SKVC

STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Klaipėdos universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
ŠEIMOS EDUKOLOGIJA IR VAIKO TEISIŲ APSAUGA
(valstybinis kodas – 621X20007)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS
––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––
EVALUATION REPORT
OF *FAMILY EDUCATION AND PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS*
OF THE CHILD (*state code – 621X20007*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Klaipeda University

Expert team:

1. **Prof. Ian Smith (team leader),** *academic,*

2. **Prof. Dr Marit Allern,** *academic,*

3. **Dr Maria Filomena Rodrigues Teixeira,** *academic,*

4. **Ms Danguolė Kiznienė,** *representative of social partners,*

5. **Ms Gerda Šidlauskytė,** *student representative*.

Evaluation coordinator -
Ms Rūta Šlaustienė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2016

Studijų programos pavadinimas	*Šeimos edukologija ir vaiko teisių apsauga*
Valstybinis kodas	621X20007
Studijų sritis	socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	edukologija
Studijų programos rūšis	universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	nuolatinės (1,5), ištęstinės (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	90
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	edukologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2006 m. balandžio 7 d.

—————————————————————

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	*Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child*
State code	621X20007
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Education Studies
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1,5), Part-time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	90
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master in Education Studies
Date of registration of the study programme	7 April 2006

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

The evaluation of on-going study programmes is based on the **Methodology for evaluation of Higher Education study programmes,** approved by Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereafter – SKVC).

The evaluation is intended to help higher education institutions to constantly improve their study programmes and to inform the public about the quality of studies.

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: *1) self-evaluation and self-evaluation report prepared by Higher Education Institution (hereafter – HEI); 2) visit of the review team at the higher education institution; 3) production of the evaluation report by the review team and its publication; 4) follow-up activities.*

On the basis of external evaluation report of the study programme SKVC takes a decision to accredit the study programme either for 6 years or for 3 years. If the programme evaluation is negative such a programme is not accredited.

The programme is **accredited for 6 years** if all evaluation areas are evaluated as "very good" (4 points) or "good" (3 points).

The programme is **accredited for 3 years** if none of the areas was evaluated as "unsatisfactory" (1 point) and at least one evaluation area was evaluated as "satisfactory" (2 points).

The programme **is not accredited** if at least one of evaluation areas was evaluated as "unsatisfactory" (1 point).

1.2. General

The Application documentation submitted by the HEI follows the outline recommended by the SKVC. Along with the self-evaluation report and annexes, no additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit.

1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/Additional information

Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child is a second cycle programme delivered by the Department of Childhood Pedagogy of the Faculty of Pedagogy at Klaipeda University. The Faculty of Pedagogy is one of 5 Faculties at Klaipeda University.

The *Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child* Programme leads to the award of Master of Education (although see Section 2.2 below on the Programme's title). The Programme carries 90 ECTS. It is available in full-time (1.5 years) and part-time (2 years) modes, although in practice it is only being taken by students in part-time mode (see Section 2.5 below). The Programme is in the Study field of Education Studies, within the Study area of Social Sciences.

The Programme was previously evaluated in 2013, and the current Review Team has taken full account of the 2013 Evaluation Report, and the Recommendations within it.

As detailed in Section 1.4 below, the current evaluation review of the Programme was carried out by a five-person Review Team, comprising three international academic experts (one of them the Team leader) and two Lithuanian members (one representing social partners, and one representing students), assisted by a SKVC coordinator.

This Programme was one of three being reviewed by the Review Team during a one-week visit to Lithuania. After receiving the University's Self-Assessment Report (SAR) and associated documents, all members of the Review Team were invited to contribute to a Preliminary Report highlighting potential issues for discussion at meetings held during the visit day to Klaipeda University. However, given the need to cover three programmes during this evaluation exercise, three specific members of the Team were identified to focus on particular Evaluation areas for this Programme, thus ensuring sufficient in-depth focus on all aspects of the Programme. One of these was the Team leader, who also took overall responsibility for producing this final report.

Meetings were held with senior staff of the Faculty, the Self-analysis group responsible for producing the SAR, teachers of the Programme, current students of the Programme, recent graduates of the Programme, and social partners involved with the Programme.

Of course, all members of the Review Team had the opportunity to contribute to the contents of this final report, both through participating in post-visit discussions in Lithuania, and in commenting electronically on a draft version before it was finalised.

1.4. The Review Team

The Review Team was assembled in accordance with the *Expert Selection Procedure*, approved by Order No 1-55 of 19 March 2007 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education, as amended on 11 November 2011. The Review Visit to the HEI was conducted by the team on 20 October 2015.

1. **Prof. Ian Smith (team leader),** *Professor of Education, School of Education, University of the West of Scotland, the United Kingdom.*

2. **Prof. Dr Marit Allern,** *Professor of Education, Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology, UiT The Arctic university of Norway, Norway.*

3. **Dr Maria Filomena Rodrigues Teixeira,** *Coordinator Professor, coordinator of study programmes at the Higher School of Education – Polytechnic Institute of Coimbra, Portugal.*

4. **Ms Danguolė Kiznienė,** *Self-employed consultant, former Partnerships and Projects Manager at the British Council, Advisor to the Minister of Education and Science.*

5. **Ms Gerda Šidlauskytė,** *postgraduate student in Education at Vilnius University, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

In the 2013 Evaluation Report, there were significant comments suggesting lack of clarity regarding programme aims and learning outcomes, including: lack of consistency with official Lithuanian descriptors; active verbs not used in programme learning outcomes; use of competence statements rather than learning outcomes.

There were also suggestions that employability aspects needed to be addressed further, e.g. generally clarifying what positions graduates of the programme could apply for, and specifically reviewing certain claims on training of counsellors judged unrealistic due to the absence of psychology modules on the programme.

These comments led to recommendations that Programme Aims, Programme Learning Outcomes and Module (Course) Learning Outcomes must be clearly written, and career options for programme graduates must be clarified.

In the SAR, the Review Team found evidence of an explicit attempt to align the Programme Learning Outcomes with the 2nd Study Cycle Descriptor of the Ministry of Education and Science (see par.9/Table 1), and this was highlighted in Appendix 3.6 ('Summary of the conclusions of the international external evaluation of 2013 and actions for improvement'). There also appeared to be a comprehensive attempt to link Module Learning Outcomes with Programme Learning Outcomes (see relevant sections of the Syllabus documentation). These developments seemed largely to address the Learning Outcomes issues raised in 2013. In addition, Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes are publicly accessible on the University website (www.ku.lt) and on the AIKOS system (www.aikos.smm.lt).

In progressing such developments, good use had been made of the self-evaluation views of the teaching staff, graduates and social partners of the Programme.

Regarding career options for Programme graduates, in Appendix 3.6 of the SAR, the main reference that this has been addressed was to par.55 in the SAR. However, par.55 really only focuses on formal aspects of the admissions process (the requirement to have a Bachelors in the group of fields of education and training, points to be obtained for academic qualifications etc.), and does not deal with the broader and deeper issues of graduate career pathways. Some of the issues of graduate destinations are addressed up to a point elsewhere in Section 2.1 of the SAR (e.g. at par.11, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18). However, the Review Team judged that the Faculty still needed to clarify its thinking on graduate destinations further, articulating clearly the most appropriate links between the Programme's aims and relevant professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market.

In particular, senior Faculty staff still need to move forward even further from any lingering confusion that the Programme can be linked with Social Pedagogy and its specific legal dimensions. These staff need to move on from referring to the 'double career' possibilities for graduates of the Programme.

Members of the Review Team continued to judge that there were issues around the possible implication that the Programme provided its graduates with more of a 'legal' qualification to protect child rights than it actually did. This even led to some concerns about the appropriateness of the 'Protection of the Rights of the Child' part of the Programme's title.

The clearest explanation of the distinctive role of a Social Pedagogue in Lithuania came during the meeting with graduates. Graduates explained that only Social Pedagogues can represent a child in court (something which graduates of the current Programme cannot do).

It is particularly important to emphasise the distinctions between career pathways for graduates of this Programme and careers as Social Pedagogues because the SAR itself makes such an explicit case for rejecting merger with the Social Pedagogy programme.

In meetings, the overall aim of the Programme was best presented by the Self-analysis group, teachers on the Programme, graduates of the Programme and social partners. The Review Team understands this aim to be the enhancement of the skills of existing pre-school teachers and primary school teachers to address the needs of their pupils in relation to increasingly challenging social issues affecting them.

In this context, the SAR identified a weakness of the Programme as 'Insufficient involvement of social partners in discussions on the graduate career opportunities' (par.18). However, from meetings with social partners, the Review Team judged that social partners clearly aligned with the above overall aim of the Programme, and felt they had been able to express this in discussions with University staff.

However, in conclusion on 'Programme aims and learning outcomes', it is important to stress once again that this clearer expression of the overall aim of the Programme came from specific comments made by graduates and social partners, and certain University staff. Not all University staff, especially senior Faculty staff, presented this overall aim so clearly. Therefore, more work needs to be done on the systematic development of the communication of the Programme's overall aim.

2.2. Curriculum design

In the 2013 Evaluation Report, there were a number of comments about 'Curriculum design'. For example, the Report highlighted the very small psychology component in terms of counselling activities; the need to clarify how the legal aspects of the curriculum would develop, especially given the inclusion of 'protection of child rights' within the programme's title; overlap issues with the Faculty's Social Pedagogy programme.

These comments led to recommendations that the programme's aim to train counsellors should be removed unless the emphasis on this area is heavily increased within the programme, and associated admission requirements become more focused.

It was also recommended that the term 'Educology' should be removed from the programme title, and consideration should be given to merging the programme with the Social Pedagogy programme to form one programme based on the 'protection of child rights'.

On the issue of training counsellors, in Appendix 3.6 of the SAR, reference is made to the updating of Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes (par.9, i.e. Table 1). Par.9/Table 1 seems to make no explicit reference to counselling, and the Review Team judged that this addressed the issue from 2013.

On the use of the term 'Educology', certainly, as indicated in Appendix 3.6 of the SAR, the term 'edukologija' has now been translated as 'Education' in the programme title, and generally this seems to be the case across the documentation provided by the University. However, at par.14 in Section 2 of the SAR ('Programme aims and the intended learning

outcomes'), the term 'the degree of Master in Educology' seems to have re-appeared, and University staff should ensure that any such references are removed from ongoing Programme documentation, with the degree title 'Master in Education Studies' being used.

Regarding how the Programme deals with the legal aspects of the curriculum, as already discussed in Section 2.1 above, the new Programme explicitly rejects the 2013 Evaluation Report suggestion to merge with the University's Social Pedagogy programme (e.g., see Appendix 3.6 in the SAR). However, as already emphasised, Faculty staff should continue to work further on reinforcing the distinction between the *Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child* Programme and the Social Pedagogy programme.

Additionally on 'Curriculum design', the Review Team asked questions about possible overlap between different subjects within the Programme. For example, 'child rights protection assurance' is identified in several subjects: *Family Education, Social and Family Policies, Educational Project Management, Family and Child Legal Representation, Sociology of Education, Family and Child Law, Children's Social Care and Welfare, Family and Child Pedagogical Counselling, Legal Pedagogical Education and Services.* Overlap was clearly not an issue for graduates or current students. For example, graduates made the point that the same topic would often be helpfully considered from different perspectives.

As a final specific point on 'Curriculum design', the SAR indicates as an 'Action for improvement' diversifying 'the forms and methods of student independent work organisation, to more broadly apply the opportunities of the KU virtual learning environment' (par.30). In meetings, the use of the University's virtual learning environment (VLE) was clearly recognised as an important development by teaching staff, and had already been well-received by former and current students.

Therefore, in conclusion on 'Curriculum Design', the Programme documentation seems to have dropped any explicit reference to the training of counsellors; the term 'Educology' generally seems to have been removed from the Programme documentation; curriculum design has now incorporated the use of the University's VLE. Broadly, the Programme meets legal requirements, is of sufficient scope to ensure learning outcomes, and its content reflects current developments in relevant subjects.

On the other hand, some issues still remain. There is the specific need to ensure that no references to the term 'Educology' appear in Programme documentation. More generally, the coherence of the Programme will be strengthened through demonstrating a more explicit and sustained strategic connection between curriculum design and the overall aim of the Programme (i.e., enhancing the skills of existing pre-school and primary school teachers to address the needs of their pupils in relation to increasingly challenging social issues affecting them). This connects to comments already made on 'Programme aims and learning outcomes' under Section 2.1 above.

For example, all the five groups of Learning Outcomes for the Programme (Knowledge and its application, Research abilities, Special abilities, Social abilities, and Personal abilities) include specific references to 'pre-school, before-school and junior school/primary school'. However, further detail could be developed in highlighting how all subjects within the curriculum relate specifically to the work of pre-school and primary school teachers. In the subject syllabuses, this could be done particularly for Philosophy of Education, Intercultural Educational Strategies, Health Education and Well-Being in Family, where there are no particular references to pre-school and primary school in the subject syllabus aims and learning outcomes. However, more widely, other subject syllabuses tend only to cover specific references to pre-school and primary school within a limited number of learning outcomes, or

sometimes only in the aim. An ongoing general review of subject syllabuses for specific coverage of pre-school and primary school would further ensure that the content of subjects is consistent with the type of studies required by this Programme, and that the content of the subjects is appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

Therefore, just as Section 2.1 concluded that more work needs to be done on the systematic development of the communication of the Programme's overall aim, the current Section 2.2 concludes that more work needs to be done on the systematic development of the strategic connection between that overall aim and 'Curriculum Design'.

2.3. Teaching staff

The 2013 Evaluation Report recommended that the professional development of staff needed to be more directed towards issues such as aligning teaching and learning with the Programme's learning outcomes, and also relating learning outcomes to assessment. It also recommended that institutional support was needed to encourage staff to publish in international journals.

The teaching staff for this Programme meet the legal requirements on staffing. 13 lecturers deliver the Programme and the staff to student ratio is 1:1, which certainly indicates the number of teaching staff is adequate to ensure the learning outcomes. The teaching staff are qualified in terms of research degrees, with almost all of them PhD holders. Most of them are qualified in education, usually early childhood education. The turnover of teaching staff is reasonable.

The Programme's staff are provided with a number of forms of staff development support, including for their research development. There is a University Research and Study Promotion Fund to sponsor staff participation in international scientific events and conferences. The University's Institute of Continuous Studies organises professional development seminars for academic staff. There is the Research Forum, held monthly by the Faculty of Pedagogy. Opportunities are given for undertaking international academic exchanges and research leaves. Examples were given of participation in international projects. Teaching staff spoke of cash prize incentives for publishing, and the Head of Department spoke of adjusting teaching loads for research.

However, it was not fully clear in meetings exactly how the Research Forum functioned to enhance staff research capacity and expertise, including how participants are able to give feedback on the Forum. In general, further attention should be given to how the professional development of staff is related to Programme management goals, e.g. how the international projects which staff participate in relate to Programme goals. Similarly, further attention should be given to whether there is an overall coherent staff development management plan, and, if so, who is responsible for it.

For example, in meeting with senior Faculty staff, the Head of Department was identified as accountable for research performance, but there also seems to be a Faculty dimension, e.g. for funding, and new Faculty mergers will have an impact on research.

The Self-analysis group referred to the various Tables in the SAR which listed academic exchanges (Table 6), research leaves (Table 7), participation in professional development (Table 8), participation in project activities (Table 9) and participation in conferences, 2010-2014 (Table 10). The Review Team accepted that there was much descriptive detail in these Tables. However, the Review Team wanted to see more evidence of an overall coherent plan being

developed and applied to these activities. Similarly, in discussions with teachers of the Programme, the Review Team felt it was being presented with specific examples of support for the professional and research development of individuals, rather than evidence of a coherent overall planning approach to this support, linked clearly to Programme goals (although the role of the Head of Department in reducing teaching workloads in response to research achievements was mentioned).

On publication in international journals specifically, in Appendix 3.6 of the SAR, the claim was made that 'Over the analysed period…programme teachers published 28 scientific papers in international journals'. However, in analysing the detailed 'Curricula vitae of academic staff' (SAR, Appendix 3.3) the Review Team struggled to identify this number of papers, certainly not full papers in prestigious English language international journals. The Review Team wondered if this total included a particular 'cluster' of papers presented at a specific ATEE Spring Conference held at Klaipeda University in 2014 (but not subsequently appearing as full journal papers), and papers appearing in Klaipeda University's own Tiltai journal. The Review Team would certainly look for more explicit evidence of publications in prestigious international journals, including English language journals. This will strengthen further the research activity of staff which is directly related to the study programme.

More broadly on the English language capacities of Programme staff, the Review Team judged from its various meetings with staff that the clear majority of staff are not comfortable using spoken English, preferring to rely on interpretation into Lithuanian. This suggests there is a wider need for staff development on underlying English language competences, not only those relating to specialist academic writing.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

In the 2013 Evaluation Report, there was a generally positive evaluation of 'Facilities and learning resources', covering both campus resources and arrangements for students' practice. The main recommendation was to increase students' utilisation of electronic databases of international literature in the English language and also international publications in the English language, e.g. through introducing assignments written in English and with requirements of a set number of references from international journals.

In the 2015 SAR, considerable positive detail is repeated on the ongoing development of campus resources, 'methodological resources' and partner agreements underpinning arrangements for students' practice (par.45-53).

Within par.50-53, much of this detail can be linked to students' utilisation of English language materials. There is also a specific comment about addressing the 'literature in foreign languages' issue in Appendix 3.6.

However, Section 2.4 (Facilities and learning resources) of the SAR does not explicitly refer back to the 2013 recommendation. Beyond the 'Facilities and learning resources' section of the SAR, there does not appear to be a specific highlighting of the English language and international references assessment recommendations in the 'Study process and student assessment' Section (Section 2.5). Under 'Facilities and learning resources', it may also have been helpful to know more about how the placing of the programme on the University VLE has been worked through, e.g. how this may connect with the English language and international references issues mentioned above. Of course, students were generally happy with the VLE aspects of the Programme. There were occasional 'crashes' of the Moodle system, but these had been for a maximum of one day and were not a major issue. However, there will still be ongoing

work in further utilising the University's Moodle VLE for the Programme, and therefore in the use of electronic data bases, including for international English language resources.

More specifically on 'Facilities and learning resources', the SAR identified 'working hours of the KU Library' as a weakness/action for improvement. In the meeting with senior Faculty staff, these staff were clearly aware of the need to further extend the Library's opening hours, and emphasised that they are 'trying hard' to achieve 'round the clock' access, but such decisions are taken at University-wide level.

More widely, there has clearly been some investment in teaching rooms, and it was good to see exemplar primary school literature on display in a number of teaching rooms. Significant efforts have been made to upgrade the Faculty Library, and Library staff were committed and enthusiastic.

On the other hand, student comments were made about the need to improve the University environment. The Review Team could see evidence of the need for this from their own observation of the general condition of the Faculty's buildings. Therefore, strategic priority should be given to major investment so that the overall environment for students can be improved (although it is recognised that the University faces major challenges in maintaining and upgrading the historical buildings which house the Faculty, and therefore this Programme). This investment should include an enhanced provision of rest areas for students within the Faculty buildings.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

There are important strengths in the 'Study process and students' performance assessment' aspects of the Programme.

For example, in relation to participating in research, students are involved in research particularly through working on their final theses, and through participating in conferences (see SAR, par.61). Students receive a range of supports, e.g. the Library provides training in the accessing of resources, and the University's Career Centre organises counselling, seminars and training about career planning. More generally, the organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

In most of the subject syllabuses, the requirements and assessment criteria for each of the assessments generally are clearly defined (but see comments below on criteria statements for grades 10 and 9). The students and graduates said that course assessment approaches were made clear to them on the Moodle system at the beginning of subjects, and that they can go to lecturers for additional feedback discussion on grades awarded.

An emphasis is put on academic honesty. For example, students sign an agreement on academic honesty. Representatives from the University Student Union observe with staff during theoretical exams, and staff use the *National Plagiarism Detection System* (www.plag.lt). Students, graduates and staff all emphasised that the students were 'almost colleagues' of staff within such small Masters student groups, and this 'atmosphere' protected against any potential plagiarism issues.

As indicated in the SAR (par.70), during the assessed period 16 out of 20 graduates work in educational institutions. These numbers show that the professional activities of the graduates meet the expectations of the providers of the Programme. Students mentioned that they were encouraged to apply for the Programme when undergraduates.

The 2013 Evaluation Report raised certain issues on 'Study process and students' performance assessment'. The Report recommended that admission requirements should focus more on undergraduate qualifications that guarantee students have sufficient prior knowledge in relevant fields (e.g., psychology, sociology and education). There were also recommendations that there should be a greater variety of assessment methods, and that short-term options convenient for part-time students with job and family responsibilities should be explored to increase student mobility.

On these issues, the Review Team judged that the admission requirements are now clear and well-founded. As is stated in the SAR (par.55), students must have a Bachelors degree in the group of fields of education and training.

On student mobility, 11 international bipartite collaboration and exchange agreements in Education have been signed. However, during the assessed period, there has only been one outgoing student from the Programme, and only one incoming. These numbers are explained by students' family circumstances and their jobs. Graduates emphasised that work commitments had prevented them taking up Erasmus opportunities. This reflects the fact that effectively the Programme is delivered as a part-time Programme only (see SAR, par.57). The Review Team would repeat the 2013 Evaluation Report recommendation that the Faculty and the Programme team should further explore short-term placement options within existing bipartite agreements so that Programme student participation in international mobility programmes can be increased. Of course, the Review Team recognises the challenges in achieving this with part-time students.

More generally, the Review Team would suggest that the Faculty should acknowledge more explicitly that the Programme in practice is likely to be undertaken exclusively by part-time students, and plan all aspects of the Programme fully for this.

On variety of assessment, the assessment system includes a variety of types of assignments (including group work and case studies), but exams account for no less than 50% of the final grade (see SAR, par.66). The Faculty and Programme staff should also give further consideration to reducing the current heavy reliance on examinations as a form of assessment on the Programme. Alternative forms of assessment more suited to Masters level work should be considered.

While the requirements and assessment criteria for each of the assessments generally are clearly defined across the subject syllabuses, in some of the syllabuses (*Family Education, Educational Project Management, Sociology of Education, Family and Child Pedagogical Counselling, Health Education and Well-Being in Family, Contemporary Children Development Theories, Legal Pedagogical Education and Services*), there are issues with distinguishing between the level of attainment required to achieve an 'excellent' grade (10) and a 'very good' grade (9). For example, there are statements such as 'Student gets an excellent (10) or very good (9) grade when all the set requirements (criteria) are met'. This does not make clear how grades 10 and 9 are distinguished from each other. Another specific example found was in the *Methodology of Educational Research* subject syllabus, where the distinction between the Assessment criteria for an 'excellent' (10) and a 'very good' (9) for the individual assignment appeared to be that at grade 10 the student provided conclusions, but that conclusions were not required for grade 9. It seemed odd to the Review Team that a grade 9 (i.e. very good) could be achieved at Masters level by an assignment which did not have conclusions.

On these grade criteria issues, the Self-analysis group described a system which involved grade criteria definitions being considered by the Faculty Course Description Testing Committee, with the Department also looking at these. However, it was also conceded that there

was a degree of individual teacher responsibility here, and that the example on *Methodology of Educational Research* came from another Department.

Nevertheless, the University, Faculty and Programme team should continue to work on further clarifying the definitions of grade criteria being applied in assessment. In particular, the statements which provide the basis for distinguishing between grade 10 and grade 9 levels of attainment need to be considered further.

Finally, in relation to assessment, in the context of checking that the Programme meets all legal requirements for second cycle study programmes, the Review Team sought to ensure that the Programme met the legal requirement that one member of the assessment committee for the final thesis (preferably the chair of the committee) should be a person who has not worked at the University for the last three years. Senior Faculty staff assured the Review Team that this requirement was met, usually by the involvement of a social partner in the final thesis assessment committee.

2.6. Programme management

The 2013 Evaluation Report recommended that regular Programme Committee meetings should be used to achieve ongoing student and employer representation in Programme management, rather than inviting students and social partners to Departmental meetings when the need arose.

The management of Programme quality is now taken forward at three levels: University level (University Senate, Study Quality Committee, Vice-Rector of Studies, Study Directorate); Faculty level (Faculty Council, Dean's Office, Faculty Study Programme Committee, Course Description Attestation Committee); Department level (Department of Childhood Pedagogy, including specifically the Head of Department, and the *Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child* Study Programme Committee, which is responsible for Programme implementation and monitoring). According to the SAR, open Study Programme Committee meetings are held four times a year involving students, lecturers, and social partners. These discuss a range of Programme issues, including study process, student research activity and student assessment.

Graduates talked fully about being involved as students in completing anonymous questionnaires, and participating in round-table meetings, at the end of each semester. Social partners are invited to round-table discussions, and receive e-mail invitations to participate in these. These meetings discuss their vision for the Programme. The social partners are also written to asking what competences they want the Programme to address. Feedback is also collected from lecturers.

Therefore, there appear to be mechanisms for evaluating teaching and learning experiences specifically. The student representative on the Study Programme Committee was responsible for distributing evaluation forms after every semester (exam session), and the Study Programme Committee captured feedback from social partners. Students and graduates said that their evaluation feedback was acted upon, e.g. graduates mentioned as a positive development the removal of practices from the Programme because it was difficult for them to leave their workplaces for these.

Overall, the outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the Programme are used for its improvement, and internal quality assurance measures are generally effective and efficient.

On the other hand, the Review Team felt that there were some aspects of 'Programme management' which would benefit from further clarification and development.

The Review Team felt that more detail on the operation of the open Study Programme Committee meetings would have been helpful, e.g. including exactly how the input of social partners and graduates impacts on the deliberations of the Study Programme Committee. The SAR itself identifies as an action for improvement 'to more actively communicate and collaborate with the alumni of the…programme' (par.80).

The Review Team also felt the need for further clarification on how the several levels of management operate in relation to the Programme, especially the relationship between the Department and the Study Programme Committee. As indicated in the SAR (par.72), the Department of Childhood Pedagogy collects and analyses information about programme quality and submits recommendations about programme quality assurance. The *Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child* Study Programme Committee also evaluates the study process of the Programme and submits proposals about programme quality assurance. The respective responsibilities between the Department and the Study Programme Committee need to be clarified.

In the meeting with teachers of the Programme, it was noticeable how extensive the role of the Head of Department post appeared to be on these issues. The Head of Department represented the Programme at Faculty level, including on the Course Attesting Committee, and through Faculty to Senate. The Review Team recognised the commitment of the Head of Department to these Programme-related roles. However, the Review Team also appreciated how many other wide-ranging responsibilities the Head of Department would have. In this context, a specifically identified Programme Leader might be the appropriate person to take a number of these Programme-related roles forward, rather than the Head of Department.

Therefore, the Faculty and Programme staff could further clarify precisely where ownership of the overall quality assurance of the Programme lies. In particular, the Programme would benefit from identifying more clearly an individual Programme Leader with significant responsibility and a clear, high profile role.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

In all public presentation of the Programme, the University, Faculty and Programme staff should continue to work further on clarifying that the overall aim of the Programme is to enhance the skills of existing pre-school and primary school teachers to address the needs of their pupils in relation to increasingly challenging social issues affecting them.

In this way, the distinctiveness of the Programme from the University's Social Pedagogy programme should be further emphasised.

2. Curriculum design

The coherence of the Programme will be strengthened through demonstrating a more explicit and sustained strategic connection between curriculum design and this overall aim of the Programme (i.e., enhancing the skills of existing pre-school and primary school teachers to address the needs of their pupils in relation to increasingly challenging social issues affecting them).

The University and Faculty should ensure that the title of the degree is clearly stated in all relevant literature as 'Master in Education Studies', not 'Master in Educology'.

3. Teaching staff

The University, the Faculty and the Department should develop a more coherent and strategic commitment to supporting the general staff development of the Programme's staff. This should address their capacities and opportunities to engage in research, especially at an international level leading to publication in prestigious international journals (including English language journals).

4. Facilities and learning resources

The University faces major challenges in maintaining and upgrading the historical buildings which house the Faculty, and therefore this Programme. However, strategic priority should be given to major investment in these buildings so that the overall environment for students can be improved. This should include an enhanced provision of rest areas for students within the Faculty buildings.

The Faculty and University should also continue to address the issue of extending Library opening hours.

5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The University, Faculty and Programme staff should continue to work on further clarifying the definitions of grade criteria being applied in assessment. In particular, the statements which provide the basis for distinguishing between grade 10 and grade 9 levels of attainment need to be considered further.

The Faculty and the Programme staff should also give further consideration to reducing the current heavy reliance on examinations as a form of assessment on the Programme. Greater use of alternative forms of assessment more suited to Masters level work should be considered.

The Faculty and the Programme staff should further explore short-term placement options within existing bipartite agreements so that Programme student participation in international student mobility programmes can be increased.

Although the challenges in achieving this with part-time students is recognised, this action should be part of a more explicit recognition by the Faculty that this Programme is effectively a part-time Programme, and the needs of its part-time students must be addressed accordingly.

6. Programme management

The Faculty and Programme team should further clarify precisely where ownership of the overall quality assurance of the Programme lies. This should include clarifying the relationship between the Department of Childhood Pedagogy and the *Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child* Study Programme Committee, and explicitly detailing how this Committee operates. In particular, the Programme will benefit from identifying more clearly an individual Programme Leader with significant responsibility and a clear, high profile role.

IV. SUMMARY

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The Faculty and the Programme team have made good use of the views of teaching staff, graduates and social partners in the self-evaluation of the Programme. In meetings, the overall aim of the Programme was best presented by the Self-analysis group, teachers on the Programme, graduates of the Programme and social partners. The Review Team understands this aim to be the enhancement of the skills of existing pre-school teachers and primary school teachers to address the needs of their pupils in relation to increasingly challenging social issues affecting them.

On the other hand, senior Faculty staff still need to move forward even further from any lingering confusion that the Programme can be linked with Social Pedagogy and its specific legal dimensions. These staff need to move on from referring to the 'double career' possibilities for graduates of the Programme.

This is particularly the case because the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) itself makes such an explicit case for rejecting merger with the Social Pedagogy programme.

2. Curriculum design

The Programme documentation seems to have dropped any explicit reference to the training of counsellors. The term 'Educology' generally seems to have been removed from the Programme documentation. Curriculum design has now incorporated the use of the University's virtual learning environment (VLE).

On the other hand, the coherence of the Programme will be strengthened through demonstrating a more explicit and sustained strategic connection between curriculum design and the overall aim of the Programme (i.e., enhancing the skills of existing pre-school and primary school teachers to address the needs of their pupils in relation to increasingly challenging social issues affecting them). This connects to comments already made above on 'Programme aims and learning outcomes'.

There is also the specific need to ensure that no references to the term 'Educology' appear in future Programme documentation. For example, the term re-appears in the SAR at par.14 in Section 2 'Programme aims and the intended learning outcomes'.

3. Teaching Staff

The Programme's staff are provided with a number of forms of staff development support, including for their research development. There is a University Research and Study Promotion Fund to sponsor staff participation in international scientific events and conferences. The University's Institute of Continuous Studies organises professional development seminars for academic staff. There is the Research Forum, held monthly by the Faculty of Pedagogy. Opportunities are given for undertaking international academic exchanges and research leaves. Examples were given of participation in international projects. Teaching staff spoke of cash prize incentives for publishing, and the Head of Department spoke of adjusting teaching loads for research.

However, the Review Team felt it was being presented with specific examples of support for the professional and research development of individuals, rather than evidence of a coherent overall planning approach to this support, linked clearly to Programme goals. The

University, the Faculty and the Department should develop a more coherent and strategic commitment to supporting the general staff development of the Programme's staff. This should address their capacities and opportunities to engage in research, especially at an international level. Participation in joint international research should be further encouraged, and publication in high quality English language international journals should also be targeted further.

4. Facilities and learning resources

There has clearly been some investment in teaching rooms, and it was good to see exemplar primary school literature on display in a number of teaching rooms. Significant efforts have been made to upgrade the Library. There is ongoing work in using the University's Moodle VLE for the Programme, and therefore in the use of electronic data bases, including for international English language resources. The senior Faculty staff are aware of the need to further extend the Library's opening hours.

On the other hand, student comments were made about the need to improve the University environment. Therefore, strategic priority should be given to major investment so that the overall environment for students can be improved (although the Review Team recognises that the University faces major challenges in maintaining and upgrading the historical buildings which house the Faculty, and therefore this Programme). This investment should include an enhanced provision of rest areas for students within the Faculty buildings. The Faculty and University should also continue to address the issue of extending Library opening hours.

5. Study process and students' performance assessment

Students are involved in research, and receive a range of appropriate supports. Across the subject syllabuses, students are made aware of assessment approaches at the beginning of each subject, and generally the requirements and assessment criteria for each assessment are clearly defined. Neither the staff nor students see any potential issues with plagiarism on the Programme, where there is a shared mature professional culture between staff and postgraduate students. The admission requirements are clear and publicly acceptable. There are a number of bipartite agreements to assist with international student mobility.

On the other hand, the University, Faculty and Programme staff should continue to work on further clarifying the definitions of grade criteria being applied in assessment. In particular, the statements which provide the basis for distinguishing between grade 10 and grade 9 levels of attainment need to be considered further.

The Faculty and Programme staff should also give further consideration to reducing the current heavy reliance on examinations as a form of assessment on the Programme. Alternative forms of assessment more suited to Masters level work should be considered further.

The Faculty and the Programme staff should seek to utilise further short-term placements within the existing bipartite agreements on international student mobility so that Programme student participation in mobility programmes can be increased. Of course, the Review Team recognises the challenges in achieving this with part-time students.

More generally, the Review Team would suggest that the Faculty should acknowledge more explicitly that the Programme in practice is likely to be undertaken exclusively by part-time students, and plan all aspects of the Programme fully for this.

6. Programme management

The management of Programme quality is now taken forward at three levels: University level; Faculty level; Department level (Department of Childhood Pedagogy, including specifically the Head of Department, and the *Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child* Study Programme Committee, which is responsible for Programme implementation and monitoring). According to the SAR, open Study Programme Committee meetings are held four times a year involving students, lecturers, and social partners. These discuss a range of Programme issues, including study process, student research activity and student assessment.

Graduates talked fully about being involved as students in completing anonymous questionnaires (distributed by the student representative on the Study Programme Committee), and participating in round-table meetings, at the end of each semester. Feedback is also collected from lecturers. Therefore, there appear to be mechanisms for evaluating teaching and learning experiences specifically. The Study Programme Committee also captures feedback from social partners, who are invited to round-table discussions on their vision of the Programme, and who are written to asking what competences the Programme should address.

On the other hand, the Review Team felt that there were some aspects of 'Programme management' which would benefit from further clarification and development. In particular, the Faculty and Programme staff should further clarify precisely where ownership of the overall quality assurance of the Programme lies. This should include clarifying the relationship between the Department of Childhood Pedagogy and the *Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child* Study Programme Committee, and explicitly detailing how this Committee operates. In particular, the Programme will benefit from identifying more clearly an individual Programme Leader with significant responsibility and a clear, high profile role.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Family Education and Protection of the Rights of the Child* (state code – 621X20007) at Klaipeda University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Teaching staff	2
4.	Facilities and learning resources	2
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	**14**

*1 (unsatisfactory) - there are essential shortcomings that must be eliminated;

2 (satisfactory) - meets the established minimum requirements, needs improvement;

3 (good) - the field develops systematically, has distinctive features;

4 (very good) - the field is exceptionally good.

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Prof. Ian Smith
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Dr Marit Allern
	Dr Maria Filomena Rodrigues Teixeira
	Ms Danguolė Kiznienė
	Ms Gerda Šidlauskytė

KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
ŠEIMOS EDUKOLOGIJA IR VAIKO TEISIŲ APSAUGA **(VALSTYBINIS KODAS –**
621X20007)
2016-02-15 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-61 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Šeimos edukologija ir vaiko teisių apsauga* (valstybinis kodas – 621X20007) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	2
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	**14**

* 1 - Nepatenkinamai (yra esminių trūkumų, kuriuos būtina pašalinti)

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

3 - Gerai (sistemiškai plėtojama sritis, turi savitų bruožų)

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

1. Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai

Pedagogikos fakultetas ir studijų programos *Šeimos edukologija ir vaiko teisių apsauga* grupė savianalizės suvestinėje atsižvelgė į dėstytojų, absolventų ir socialinių partnerių nuomones. Per susitikimus geriausiai bendrą šios programos tikslą nurodė savianalizės suvestinės rengimo grupė, šios studijų programos dėstytojai, absolventai ir socialiniai partneriai. Vertinimo grupė supranta, kad tikslas yra stiprinti dabartinių ikimokyklinio ugdymo įstaigų ir pradinių mokyklų mokytojų gebėjimus, siekiant tenkinti mokinių poreikius, atsirandančius nuolat didėjant socialinėms problemoms, kurios turi jiems poveikį.

Antra vertus, Fakulteto vadovybė turi dar labiau įsisąmoninti, kad ši programa negali būti siejama su studijų programa *Socialinė pedagogika* ir jai būdingais teisiniais aspektais. Šie darbuotojai turi atsisakyti minties apie šios studijų programos absolventų „dvigubos profesijos" galimybes.

Tai ypač būtina, nes ir pačioje savianalizės suvestinėje aiškiai pateikiami argumentai dėl to, kad susijungimo su studijų programa *Socialinė pedagogika* reikia atsisakyti.

2. Programos sandara

Šios programos dokumentuose, atrodo, panaikinta bet kokia aiški nuoroda į konsultantų rengimą. Panašu, kad sąvoka „educology" apskritai pašalinta iš programos dokumentų anglų kalba. Į programos sandarą dabar įtrauktas naudojimasis Universiteto virtualia mokymosi aplinka.

Antra vertus, programa bus darnesnė aiškiau atskleidus ilgalaikį strateginį ryšį tarp programos sandaros ir bendro programos tikslo (t. y., stiprinti dabartinių ikimokyklinio ugdymo įstaigų ir pradinių mokyklų mokytojų gebėjimus siekiant tenkinti mokinių poreikius, atsirandančius nuolat didėjant socialinėms problemoms, kurios turi jiems poveikį). Tai siejasi su pirmiau pateiktomis pastabomis dėl „Programos tikslų ir numatomų studijų rezultatų".

Be to, dar labai svarbu užtikrinti, kad būsimuose šios programos dokumentuose anglų kalba sąvoka „educology" nebūtų vartojama. Pavyzdžiui, ji dar kartą pasikartoja savianalizės suvestinės 2 dalies („Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai") 14 punkte.

3. Personalas

Šios studijų programos dėstytojams suteikiama įvairių formų pagalba jų kvalifikacijai kelti, įskaitant pagalbą mokslinių tyrimų srityje. Įsteigtas Universiteto mokslo ir studijų skatinimo fondas, skirtas remti dėstytojų dalyvavimą tarptautiniuose moksliniuose renginiuose bei konferencijose. Universiteto Tęstinių studijų institutas organizuoja akademinio personalo profesiniam tobulinimui skirtus seminarus. Pedagogikos fakultetas kiekvieną mėnesį organizuoja mokslininkų forumą. Suteikiamos galimybės dalyvauti tarptautinėse akademinių mainų programose ir gauti atostogas moksliniams tyrimams atlikti. Pateikti dalyvavimo tarptautiniuose projektuose pavyzdžiai. Dėstytojai kalbėjo apie piniginę paskatą publikacijoms skelbti, o Katedros vedėjas – apie dėstymo krūvio derinimą su mokslinių tyrimų veikla.

Tačiau vertinimo grupė mano, kad jai buvo pateikti konkretūs paramos atskirų asmenų profesiniam ir moksliniam tobulėjimui pavyzdžiai, o ne darnaus, visaapimančio rėmimo plano, aiškiai susieto su programos tikslais, įrodymai. Universitetas, Fakultetas ir Katedra turėtų parengti aiškesnę šios studijų programos dėstytojų kompetencijų tobulinimo rėmimo strategiją. Ji turėtų apimti dėstytojų gebėjimus ir galimybes dalyvauti moksliniuose tyrimuose, ypač tarptautiniuose. Reikėtų toliau skatinti dalyvavimą bendruose tarptautiniuose tyrimuose, toliau siekti skelbti publikacijas prestižiniuose tarptautiniuose žurnaluose anglų kalba.

4. Materialieji ištekliai

Akivaizdu, kad skirta lėšų klasėms; buvo malonu daugelyje iš jų matyti demonstruojamą pavyzdinę pradinių mokyklų literatūrą. Daug pastangų įdėta siekiant modernizuoti biblioteką. Ir toliau tobulinama Universiteto virtuali mokymosi aplinka *Moodle*, kad įgyvendinant šią studijų programą būtų galima naudotis ja, taigi ir elektroninių duomenų bazėmis, įskaitant tarptautinius šaltinius anglų kalba. Fakulteto vadovybė supranta, kad reikia dar pratęsti bibliotekos darbo laiką.

Antra vertus, studentai kalbėjo apie būtinybę gerinti Universiteto aplinką. Todėl strateginis prioritetas turėtų būti kapitalinės investicijos, kad pagerėtų bendra studentų aplinka (nors vertinimo grupė pripažįsta, kad Universitetui kyla uždavinys išsaugoti ir modernizuoti istorinius pastatus, kuriuose įsikūręs Pedagogikos fakultetas). Visų pirma lėšos turėtų būti skirtos studentų poilsio zonoms Fakulteto pastatuose įrengti. Be to, Fakultetas ir Universitetas turėtų toliau spręsti bibliotekos darbo laiko pratęsimo problemą.

5. Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

Studentai dalyvauja moksliniuose tyrimuose ir gauna įvairią tam reikalingą paramą. Prieš padedant studijuoti kiekvieną dalyką studentai supažindinami su aprašuose nurodytais dalykų vertinimo metodais; apskritai kiekvieno vertinimo reikalavimai ir kriterijai yra aiškiai apibrėžti. Nei dėstytojai, nei studentai nemano, kad galėtų kilti su plagijavimu susijusių problemų įgyvendinant šią studijų programą, kai dėstytojai ir magistrantai laikosi profesinės kultūros

principų. Priėmimo reikalavimai yra aiškūs ir viešai skelbiami. Sudaryta nemažai dvišalių susitarimų, skatinančių studentų tarptautinį judumą.

Antra vertus, Universitetas, Fakultetas ir šios studijų programos personalas turėtų ir toliau stengtis aiškiai nustatyti vertinimui taikomų balų skyrimo kriterijus. Ypač reikia ir toliau svarstyti teiginius, kurie padeda atskirti dešimčia (10) balų vertinamą pasiekimų lygį nuo devyniais (9) balais vertinamo pasiekimų lygio.

Fakultetas ir šios studijų programos personalas turėtų toliau svarstyti, kaip sumažinti egzaminų, kaip vienos iš vertinimo formų, svarbą. Reikėtų apsvarstyti alternatyvias vertinimo formas, labiau tinkančias magistrantūros programai.

Fakultetas ir šios programos personalas turėtų toliau pasinaudoti trumpalaike praktika pagal esamus dvišalius susitarimus dėl tarptautinio studentų judumo, kad padidintų tarptautinėse studentų mainų programose dalyvaujančių studentų skaičių. Vertinimo grupė, be abejo, pripažįsta, kad tai sunkiai įveikiamas uždavinys turint omenyje ištęstinių studijų studentus.

Apskritai vertinimo grupė patartų Fakultetui pripažinti, kad faktiškai šios studijų programos studentams reikėtų taikyti tik ištęstinių studijų formą ir į tai atsižvelgiant planuoti visus šios programos aspektus.

6. Programos vadyba

Programos kokybės vadyba dabar vykdoma trim lygiais: Universiteto, Fakulteto ir Katedros (Vaikystės pedagogikos katedra, įskaitant konkrečiai Katedros vadovą ir studijų programos *Šeimos edukologija ir vaiko teisių apsauga* komitetą, kuris yra atsakingas už programos įgyvendinimą ir stebėseną). Kaip nurodyta savianalizės suvestinėje, keturis kartus per metus vyksta studijų programos komiteto posėdžiai, kuriuose dalyvauja studentai, dėstytojai ir socialiniai partneriai. Posėdžiuose aptariami įvairūs su programa susiję klausimai – dėl studijų eigos, studentų mokslinės veiklos ir studentų vertinimo.

Absolventai kalbėjo, kad kiekvieno semestro pabaigoje jie kaip studentai pildo anonimiškus klausimynus (kuriuos išdalina studentų atstovas studijų programos komitete), ir dalyvauja apskritojo stalo susitikimuose. Dėstytojai taip pat teikia grįžtamąjį ryšį. Todėl galima sakyti, kad mokymo ir mokymosi patirties mechanizmai yra. Grįžtamąjį ryšį studijų programos komitetui teikia ir socialiniai partneriai, kurie yra kviečiami į apskritojo stalo diskusijas apie programos viziją ir kurių raštu klausiama, kokie gebėjimai turėtų būti ugdomi šioje programoje.

Antra vertus, vertinimo grupė mano, kad programos vadybai būtų naudinga, jei kai kurie jos aspektai būtų toliau aiškinami ir tobulinami. Visų pirma Fakultetas ir programos personalas turėtų tiksliai išaiškinti atsakomybę už bendrą programos kokybės užtikrinimą. Tai turėtų apimti ryšio tarp Vaikystės pedagogikos katedros ir studijų programos *Šeimos edukologija ir vaiko teisių apsauga* komiteto nustatymą, aiškiai nurodant, kaip šis komitetas dirba. Ypač naudinga būtų aiškiau išskirti konkretų šios studijų programos vadovą, kuriam būtų pavesta pagrindinė atsakomybė ir priskirtos aiškios svarbios funkcijos.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai

Visur viešai pristatydami studijų programą *Šeimos edukologija ir vaiko teisių apsauga* Klaipėdos Universitetas, jo Pedagogikos fakultetas ir šios programos dėstytojai turėtų toliau aiškinti, kad bendras šios programos tikslas yra stiprinti dabartinių ikimokyklinio ugdymo įstaigų ir pradinių mokyklų mokytojų gebėjimus, siekiant tenkinti mokinių poreikius, atsirandančius nuolat didėjant socialinėms problemoms, kurios turi jiems poveikį.

Taigi reikėtų ir toliau akcentuoti šios studijų programos skirtingumą nuo Universitete vykdomos studijų programos *Socialinė pedagogika*.

2. Programos sandara

Ši studijų programa bus darnesnė užtikrinus aiškesnį ir tvaresnį strateginį ryšį tarp programos sandaros ir minėto programos bendrojo tikslo (t. y. stiprinti dabartinių ikimokyklinio ir pradinio ugdymo įstaigų mokytojų gebėjimus siekiant tenkinti mokinių poreikius, atsirandančius nuolat didėjant socialinėms problemoms, kurios turi jiems poveikį).

Universitetas ir Fakultetas turėtų užtikrinti, kad visuose dokumentuose būtų aiškiai nurodyta, kad suteikiamo mokslinio laipsnio pavadinimas anglų kalba yra ne „Master in Educology", o „Master in Education Studies".

3. Personalas

Universitetas, Pedagogikos fakultetas ir Vaikystės pedagogikos katedra turėtų parengti aiškesnę šios studijų programos dėstytojų tobulinimo rėmimo strategiją. Ji turėtų apimti dėstytojų gebėjimus ir galimybes dalyvauti moksliniuose tyrimuose, ypač tarptautiniuose, po kurių būtų skelbiamos publikacijos prestižiniuose tarptautiniuose žurnaluose (įskaitant žurnalus anglų kalba).

4. Materialieji ištekliai

Universitetas susiduria su dideliais sunkumais išsaugojant ir atnaujinant istorinius pastatus, kuriuose įsikūręs Pedagogikos fakultetas, taigi ir vykdoma ši programa. Tačiau strateginis prioritetas būtų investavimas į minėtus pastatus siekiant pagerinti bendrą studentų aplinką, be kita ko, Fakulteto pastatuose įrengiant studentams skirtas poilsio zonas.

Be to, Pedagogikos fakultetas ir Universitetas turėtų toliau spręsti bibliotekos darbo laiko pratęsimo problemą.

5. Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

Universitetas, Fakultetas ir šios studijų programos dėstytojai turėtų aiškiau apibrėžti vertinimui taikomų balų skyrimo kriterijus. Ypač reikia ir toliau svarstyti teiginius, kurie padeda atskirti dešimčia (10) balų vertinamą pasiekimų lygį nuo devyniais (9) balais vertinamo pasiekimų lygio.

Be to, Fakultetas ir šios studijų programos dėstytojai turėtų toliau svarstyti, kaip sumažinti perdėtą egzaminų, kaip vienos iš vertinimo formų, svarbą. Reikėtų apsvarstyti alternatyvias vertinimo formas, labiau tinkančias magistrantūros programai.

Fakultetas ir šios programos dėstytojai turėtų toliau tirti trumpalaikės praktikos galimybes remdamiesi dabartiniais dvišaliais susitarimais, kad padidintų tarptautinėse studentų mainų programose dalyvaujančių šios programos studentų skaičių.

Nors pripažįstama, kad ištęstinių studijų studentams tai yra sunkiai pasiekiamas uždavinys, Fakultetas ir šios studijų programos dėstytojai turėtų dar aiškiau suprasti, kad ištęstinė šios studijų programos forma yra veiksminga, taigi ir ištęstinių studijų studentų poreikiai turi būti tenkinami.

6. Programos vadyba

Fakultetas ir šios studijų programos grupė turėtų tiksliai išsiaiškinti kas yra atsakingas už bendrą programos kokybės užtikrinimą. Tai turėtų apimti ryšio tarp Vaikystės pedagogikos katedros ir studijų programos *Šeimos edukologija ir vaiko teisių apsauga* komiteto nustatymą, aiškiai nurodant, kaip šis komitetas dirba. Ypač naudinga būtų aiškiau išskirti konkretų šios studijų programos vadovą, kuriam būtų pavesta pagrindinė atsakomybė ir priskirtos aiškios svarbios funkcijos.

<...>

_____

Paslaugos teikėjas patvirtina, jog yra susipažinęs su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)