumptions.
SC7	Take initiative in addressing barriers to participation and communication.	—	Observation of initiative and barrier-reduction proposals.
SC8	Give constructive peer feedback and revise work in response to valid criticism.	—	Peer-feedback record and revised output.
SC9	Credit sources and contributors and respect permissions for publication and reuse.	—	Source, attribution and permissions checklist.
SC10	Reflect on learning and identify a feasible next step for applying the school's competences.	—	Individual learning reflection and transfer plan.

Learning content

no	Description of the issue	Number of Hours	
		Lectures and practice	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
1	1) Rationale and objectives Examine how European cultural identity, pluralism and heritage policy inform responsible decisions about access, representation and publication in Polish higher education.	60 (L – 20; WP – 40)	–
	Target group: BA, MA and doctoral students, early-career researchers, higher-education staff and relevant external stakeholders. Specialist EU-law knowledge is not required; core concepts are introduced in the opening sessions.		
	Format: 14 calendar days; 10 teaching days, Monday to Friday over two weeks; 6 contact hours per teaching day. School total: 60 contact hours, comprising 20 lecture hours and 40 hours of seminars and supervised practical work. Breaks and independent study are excluded from contact hours. Exact dates and the delivery language are announced before enrolment.		
	2) Teaching responsibilities The four named teachers deliver the school jointly. The thematic assignments below identify who teaches each area; staff-hour totals are not allocated in this syllabus.		
	Block 1 — Heritage identity and EU values Taught by: Prof. Dr. Habil. Yan Kapranov. European identity; cultural and linguistic diversity; interpretation and representation of heritage.		
	Block 2 — Rights and cultural governance Taught by: Dr. Dawid Stadniczeńko. EU cultural competence; Charter scope; access, expression, privacy and publication decisions.		
	Block 3 — Inclusive heritage learning and curation Taught by: Dr. Habil. Olena Pimenova. Accessible descriptions; inclusive learning resources; consultation and curation-policy workshop.		
	Block 4 — Stakeholder dialogue and policy decisions Taught by: Dr. Serhat Demir. Stakeholder session; committee simulation; policy options, implementation and public communication.		
	Project responsibilities Yan Kapranov: coordination, quality assurance and evaluation (T1.1/T1.5). Olena Pimenova: school delivery and teaching-package coordination (T1.2). Dawid Stadniczeńko: HUBonEU and reusable resources (T1.3). Serhat Demir: stakeholder dialogue and policy outputs (T1.4).		

no	Description of the issue	Number of Hours	
		Lectures and practice	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
	3) Learning content and two-week sequence Each day includes 2 lecture hours and 4 hours of seminars, supervised workshops or simulation. The thematic teacher named above leads the relevant subject; practical integration and final assessment are delivered jointly.		
	Day 1 — EU values and heritage dilemmas. Diagnostic activity; distinguish facts, assumptions, values and rights in the case.		
	Day 2 — European identity and pluralism. Compare competing descriptions of the same heritage item; identify framing choices.		
	Day 3 — EU cultural competence and instruments. Map EU, national and university responsibilities and locate primary sources.		
	Day 4 — Rights, expression and cultural diversity. Build a rights map and check the Charter scope before drawing conclusions.		
	Day 5 — Access, language and representation. Draft multilingual access and curation options; complete a formative case clinic.		
	Day 6 — Evidence and ethical publication. Assess source provenance, attribution, permissions and publication risks.		
	Day 7 — Stakeholder perspectives. Structured dialogue with a cultural, civil-society or public-sector stakeholder; synthesis.		
	Day 8 — Policy options and trade-offs. Simulate an editorial committee and compare alternative publication policies.		
	Day 9 — Implementation and communication. Supervised policy drafting, infographic design and peer review.		
	Day 10 — Reasoned decisions and transfer. Oral defences, final case clinic, post-test and structured learning feedback.		
	4) Assessed student outputs A team curation and publication policy of 1,200–1,500 words for a simulated Polish university heritage collection. Include a values and rights map, at least three stakeholder perspectives, two alternative publication options, a reasoned decision, access and language rules, responsibilities and a review route. Attach a one-page infographic and a source list. Each student submits an individual 500–700-word case brief explaining their own reasoning.		
	Flagship case: Heritage Commons Poland — Digitise, Describe, Disagree The student identifies relevant EU values and rights, checks the Charter's scope, locates the governance context, compares alternatives and explains a justified response. The case is a teaching simulation; assumptions and synthetic data must be labelled.		
	5) Assessment and feedback Each school: individual post-test 40%; supervised practical portfolio and oral defence 40%; individual written case analysis or reflection 20%. The pre-test is diagnostic. Feedback surveys evaluate teaching and do not substitute for assessment of achievement.		

no	Description of the issue	Number of Hours	
		Lectures and practice	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
	Practical assessment criteria: EU reasoning 25%; evidence and sources 20%; analysis of options 20%; feasibility, inclusion and accessibility 20%; clear presentation, cooperation and individual defence 15%.		
	Completion: at least 60/100 overall, at least 50/100 in each component, all outputs submitted, and participation in at least 48 of 60 contact hours. Missed assessed activities require an equivalent supervised task. A failed component may be resubmitted once after feedback. University-wide rules take precedence.		
	6) Independent work and reuse Independent work is estimated at 60 hours per school: preparation 20; mandatory reading 10; individual written work 10; other primary-source and case materials 10; revision for the final assessment 10. Across the year, 120 contact hours plus 120 independent hours give 240 hours of estimated workload. ECTS recognition is subject to a separate university decision.		
	Required reading is limited to the indicated sections. Recommended reading and Additional resources support deeper study and project work. They do not add compulsory contact hours. Source versions and applicable rules are checked before delivery. Council of Europe and UNESCO materials complement the EU sources.		
	The Day 7 stakeholder dialogue is embedded within practical teaching. Student synthesis informs the team's annual policy brief; selected reviewed outputs may support HUBonEU. Publication requires appropriate permissions and attribution. Personal assessment and attendance records are stored securely; evaluation findings are reported in aggregate.		
	Total	60	0

Teaching methods

Giving methods: short explanatory lectures, source-based demonstrations and guided questions.

Activating methods: case discussion, stakeholder dialogue, role-play, simulations and peer review.

Practical methods: supervised case analysis, individual writing, collaborative policy or institutional design, presentations and revision after feedback.

Forms of work: individual, pairs, small groups and whole-class discussion.

Assessment and completion

<i>Method of passing</i>	Weight (%)
	Exercises
<i>Individual post-test with knowledge and applied case questions</i>	40
<i>Supervised practical portfolio and oral defence</i>	40
<i>Individual written case analysis or reflection prepared outside class</i>	20
Together	100%

Independent study

no	Individual Work Activities	Estimated Number of Hours	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
1	Preparation to participate in classes (e.g., preliminary reading, preparation or collection of materials, aids, preparation of a paper or presentation for classes, etc.)	20	–
2	Mandatory reading	10	–
3	Preparation of written work outside of class	10	–
4	Mandatory reading of other materials or content (e.g., audio, video, tools, aids, software, hardware, legal acts, documentation, workplace conditions, etc.)	10	–
5	Preparation for the colloquium	10	–
	Total	60	–

Reading and online resources

Read the selected sections in Required reading within the allocated preparation and reading hours. Recommended reading supports deeper analysis; Additional resources are optional for projects and independent study. The entire list is not an additional compulsory workload. Links lead to official texts, open publications or publisher records; access to some journal articles may depend on your university library.

Required reading

Core texts for preparation, class discussion and assessment.

ID	Source and reading focus
R1	European Union. (2016). Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union. Article 2. Read online Read: Article 2 and the values used in the school case.
R2	European Union. (2016). Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Selected rights and Articles 51–52. Read online Read: Relevant rights and Articles 51–52 on scope and interpretation.
R3	European Union. (2016). Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Selected provisions on citizenship, education, culture and the environment. Read online Read: Selected articles on citizenship, education, culture or the environment, as relevant to the school.

ID	Source and reading focus
R4	Council of the European Union. (2018). Recommendation on promoting common values, inclusive education, and the European dimension of teaching (2018/C 195/01). Read online Read: Recommendations on common values, inclusive education and the European dimension of teaching.
R5	European Parliament & Council. (2021). Regulation (EU) 2021/818 establishing the Creative Europe Programme (2021 to 2027). Read online Read: Programme objectives and the provisions relevant to cultural cooperation.
R6	Cores-Bilbao, E., Méndez-García, M. del C., & Fonseca-Mora, M. C. (2020). University students' representations of Europe and self-identification as Europeans: A synthesis of qualitative evidence for future policy formulation. European Journal of Futures Research, 8, Article 1. DOI and full text Read: Research question, synthesis findings and implications for European identity.
R7	UNESCO. (2015). Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives. Read online Read: Learning objectives relevant to higher education and civic participation.
R8	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2018). Applying the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union in law and policymaking at national level: Guidance. Read online Read: Guidance on when the Charter applies and how to use it in policy reasoning.

Recommended reading

Selected research and guidance for developing the school assignment.

ID	Source and reading focus
P1	Council of Europe. (2005). Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (CETS No. 199). Read online Focus: Heritage communities and participation
P2	Vlachopoulos, D., Querci, I., Ertan, Y., Nacházlová, E., Arsoy, A. P., & Camarioti, A. (2025). Instructors' and students' perceptions of the integration of EU values into teaching and learning in higher education: A phenomenological study in The Netherlands, Türkiye, Greece, Czechia, and Italy. Sustainability, 17(10), 4589. DOI and full text Focus: Teaching EU values in higher education
P3	Council of Europe. (2018). Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture. Volume 1: Context, concepts and model. Council of Europe Publishing. Read online Focus: Democratic culture and competences
P4	Council of Europe. (2018). Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture. Volume 2: Descriptors. Council of Europe Publishing. Read online Focus: Descriptors for assessing democratic competences
P5	Council of Europe. (2018). Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture. Volume 3: Guidance for implementation. Council of Europe Publishing. Read online Focus: Curriculum and assessment guidance
P6	Council of Europe. (2008). White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue: Living together as equals in dignity. Read online Focus: Dialogue and pluralism
P7	UNESCO. (2013). Intercultural competences: Conceptual and operational framework. Read online Focus: Intercultural concepts and practice
P8	Deardorff, D. K. (2020). Manual for developing intercultural competencies: Story circles. UNESCO and Routledge. DOI and full text Focus: Listening and facilitated dialogue
P9	UNESCO. (2019). Recommendation on Open Educational Resources (OER). Read online Focus: Open licensing and educational resources

ID	Source and reading focus
P10	World Wide Web Consortium. (2024). Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2. W3C Recommendation, 12 December 2024. Read online Focus: Digital accessibility

Additional resources

Optional reading across related topics and transferable skills.

ID	Source and reading focus
A1	Lambrechts, A. A., Cavallaro, M., & Lepori, B. (2024). The European Universities initiative: Between status hierarchies and inclusion. Higher Education, 88, 1227–1247. Publisher record Focus: Inclusion in European university cooperation
A2	Brooks, R., Gupta, A., Jayadeva, S., & Abrahams, J. (2021). Students' views about the purpose of higher education: A comparative analysis of six European countries. Higher Education Research & Development, 40(7), 1375–1388. Publisher record Focus: Student perspectives on higher education
A3	Dobbins, M., Knill, C., & Vögtle, E. M. (2011). An analytical framework for the cross-country comparison of higher education governance. Higher Education, 62, 665–683. Publisher record Focus: Institutional governance
A4	Sala, A., Punie, Y., Garkov, V., & Cabrera Giraldez, M. (2020). LifeComp: The European Framework for Personal, Social and Learning to Learn Key Competence. Publications Office of the European Union. DOI and full text Focus: Personal and social learning
A5	Vuorikari, R., Kluzer, S., & Punie, Y. (2022). DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens. With new examples of knowledge, skills and attitudes. Publications Office of the European Union. DOI and full text Focus: Digital competence
A6	Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. Read online Focus: Responsible educational use of AI
A7	Richardson, J., & Milovidov, E. (2022). Digital citizenship education handbook: Being online, well-being online, rights online (2022 edition). Council of Europe. Read online Focus: Digital citizenship
A8	Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making (DGI(2017)09). Council of Europe. Read online Focus: Misinformation and disinformation
A9	European Commission, Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. (2026). Guidelines for teachers and educators on tackling disinformation and promoting digital literacy through education and training (updated ed.). Publications Office of the European Union. DOI and full text Focus: Media literacy and classroom activities
A10	OECD. (2022). OECD guidelines for citizen participation processes. OECD Publishing. DOI and full text Focus: Inclusive participation design

EU legislation, Council of Europe conventions, UN instruments and educational guidance have different legal status. Use each source within its scope. Where other language versions are offered on the source page, they may support preparation; cite the version consulted.

SUMMER SCHOOL 2027

Green Campus Fair Futures

Sustainability and EU Policy Responses to Global Challenges

Thematic question: How can a university make environmental choices that are transparent, affordable and socially fair?

Two weeks • 60 contact hours • 20 lecture hours • 40 practical hours

Learning objectives

1	Connect EU sustainability priorities with transparent institutional choices, using a Polish higher-education procurement simulation to analyse environmental, financial and social trade-offs.
2	Explain the relationship between EU sustainability priorities, policy instruments and institutional implementation.
3	Distinguish environmental objectives, social fairness, evidence quality and governance constraints in procurement decisions.
4	Construct a transparent comparison of three bids using defined criteria, weights and cited evidence.
5	Test how changing weights or uncertain data affects the preferred option and justify a recommendation.
6	Design a feasible implementation and monitoring plan with responsibilities and indicators.
7	Disclose assumptions and negotiate competing priorities without concealing adverse impacts.
8	Develop an evidence-based individual case analysis and a defensible team output.
9	Use stakeholder feedback to improve feasibility, inclusion and public communication.
10	Apply the school's learning to a Polish higher-education setting and identify a next learning step.

Learning outcomes

KNOWLEDGE			
no	Results	Reference to directional results	Verification method
K1	Explain the connection between EU values and sustainable development.	—	Source-based post-test and guided discussion.
K2	Describe EU environmental competence and the main levels of sustainability governance.	—	Applied post-test question and rights-mapping task.
K3	Distinguish policy objectives, operational indicators and institutional actions.	—	Short source commentary checked by the teacher.
K4	Explain lifecycle reasoning and the limits of supplied environmental data.	—	Case-based question and seminar explanation.
K5	Describe environmental, financial and social criteria in a procurement case.	—	Scenario analysis against an instructor checklist.
K6	Explain distributive fairness and affordability in campus decisions.	—	Source-based question and brief justification.
K7	Explain how weights and assumptions influence a decision matrix.	—	Case comparison and reasoned explanation.
K8	Distinguish transparent evidence from unsupported sustainability claims.	—	Evidence checklist and post-test question.

K9	Identify institutional responsibilities and stakeholder interests in procurement.	—	Stakeholder map and oral explanation.
K10	Explain the function of monitoring indicators and review mechanisms.	—	Evaluation plan and applied post-test question.

SKILLS

no	Results	Reference to directional results	Verification method
S1	Locate and cite relevant EU sustainability sources.	—	Source record reviewed for accuracy.
S2	Translate a policy objective into a campus decision criterion.	—	Individual analytical task with teacher feedback.
S3	Interpret the supplied environmental and cost data accurately.	—	Case worksheet and oral explanation.
S4	Construct a weighted comparison of three bids.	—	Supervised workshop product assessed with a rubric.
S5	Document assumptions, evidence gaps and uncertainty.	—	Assumptions and limitations checklist.
S6	Run at least two sensitivity scenarios and interpret changed rankings.	—	Practical output and reasoned justification.
S7	Evaluate social impacts and affordability for affected groups.	—	Case portfolio assessed against stated criteria.
S8	Draft a reasoned recommendation memo and implementation plan.	—	Final written product and individual contribution record.
S9	Design three monitoring indicators and a public explanation.	—	Checklist review of communication or monitoring output.
S10	Defend a procurement decision and respond to alternative priorities.	—	Final presentation, individual defence and revision record.

SOCIAL COMPETENCE

no	Results	Reference to directional results	Verification method
SC1	Collaborate responsibly in an interdisciplinary team and document individual contributions.	—	Observation and individual contribution record.
SC2	Listen respectfully to different cultural, social and institutional perspectives.	—	Discussion observation and peer feedback.
SC3	Justify a position with evidence and remain open to reasoned disagreement.	—	Reasoned response during a case debate.
SC4	Recognise the limits of personal expertise and identify issues requiring specialist input.	—	Individual reflection on limitations and referral needs.
SC5	Handle sensitive information responsibly and avoid unnecessary personal disclosures.	—	Privacy checklist and observation of practice.
SC6	Represent affected groups fairly and avoid stereotyping or unsupported generalisations.	—	Review of language, representation and assumptions.

SC7	Take initiative in addressing barriers to participation and communication.	—	Observation of initiative and barrier-reduction proposals.
SC8	Give constructive peer feedback and revise work in response to valid criticism.	—	Peer-feedback record and revised output.
SC9	Credit sources and contributors and respect permissions for publication and reuse.	—	Source, attribution and permissions checklist.
SC10	Reflect on learning and identify a feasible next step for applying the school's competences.	—	Individual learning reflection and transfer plan.

Learning content

no	Description of the issue	Number of Hours	
		Lectures and practice	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
1	1) Rationale and objectives Connect EU sustainability priorities with transparent institutional choices, using a Polish higher-education procurement simulation to analyse environmental, financial and social trade-offs. Target group: BA, MA and doctoral students, early-career researchers, higher-education staff and relevant external stakeholders. Specialist EU-law knowledge is not required; core concepts are introduced in the opening sessions. Format: 14 calendar days; 10 teaching days, Monday to Friday over two weeks; 6 contact hours per teaching day. School total: 60 contact hours, comprising 20 lecture hours and 40 hours of seminars and supervised practical work. Breaks and independent study are excluded from contact hours. Exact dates and the delivery language are announced before enrolment. 2) Teaching responsibilities The four named teachers deliver the school jointly. The thematic assignments below identify who teaches each area; staff-hour totals are not allocated in this syllabus. Block 1 — EU sustainability governance and policy Taught by: Dr. Serhat Demir. EU policy priorities; implementation actors; transparent institutional decisions and stakeholder dialogue. Block 2 — Rights accountability and procurement reasoning Taught by: Dr. Dawid Stadniczeńko. EU governance context; fairness, accountability and documented reasons in the procurement simulation. Block 3 — Inclusive decision design Taught by: Dr. Habil. Olena Pimenova. Social impacts, accessible participation, decision criteria, weighted matrices and supervised sensitivity exercises.	60 (L – 20; WP – 40)	–

no	Description of the issue	Number of Hours	
		Lectures and practice	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
	Block 4 — Values evidence and public communication Taught by: Prof. Dr. Habil. Yan Kapranov. Competing values; source criticism; policy-memo reasoning; accessible public explanations and feedback.		
	Project responsibilities Yan Kapranov: coordination, quality assurance and evaluation (T1.1/T1.5). Olena Pimenova: school delivery and teaching-package coordination (T1.2). Dawid Stadniczeńko: HUBonEU and reusable resources (T1.3). Serhat Demir: stakeholder dialogue and policy outputs (T1.4).		
	3) Learning content and two-week sequence Each day includes 2 lecture hours and 4 hours of seminars, supervised workshops or simulation. The thematic teacher named above leads the relevant subject; practical integration and final assessment are delivered jointly.		
	Day 1 — EU values and sustainability. Diagnostic activity; introduce the three-bid campus case and competing priorities.		
	Day 2 — EU sustainability governance. Map the route from EU policy objectives to national and campus-level decisions.		
	Day 3 — Environmental evidence and uncertainty. Interpret supplied footprint and lifecycle data; record evidence limitations.		
	Day 4 — Social fairness and affordability. Analyse access, affordability and distribution of costs and benefits.		
	Day 5 — Transparent decision criteria. Build a weighted matrix and justify the choice of criteria.		
	Day 6 — Trade-offs and sensitivity. Recalculate rankings under alternative weights and uncertain assumptions.		
	Day 7 — Stakeholder perspectives. Structured dialogue with public administration, civil society or a campus practitioner.		
	Day 8 — Institutional decision-making. Simulate a procurement committee and document dissent and decision reasons.		
	Day 9 — Implementation and public communication. Draft the memo, monitoring plan and accessible public explanation.		
	Day 10 — Evaluation and transfer. Defend the decision, revise the dossier, complete post-test and learning feedback.		
	4) Assessed student outputs A team decision dossier containing a three-bid matrix, clearly explained criteria and weights, at least two sensitivity scenarios, and a 1,200–1,500-word recommendation memo. Include implementation responsibilities, three monitoring indicators, limitations and a one-page public explanation. Each student submits an individual 500–700-word critique of the chosen option. Use supplied simulation data and label assumptions; do not present invented figures as institutional facts.		

no	Description of the issue	Number of Hours	
		Lectures and practice	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
	Flagship case: Green Campus Procurement — The 3 Bids Problem The student identifies relevant EU values and rights, checks the Charter's scope, locates the governance context, compares alternatives and explains a justified response. The case is a teaching simulation; assumptions and synthetic data must be labelled.		
	5) Assessment and feedback Each school: individual post-test 40%; supervised practical portfolio and oral defence 40%; individual written case analysis or reflection 20%. The pre-test is diagnostic. Feedback surveys evaluate teaching and do not substitute for assessment of achievement.		
	Practical assessment criteria: EU reasoning 25%; evidence and sources 20%; analysis of options 20%; feasibility, inclusion and accessibility 20%; clear presentation, cooperation and individual defence 15%.		
	Completion: at least 60/100 overall, at least 50/100 in each component, all outputs submitted, and participation in at least 48 of 60 contact hours. Missed assessed activities require an equivalent supervised task. A failed component may be resubmitted once after feedback. University-wide rules take precedence.		
	6) Independent work and reuse Independent work is estimated at 60 hours per school: preparation 20; mandatory reading 10; individual written work 10; other primary-source and case materials 10; revision for the final assessment 10. Across the year, 120 contact hours plus 120 independent hours give 240 hours of estimated workload. ECTS recognition is subject to a separate university decision.		
	Required reading is limited to the indicated sections. Recommended reading and Additional resources support deeper study and project work. They do not add compulsory contact hours. Source versions and applicable rules are checked before delivery. Council of Europe and UNESCO materials complement the EU sources.		
	The Day 7 stakeholder dialogue is embedded within practical teaching. Student synthesis informs the team's annual policy brief; selected reviewed outputs may support HUBonEU. Publication requires appropriate permissions and attribution. Personal assessment and attendance records are stored securely; evaluation findings are reported in aggregate.		
	Total	60	0

Teaching methods

Giving methods: short explanatory lectures, source-based demonstrations and guided questions.

Activating methods: case discussion, stakeholder dialogue, role-play, simulations and peer review.

Practical methods: supervised case analysis, individual writing, collaborative policy or institutional design, presentations and revision after feedback.

Forms of work: individual, pairs, small groups and whole-class discussion.

Assessment and completion

<i>Method of passing</i>	Weight (%)
	Exercises
<i>Individual post-test with knowledge and applied case questions</i>	40
<i>Supervised practical portfolio and oral defence</i>	40
<i>Individual written case analysis or reflection prepared outside class</i>	20
Together	100%

Independent study

no	Individual Work Activities	Estimated Number of Hours	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
1	Preparation to participate in classes (e.g., preliminary reading, preparation or collection of materials, aids, preparation of a paper or presentation for classes, etc.)	20	–
2	Mandatory reading	10	–
3	Preparation of written work outside of class	10	–
4	Mandatory reading of other materials or content (e.g., audio, video, tools, aids, software, hardware, legal acts, documentation, workplace conditions, etc.)	10	–
5	Preparation for the colloquium	10	–
	Total	60	–

Reading and online resources

Read the selected sections in Required reading within the allocated preparation and reading hours. Recommended reading supports deeper analysis; Additional resources are optional for projects and independent study. The entire list is not an additional compulsory workload. Links lead to official texts, open publications or publisher records; access to some journal articles may depend on your university library.

Required reading

Core texts for preparation, class discussion and assessment.

ID	Source and reading focus
R1	European Union. (2016). Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union. Article 2. Read online Read: Article 2 and the values used in the school case.
R2	European Union. (2016). Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Selected rights and Articles 51–52. Read online Read: Relevant rights and Articles 51–52 on scope and interpretation.
R3	European Union. (2016). Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Selected provisions on citizenship, education, culture and the environment. Read online Read: Selected articles on citizenship, education, culture or the environment, as relevant to the school.

ID	Source and reading focus
R4	Council of the European Union. (2022). Recommendation on learning for the green transition and sustainable development (2022/C 243/01). Read online Read: Recommended actions for institutions and learners in the green transition.
R5	European Commission, Joint Research Centre. (2022). GreenComp: The European sustainability competence framework. Publications Office of the European Union. Read online Read: The four competence areas and their application to the campus case.
R6	UNESCO. (2017). Education for Sustainable Development Goals: Learning objectives. Read online Read: Learning objectives and suggested activities for the selected SDGs.
R7	European Commission, Directorate-General for Environment, & ICLEI. (2016). Buying green! A handbook on green public procurement (3rd ed.). Publications Office of the European Union. DOI and full text Read: Award criteria and life-cycle costing; use as a methodological guide, checking current rules separately.
R8	UNESCO. (2020). Education for sustainable development: A roadmap. Read online Read: Education environments, youth and local-level action.

Recommended reading

Selected research and guidance for developing the school assignment.

ID	Source and reading focus
P1	Council of the European Union. (2018). Recommendation on promoting common values, inclusive education, and the European dimension of teaching (2018/C 195/01). Read online Focus: Common values in education
P2	Vlachopoulos, D., Querci, I., Ertan, Y., Nacházellová, E., Arsoy, A. P., & Camarioti, A. (2025). Instructors' and students' perceptions of the integration of EU values into teaching and learning in higher education: A phenomenological study in The Netherlands, Türkiye, Greece, Czechia, and Italy. Sustainability, 17(10), 4589. DOI and full text Focus: Teaching EU values in higher education
P3	Dobbins, M., Knill, C., & Vögtle, E. M. (2011). An analytical framework for the cross-country comparison of higher education governance. Higher Education, 62, 665–683. Publisher record Focus: Institutional governance
P4	OECD. (2022). OECD guidelines for citizen participation processes. OECD Publishing. DOI and full text Focus: Inclusive participation design
P5	OECD. (2020). Innovative citizen participation and new democratic institutions: Catching the deliberative wave. OECD Publishing. DOI and full text Focus: Deliberative democracy
P6	Council of Europe. (2018). Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture. Volume 1: Context, concepts and model. Council of Europe Publishing. Read online Focus: Democratic culture and competences
P7	Sala, A., Punie, Y., Garkov, V., & Cabrera Giraldez, M. (2020). LifeComp: The European Framework for Personal, Social and Learning to Learn Key Competence. Publications Office of the European Union. DOI and full text Focus: Personal and social learning
P8	UNESCO. (2017). A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education. Read online Focus: Inclusive policy and practice
P9	UNESCO. (2020). Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and education — All means all. Read online Focus: Educational exclusion and inequality
P10	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights & Council of Europe. (2018). Handbook on European non-discrimination law: 2018 edition. Read online Focus: Non-discrimination

Additional resources

Optional reading across related topics and transferable skills.

ID	Source and reading focus
A1	Vuorikari, R., Kluzer, S., & Punie, Y. (2022). DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens. With new examples of knowledge, skills and attitudes. Publications Office of the European Union. DOI and full text Focus: Digital competence
A2	Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. Read online Focus: Responsible educational use of AI
A3	UNESCO. (2019). Recommendation on Open Educational Resources (OER). Read online Focus: Open licensing and educational resources
A4	Richardson, J., & Milovidov, E. (2022). Digital citizenship education handbook: Being online, well-being online, rights online (2022 edition). Council of Europe. Read online Focus: Digital citizenship
A5	Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making (DGI(2017)09). Council of Europe. Read online Focus: Misinformation and disinformation
A6	European Commission, Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. (2026). Guidelines for teachers and educators on tackling disinformation and promoting digital literacy through education and training (updated ed.). Publications Office of the European Union. DOI and full text Focus: Media literacy and classroom activities
A7	World Wide Web Consortium. (2024). Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2. W3C Recommendation, 12 December 2024. Read online Focus: Digital accessibility
A8	Council of Europe. (2018). Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture. Volume 2: Descriptors. Council of Europe Publishing. Read online Focus: Descriptors for assessing democratic competences
A9	Council of Europe. (2018). Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture. Volume 3: Guidance for implementation. Council of Europe Publishing. Read online Focus: Curriculum and assessment guidance
A10	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2018). Applying the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union in law and policymaking at national level: Guidance. Read online Focus: Rights and policy reasoning

EU legislation, Council of Europe conventions, UN instruments and educational guidance have different legal status. Use each source within its scope. Where other language versions are offered on the source page, they may support preparation; cite the version consulted.