

ACADEMIC YEAR 2027/2028

EU Values in Action

Inclusive Citizenship in Polish Higher Education

EUVIA4PL Jean Monnet Module

Year 2 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 2028

Equal Rights Inclusive Communities

EU Inclusion Equality and Non Discrimination

Thematic question: How should a university respond fairly when equal access and non-discrimination are challenged?

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

Learning objectives

- 1 Develop evidence-based responses to equality and access dilemmas in Polish higher education, connecting EU values and relevant legal frameworks with fair institutional procedures.
- 2 Explain equality and non-discrimination concepts and identify the limits of relevant EU instruments.
- 3 Distinguish direct and indirect discrimination, access barriers and evidential uncertainty in a case.
- 4 Analyse an admissions or support complaint through a rights, evidence and stakeholder map.
- 5 Design a fair complaints workflow with accessible entry points, responsibilities and review stages.
- 6 Write a clear response that explains process and next steps without prejudging disputed facts.
- 7 Handle sensitive information responsibly and engage constructively with conflicting accounts.
- 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 equality, inclusion and non-discrimination in the EU context.	—	Source-based post-test and guided discussion.
K2	Distinguish relevant Charter rights from their conditions of legal application.	—	Applied post-test question and rights-mapping task.
K3	Explain direct and indirect discrimination using case examples.	—	Short source commentary checked by the teacher.
K4	Describe the scope of Directive 2000/43/EC, including education.	—	Case-based question and seminar explanation.
K5	Identify communication, procedural and access barriers in admissions and support.	—	Scenario analysis against an instructor checklist.
K6	Distinguish an allegation, an established fact and an inference.	—	Source-based question and brief justification.
K7	Explain impartiality and procedural fairness in handling complaints.	—	Case comparison and reasoned explanation.
K8	Describe the responsibilities of institutional and external stakeholders.	—	Evidence checklist and post-test question.
K9	Explain privacy and proportional information handling in a case file.	—	Stakeholder map and oral explanation.
K10	Describe the purpose of remedies, review and preventive institutional measures.	—	Evaluation plan and applied post-test question.
SKILLS			
no	Results	Reference to directional results	Verification method
S1	Locate and cite the relevant equality and rights sources.	—	Source record reviewed for accuracy.
S2	Map an admissions or support case to values, rights and institutional roles.	—	Individual analytical task with teacher feedback.
S3	Classify potential discrimination issues without prejudging disputed facts.	—	Case worksheet and oral explanation.
S4	Prepare a proportionate evidence-gathering plan.	—	Supervised workshop product assessed with a rubric.
S5	Identify barriers in information, criteria and complaints channels.	—	Assumptions and limitations checklist.
S6	Draft an accessible complaints workflow with responsibilities and review stages.	—	Practical output and reasoned justification.

S7	Compare response and remedy options using stated criteria.	—	Case portfolio assessed against stated criteria.
S8	Write a clear institutional response explaining process and next steps.	—	Final written product and individual contribution record.
S9	Create a prevention checklist informed by stakeholder feedback.	—	Checklist review of communication or monitoring output.
S10	Defend and revise the response pack using evidence and peer review.	—	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 Develop evidence-based responses to equality and access dilemmas in Polish higher education, connecting EU values and relevant legal frameworks with fair institutional procedures.	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 — EU equality and rights frameworks Taught by: Dr. Dawid Stadniczeńko. Equality concepts; Charter scope; Directive 2000/43/EC and evidence-based legal reasoning.		
	Block 2 — Inclusive admissions and support practice Taught by: Dr. Habil. Olena Pimenova. Access barriers; accessible information; learner support; complaints-workflow design.		
	Block 3 — Values language and responsible communication Taught by: Prof. Dr. Habil. Yan Kapranov. Representation; framing; respectful communication; evidence and individual case analysis.		
	Block 4 — Institutional responses and stakeholder dialogue Taught by: Dr. Serhat Demir. Stakeholder session; review-meeting simulation; remedies, prevention and response planning.		
	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 — Values, equality and inclusion. Diagnostic activity; identify barriers in the admissions and support scenario.		
	Day 2 — EU equality frameworks and scope. Read selected provisions; distinguish instrument, scope and institutional relevance.		
	Day 3 — Forms of discrimination. Classify case variations and explain the evidence needed for each interpretation.		
	Day 4 — Evidence and procedural fairness. Separate allegations, records and assumptions; design a fair evidence plan.		
	Day 5 — Rights and stakeholder mapping. Compare student, staff and institutional perspectives; formative case clinic.		
	Day 6 — Accessible complaints procedures. Design entry channels, responsibilities, review steps and communication points.		
	Day 7 — Stakeholder perspectives. Structured dialogue with an equality, civil-society or public-sector practitioner.		
	Day 8 — Reasoned institutional responses. Simulate a review meeting and test the workflow against case variations.		
	Day 9 — Remedy and prevention. Draft the response pack, accessibility checklist and prevention measures.		
	Day 10 — Evaluation and transfer. Present and defend the workflow; post-test and structured learning feedback.		
	4) Assessed student outputs A team equality response pack: a complaints workflow, a 1,200–1,500-word procedural rationale, an accessibility checklist and a 300–400-word response to the complainant. Show intake, evidence gathering, impartial review, reasoned communication, remedy options and follow-up. Distinguish verified facts from allegations and identify questions needing institutional legal review. Each student submits an individual 500–700-word analysis of one disputed issue.		
	Flagship case: Equal Access Under Pressure — Admissions, Support, and Complaints 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.		

no	Description of the issue	Number of Hours	
		Lectures and practice	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
	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	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.

ID	Source and reading focus
R4	Council of the European Union. (2000). Directive 2000/43/EC implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin. Read online Read: Articles 1–3 and the provisions relevant to equal treatment and access to education.
R5	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights & Council of Europe. (2018). Handbook on European non-discrimination law: 2018 edition. Read online Read: Concepts of discrimination and the discussion of education.
R6	European Commission. (2021). Union of Equality: Strategy for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 2021–2030 (COM(2021) 101 final). Read online Read: Education, accessibility and equal participation priorities.
R7	UNESCO. (2017). A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education. Read online Read: Conceptual framework and the review of inclusion in policy and practice.
R8	United Nations. (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Read online Read: Articles 2, 5, 9 and 24 on accommodation, equality, accessibility and education.

Recommended reading

Selected research and guidance for developing the school assignment.

ID	Source and reading focus
P1	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
P2	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
P3	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
P4	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 Focus: EU competences and institutional scope
P5	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
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	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
P8	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
P9	CAST. (2024). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0. Read online Focus: Accessible learning design

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	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
A2	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
A3	Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. Read online Focus: Responsible educational use of AI
A4	UNESCO. (2019). Recommendation on Open Educational Resources (OER). Read online Focus: Open licensing and educational resources
A5	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
A6	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
A7	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
A8	UNESCO. (2013). Intercultural competences: Conceptual and operational framework. Read online Focus: Intercultural concepts and practice
A9	Deardorff, D. K. (2020). Manual for developing intercultural competencies: Story circles. UNESCO and Routledge. DOI and full text Focus: Listening and facilitated dialogue
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 2028

Learning Without Barriers

Inclusive Education and Equal Opportunities

Thematic question: How can learning and assessment become more accessible while preserving academic standards?

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

Learning objectives

- 1 Design accessible assessment and support arrangements that preserve learning standards while removing avoidable barriers to participation in Polish higher education.
- 2 Explain how EU inclusion priorities and rights frameworks inform educational access and participation.
- 3 Distinguish essential learning outcomes, assessment formats, access barriers and support measures.
- 4 Audit a supplied assessment scenario for barriers without inferring a learner's needs from stereotypes.
- 5 Redesign an assessment with equivalent learning outcomes, transparent criteria and justified accommodations.
- 6 Prepare an implementation and review plan with responsibilities, accessible communication and indicators.
- 7 Consult the learner respectfully and balance privacy, fairness and academic integrity.
- 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 inclusive education and equal opportunity as educational policy objectives.	—	Source-based post-test and guided discussion.
K2	Identify relevant EU values and rights while checking the scope of applicable instruments.	—	Applied post-test question and rights-mapping task.
K3	Distinguish essential learning outcomes from assessment format requirements.	—	Short source commentary checked by the teacher.
K4	Explain access barriers related to instructions, timing, materials and communication.	—	Case-based question and seminar explanation.
K5	Describe reasonable accommodation and its relationship to equivalent academic standards.	—	Scenario analysis against an instructor checklist.
K6	Explain the role of learner consultation in identifying support needs.	—	Source-based question and brief justification.
K7	Describe transparent assessment criteria and rubrics.	—	Case comparison and reasoned explanation.
K8	Distinguish personal support information from information necessary for assessment.	—	Evidence checklist and post-test question.

K9	Identify institutional roles in consultation, implementation and review.	—	Stakeholder map and oral explanation.
K10	Explain indicators for evaluating access, participation and assessment fairness.	—	Evaluation plan and applied post-test question.

SKILLS

no	Results	Reference to directional results	Verification method
S1	Locate and interpret selected inclusion-policy sources.	—	Source record reviewed for accuracy.
S2	Audit a supplied assessment for avoidable barriers.	—	Individual analytical task with teacher feedback.
S3	Map each essential learning outcome to suitable assessment evidence.	—	Case worksheet and oral explanation.
S4	Conduct a simulated learner consultation without relying on stereotypes.	—	Supervised workshop product assessed with a rubric.
S5	Compare alternative assessment formats for validity and accessibility.	—	Assumptions and limitations checklist.
S6	Design justified support measures that preserve academic standards.	—	Practical output and reasoned justification.
S7	Create an outcome-to-criteria matrix and marking rubric.	—	Case portfolio assessed against stated criteria.
S8	Draft a consultation, implementation and review workflow.	—	Final written product and individual contribution record.
S9	Design an accessibility checklist and three monitoring indicators.	—	Checklist review of communication or monitoring output.
S10	Explain and defend the proposed assessment package.	—	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 Design accessible assessment and support arrangements that preserve learning standards while removing avoidable barriers to participation 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 — Inclusive learning and assessment Taught by: Dr. Habil. Olena Pimenova. Essential learning outcomes; access barriers; alternative formats; transparent rubrics and equivalent standards.		
	Block 2 — Rights and institutional responsibilities Taught by: Dr. Dawid Stadniczeńko. EU rights and inclusion frameworks; scope; privacy; consultation, implementation and review responsibilities.		
	Block 3 — Accessible communication and learner perspectives Taught by: Prof. Dr. Habil. Yan Kapranov. Clear instructions; language and cultural inclusion; respectful consultation and feedback.		

no	Description of the issue	Number of Hours	
		Lectures and practice	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
	Block 4 — Implementation policy and stakeholder dialogue Taught by: Dr. Serhat Demir. Stakeholder session; feasibility; implementation plans; indicators and institutional review.		
	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 educational inclusion. Diagnostic activity; analyse the accommodation request and staff concerns.		
	Day 2 — Equal opportunities and policy frameworks. Map responsibilities and distinguish policy aims from applicable obligations.		
	Day 3 — Learning outcomes and academic standards. Identify essential outcomes and separate them from avoidable format barriers.		
	Day 4 — Barriers and learner consultation. Audit instructions and materials; practise a respectful consultation.		
	Day 5 — Accessible assessment design. Generate alternative formats and compare their validity and feasibility.		
	Day 6 — Rubrics and equivalent standards. Draft criteria and test equivalent evidence of achievement across formats.		
	Day 7 — Stakeholder perspectives. Structured dialogue with a disability, student-support or civil-society practitioner.		
	Day 8 — Implementation and privacy. Design responsibilities, consultation records and a review pathway.		
	Day 9 — Prototype testing and revision. Peer-test accessible tasks and revise the package using feedback.		
	Day 10 — Evaluation and transfer. Defend the assessment design; post-test and structured learning feedback.		
	4) Assessed student outputs A team inclusive assessment package: a redesigned task, outcome-to-criteria matrix, marking rubric and 1,200–1,500-word rationale. Add a consultation and implementation workflow, an accessibility checklist and three monitoring indicators. Demonstrate how the same essential learning outcomes can be assessed through an accessible format. Each student submits an individual 500–700-word explanation of one accommodation decision and its limitations.		

no	Description of the issue	Number of Hours	
		Lectures and practice	
		Full-Time Study	Part-Time Study
	Flagship case: Reasonable Accommodation Lab — Fair Assessment in Practice 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	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.

ID	Source and reading focus
R4	European Commission. (2021). Union of Equality: Strategy for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 2021–2030 (COM(2021) 101 final). Read online Read: Education, accessibility and equal participation priorities.
R5	UNESCO. (2017). A guide for ensuring inclusion and equity in education. Read online Read: Conceptual framework and the review of inclusion in policy and practice.
R6	UNESCO. (2020). Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and education — All means all. Read online Read: Overview and recommendations on barriers to inclusion.
R7	CAST. (2024). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0. Read online Read: Engagement, representation, and action and expression guidelines.
R8	United Nations. (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Read online Read: Articles 2, 5, 9 and 24 on accommodation, equality, accessibility and education.

Recommended reading

Selected research and guidance for developing the school assignment.

ID	Source and reading focus
P1	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
P2	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
P3	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
P4	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights & Council of Europe. (2018). Handbook on European non-discrimination law: 2018 edition. Read online Focus: Non-discrimination
P5	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
P6	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
P7	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
P8	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
P9	World Wide Web Consortium. (2024). Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2. W3C Recommendation, 12 December 2024. Read online Focus: Digital accessibility

ID	Source and reading focus
P10	UNESCO. (2019). Recommendation on Open Educational Resources (OER). Read online Focus: Open licensing and educational resources

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	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
A4	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
A5	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
A6	UNESCO. (2013). Intercultural competences: Conceptual and operational framework. Read online Focus: Intercultural concepts and practice
A7	Deardorff, D. K. (2020). Manual for developing intercultural competencies: Story circles. UNESCO and Routledge. DOI and full text Focus: Listening and facilitated dialogue
A8	OECD. (2022). OECD guidelines for citizen participation processes. OECD Publishing. DOI and full text Focus: Inclusive participation design
A9	OECD. (2020). Innovative citizen participation and new democratic institutions: Catching the deliberative wave. OECD Publishing. DOI and full text Focus: Deliberative democracy
A10	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 Focus: EU competences and institutional scope

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.