

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32626/2309-9763.2026-40-201-212>

УДК 37.014.5:005.336.2-051(438:477)

Olha Lavro,

PhD student at Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,

Lecturer at the Department of Foreign Languages,

Zhytomyr Military Institute named after S. P. Koroliov, Zhytomyr,

Ukraine

ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-1285-9790

olialavro1999@gmail.com

DEVELOPING A TRAINING PROGRAM FOR EXPERTS IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION IN UKRAINE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF UKRAINIAN AND POLISH PRACTICES

Abstract. The full-scale russian invasion of Ukraine has fundamentally disrupted the national educational landscape, simultaneously accelerating the urgency of ongoing structural reforms and introducing unprecedented demands for post-conflict recovery. Central to these systemic transformations is the professionalization of experts in the field of education – specialists tasked with quality assurance, accreditation, and pedagogical support. This article presents a comparative policy analysis of the institutional frameworks governing the training and deployment of experts in the field of education in Ukraine and the Republic of Poland. The study aims to distil actionable insights from the mature, decentralized Polish system to inform the conceptualization of a resilient, crisis-aware training program for Ukrainian experts. Methodologically, the research relies on a comparative documentary analysis of legislative frameworks, national policy strategies, and institutional reports. It examines the historical trajectories and contemporary mandates of key national bodies, including the Polish Centre for Education Development (ORE) and the Ukrainian National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA), and the State Quality Service of Education (SQE). The findings reveal a fundamental conceptual divergence: while the Polish system cultivates the expert primarily as a developmental «mentor» operating within a high-trust, decentralized network, the Ukrainian model, driven by an accelerated EU integration timeline and an imperative to combat legacy corruption, currently prioritizes the expert as an independent «auditor, consultant». The paper argues against the direct transplantation of Polish practices. Instead, it proposes a context-sensitive adaptation of Poland's coordinated multi-level training infrastructure, modular e-learning ecosystems, and formalized mentorship networks. Crucially, the study concludes that any adapted Ukrainian training framework must be conceptually redesigned to incorporate trauma-informed pedagogy and crisis management competencies. This ensures that the new era of experts is equipped to navigate both European accreditation standards and the profound psycho-social exigencies of wartime and post-war educational reconstruction.

Keywords: expert in the field of education; professional training; study programme; quality assurance; comparative education policy; professional development; post-conflict recovery; educational reform; educational resilience; Ukraine; Poland.

1. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the problem. The full-scale russian invasion of Ukraine on February 24, 2022, represents not only a profound geopolitical and humanitarian crisis but also a critical inflection point for the nation's educational system. Before the invasion, Ukraine was in the midst of ambitious, systemic reforms, aimed at fundamentally reshaping pedagogical approaches and aligning the educational sector with European standards. A key, though often overlooked, element of this reform architecture was the development of a new era of experts in the field of education – individuals tasked with accreditation, quality assurance, teacher training, and curriculum development. The war has not negated the need for this expertise; it has, in fact, magnified its urgency while radically altering its required substance and scope. This paradigm shift introduces a complex dual challenge: how to sustain the momentum of pre-war reforms while simultaneously adapting the system to the exigent realities of education in and after conflict, a context demanding resilience, trauma-informed pedagogy, and rapid reconstruction.

This paper addresses a central puzzle emerging from this dual challenge: what constitutes an effective training program for experts in the field of education in Ukraine today? I argue that designing such a program requires more than an emergency response; it necessitates a critical and comparative look at established practices in a country that offers relevant, though not identical, parallels. As Iveta Silova has noted, post-socialist education systems are often shaped by a complex interplay of global policy trends and local institutional legacies, resulting in hybrid models of reform that resist simple transplantation. In this context, Poland offers a particularly instructive case. As a neighbouring country that navigated its own post-socialist transition and subsequent European Union integration, Poland provides a valuable – though not uncritical mirror for Ukraine's institutional aspirations [1]. Its experience in building a robust system for expert training offers a rich repository of policy lessons, institutional models, and potential pitfalls. This research, therefore, moves beyond a simple description of systems to engage in a process of «policy learning», seeking not to copy but to selectively and critically adapt practices that could strengthen Ukrainian educational resilience.

The analysis proceeds from the premise that the concept of the «experts in the field of education» is itself a social and political construct, shaped by national histories and policy priorities [1]. The comparison between Ukraine's nascent frameworks, such as those governed by the National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA) and the State Quality Service of Education (SQE), and Poland's more established structures, like the Centre for Education Development (Ośrodek Rozwoju Edukacji, ORE), reveals fundamental divergences in how expertise is defined, certified, and deployed. This paper, which forms a part of my broader PhD dissertation, draws primarily on a comparative analysis of legislative

documents, national policy strategies, and institutional reports from both countries supplemented by preliminary insights from a pilot expert interview.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The transformation of post-socialist education systems and their alignment with European standards has been extensively analysed in contemporary academic discourse. Scholars such as Iveta Silova emphasize that these systems are shaped by a complex interplay of global policy trends and local institutional legacies, resulting in hybrid models of reform that resist simple transplantation. Broad research on European quality assurance frameworks has covered the institutionalization of structural bodies, yet the conceptualization of «experts in the field of education» as a distinct professional cadre remains under-researched. Furthermore, existing literature predominantly examines policy transfer and educational reforms in peacetime contexts. Consequently, a significant unresolved part of the general problem is the lack of empirical and theoretical frameworks for designing expert training programs under the dual, unprecedented pressures of armed conflict and accelerated European integration. This necessitates a critical comparative analysis of mature, decentralized models (such as in Poland) and nascent, crisis-driven models (such as in Ukraine).

2. AIM AND TASKS

The objective of the article. The primary objective of this study is to distil actionable insights from the Polish experience of professionalizing educational experts in order to inform the conceptualization and design of a contextually sensitive, crisis-aware training program for experts in the field of education in Ukraine. To achieve this aim, the study sets the following **tasks**: 1) to compare the historical and contemporary institutional frameworks for expert training in both countries; 2) to analyse the conceptual divergences and structural tensions between the Polish «developmental mentor» model and the Ukrainian «independent auditor» model; and 3) to identify adaptable best practices that address the specific requirements of wartime resilience and post-war reconstruction in Ukraine.

3. RESEARCH FINDINGS

The contemporary systems for training and deploying experts in the field of education in Ukraine and Poland are products of divergent historical paths, despite their shared starting point within the Soviet bloc. While both nations regained or reshaped their statehood following the collapse of communist regimes in 1989 – 1991, they inherited highly centralized educational systems rooted in a paradigm where expertise was synonymous with state control and ideological conformity. The «expert» of the Soviet era, often referred to as a *metodyst* (a Soviet-style methodologist) or an inspector, was primarily an agent of bureaucratic enforcement, tasked with ensuring compliance with curricula and pedagogical doctrines dictated from the centre. The subsequent three decades witnessed a profound, albeit uneven, process of dismantling this legacy.

Poland's trajectory was characterized by a rapid and decisive break with the past, driven by the political imperative of swift integration into Western European structures. The educational reforms of the late 1990s were foundational, introducing decentralization that shifted significant administrative power to local governments (*samorządy*) and fostering institutional autonomy. This process necessitated a re-conceptualization of educational expertise. The role evolved from one of inspection to one of support, evaluation, and professional development. Key institutions were established to facilitate this transition. The Centre for Education Development (*Ośrodek Rozwoju Edukacji, ORE*), created through the merger of several existing bodies in 2010, became a central hub for in-service teacher training and the dissemination of new pedagogical methods [9]. It, along with its predecessors like the National Centre for Supporting Vocational and Continuing Education (*KOWEŻiU*), was instrumental in cultivating a new type of expert focused on quality improvement rather than mere compliance. This transformation was deeply embedded in the logic of Europeanization; alignment with standards from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the European Union was not just a policy goal but a driver of institutional identity, shaping the very definition of what a Polish educational expert should be and do.

Ukraine's path, by contrast, was marked by what Iveta Silova terms a more «ambivalent and contested» relationship with its Soviet past [3]. For much of the 1990s and 2000s, educational reforms were often superficial, with the core structures of the Soviet system, including the pervasive influence of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and the established role of regional methodologists, remaining largely intact. The concept of the expert remained tied to the old paradigm of administrative oversight. A decisive shift only began after the 2014 Revolution of Dignity, which created a powerful political mandate for genuine European integration and systemic de-Sovietization. This period saw the «belated but accelerated» adoption of reforms that Poland had initiated decades earlier [2].

The establishment of the National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA) in 2014 (though it became fully operational later) and the State Quality Service of Education (SQE) in 2017 were landmark events. They signalled a fundamental break from the old model of state inspection and introduced a European-style, peer-review-based approach to quality assurance. These new bodies were tasked with creating a pool of independent, certified experts for accrediting higher education programs (NAQA) and conducting institutional audits of schools (SQE). However, this process was not merely a technical exercise in «policy borrowing». It was, and remains, a deeply political project aimed at dismantling entrenched interests and fostering a new culture of academic integrity and quality [6]. The experts trained by NAQA and SQE were envisioned as change agents, a stark contrast to the roles they historically occupied. Unlike in Poland, where the evolution of expertise was a more gradual, decades-long process, in Ukraine it has been a compressed and intense development, driven by crisis and the urgent need to align with European standards as a matter of national security and identity. Thus, while both countries sought to build modern systems of educational expertise, their journeys were shaped by different timelines, political dynamics, and relationships with the legacy of their socialist pasts.

The institutional frameworks governing the training and operation of experts in the field of education in Poland and Ukraine reflect their distinct reform trajectories. Poland's system is mature, multi-layered, and relatively decentralized, while Ukraine's is newer, more centralized in its quality assurance functions, and still in the process of defining the roles and responsibilities across its institutional landscape.

In Poland, the framework is anchored by the Ministry of Education and Science (Ministerstwo Edukacji i Nauki), which sets the overarching policy but delegates significant operational responsibility. A key piece of legislation, the Act on School Education, outlines the categories of experts, such as those for teacher professional advancement commissions or textbook evaluation [14]. The training and continuous professional development for these experts are largely orchestrated by the Centre for Education Development (ORE). ORE functions as a national support centre, providing standardized training programs, developing materials, and maintaining registers of qualified experts, ensuring a consistent level of competence nationwide [11]. This centralized provision of training contrasts with the decentralized nature of the educational system itself. Alongside ORE, a network of regional and local teacher training centres (*placówki doskonalenia nauczycieli*) offers more localized support, creating a tiered system where national standards are adapted to local needs. The now-integrated KOWEŻiU historically played a similar role specifically for vocational education, highlighting a Polish tendency to create specialized bodies for specific expert functions, which are later consolidated for efficiency.

The Ukrainian framework, shaped by the post-2014 reforms, presents a different model. Here, the dominant institutions are the national quality assurance bodies, born from a political imperative to combat corruption and enforce new standards. The National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA) has established a rigorous, multi-stage process for selecting and training experts for higher education accreditation. This includes online courses, examinations, and interviews, all designed to cultivate a specific set of competencies centred on objectivity, analytical skills, and academic integrity [7]. Its policies explicitly aim to create a pool of experts who are independent from the institutions they evaluate, breaking the closed-loop systems of the past. The NAQA Action Plan for 2024 – 2026 further emphasizes the internationalization of its expert pool and the continuous professional development of existing experts, signaling an ambition to align fully with the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG) [8].

For general secondary education, the State Quality Service (SQE) performs a similar function, training experts to conduct institutional audits of schools. These audits are not inspections in the Soviet sense; they are designed to be supportive, evaluating the entire educational environment and providing recommendations for improvement based on clearly defined criteria [5]. However, a significant portion of expert development in the school sector still occurs within the legacy system of regional In-service Teacher Training Institutes (IPPEs). These institutes, while undergoing their own transformation, have historically been responsible for the continuous professional development of all pedagogical staff, including those in leadership or methodological roles. There is an emergent tension and overlap between the centrally managed, competency-based training provided by SQE for its specific audit functions, and the broader, more traditional pedagogical training offered by the regional

IPPEs. Unlike the Polish model, where the national body (ORE) and regional centres have more clearly delineated, complementary roles, the Ukrainian system appears to be navigating a more complex co-existence of new, specialized quality assurance agencies and established regional training infrastructures.

While Poland and Ukraine share a common goal of aligning their educational systems with European standards, a closer analysis reveals fundamental divergences in how they conceptualize, institutionalize, and operationalize the role of the educational expert. These differences are not merely technical; they reflect distinct political priorities, historical legacies, and institutional capacities, which in turn generate significant challenges for policy learning and transfer.

A primary divergence lies in the conceptualization of «expertise» itself. In Poland, the role has matured into a professionalized function focused on development and support. The Polish expert, particularly one operating under the auspices of ORE or regional teacher training centres, is primarily a facilitator of professional growth, a consultant, and a peer evaluator. This model evolved within a context of established decentralization and institutional trust. In Ukraine, by contrast, the emerging role of the expert, as shaped by new quality assurance bodies (NAQA and SQE), reflects a dual function – as a guarantor of standards and as an agent of disruption. The training for NAQA experts, for instance, is heavily focused on the procedural and ethical dimensions of accreditation, aiming to build a cadre capable of resisting the corrupt practices of the past [7]. This represents a deliberate redrawing of professional jurisdictions, where the authority of the expert is derived not from pedagogical seniority (the old Soviet model) but from a claim to procedural objectivity and independence – a classic case of a new professional segment carving out its niche [1]. The Ukrainian expert is thus conceived as an external auditor first and a developmental mentor second, a prioritization dictated by the urgent need to build system-wide trust and credibility.

This conceptual difference is inextricably linked to the divergent models of centralization. Poland's system can be described as one of coordinated decentralization. The Ministry sets the direction, ORE provides standardized training and resources, but the application and further professional development are handled by a robust network of regional and local institutions. This allows for flexibility and adaptation to local contexts. Ukraine's model is more akin to a centralized intervention within a decentralizing system. The post-2014 reforms created powerful, top-down quality assurance agencies that operate nationally. NAQA and SQE have a clear mandate to enforce a single, high standard of quality across the country, a necessary step to overcome regional disparities and vested interests. This has led to a palpable tension. While administrative and financial decentralization empowers local communities and schools, the quality assurance framework recentralizes a critical function, creating a potential clash between local autonomy and national standardization.

This tension manifests as institutional friction. In Poland, the national (ORE) and regional (*placówki doskonalenia*) bodies have largely complementary functions. In Ukraine, the new quality assurance agencies and the old regional In-service Teacher Training Institutes (IPPEs) exist in a more ambiguous and sometimes competitive relationship. The SQE trains experts for its institutional audits according to a specific, competency-based framework [5].

The IPPEs, however, continue to provide broader, often more traditional, professional development for school leaders and teachers, who may also be SQE experts. This can result in fragmented or even contradictory training, where an expert receives procedural instruction from the national agency but pedagogical guidance from a regional institute still partially rooted in older methodologies. This lack of a coherent, system-wide strategy for expert development, bridging both quality assurance and pedagogical support, is a significant challenge for Ukraine.

Finally, the very nature of policy transfer between the two systems is fraught with contradictions. While Ukraine rightly looks to the transparency and established procedures of the Polish system as a model, the contexts are profoundly different. The Polish model of a supportive, developmental expert is the product of three decades of peacetime reform and gradual trust-building. Ukraine is attempting to implement similar reforms under the extreme pressures of war and an accelerated EU accession timeline, which prioritizes accountability, anti-corruption, and rapid verification of standards above all else. Simply adopting the Polish model of a developmental expert without first firmly establishing the institutional and ethical foundations of quality assurance would be premature. The core challenge for Ukraine is therefore not to choose between the Polish «developmental» model and its own «auditor» model, but to find a way to sequence them, building a foundation of rigorous quality assurance upon which a more supportive, trust-based culture of professional expertise can eventually be built.

Engaging in policy learning between Poland and Ukraine requires a departure from the notion of simple «best practice» transfer. Given the profound contextual differences – most notably, Ukraine’s active state of war and its compressed reform timeline – a more nuanced, experimental approach is necessary. This involves identifying specific mechanisms within the Polish system, interrogating their underlying principles, and exploring how they might be radically adapted to function within Ukraine’s unique reality. Three areas from the Polish experience seem particularly promising for such critical adaptation: the coordinated training infrastructure, the use of modular e-learning platforms, and the formalization of mentoring networks.

The most compelling feature of the Polish system is its coordinated, multi-level infrastructure for professional development, linking the national Centre for Education Development (ORE) with a network of regional and local teacher training centers (placówki doskonalenia nauczycieli). ORE develops standardized training programs and materials for various expert roles, ensuring a baseline of quality and a common conceptual language across the country [11]. This provides a potential solution to the institutional friction identified in Ukraine between national quality agencies (NAQA, SQE) and regional In-service Teacher Training Institutes (IPPEs). A hypothetical adaptation could see the development of a core curriculum for Ukrainian experts, co-designed by NAQA, SQE, and the Ministry of Education and Science. This curriculum, focusing on procedural ethics, quality criteria, and analytical methods, could then be licensed or mandated for delivery through the existing IPPE network. Such a move would not only harmonize training standards but also repurpose the IPPEs, integrating them into the new quality assurance paradigm rather than leaving them as competing sources of professional identity. The

Polish model shows that national standardization and regional delivery are not mutually exclusive; they can be mutually reinforcing.

A second, highly transferable practice is Poland's extensive use of digital infrastructure for expert training. ORE's e-learning platform (platforma.ore.edu.pl) serves as a national hub, offering a wide array of online courses, webinars, and digital resources for teachers and experts [10]. This model offers a powerful blueprint for Ukraine, where the war has made remote and flexible learning not a convenience but a necessity. Developing a similar unified digital platform in Ukraine could serve multiple functions: it could host the standardized training modules discussed above, provide a secure repository for audit and accreditation materials, and foster a virtual community of practice for experts. The feasibility of creating such a platform from scratch during wartime is questionable. However, a phased approach seems plausible. Initially, this could involve leveraging existing technologies to create a central resource portal, later evolving into a more interactive platform with modular courses. This approach aligns with recommendations from international bodies like UNESCO, which emphasize the need for flexible, technology-enabled learning systems to ensure educational continuity during crises [13]. The Polish experience provides a concrete example of what a resilient, state-supported digital ecosystem for professional development can look like.

Finally, Poland's system offers insights into formalizing mentorship. While less centralized than its training programs, the Polish framework for professional advancement recognizes experienced, high-performing teachers (*nauczyciel dyplomowany*), who often take on mentoring roles within their schools and regions [14]. This concept could be adapted to address the challenge of scaling up Ukraine's expert pool rapidly. A structured «train-the-mentor» program could be established, identifying experienced Ukrainian experts certified by NAQA or SQE and training them specifically in coaching and mentoring methodologies. These lead experts could then support newly trained colleagues, providing guidance on complex cases, ethical dilemmas, and report writing. This creates a cascading model of professional development that is less reliant on centralized, in-person training sessions and more embedded in a network of peer support. The key here is adaptation: rather than just expecting mentorship to happen organically, Ukraine could learn from Poland by creating a formal status and support structure for expert-mentors.

However, the process of adapting these practices is fraught with risks that demand an experimental mindset. Could a nationally mandated curriculum stifle regional innovation at the IPPEs, or would it resolve the current institutional confusion? This is not a theoretical question. A graduate of a regional ORE-led training program interviewed for this study pointed directly to the «lack of coordination and duplication of training» between her institute and the SQE, describing a system where school leaders are unsure whose guidance to follow. She advocated for a «*unified national approach*» to set core competencies for experts, but one that explicitly empowers regional centres like the IPPEs to design and deliver the training with «flexibility to meet local needs». How would a mentoring network, another promising Polish practice, function in a low-trust environment where the legacy of hierarchical inspection is still potent? Most critically, any training program for Ukrainian experts must be fundamentally redesigned to address the deep traumas of war. Polish curricula, developed in peacetime, do not contain modules on identifying

student trauma, implementing psychosocial support, or planning for education in post-conflict recovery. Therefore, a central task of policy learning is not just to borrow structures, but to infuse them with new, contextually vital content. This would mean integrating guidelines on crisis-responsive education from sources like the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) into the very core of any adapted training module. Ultimately, the Polish system offers a valuable set of tools and institutional hypotheses. For Ukraine, the task is to treat them not as a finished blueprint, but as a starting point for a process of creative and context-aware experimentation.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Through this research, I set out to understand how Ukraine might design a training system for experts in the field of education amidst war and reform. The Polish experience served as a useful point of reference – but one that had to be questioned at every turn. The Polish case serves as a critical, if imperfect, mirror, reflecting both the possibilities of a mature, decentralized system and the deep contextual chasms that separate the two nations' present realities. My analysis suggests that the primary challenge for Ukraine is not a lack of reformist ambition, but a series of structural and conceptual tensions that complicate the process of policy learning. These include the conflicting conceptualizations of the expert as either an «auditor» or a «mentor», the institutional friction between new quality assurance agencies and legacy training institutes, and the overarching paradox of attempting to foster a trust-based developmental culture within a context that demands stringent, top-down accountability.

The Polish experience underscores that a functional expert system relies on institutional coherence and a clear division of labour – outcomes of a decades-long, peacetime evolution. Ukraine does not have the luxury of such time. Therefore, the goal cannot be replication. Instead, the task is one of radical and context-aware adaptation. The Polish models of coordinated training infrastructure, national e-learning platforms, and formalized mentorship offer powerful structural hypotheses, but they must be infused with content that is uniquely Ukrainian. This means embedding competencies related to trauma-informed pedagogy, crisis management, and post-conflict recovery into the very DNA of any training program. The expert of tomorrow's Ukraine must be as adept at identifying and supporting a traumatized child as they are at evaluating a curriculum for compliance with European standards.

Moving forward, this research will pivot to a more intensive qualitative phase, seeking to deepen the insights gained from the preliminary interview in Lviv. By engaging with a broader range of experts from NAQA, SQE, IPPEs, and their Polish counterparts, I aim to further test the feasibility of the adaptive models proposed in this paper. The ultimate objective remains the development of a flexible, modular, and resilient training program framework that can serve Ukraine not only in its current struggle for survival but in the monumental task of post-war reconstruction that lies ahead. The future of the Ukrainian education system depends on its ability to cultivate a new generation of experts who embody

both the highest standards of professional integrity and the deepest commitment to human-centered, resilient pedagogy.

The findings of this study, including the comparative analysis and the conducted expert interviews, will serve as preliminary groundwork for my future doctoral research. These materials will be **further developed**, expanded, and systematically analysed as part of my dissertation, which aims to explore the evolution of educational expertise and quality assurance in post-socialist contexts.

5. REFERENCES (TRANSLITERATED)

1. Abbott, A., 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
2. Berezivska, L., Kalashnikova, L. S., Ogienko, O. O., & Pinchuk, O. S., 2023. The New Ukrainian School Reform and Its Impact on the Development of School Principals' Leadership Potential. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(6). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432231184394>.
3. Chankseliani, M., & Silova, I. (Eds.), 2018. *Comparing Post-socialist Transformations: Purposes, Policies, and Practices in Education*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.
4. Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies, 2010. *INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*. New York, NY: INEE.
5. *Approving the Procedure for Conducting Institutional Audits of General Secondary Education Institutions*. Order No. 17. Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. Available at: zakon.rada.gov.ua.
6. *Development of the National Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education for 2020, 2021*. National Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education. Kyiv: NAQA.
7. Regulations on NAQA Experts and Expert Groups, 2024. National Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, protocol 15(65).
8. Strategy and Action Plan for the Development of NAQA for 2024–2026, 2023. National Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education. Kyiv: NAQA.
9. *Report on the Activities of the Centre for Education Development for 2011, 2012*. Education Development Center. Warsaw: ORE.
10. *Report on the Implementation of Tasks in 2022, 2023*. Education Development Center. Warsaw: ORE.
11. Statute of the Centre for Education Development in Warsaw, 2018. Education Development Center. Warsaw: ORE.
12. Silova, I. (Ed.), 2010. *Post-Socialist Mobilities: Cross-Border Transformations in Education and Gender in the Post-Soviet Block*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.
13. *Education in Emergencies*, 2017. UNESCO Paris: UNESCO. Available at: unesco.org.
14. Ustawa z dnia 14 grudnia 2016 r. – Prawo oświatowe [Act of 14 December 2016 – Law on School Education], 2017. Dz.U. z 2017 r. poz. 59.

РОЗРОБКА ПРОГРАМИ ПРОФЕСІЙНОЇ ПІДГОТОВКИ ЕКСПЕРТІВ У ГАЛУЗІ ОСВІТИ В УКРАЇНІ: ПОРІВНЯЛЬНЕ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ТА ПОЛЬСЬКИХ ПРАКТИК

Лавро Ольга Олегівна,

аспірантка Львівського національного університету імені І. Я. Франка,

викладач кафедри іноземних мов,

Житомирський військовий інститут імені С. П. Корольова,

Житомир, Україна

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1285-9790>

olialavro1999@gmail.com

Анотація. Повномасштабне російське вторгнення в Україну фундаментально дестабілізувало національний освітній ландшафт, водночас каталізувавши нагальність структурних реформ та сформувавши безпрецедентні виклики щодо повоєнного відновлення. Центральним елементом цих системних трансформацій є професіоналізація експертів у галузі освіти – фахівців, на яких покладено функції забезпечення якості, акредитації та педагогічного (консультативного) супроводу. У статті представлено порівняльний аналіз інституційних моделей підготовки та залучення експертів у галузі освіти в Україні та Республіці Польща. Метою дослідження є виокремлення релевантного досвіду зрілої децентралізованої польської системи для концептуалізації адаптивної, кризово-орієнтованої програми підготовки українських фахівців. Методологічно дослідження ґрунтується на порівняльному аналізі нормативно-правової бази, національних стратегій та інституційних звітів, зіставляючи історичні траєкторії та поточні повноваження ключових національних інституцій, серед яких польський Центр розвитку освіти (ORE), а також українські Національне агентство із забезпечення якості вищої освіти (НАЗЯВО) та Державна служба якості освіти (ДСЯО). Результати дослідження виявляють фундаментальну концептуальну дивергенцію: якщо польська система формує експерта насамперед як «ментора» з розвитку, що діє в межах децентралізованої мережі з високим рівнем довіри, то українська модель, детермінована прискореним курсом на євроінтеграцію та імперативом подолання корупційної спадщини, наразі пріоритезує роль експерта як незалежного «аудитора, консультанта». У статті аргументується недоцільність прямого перенесення іноземного досвіду. Натомість пропонується контекстуально чутлива адаптація польської координованої багаторівневої інфраструктури підготовки, модульних екосистем електронного навчання та формалізованих менторських мереж. Зроблено висновок, що будь-яка адаптована українська модель підготовки повинна бути докорінно переосмислена шляхом інтеграції травмо-орієнтованої педагогіки та антикризового менеджменту. Це гарантуватиме, що нова генерація експертів буде здатна не лише імплементувати європейські стандарти акредитації, але й

ефективно реагувати на глибокі психосоціальні виклики воєнного часу та повоєнної відбудови освіти.

Ключові слова: експерт у галузі освіти; професійна підготовка; освітня програма; забезпечення якості освіти; порівняльна освітня політика; професійний розвиток; повоєнне відновлення; освітня реформа; освітня резильєнтність; Україна; Польща.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Abbott, A., 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
2. Berezivska, L., Kalashnikova, L. S., Ogienko, O. O., & Pinchuk, O. S., 2023. The New Ukrainian School Reform and Its Impact on the Development of School Principals' Leadership Potential. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 51(6). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432231184394>.
3. Chankseliani, M., & Silova, I. (Eds.), 2018. *Comparing Post-socialist Transformations: Purposes, Policies, and Practices in Education*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.
4. Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies, 2010. *INEE Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery*. New York, NY: INEE.
5. Міністерство освіти і науки України, 2019. Про затвердження Порядку проведення інституційного аудиту закладів загальної середньої освіти: Наказ МОН України від 09.01.2019 № 17 [Онлайн]. Доступно: <<https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0250-19>>.
6. Національне агентство із забезпечення якості вищої освіти, 2021. *Звіт про діяльність Національного агентства із забезпечення якості вищої освіти за 2020 рік*. Київ: НАЗЯВО.
7. Національне агентство із забезпечення якості вищої освіти, 2024. *Положення про експертів та експертні групи Національного агентства із забезпечення якості вищої освіти*, протокол № 15 (65) [Онлайн]. Доступно: <<https://naqa.gov.ua>>.
8. Національне агентство із забезпечення якості вищої освіти, 2023. *Стратегія та план дій щодо розвитку Національного агентства із забезпечення якості вищої освіти на 2024–2026 роки*. Київ: НАЗЯВО.
9. *Sprawozdanie z działalności Ośrodka Rozwoju Edukacji za rok 2011*, 2012. Ośrodek Rozwoju Edukacji. Warsaw: ORE.
10. *Sprawozdanie z realizacji zadań w 2022 roku*, 2023. Ośrodek Rozwoju Edukacji. Warsaw: ORE.
11. *Statut Ośrodka Rozwoju Edukacji w Warszawie*, 2018. Ośrodek Rozwoju Edukacji. Warsaw: ORE.
12. Silova, I. (Ed.), 2010. *Post-Socialist Mobilities: Cross-Border Transformations in Education and Gender in the Post-Soviet Block*. Oxford, UK: Symposium Books.
13. *Education in Emergencies*, 2017. UNESCO Paris: UNESCO. Available at: <unesco.org>.
14. Ustawa z dnia 14 grudnia 2016 r. – Prawo oświatowe, 2017. Dz.U. z 2017 r. poz. 59.

Дата першого подання статті до публікації: 09.02.2026

Дата прийняття статті до публікації після рецензування: 02.03.2026

Дата публікації: 29.05.2026