UDC 378.147:340
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31359/1993-0941-2024-48-552

I. V. Kostenko, *Ph.D., Researcher Scientific Research Institute of the State Building and Local Government of National Academy of Law Sciences of Ukraine*
orcid ID : 0000-0002-8784-5422

T. V. Chebotarova, *junior researcher in the municipal law and local self-government sector of the Research Institute of State Building and Local Self-Government of the National Academy of Public Administration under the President of Ukraine*
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-4179-1135

CONSTRUCTIVE ALIGNMENT IN LEGAL EDUCATION: COHERENT OUTCOMES AND DEEP LEARNING

Abstract. *This article explores the integration of the constructive alignment model within legal education, emphasising the importance of coherence between intended learning outcomes, teaching strategies, and assessment methods. Constructive alignment, as proposed by Biggs and Tang, provides a pedagogical framework that promotes deep learning and critical engagement, both of which are essential competencies for future legal professionals. The paper highlights how active learning, problem-based approaches, and game-based methodologies contribute to the development of student autonomy, legal reasoning, and reflective*

judgement. Particular attention is paid to how these strategies align with the objectives of contemporary legal curricula and prepare students to function effectively in complex, dynamic legal environments.

Drawing on international research and best practices in higher education pedagogy, the article analyses the challenges and opportunities of implementing constructive alignment in law faculties. Additionally, it discusses the transformative role of the educator – from a transmitter of knowledge to a facilitator of learning – and considers how digital technologies, formative assessment, and student-centred teaching contribute to meaningful legal education reform. The study synthesises evidence from a variety of scholarly sources and provides practical insights for aligning course design, delivery, and evaluation with the cognitive and ethical demands of the legal profession in the 21st century.

Keywords: *constructive alignment, legal education, learning outcomes, critical thinking, gamification.*

Introduction. In today's world, characterised by rapid changes in the legal, technological, and social environment, traditional approaches to legal education are increasingly proving insufficient for shaping a competitive speciality. The requirements for a 21st-century lawyer include not only knowledge of the regulatory framework but also a high level of critical thinking, analytical skills, adaptability, communication competence, and the ability to make decisions in conditions of uncertainty.

In this context, the concept of constructive alignment becomes particularly relevant, which involves the holistic design of the educational process through the alignment of learning outcomes, teaching methods, and assessment tools. Such an approach fosters the formation of deep, conscious knowledge rather than mere mechanical memorisation of material.

Legal education, as a specific field of professional training, has outstanding potential for implementing constructive alignment, particularly through interactive, problem-orientated, and game-based learning methodologies, which are gaining popularity in leading higher education institutions worldwide.

However, in the Ukrainian academic environment, the practical implementation of this model in the legal field remains insufficiently developed.

Thus, the study of the potential of constructive alignment in the context of legal education is timely and socially significant, as it aims to enhance the quality of legal training, the readiness of lawyers for interdisciplinary interaction, and their successful professional realisations.

Research Methods. The methodological basis of the research is a combination of qualitative, analytical, and comparative approaches, which allows for a comprehensive examination of the application of constructive alignment in legal education.

The research is based on the principles of constructivist learning theory and the approach to educational program design proposed by J. Biggs and C. Tang [4], as well as further theoretical developments regarding the alignment of learning outcomes, teaching methods, and assessment forms [3; 13].

For the analysis of the application of constructive alignment in the modern educational space, a content analysis of scientific and analytical sources was used, including international pedagogical publications, reports, educational policies, and models of instructional design [1; 6; 7; 9].

A comparative analysis was used to study the experience of implementing constructive alignment in various academic disciplines and contexts: specifically, in interdisciplinary (Zadravec, 2023) [15], digital (Pereira et al., 2024) [14], and gaming (Adipat et al., 2021; Liu & Israel, 2022) [12], as well as legal education programs.

The interpretive approach allowed tracing the connection between cognitive, metacognitive, and affective components of learning in the context of implementing deep learning, critical thinking [8], student partnerships [7], and problem-oriented learning [11].

The work also incorporates elements of case studies based on the description of CA application practices in specific courses (O'Sullivan, 2024 [13]; Hristov, 2024 [9]; Ali, 2018 [1]), which allowed for the identification of typical models of integrating constructive alignment into the educational process.

Additionally, an analytical review was conducted based on the principles of practical assessment and self-assessment [5; 10], as well

as formative feedback models [15], which are an integral part of the successful implementation of CA.

Presentation of the main research material. Constructive alignment, proposed by John Biggs [3], is an educational model that combines constructivist views of learning with a systematic approach to the design of the educational process. In his seminal 1996 article, Biggs notes that knowledge is not passively transmitted from the teacher to the student but actively constructed by the student through their own cognitive activity in the appropriate learning environment [3, p. 348]. Thus, the main task of the instructor is not to transmit ready-made knowledge but to design conditions and tasks that allow the student to form understanding at a deeper level independently.

The concept received further development in the foundational work by Biggs & Tang (2011), where constructive alignment is defined as the process of aligning three key components of the educational process: intended learning outcomes (ILO), teaching and learning activities (TLA), and assessment tasks (AT) [4, pp. 95–96]. This is not just a logical connection but an educational ecosystem in which each element must clearly reflect the others. When, for example, the learning outcome involves developing the ability to argue and resolve legal cases, the teaching methods should include modelling court processes, debates, and the analysis of practical situations, while the assessment should consist of tasks that allow demonstrating these skills in context [4, pp. 191–193].

In the context of legal education, this has special significance, as Biggs emphasises: only functional learning outcomes – that is, those that involve the student's ability to apply knowledge in specific situations – have a transformative nature and contribute to «deep learning» [4, pp. 160–165]. Biggs distinguishes between two types of learning outcomes: declarative (knowing about) and functional (knowing how). In a traditional academic context, declarative outcomes often dominate, for example, knowledge of legal norms. However, constructive alignment focuses specifically on functional outcomes, such as the ability to apply the law in practical cases, formulate legal positions, argue decisions, and so on.

From this perspective, constructive alignment is not just a «planned» coordination. It serves as a filter and a critical tool that forces each instructor to check: do their methods truly lead to the expected results? Does the assessment verify exactly what is being taught and learnt? Biggs emphasises that often failures in achieving educational goals are not related to «bad» students but to the «misaligned» course design, where the objectives, activities, and assessment are not synchronised [4, pp. 281–283].

An essential aspect of the Biggs & Tang approach is also the concept of the zone of proximal development and the support of the students' metacognition. The authors emphasise the necessity for students to be not just objects of pedagogical influence but active participants in the processes of planning, assessment, and reflection. For example, formative assessment, which allows students to understand their progress and identify gaps, directly follows from the logic of constructive alignment, where assessment becomes part of the learning process rather than just a tool for summative evaluation [4, pp. 224–226].

Another significant aspect highlighted in Biggs' works is the connection between the teaching context and the type of thinking required by the discipline. Legal education, being intensely cognitive, requires the design of teaching at the levels of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, that is, at the higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy. Constructive alignment allows these cognitive levels to be immediately «embedded» into the system of outcomes, activities, and assessment, thereby avoiding superficial learning and fragmented knowledge acquisition [3; 4].

Thus, constructive alignment in Biggs' interpretation is not just a methodology or a set of techniques. It is a paradigm of deeply integrated learning, based on the understanding of the learning process as a holistic and active process of knowledge construction. In the context of modern legal education, this approach opens opportunities for training not only «knowledgeable» but also «capable» specialists who can solve complex problems in conditions of uncertainty.

The new understanding of this concept, as noted by O'Sullivan, lies in shifting the focus from the formal alignment of components

to a deep transformation of thinking about learning – through the prioritisation of systematic and precise definition of learning outcomes [13]. The author emphasises that it is the specificity and structure of learning outcomes that determine the logic and content of the entire course: if the outcome is formulated superficially or abstractly, no pedagogical strategy will be able to ensure effective learning.In this context, O'Sullivan proposes a distinction between two types of knowledge: knowledge «about» (knowledge about) and knowledge «how» or «in action» (knowledge of). If the first is reproductive and often transmitted through lectures or textbooks, then the second is embodied, situational, and formed through direct experience and immersion in the professional context [13]. For legal education, this distinction is critically important: a graduate must not only know, for example, how to interpret a legal norm but also be able to apply it promptly in a real case, taking into account the context, risks, and ethical dilemmas.

The article also addresses the issue of the taxonomic level of outcomes: O'Sullivan supports the idea that effective ILOs should go beyond the description of knowledge and include actions (apply, evaluate, create), which correspond to the higher levels of the revised Bloom's taxonomy. Such an approach enables not only the construction of meaningful activities but also precise alignment with assessment forms. Especially this applies to situations where a student must demonstrate the ability for autonomous legal thinking, position construction, or decision justification – elements that cannot be assessed through formal multiple-choice tests.

Moreover, O'Sullivan draws attention to the risks of excessive standardisation in constructive alignment, where the formulation of outcomes becomes merely an administrative procedure. In such cases, there is an imitation of constructive logic without any real impact on learning. He calls this phenomenon the «illusion of control,» which neither fosters the development of teaching flexibility nor supports active learning [13].In legal education, this means a shift from programs focused on the mastery of codes and definitions to courses that prepare students for practical activities: case management, legal analysis, and ethical judgement. It is here that

O'Sullivan's idea of the transformational potential of learning outcomes as the core of constructive alignment becomes relevant. He emphasises, «The key is not only in formulating what a student should know but also in what they should be able to do with what they know» [13, p. 7].

Thus, the modern interpretation of constructive alignment involves not just the «technical» alignment of goals, methods, and assessments, but also strategic work on the structure and content of expected outcomes. This opens up new opportunities for the development of flexible, professionally relevant courses in the field of law, which not only impart knowledge but also cultivate the ability to apply, critique, and reflect – that is, ensure deep learning.

Within the framework of modern higher education, the need to create not just effective courses or programs but holistic educational ecosystems, where all components – from goal formulation to final assessment – function in harmony, ensuring deep, functional learning, is becoming increasingly relevant. In this context, Slav a Hristov's research is extremely valuable, as it offers a conceptual model of constructive alignment (CA) that not only reflects the logic of Biggs & Tang but also adapts it to the realities of the European higher education system and the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS).

Hristov highlights the critical need for «holistic alignment» among all components of the educational process: course objectives, educational content, student workload, teaching methods, and assessment forms, emphasising that «the success of learning at all levels largely depends on constructive alignment» [9, p. 21]. The author notes that the instructor should start developing the course not by selecting content but by defining clear competencies that the student should acquire, and only after that should they choose appropriate educational activities and assessment methods.

Particular attention deserves the detailed disclosure of the connection between ECTS, learning outcomes (ILO), teaching methods, and assessment forms, which Hristov considers a necessary condition for the internal quality assurance of the educational process. As the authors emphasise, the effective application of ECTS is only

possible if the learning outcomes are already formulated and the educational activities and assessments are built upon them. In other cases, the introduction of credits becomes a formality that has no educational effect [9, p. 24].

A particular emphasis is placed on the importance of assessing not only the educational product (knowledge) but also the process – the metacognitive activity of students, their ability to reflect, integrate knowledge, and apply it in practical situations. This, according to the logic of Biggs & Tang, is the criterion for «deep learning» [4, pp. 160–165].

At the same time, Zadravec's [15] research deepens the discussion by adding a dimension of disciplinary specificity to the model of constructive alignment. The author introduces the concept of a «constructively aligned, internationalised curriculum» as a conceptual bridge between the global goals of higher education (thedevelopment of intercultural competence, transversal skills, and interdisciplinarity) and teaching practices at the level of specific academic disciplines. Within her research, she demonstrates that even with adherence to the formal logic of CA (alignment of outcomes, methods, and assessment), there can be profound differences in the ways this model is implemented depending on the academic field.

According to a survey of 1,367 lecturers from all higher education institutions in Slovenia, Zadravec found that in «soft» disciplines (humanities, social sciences, law, education), the level of internationalised elements in all components of CA – from the formulation of outcomes to assessment methods – is significantly higher than in «hard» disciplines (technical, natural sciences) [15, p. 6]. This confirms the thesis that the disciplinary culture itself shapes the attitudes of educators towards teaching, internationalisation, competency-based approaches, and, accordingly, the application of CA.

Moreover, Zadravec emphasises that constructive alignment should not be a universal model without considering disciplinary contexts. She notes, «Although constructive alignment is often promoted as a general model for curriculum design, our findings show

that its implementation is strongly shaped by the disciplinary background of the academic staff» [15, p. 8].

Thus, a joint reading of the works of Hristov and Zadravec allows us to draw several important conclusions:

– CA should be a flexible model that adapts to the goals and specifics of a particular discipline, rather than a single unified template for all fields of knowledge.

– The integration of competencies into the design of the educational process is a key condition for the successful implementation of CA and cannot be achieved without a profound understanding of what specific knowledge and actions are valuable in a particular professional field.

– Disciplinary culture shapes not only the course content but also the approaches to teaching and assessment, which is why it is important to consider the differences between «soft» and «hard» disciplines when implementing CA.

The internationalisation of learning outcomes and content is not only an addition to the CA model but also a tool for its deepening – through the expansion of students' worldview, the development of intercultural competence, and critical thinking.

Thus, constructive alignment in modern higher education emerges not only as a pedagogical technology but also as a strategic framework for transforming the content and forms of higher education in response to the challenges of the 21st century – globalisation, interdisciplinarity, the labour market, and technological changes.

In the context of digitalisation, the application of outcome-orientated assessment tools becomes particularly significant. Considering the new challenges in higher education, digital technologies are becoming not just auxiliary tools but an integral element of effective instructional design. As Ferrell [6] notes, designing learning and assessment in the digital age requires rethinking approaches to constructing the educational experience. She emphasises that modern platforms and digital tools allow for greater flexibility, transparency, and adaptability in the assessment process, especially in the context of online or blended learning.

Based on the analysis of numerous interviews with lecturers from British universities, Ferrell identifies several key directions for the transformation of assessment in the digital environment: firstly, the importance of considering students’ opinions on the use of digital technologies in education is increasing; secondly, the focus is shifting from formal testing to flexible, substantive, student-centred forms of assessment; thirdly, digital analytical tools (learning analytics) are increasingly being used to monitor success and create individualised learning pathways [6].

Ferrell also draws attention to the effectiveness of the so-called «storyboard approach,» borrowed from the Viewpoints project at the University of Ulster, which allows for the creation of visual models of the educational course, the adaptation of constructive alignment components, and the comprehensive integration of learning outcomes, activities, and assessments. This approach is extremely relevant for legal education, where a significant portion of learning outcomes is related not to the reproduction of knowledge, but to the development of critical thinking, ethical reflection, and argumentation skills – components that are difficult to assess using standard tests.

Another important direction in the digitalisation of educational design is the implementation of artificial intelligence, particularly large language models (LLMs), such as ChatGPT, in the processes of shaping learning outcomes, creating educational tasks, and developing assessment strategies. In the article by Pereira et al. [14], an innovative model for the application of LLM within the framework of constructive alignment is presented, using the example of a master’s course in project management. The authors argue that with the help of ChatGPT, it is possible to automate the definition of learning outcomes, align them with assessment forms, create learning activities, and build a course calendar.

The model proposed by Pereira and colleagues is based on a four-stage process: (1) gathering course information, (2) formulating learning outcomes, (3) developing assessments, and (4) planning the schedule and activities. At each stage, there is an iterative verification of the alignment between the components of constructive alignment. For example, after formulating the learning outcomes, ChatGPT

generates suggestions for appropriate forms of assessment: role-playing games, simulations, group projects, etc., that align not only with the content but also with the cognitive goals of the course.

Although LLMs demonstrate significant potential to support educators, the authors emphasise the necessity of faculty oversight over AI-generated outcomes. ChatGPT, as emphasised in the study, does not always consider the specifics of the discipline or the context of the course and can generate general or overly standardised results, which contradict the principles of academic integrity and instructional design quality. This is why the instructor always retains the final say, requiring expert verification of the proposed solutions [14].

Especially valuable is the fact that the proposed LLM model allows for the integration of assessment into the learning process, thereby supporting the formative function of assessment. For example, ChatGPT can offer individual tasks with automatic feedback, assist in creating criteria-orientated rubrics, and develop tasks for self-assessment or peer assessment within group projects. This aligns with the logic of constructive alignment, where assessment is not just a verification tool but becomes an organic part of the learning experience.

In conclusion, it can be argued that the combination of digital platforms, particularly adaptive assessment tools, with the intellectual capabilities of LLMs opens new horizons for deep, personalised, and effective learning. In the field of legal education, this allows for a transition from standardised tests to authentic forms of assessment – case studies, courtroom simulations, and project work – that better reflect real professional challenges. At the same time, the effectiveness of such an approach depends on the ethical use of AI, adherence to the principles of academic integrity, transparency of algorithms, and the responsibility of the instructor as a facilitator of the learning process.

The development of educational content within the framework of Constructive Alignment (CA) requires a deep understanding of the cognitive level of tasks and their connection to the expected learning outcomes. This involves not only alignment between the content, methods, and forms of assessment but also consideration of the depth of students' cognitive activities. As Ali notes, the effectiveness of CA

largely depends on the level of coherence between formative assessment, the curriculum, and teaching methodologies. Such an approach ensures academic integrity and the alignment of the educational process with contemporary higher education standards [1].

The central element of deep learning is the active engagement of students in knowledge construction through participation in meaningful learning practices. As indicated in the collection edited by Betts, the implementation of problem-orientated learning contributes to the development of critical analysis skills, self-reflection, and collective decision-making [2]. Such an education not only activates the intellectual resources of the student but also fosters the ability to collaborate in complex professional contexts. In the context of legal education, where case analysis, modelling legal situations, and working with legal texts form the foundation of professional activity, problem-orientated approaches prove to be extremely effective.

Particular attention should be paid to the role of gamification within CA as a form of integrating students’ authentic experiences into the learning process. Liu and Israel, studying problem-solving processes in gamified environments, found that students demonstrate different problem-solving strategies depending on the cognitive complexity of the tasks. Data obtained using the hidden Markov model showed that students who progressed to higher phases of thinking (e.g., systematic testing and generalisation of solutions) demonstrated a higher level of awareness of their own thinking process [12]. This confirms that the use of gamification elements is not only a tool for engagement but also contributes to the development of metacognitive competence.

In turn, Adipat emphasises that gamification of the learning environment creates conditions for increased student engagement, reduces anxiety levels before tasks, and enhances motivation to learn [1]. In legal education, where traditional lecture formats often dominate, the introduction of gamified scenarios – such as court trial simulations, debates, or interactive platforms with legal cases – creates new opportunities for developing functional learning outcomes. This allows for a transition from passive absorption of normative material

to its contextual application in complex, sometimes conflicting situations.

However, the effectiveness of such approaches directly depends on the careful design of learning outcomes. As Ali rightly points out, educational objectives should not only reflect the subject matter logic but also correspond to the level of cognitive complexity outlined in Bloom's taxonomy. Tasks that involve merely reproducing information are not capable of activating deep learning. Instead, tasks such as «evaluate,» «create,» and «justify a legal position» stimulate critical thinking and develop professional competence [1].

The integration of gamification, active learning, and problem-orientated approaches within the context of constructive alignment allows for the creation of an environment where each component – goals, methods, assessment – contributes to the development of deep knowledge and professional skills. This meets the requirements of modern legal education, which must prepare not just a «knowledgeable» lawyer but a «capable of acting» lawyer specialist who thinks critically, argues logically, and acts ethically.

Therefore, to ensure the effective implementation of CA in legal education, it is necessary:

– the combination of subject logic with the principles of cognitive psychology;

– consideration of student experience and the involvement of technological tools, particularly gamification;

– the formation of tasks that stimulate analysis, synthesis, and reflection;

– systematic assessment framework with a focus on formative feedback.

Thus, constructive alignment ceases to be merely a tool for the internal quality of the course. It transforms into a methodology for deep change in educational thinking, where learning emerges as an active, conscious, contextualised process capable of providing genuine preparation for a modern specialist in the field of law.

One of the fundamental prerequisites for the effective implementation of constructive alignment (CA) in legal education is the rethinking of the teacher's role. In the traditional model of the

educational process, the instructor serves as the main bearer of knowledge, focused on delivering normative information in the form of lectures, normative materials, or summarised presentations. Such an approach, although it has its historical and structural logic, increasingly demonstrates a limited ability to develop critical thinking, legal reasoning, decision-making in situations of uncertainty, and ethical choice among students.

In contrast to this model, modern pedagogical approaches emphasise the need to shift from the role of a knowledge transmitter to that of a facilitator of the learning process. As Healey, Matthews, and Cook-Sather note, this shift is not only related to teaching methodology but also to a profound restructuring of relationships among participants in the educational process, within which students are recognised as full partners in the process of knowledge creation [7]. This partnership is realised through involving students in the design of learning outcomes, discussing assessment criteria, and jointly interpreting the learning experience. Such an approach aligns with the logic of constructive alignment, where all components of the educational process (goals, methods, and assessment) must be interrelated and logically coherent.

In turn, critical thinking plays an important role in rethinking pedagogical interaction, which, according to bell hooks, is not just an intellectual tool but a practice of freedom means that allows the student not only to consume knowledge but also to understand, analyse, and change the world around them [8]. In the context of CA, this means that critical thinking should not be a side effect or an optional skill but a structural element of learning outcomes. Legal courses should anticipate outcomes that go beyond the reproduction of legal norms and involve the analysis of complex legal situations, formulation of positions, ethical reflection, and integration of interdisciplinary approaches.

These ideas are directly related to the classical principles of CA developed by Biggs and Tang. In their concept, they insist that any learning should begin with a clear formulation of outcomes (ILO), which should reflect not only the subject logic but also the value, cognitive, and practical components of professional activity [4, pp.

95–96]. Particular importance is given to the distinction between declarative and functional learning outcomes: while the former involves knowledge «about something» (for example, knowledge of the provisions of the civil code), the latter involves knowledge «in action,» that is, the ability to apply this knowledge in a specific legal context (for example, solving a case, formulating a legal position).

As Ketteridge notes in the academic practice guide, effective design of learning outcomes should be based on Bloom's taxonomy, with an emphasis on the cognitive levels of «application,» «analysis,» «evaluation,» and «creation» [10]. In legal education, this allows for a transition from the formal assimilation of norms to the development of critical legal thinking, the ability to argue, and the ability to make decisions that align with both norms and professional ethics.

On this basis, the logic of choosing pedagogical strategies is developed. One of the most effective within CA is the problem-based learning (PBL) model, which, as shown by the research of Khoiriyah and Husamah, significantly enhances students' levels of critical and creative thinking, activates their ability to reflect, and makes independent decisions [11]. In legal education, this approach becomes particularly effective due to its proximity to real professional practices: case analysis, process modelling, and role-playing with legal content.

According to Biggs and Tang, such activities as modelling real situations, group discussions of complex cases, debates, and simulations most adequately correspond to high-level cognitive outcomes [4, pp. 191–193]. They not only allow students to demonstrate knowledge but also actively construct new ways to apply it in different contexts. Moreover, in the context of using CA, the choice of such teaching methods is always determined by clearly formulated outcomes. Thus, a «learning ecosystem» is ensured, where each element is interconnected with others.

In the modern educational environment, the digital dimension of teaching and assessment requires special attention. As emphasised in the analytical work of Csap and Funke, digital tools open new opportunities for implementing complex cognitive tasks and formative assessment focused on feedback and supporting learning progress [5]. At the same time, the effective application of digital technologies

is possible only with a clear integration into the logic of CA, where assessment is not a separate procedure but an organic part of the educational process.

Conclusions. As a result of the conducted research, it has been established that the model of constructive alignment, developed by J. Biggs and C. Tang, is an effective pedagogical tool that ensures the internal coherence of the educational process and directs it towards achieving deep, functional learning outcomes. In the context of legal education, this model allows for the transformation of the traditional teaching paradigm, which is primarily focused on the reproductive assimilation of normative material, towards the formation of practical, analytical, and ethics-orientated competencies that meet the modern requirements of the legal profession.

The emphasis on alignment between goals, methods, and assessment fosters students’ awareness of the logic of their learning, the development of reflective thinking, and the ability to autonomously acquire and apply knowledge in a changing professional environment. The results of the analysis of international experience in implementing CA in higher education demonstrate that the effectiveness of this model largely depends on the level of specification of learning outcomes and their correspondence to the cognitive complexity of the discipline, as well as the contextual adaptation to the specifics of the field of knowledge.

A special significance in the process of implementing constructive alignment lies in rethinking the role of the instructor as a facilitator of learning, capable of engaging students in active participation in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the educational process. At the same time, modern digital technologies, including adaptive platforms and large language models (LLM), open new perspectives for designing integrated educational environments that align with the logic of CA and provide individualised support for educational activities.

Therefore, constructive alignment in legal education emerges not only as a didactic strategy but also as a systemic foundation for modernising the content, forms, and methods of legal training, aimed at ensuring academic quality, professional relevance, and social responsibility in educational programs.

Reference:

1. Ali, L. The design of curriculum, assessment and evaluation in higher education with constructive alignment [Електронний ресурс] // *Journal of Education and Learning.* 2018. Vol. 7, No. 3. p. 116–123. URL: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1173088.pdf
2. Betts, T., Carey, R., Kapushion, B. Disrupting traditional pedagogy: active learning in practice. Brighton: Sussex Open Press, 2019. URL: https://openpress.sussex.ac.uk/disruptingtraditionalpedagogy/
3. Biggs, J. Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment // *Higher Education.* 1996. Vol. 32, № 3. P. 347–364. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871.
4. Biggs, J., Tang, C. Teaching for quality learning at university. 4th ed. McGraw-Hill Education, 2011. 418 p. URL: https://cetl.ppu.edu/sites/default/files/publications/-John_Biggs_and_Catherine_Tang-_Teaching_for_Quali-BookFiorg-.pdf
5. Csap , B., Funke, J. The nature of problem solving: using research to inspire 21st century learning. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2017. 320 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264273955-en.
6. Ferrell, G. Designing learning and assessment in a digital age – a new guide for higher and further education. Jisc e-learning blog. 29 January 2018. URL: https://elearning.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2018/01/29/designing-learning-and-assessment-in-a-digital-age-new-guide-for-higher-and-further-education/
7. Healey, M., Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A. (2020). Writing about learning and teaching in higher education: creating and contributing to scholarly conversations across a range of genres. URL: https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/books/writing-about-learning/
8. Hooks, b. Teaching critical thinking: practical wisdom. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2009. 216 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203869192.
9. Hristov, S. (2024). Constructive alignment between objectives, teaching and learning activities, student competencies and assessment methods in higher education. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377320105
10. Ketteridge, S., Marshall, S., Fry, H. (2014.) A handbook for teaching and learning in higher education: enhancing academic practice. 4th ed. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2014. 544 p. URL: http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/leicester/detail.action?docID=1770537
11. Khoiriyah, A., Husamah, H. (2018). Problem-based learning: creative thinking skills, problem-solving skills, and learning outcomes of seventh grade students // Jurnal Pendidikan Biologi Indonesia. Vol. 4, No. 2. p. 151–160. URL: https://www.mendeley.com/catalogue/43a4f125-0946-3fa0-b76ed-de1e42acdd1/

12. Liu, T., Israel, M. (2022). Uncovering students’ problem-solving processes in game-based learning environments. Computers & Education. Vol. 182. Article 104462. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104462.
13. O’Sullivan, M. (2024). Reconceptualising constructive alignment within the curriculum. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2024.2439969.
14. Pereira, E., Mesa, J., Huang, W. (2024). Constructive alignment in a graduate-level project management course: an innovative framework using LLMs. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. Vol. 21. Article 15. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00457-2.
15. Zadravec, K. A. (2023). The impact of academic disciplines on a constructively aligned internationalised curriculum. *BMC Medical Education*. Vol. 23. Article 51. URL: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9942072/

І. В. Костенко, Т. В. Чеботарьова

Конструктивне узгодження в юридичній освіті : цілісні результати та глибинне навчання

Анотація. *У статті досліджується впровадження моделі конструктивного узгодження (Constructive Alignment) у сферу юридичної освіти, з особливим акцентом на необхідність внутрішньої узгодженості між сформульованими результатами навчання, методами викладання та формами оцінювання. Концепція, розроблена Дж. Біггзом і К. Танґом, пропонує цілісну педагогічну рамку, яка спрямована на досягнення глибокого навчання, розвиток критичного мислення та формування функціональних компетентностей, що мають ключове значення для сучасного правника.*

У центрі уваги публікації – аналіз того, яким чином активні методи навчання, проблемно орієнтовані стратегії, а також ігрові й симуляційні підходи сприяють формуванню автономії студента, розвиткові юридичного мислення, навичок аргументації та рефлексивного судження. Авторка підкреслює важливість забезпечення відповідності між методами викладання і змістом освітніх програм, які повинні відповідати вимогам сучасного, динамічного та міждисциплінарного правового середовища.

Спираючись на результати міжнародних досліджень, нормативні документи та передові практики вищої освіти, у статті розглянуто як потенціал конструктивного узгодження, так і виклики, пов’язані

з його імплементацією у вітчизняних правничих факультетах. Особливу увагу приділено трансформації ролі викладача – від носія знань до фасіліматора навчального процесу, а також ролі студента як активного учасника побудови знання.

Важливим компонентом аналізу є інтеграція цифрових інструментів, адаптивного оцінювання, моделей формувального зворотного зв’язку та застосування великих мовних моделей (LLM), які відкривають нові можливості для персоналізації освітнього досвіду.

Крім того, дослідження демонструє, що ефективне впровадження конструктивного узгодження можливе лише за умови чіткого формулювання очікуваних результатів навчання, орієнтованих на високі когнітивні рівні (аналіз, оцінювання, створення) відповідно до оновленої таксономії Блума. Акцентується на необхідності поєднання когнітивної складності, етичного компонента правничої діяльності та актуальних освітніх стратегій. Також наголошується на важливості врахування дисциплінарного контексту під час проєктування навчального курсу та адаптації конструктивного узгодження (Constructive Alignment) до особливостей «гуманітарного» або «технічного» освітнього поля.

Таким чином, конструктивне узгодження розглядається не лише як педагогічна техніка, а як стратегічна рамка, здатна забезпечити змістовне оновлення юридичної освіти. Стаття надає практичні рекомендації щодо розроблення, реалізації та оцінювання курсів, які відповідають когнітивним, професійним і етичним викликам правничої професії у XXI столітті.

***Ключові** слова: конструктивне узгодження, юридична освіта, результати навчання, критичне мислення, гейміфікація.*