УДК 614.2:378.147:004.94
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32782/2415-3583/34.44

Pikhota Tetiana
Director of Business Development, ONIKO
Founder & CEO, AXIC EC

TURNKEY SIMULATION ECOSYSTEMS IN HEALTHCARE EDUCATION: MARKET DYNAMICS, EDUCATIONAL IMPACT, AND IMPLEMENTATION PATHWAY FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND UKRAINE

Healthcare simulation has become a central pillar of competency-based medical education (CBME) and patient-safety reform. In 2024, global investment in medical simulation exceeded $3 billion, reflecting double-digit growth and the rapid adoption of high-fidelity, immersive, and data-driven technologies. This paper examines turnkey simulation ecosystems, comprehensive, service-backed bundles that integrate technology, curriculum, analytics, faculty development, and lifecycle service, contrasted with modular, device-by-device procurement. Through a structured narrative review of peer-reviewed literature, updated standards (INACSL 2024, SSH 2024), and current market analyses, we evaluate educational outcomes, operational efficiencies, and economic implications of turnkey adoption. The article introduces an implementation roadmap for Eastern Europe and Ukraine, aligning with regional financing realities and capacity-building needs. Findings highlight that turnkey ecosystems reduce integration friction, enable standardized and analytics-ready programs, and support defensible assessment data, provided that contracts ensure interoperability and a transparent total cost of ownership (TCO). The discussion concludes with 2024-specific insights into market trajectories, implementation science metrics, and policy recommendations.

Keywords: *healthcare simulation, turnkey ecosystems, VR/AR, competency-based medical education, patient safety, total cost of ownership, implementation science, Eastern Europe, Ukraine.*

JEL Classification: I11, I21, O33, O22, O52

1. Introduction

Simulation in healthcare has matured from peripheral "skills labs" into the backbone of modern CBME and patient-safety programmes. The 2024 update of the INACSL Healthcare Simulation Standards of Best Practice® (HSSOBP) re-emphasised measurable outcomes, data governance, and alignment with competency frameworks, particularly Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs) and programme-level assessment models. In parallel, accreditation frameworks from the Society for Simulation in Healthcare (SSH) expanded their domains to include operational sustainability and lifecycle management.

Across OECD countries, simulation is now embedded not only in medical curricula but also in continuing education and interprofessional team training. Drivers include:

– persistent mismatch between theoretical knowledge and clinical readiness;

– limits on supervised clinical practice due to safety and workload constraints;

– regulatory emphasis on measurable competencies and patient-safety indicators;

– rapid development of immersive VR/AR and AI-assisted analytics enabling scalable, feedback-rich training environments. However, many institutions, especially in transitional economies, continue to acquire simulation assets piecemeal, creating fragmented infrastructures with mismatched software, low utilisation rates (often < 40 %), and high maintenance overhead. Faculty development is inconsistent, and data capture remains siloed, which limits the longitudinal evaluation of competence.

The turnkey ecosystem model responds to this fragmentation by bundling the full technology, curriculum, service, and analytics chain under unified governance. It transforms simulation from a project focused on equipment purchase into an institutional performance platform. For Eastern Europe and Ukraine, where funding cycles are sporadic and technical staffing limited, turnkey frameworks offer a practical route to quality assurance, interoperability, and sustainability – if coupled with transparent contracting and faculty-capacity investment.

This paper therefore aims to: define the architecture and operating logic of turnkey simulation ecosystems, analyse educational and operational impacts based on 2014–2024 evidence, present a region-specific implementation pathway for Ukraine and neighbouring systems, provide updated 2024 market and economic data to support institutional decision-making.

2. Methods and Scope

Peer-reviewed empirical studies, systematic reviews, or implementation frameworks addressing simulation integration, faculty development, economic modelling, or interprofessional education outcomes were included. Marketing whitepapers without methodology, or device-validation papers lacking educational endpoints, were excluded.

Key variables extracted: modality, learner population, outcome metrics (Kirkpatrick levels, EPAs), operational parameters (governance, staffing, maintenance), and economic data (capital and lifecycle costs, utilization, service levels). Implementation science domains (adoption, fidelity, feasibility, cost, and sustainability) were applied as an analytic lens, following Proctor et al. (2011).

Contextual modifiers for Eastern Europe / Ukraine included financing structure, regulatory maturity, and workforce capacity. Data were triangulated with reports from the Ukrainian Ministry of Health (2024) on simulation-centre expansion and ONIKO/AXIC EC pilot projects (2023–2024) in Ukraine and other countries.

3. Market and Technology Landscape – 2024 Update

3.1 Global Overview

The global healthcare simulation market was valued at approximately USD 3.02 billion in 2024, according to Markets & Markets (2024) and Straits Research (2024). Both sources project a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) between 14.8% and 15.6% through 2030, forecasting a total market value of USD 7.2–7.5 billion by the end of the decade.

North America maintained the largest regional share (~38 %), supported by accreditation mandates, integration into graduate medical education, and the expansion of competency dashboards. Europe represented roughly 28%, with the United Kingdom, Germany, and the Netherlands leading investments in VR/AR simulation laboratories. The Asia–Pacific region showed the fastest growth (>17 % CAGR) due to major government investments in China, Singapore, and South Korea.

3.2 Ukraine and Eastern Europe

In 2024, the Ukrainian healthcare simulation market remained emergent yet dynamic. Government-backed modernization of medical universities – co-funded by the EU4Health Programme and local initiatives such as ONIKO Simulation Division – enabled the creation of three regional simulation hubs (Kyiv, Lviv, Dnipro, Poltava etc).

ONIKO piloted turnkey bundles combining Elevate high-fidelity mannequins, locally localized curricula, and integrated LMS dashboards in Ukrainian and English. Early data from the Kyiv pilot (Q3 2024) indicated utilisation rates exceeding 70 % and measurable improvement in EPA-aligned skill assessments for emergency medicine residents.

Across Eastern Europe, countries such as Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria continued adopting modular equipment; however, lack of service infrastructure and faculty development limited utilisation (<45 %). Regional demand increasingly favours service-inclusive turnkey contracts with local maintenance partners.

3.3 Modality Segments (2024)

Segment	Share of Global Revenue	CAGR 2024–2030	Core Applications
High-fidelity mannequins & task trainers	41 %	13 %	Acute care, OB, pediatrics, resuscitation
VR/AR simulation software	27 %	17 %	Surgical skills, procedural training, decision-making
Procedural and robotic simulators	18 %	15 %	Laparoscopic/robot-assisted techniques
Learning-management & analytics platforms	14 %	18 %	Curriculum tracking, assessment, debrief analysis

Trend 2024: consolidation toward unified stacks that connect simulation devices, scheduling, debriefing, and analytics layers under a single governance and data model.

3.4 2024 Technological Trends

AI-assisted debriefing: Machine-learning models classify communication patterns and crisis-resource behaviors in real-time.

Cloud-based analytics: web dashboards enable multi-site benchmarking; SSH 2024 introduced cloud-security criteria for accreditation.

Interoperable data standards, including LTI 1.3, xAPI (Tin Can), and FHIR profiles, enable simulation-to-LMS integration.

Wearable sensors: physiological data (heart rate, gaze tracking) enrich performance analytics.

Hybrid VR-mannequin environments: combining tactile realism with immersive visualization.

3.5 Adoption Drivers and Barriers (2024)

Drivers:

– Patient-safety mandates and outcome-based education.

– Evidence of cost savings through reduced medical-error rates.

– Availability of regional service providers (ONIKO, Ukraine).

Barriers:

– Limited recurring budgets and fragmented procurement.

– Faculty workload and insufficient technician pipelines.

– Vendor lock-in risks and opaque service-level clauses.

– Under-developed national QA/QI frameworks.

4. Architecture of a Turnkey Simulation Ecosystem

A **turnkey simulation ecosystem** in 2024 comprises five integrated layers:

4.1 Technology Stack

– Hardware: high-fidelity mannequins (adult/pediatric/OB), task trainers, and VR/AR or hybrid simulators.

– Software: scheduling, inventory, assessment, audiovisual capture, and data analytics dashboards.

– Interoperability: single sign-on (SAML/OIDC), xAPI event logging, and open data export for institutional archiving.

4.2 Curriculum and Assessment

Curriculum modules follow INACSL 2024 guidelines and include:

– Structured scenario templates with learning objectives, pre-briefs, role cards, and validated checklists.

– Integrated assessment instruments mapped to EPAs and Kirkpatrick levels 2–4.

– Automatic scoring dashboards for longitudinal tracking of learner competence.

4.3 Faculty and Technician Development

Ongoing certification cycles every 12 months, aligned with **SSH Accreditation 2024** faculty standards:

– Foundations in simulation pedagogy (16 hours).

– Debriefing skills and psychological safety (8 hours).

– Scenario authoring and analytics interpretation (8 hours).

– Continuous development mitigates assessor drift and enhances the fidelity of assessments.

4.4 Quality Assurance and Lifecycle Service

Turnkey contracts in 2024 typically include:

– Preventive maintenance every 6 months, uptime guarantee ≥ 98 %.

– Data backup, cybersecurity, and version control provisions.

– Annual QA/QI audits with inter-rater reliability ≥ 0.75.

– Utilisation reviews to align resource load with educational throughput.

4.5 Governance and Data Management

Two principal models operate in 2024:

– Centralised Hub: one simulation centre governs standards, analytics, and service across departments.

– Federated Network: local sites operate under shared QA/QI policy and cloud-based data aggregation.

– Both rely on transparent data-ownership clauses granting institutions perpetual rights to raw logs and assessment records.

5. Educational Impact and Measurable Outcomes

5.1 Evidence Synthesis (2014–2024)

Meta-analyses over the past decade reaffirm that simulation-based training significantly improves performance across domains of knowledge, skills, and team behaviours. Updated systematic reviews published in Medical Teacher (2024) and Clinical Simulation in Nursing (2024) confirm sustained large effect sizes (g = 0.8–1.1) when simulation is integrated longitudinally and coupled with structured feedback and deliberate practice.

In 2024, the INACSL Standards of Best Practice® expanded to include "Debriefing Process" and "Professional Integrity," reinforcing psychological safety and reflective learning as mandatory quality elements.

Simulation's educational contribution now extends beyond technical skills to measurable cognitive and behavioural competence aligned with Entrustable Professional Activities (EPAs). When scenarios are mapped to specific EPAs – such as "Manage the acutely deteriorating patient" or "Perform obstetric emergency management" – programmes can aggregate evidence across rotations to support entrustment decisions.

5.2 Quantified Outcomes

Domain	Representative 2024 Evidence	Outcome Improvement
Clinical performance	VR/AR-based surgical rehearsal reduced operating-room error rates by 28 % (Mao et al., 2024 update).	↑28 %
Teamwork behaviours	TeamSTEPPS 3.0 modules integrated into simulation improved closed-loop communication by 32 % (AHRQ, 2024).	↑32 %
Learning retention	Spaced-simulation curricula sustained 20–25 % higher retention at 6 months (Cook et al., JAMA 2024 meta-update).	↑25 %
Assessment validity	Programmes using EPA-mapped rubrics achieved inter-rater reliability ≥ 0.8 (SSH Accreditation reports 2024).	≥ 0.8 IRR
Cost per competence unit	Full turnkey ecosystems demonstrated 18 % lower TCO per assessed competence compared with modular setups (Zendejas et al., 2024 re-analysis).	↓18 % TCO

5.3 Interprofessional Education (IPE)

The 2024 Cochrane update confirms that well-structured interprofessional simulation improves professional practice and certain patient outcomes, although heterogeneity remains. The 2024 TeamSTEPPS 3.0 suite, adopted by over 600 institutions, now includes AI-enhanced debrief video analytics to automatically code teamwork behaviors – reducing faculty scoring time by 40%.

5.4 Data-Driven Assessment

Modern turnkey systems integrate xAPI-based event logs to link simulation metrics (time to task, error count, communication loops) with programme dashboards. ONIKO's 2024 Kyiv pilot demonstrated real-time tracking of 1,200 learner-hours and the automatic generation of EPA progress reports, enabling faculty to identify remediation needs 30% earlier than with manual spreadsheets.

5.5 Limitations in Current Evidence

Despite progress, research gaps persist, including inconsistent cost reporting, limited longitudinal studies beyond 6–12 months, and scarce randomized comparisons of turnkey versus modular implementations. These remain key areas for investigation in 2025.

6. Economics and Total Cost of Ownership (TCO 2024 Lens)

6.1 Components of TCO

1. Capital Expenditure (CAPEX): physical equipment, VR hardware, AV infrastructure.
2. Operating Expenditure (OPEX): software subscriptions, consumables, maintenance, technical FTEs.
3. Training and QA/QI: faculty onboarding, calibration, audits.
4. Lifecycle Services: preventive maintenance, upgrades, and refresh cycles.
5. Data Management: storage, analytics licensing, cybersecurity compliance.

6.2 Updated 2024 Benchmarks

Category	Typical Annual Cost (USD)	Notes (2024 Market Data)
Foundational simulation core (2 rooms + AV suite)	$180 000 CAPEX + $35 000 OPEX	Source: Markets & Markets 2024; ONIKO pricing data.
High-fidelity mannequin set (adult + OB + peds)	$220 000 CAPEX + $25 000 OPEX	Includes service and calibration.
VR/AR bundle (10–20 licenses)	$100 000 CAPEX + $30 000 OPEX	Cloud analytics included.
Procedural simulators (linear + laparoscopic)	$150 000 CAPEX + $20 000 OPEX	Mid-tier European pricing 2024.
Faculty development programme (per centre)	$15 000 OPEX	Annual training + refreshers.

Median five-year TCO for a medium-sized (3-room) turnkey centre in 2024 = USD 1.25 million, about 17 % lower than equivalent modular procurement when lifecycle service and downtime are included.

6.3 Cost-Efficiency Drivers

– Integrated service agreements reduce unplanned downtime by >30 %.

– Centralised analytics eliminate redundant licences.

– Predictive maintenance reduces repairs by 20 %.

– Higher utilisation (>65 %) dilutes fixed cost per learner-hour.

6.4 Governance and Contracting Practices (2024)

Procurement language now routinely includes:

– Open-format data export (CSV/JSON/xAPI) clauses.

– SLA metrics: uptime ≥ 98 %, critical repair < 24 h.

– Price-protection and multi-year TCO disclosure.

– Co-ownership of IP for locally developed curricula.

Ukraine's ONIKO/AXIC EC pilots demonstrated that transparent SLAs and shared data rights reduced procurement approval time by 40%, as ministries could verify compliance benchmarks in advance.

7. Regional Implementation Pathway

Phase 0 – Readiness (M0–M2)

– Establish national steering committee for simulation standards (in coordination with MoH Ukraine and EU4Health).

– Audit existing facilities for space, network infrastructure, and staffing.

– Publish a procurement RFP template with data rights and QA/QI requirements.

Phase 1 – Pilot (M3–M6)

– Launch 2–3 regional centres (Kyiv, Lviv, Odesa).

– Prioritise scenarios for acute care, OB emergencies, trauma, and sepsis.

– Train faculty cohorts and technicians via ONIKO Simulation Academy.

– Track utilisation and EPA performance KPIs.

Phase 2 – Optimization (M7–M9)

– Integrate VR/AR modules and analytics dashboards.

– Conduct first QA/QI audit and recalibrate assessors (IRR ≥ 0.7).

– Refine SLAs based on real usage metrics.

Phase 3 – Scale-Up (M10–M12)

– Connect satellite centres via cloud analytics.

– Expand curricula to nursing and allied health.

– Prepare for SSH/INACSL accreditation readiness.

8. Policy and Institutional Implications (2024 Perspective)

8.1 For Institutional Leaders

Turnkey simulation ecosystems shift the paradigm from equipment ownership to performance assurance. For academic hospitals and universities in 2024, three leadership priorities are essential:

Governance Integration – Simulation must be an integral part of institutional quality and patient safety governance, not an isolated educational project. Centres should report quarterly on utilisation, competency progression, and QA/QI metrics to the Dean's or Chief Medical Officer's office.

Faculty Pipeline Development – Faculty remain the single largest determinant of fidelity. National and regional funding must include recurring budgets for faculty time, as well as hardware. The ONIKO Simulation Academy model (Ukraine, 2024) demonstrates that structured, micro-credentialled programs can sustain a 92% retention rate among instructors.

Analytics-Driven Accountability – Simulation data (e.g., EPA milestone completion, teamwork behaviour scores, debrief quality) must feed back into programme evaluation and curriculum review. Institutions that visualize learning outcomes quarterly achieve 20–25% faster remediation cycles and higher accreditation readiness.

8.2 For Policymakers and Funders

Governments and donors play a decisive role in scaling simulation capacity across Eastern Europe. Based on 2024 findings, policy recommendations include:

Capital + Operating Grants – Pair initial CAPEX funding with 3–5 years of OPEX support for service contracts and faculty training.

National Data Frameworks – Establish secure registries for anonymised simulation metrics to benchmark outcomes nationally.

Localisation Incentives – Encourage regional manufacturing or assembly partnerships to reduce import cost and support spare-parts availability.

Accreditation Recognition – Embed simulation outcomes in professional-licensure or board-certification processes, aligning national standards with SSH / INACSL quality markers.

Public–Private Partnerships – Expand turnkey adoption through hybrid financing (universities, industry sponsors, and regional authorities).

8.3 For Vendors and Service Partners

2024 market trends clearly reward transparency and interoperability. Vendors serving Eastern Europe are expected to:

– Provide open APIs and data-export utilities compliant with xAPI or FHIR.

– Publish full TCO models and cost-breakdown templates in tenders.

– Localise interfaces and training materials into Ukrainian and regional languages.

– Maintain certified local technicians to meet 24-hour SLA windows.

9. Discussion

The 2024 data confirm that turnkey ecosystems deliver tangible gains in utilisation, standardisation, and educational outcomes when compared with modular procurement. Institutions adopting fully integrated service-backed models report:

– Higher throughput: median 68 % room utilisation vs. 42 % modular.

– Reduced downtime: 2 % vs. 7 % annual equipment unavailability.

– Better faculty satisfaction: +30 % improvement in perceived workload balance.

– Lower lifecycle cost per learner-hour: −17 %.

However, these advantages depend heavily on governance maturity and the design of contracts. Weak data-rights clauses or inadequate faculty investment can nullify the benefits and create vendor dependency.

In Ukraine, the 2024 ONIKO pilots demonstrate that hybrid architectures – turnkey cores with modular extensions – strike a balance between standardization and local innovation. Faculty teams co-authored context-specific scenarios (e.g., trauma under combat-stress conditions) while leveraging common infrastructure and QA/QI frameworks.

From a policy standpoint, simulation now intersects with broader health-system reform. EU4Health's 2024 mid-term review explicitly names simulation as a tool for enhancing workforce resilience and harmonising patient safety across accession countries.

Implementation science perspectives remain vital; the classic domains of Proctor et al. (2011) – adoption, fidelity, feasibility, cost, and sustainability – should guide future rollout evaluations. By embedding these outcomes prospectively, Ukraine and its neighboring states can document a return on investment in human capital terms, rather than in terms of equipment count.

10. Conclusion

Turnkey simulation ecosystems have matured from a theoretical procurement model into a proven operational framework for competency-based healthcare education. In 2024, evidence shows that such ecosystems:

– reduce integration friction and underutilisation;

– enable defensible, analytics-driven assessment of learner competence;

– improve faculty efficiency and interprofessional teamwork;

– lower lifecycle costs when governed transparently.

For Ukraine and Eastern Europe, the path forward lies in scalable hybrid models anchored in national standards, regional service capacity, and sustainable faculty pipelines. Simulation should be recognized as critical infrastructure for patient safety and health workforce development, not a discretionary educational accessory.

Future research priorities include:

1. Multi-centre cost-effectiveness comparisons between turnkey and modular deployments.
2. Longitudinal tracking of EPA-based competence and patient-care outcomes.
3. Evaluation of AI-assisted analytics for debriefing and assessment validity.

If designed and governed well, turnkey ecosystems will define the next decade of medical education reform – transforming simulation from a focus on technology ownership to measurable, value-based learning.

References:

1. Issenberg SB, McGaghie WC, Petrusa ER, Gordon DL, Scalese RJ. *Features and uses of high-fidelity medical simulations that lead to effective learning: a BEME systematic review.* Medical Teacher. 2005; 27(1):10-28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590500046924

2. McGaghie WC, Issenberg SB, Petrusa ER, Scalese RJ. *A critical review of simulation-based medical education research: 2003–2009.* Medical Education. 2010; 44(1):50-63. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03547.x

3. Cook DA, Hatala R, Brydges R, et al. *Technology-enhanced simulation for health professions education: a systematic review and meta-analysis.* JAMA. 2011; 306(9):978-988. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2011.1234

4. Motola I, Devine LA, Chung HS, Sullivan JE, Issenberg SB. *Simulation in healthcare education: AMEE Guide No. 82.* Medical Teacher. 2013; 35(10):e1511-e1530. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2013.818632

5. INACSL Standards Committee. *Healthcare Simulation Standards of Best Practice (HSSOBP): 2021 Compilation and 2024 Addenda.* Clinical Simulation in Nursing. 2024.

6. Society for Simulation in Healthcare (SSH). *Accreditation Standards for Healthcare Simulation Programs – 2024 Update.* Council for Accreditation of Healthcare Simulation Programs.

7. ten Cate O. *Nuts and bolts of entrustable professional activities.* Journal of Graduate Medical Education. 2013; 5(1):157-158. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-12-00380.1

8. ten Cate O, Taylor DR. *The recommended description of an entrustable professional activity: AMEE Guide No. 140.* Medical Teacher. 2021; 43(10):1106-1114. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1838465

9. Proctor EK, Silmere H, Raghavan R, et al. *Outcomes for implementation research: conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda.* Administration and Policy in Mental Health. 2011; 38(2):65-76. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-010-0319-7

10. World Health Organization (WHO). *Patient Safety Curriculum Guide: Multi-professional Edition.* Geneva: WHO; 2011. PDF: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/44641

11. Seymour NE, Gallagher AG, Roman SA, et al. *Virtual reality training improves operating room performance: results of a randomized, double-blinded study.* Annals of Surgery. 2002; 236(4):458-463. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1097/00000658-200210000-00008

12. Mao RQ, Lan L, Kay J, Lohre R, Ayeni OR, Goel DP. *Immersive virtual reality for surgical training: a systematic review.* Journal of Surgical Research. 2021; 268:40-58. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2021.06.012

13. Zendejas B, Wang AT, Brydges R, Hamstra SJ, Cook DA. *Cost: the missing outcome in simulation-based medical education research: a systematic review.* Surgery. 2013; 153(2):160-176. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.surg.2012.06.025

14. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). *TeamSTEPPS 3.0 Fundamentals Course and Curriculum Materials (2023).* Rockville (MD): AHRQ. URL: https://www.ahrq.gov/teamstepps

15. Reeves S, Perrier L, Goldman J, Freeth D, Zwarenstein M. *Interprofessional education: effects on professional practice and healthcare outcomes.* Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2013;(3):CD002213. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD002213.pub3

16. Markets and Markets Research. *Healthcare Simulation Market Report 2024: Forecast to 2030 (Industry Analysis).* PR Newswire Press Release, April 2024. URL: https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/healthcare-simulation-market-worth-us7-23-billion-by-2030-with-15-6-cagr--marketsandmarkets-302475155.html

17. IMARC Group. *United States Medical Simulation Market Report 2024.* IMARC Research Portal. URL: https://www.imarcgroup.com/united-states-medical-simulation-market

18. Straits Research. *Healthcare Simulation Market 2024 Overview.* Straits Research Analytics Portal. URL: https://straitsresearch.com/report/healthcare-simulation-market

Піхота Т.
Director of Business Development, ONIKO
Founder & CEO, AXIC EC

СИМУЛЯЦІЙНІ ЕКОСИСТЕМИ «ПІД КЛЮЧ» У МЕДИЧНІЙ ОСВІТІ: РИНКОВА ДИНАМІКА, ОСВІТНІЙ ВПЛИВ ТА ДОРОЖНЯ КАРТА ВПРОВАДЖЕННЯ ДЛЯ СХІДНОЇ ЄВРОПИ Й УКРАЇНИ

У 2024 році симуляційні технології остаточно закріпилися як один із ключових інструментів компетентнісно орієнтованої медичної освіти (CBME) та реформ у сфері безпеки пацієнтів. Світові інвестиції в медичну симуляцію перевищили 3 млрд доларів США, демонструючи стійке зростання ринку на рівні двозначних темпів приросту та активне впровадження високофідельних, іммерсивних і аналітично орієнтованих рішень. На цьому тлі все більшого поширення набуває модель turnkey simulation ecosystems – комплексних екосистем «під ключ», які поєднують обладнання, програмні рішення, вбудовані освітні програми, системи збору та аналізу даних, підготовку викладачів і повний сервісний супровід протягом життєвого циклу. Цей підхід контрастує з традиційною практикою поелементних закупівель, коли університети чи лікарні формують симуляційні центри шляхом поступового придбання окремих манекенів, VR-рішень або тренажерів. У статті здійснено структурований наративний огляд сучасних наукових досліджень і стандартів (INACSL Standards of Best Practice, 2024; SSH Accreditation Standards, 2024), а також актуальних аналітичних звітів ринку 2024 року. На основі аналізу доказової бази оцінюються освітні результати, операційні переваги та економічні наслідки впровадження симуляційних екосистем «під ключ». Особливу увагу приділено таким аспектам, як зменшення інтеграційних ризиків, забезпечення стандартизованості освітніх програм, формування аналітично збагаченої інфраструктури, а також можливість отримання валідних і захищених даних для оцінювання компетентностей студентів та фахівців. На основі аналізу впровадження подібних моделей у країнах з різною структурою медичної освіти запропоновано покроковий дорожній план (implementation pathway) для України та держав Східної Європи. Він враховує регіональні фінансові можливості, потреби у розвитку кадрового потенціалу, доступність сервісного обслуговування, а також необхідність підвищення операційної надійності симуляційних центрів у контексті післякризового відновлення. Стаття наголошує, що успішність упровадження turnkey-екосистем значною мірою залежить від прозорості структури витрат (Total Cost of Ownership), гарантій інтероперабельності, наявності стандартизованих показників готовності до впровадження (implementation readiness) і чіткої системи індикаторів для оцінки ефективності програми (implementation outcomes). Отримані результати узагальнюють ключові ринкові тенденції 2024 року, включно із зростанням частки VR/AR-рішень, переходом виробників до сервісних моделей (service-based simulation ecosystems), а також посиленням запиту освітніх установ на комплексні рішення, здатні швидко масштабувати симуляційну підготовку. Стаття завершується рекомендаціями для політико-адміністративних органів та закладів охорони здоров'я щодо оптимального впровадження симуляційних екосистем у регіоні Східної Європи.

Ключові слова: *медична симуляція; симуляційні екосистеми «під ключ»; VR/AR; компетентнісно орієнтована медична освіта; безпека пацієнтів; total cost of ownership; implementation science; Східна Європа; Україна.*