



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus Universiteto  
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS "Socialinė politika" (valstybinis kodas -  
612L40002)  
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT  
OF "Social Policy" (state code - 612L40002)  
STUDY PROGRAMME  
at Vilnius University**

**Review' team:**

1. **Assoc. Prof. dr. Turo Virtanen (team leader),** *academic,*
2. **Dr Dirk Jarré,** *academic,*
3. **Assoc. Prof. dr. Iveta Reinholde,** *academic,*
4. **Dr. Marius Kalanta,** *representative of social partners'*
5. **Mr. Julius Zubė,** *students' representative.*

**Evaluation coordinator -**

***Ms. Marija Jonikova***

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language – English

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Socialinė politika
Valstybinis kodas	612L40002
Studijų krypčių grupė	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Sociologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė, 4
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Socialinių mokslų bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2012-06-12

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Social policy
State code	612L40002
Group of study field	Social Sciences
Study field	Sociology
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time, 4
Volume of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Social Sciences
Date of registration of the study programme	12th June, 2012

© Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras  
The Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education

# CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1. Background of the evaluation process.....	4
1.2. General.....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information.....	5
1.4. The Review Team.....	5
<b>II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2.2. Curriculum design .....	7
2.3. Teaching staff .....	11
2.4. Facilities and learning resources .....	13
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	16
2.6. Programme management .....	19
2.7. Examples of excellence * .....	21
<b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS* .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>IV. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>27</b>

## 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 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, the following additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	Sample of Bachelor's theses
2.	List of databases accessible in the electronic network of Vilnius University Library, 19.10.2017
3.	Examples of the allocation of academic staff's working load

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

The Bachelor's programme of Social Policy is hosted by the Department of Social Work (as of 2018 the Institute of Sociology and Social Work) of the Faculty of Philosophy in Vilnius University. The Faculty implements five first cycle study programmes, one of which is the Bachelor's programme of Social Policy, and 11 second cycle programmes. The BA programme of Social Policy was established in 2011. The programme has not been evaluated earlier by SKVC. A total of 41 academic staff - professors and lecturers - was engaged in the Social Policy Bachelor Study Programme in the period of evaluation 2014-2016. Altogether 41 students graduated in 2016.

### **1.4. The Review Team**

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. V-41 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *25/October/2017*.

1. **Assoc. Prof. dr. Turo Virtanen (team leader)** *Adjunct Professor of Political Science at University of Helsinki, Finland.*
2. **Dr. Dirk Jarré**, *Lecturer at Johannes Kepler University in Linz/Austria and Joanneum in Graz, Austria;*
3. **Assoc. prof. dr. Iveta Reinholde**, *Associate Professor, the Head of the Department of Political Science at University of Latvia, Latvia.*
4. **Dr. Marius Kalanta**, *Founder of KOG Institute for Marketing and Communications Science, expert, researcher, supervisor of programs of continuous professional development, Lithuania.*
5. **Mr. Julius Zubè**, *student of University of Copenhagen study programme - African Studies, Denmark.*

## **II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS**

### **2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes**

The aim of the programme is to “to prepare social policy specialists able to apply relevant social science theories, research methods and data, to identify and analyse social problems at local, national and international levels, to prepare social policy proposals and to organize their implementation aimed at well-being of an individual and society” (SER, p. 6). The learning outcomes of the programme are specified as four generic competences and four subject-specific competences which are further itemised in the form of 22 learning outcomes (SER, pp. 6-7). All these are well-defined and clear, optimally informative and succinct. However, it is somewhat

surprising that communication competences are not part of generic competences but part of subject-specific competences. The learning outcomes are presented as a table (SER, pp. 9-12) across all course units, which is convenient in curriculum design. The programme reflects the importance of generic competences in knowledge society and life-long learning which indicates good professional orientation in designing study programmes. The learning outcomes have been revised two years after the start of the programme, based on information from academic staff, students and social partners.

The information about the aim and learning outcomes and other relevant elements, like admission requirements, are freely accessible on the University's official website and in a special publication used for promotional events.

The SER (p. 14) lists the documents on various academic and professional standards that have been used as guidelines in designing the learning outcomes. There is no reference to international directives of international networks and associations in the field of social policy, for example, the European Network for Social Policy Analysis or Social Policy Association, but interviews indicated that these links exist, at least partly. However, as social policy is not anymore a separate study field in 2017, the programme refers to the national descriptor of the study field of sociology, but neither opens its content nor compares it to the current programme of social policy. The programme's linkages to academic and professional requirements could be more transparent, i.e. described in the main points. Anyway, the programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the type of studies and the level of qualifications typical for BA programmes.

The BA theses that were available during the site visit were compatible with the intended learning outcomes, but the research methodology could have been more sophisticated and the literature more international.

The SER (p. 14) compares the study programmes to the BA programme offered by Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas. The added value of the programme is found in providing more holistic and in-depth process and more optional courses and putting more emphasis on foreign language skills and practicing research and data analysis. The interviews also emphasised that the staff in VU is more interdisciplinary.

The SER does not address the questions, how objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the state, societal and labour market needs. However, according to interviews, the programme, together with the MA programme of social policy, is actually creating the labour market for social policy, because the need of these specialists capable of improving evidence-based social policy is not sufficiently recognized. In this sense, the programme is proactive and promotes the institutionalisation of social policy as a discipline and professional practice. This is partly based on common mission with the ministry responsible for social security. Given this vision, a more transparent analysis of initial collaboration with social partners that led to the design of the programme would have shed light also on the lack of relevant statistics of labour market and the special justification for launching the programme. The interviews of social partners indicated that, for example, there is a clear need for qualified social policy evaluations, which is surely compatible with the intended learning outcomes of the programme.

The SER does not address the questions, how programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission, operational objectives and/or strategy of Vilnius University. The interviews did not illuminate the existence or non-existence of this correspondence.

The title of the programme has changed in 2017 from BA in Social Policy to BA in Social Science. The former title would have been more informative in tuning the programme, intended learning outcomes, the content of the programme and the qualifications to be obtained.

The programme has analysed its strengths and weakness (SER, p. 15) in an informative way and specifically in relation to learning outcomes.

## ***2.2. Curriculum design***

The curriculum design of Vilnius University first-cycle study programme “Social Policy”, BA level, is in full conformity with the provisions of Lithuanian legal acts in this matter (see SER, page 15) and meets, in particular, the “General Requirements for Study Implementation” (see SER, table 2.1, pages 15 & 16).

According to the SER table 2.2 and connected explanations on page 16 there are three options to study social policy at BA-level at Vilnius University (each of them combined with general university subjects, rating at 15 ECTS): (1) Social Policy without a minor study programme,

where social policy is scoring 225 ECTS; (2) Social Policy as a major study programme, where social policy is scoring 165 ECTS and the other programme 60 ECTS; and (3) Social Policy as a minor study programme, where the other programme is scoring 165 ECTS and social policy 60 ECTS. Part of the concept is to lay the grounds for different options facilitating the choices either to go into concrete work with a BA degree or to continue the studies at MA level.

The three options allow students to familiarise themselves broadly with social policy in different degrees of intensity and, partially, in combination with another study programme of their own choice from a list of university agreed subjects. This possibility of choice at BA-level can certainly attract increased student's interest for social policy. An additional advantage is that through such combinations students have an enlarged opportunity to encounter and exchange with peers from other disciplines.

There is no indication that inside the framework of each option of the programme, subjects or topics are unnecessarily repeated.

The social policy study programme is composed by 6 groups of modules: (1) Basics of social policy, (2) Basics of social sciences for social policy, (3) Social policy paradigms, (4) Fields of social policy, (5) Research methods, and (6) General university subjects (see SER, sub-chapter 2.2 on page 17). The concept of these groups of modules and their components is convincingly argued. In the group "Fields of social policy" with a very large variety of courses (16 are mentioned) students can choose areas where they are interested in. While the more general courses bring 10 ECTS, the more specialized ones only score with 5 ECTS. However, it is not evident what the minimum number of participants in such electives is and to which extent the optional courses have finally been in fact realised.

However, interviews with students and alumni raised questions about the appropriate focus of the content elements of the compulsory courses on social policy issues, strategies and policy-making processes. It was argued that a clearer concentration on "what is social policy all about" during the first semester would boost student's understanding, interest and commitment - and that more specific aspects should then be dealt with during the following semesters.

Professional practice, a compulsory element of the BA social policy study programme, is part of the group "Fields of social policy" and accounts for 15 ECTS, with a total of 400 hours in 13 weeks. SER indicates (see pages 17 & 18) that there is a wide range of possible placements in various organisations (altogether currently 51 institutions), active in different social policy fields,



students can freely choose from. Students have also the possibility to propose themselves new places for professional practice. Professional training on the spot is considered as a very important component of the programme. Supervisors appointed by the Department and qualified staff from the training institutions look after the quality of the practice and provide coaching to students. After the practice students have to deliver a Social Policy Report on their experience describing six performed tasks. An evaluation report of a supervisor form the institution completes the dossier, which is then assessed by a university supervisor (see SER, page 19).

However, the SER addresses as a prevailing problem the lack of sufficient experienced practice supervisors in the institutions - due to the fact that the placement programme in this discipline is relatively new. At the same time the relationship with “social partners”, specifically with potential future employers of the students, seem to be not yet very developed nor really formalised - as interviews with “social partners” have confirmed.

The placements are scheduled for the last term of the study programme - and this creates a considerable problem for students, as they have to concentrate, during the same term, on their bachelor thesis and on final exams. The issue has been raised in interviews with students and alumni.

Part of the basics of the study programme are also modules “Foreign languages”, judged as indispensable for social policy students, considering that main literature is in foreign languages, predominantly in English.

The separation of “Social Policy” from “Social Work” is to be considered as very appropriate and seems to be much appreciated by both teachers as well as students. The still necessary interconnection between both subjects seems to be sufficiently ensured.

The analysis of the study programme elements as well as repeated statements during interviews with teaching staff, students and alumni give reason to trust that main characteristics and objectives of such a BA programme - namely to provide a general view on the central topics related to social policy, the development of basic knowledge of issues at stake, an understanding of what social policy is dealing with in practice, and the introduction into social science instruments - are implemented. Stakeholders confirmed that students with a BA degree in social policy have a rather high level of knowledge and good communication skills.

According to sub-chapter 2.3 of the SER on pages 17 & 18, there is a very large variety of different study methods used in the teaching of the programme subjects - seemingly appropriate for the attainment of the diverse learning goals of the programme. It is also pointed out in the SER that to an important extent teachers from other disciplines are involved in the programme.

However, in the interviews students observed in respect to the form of teaching that number of teachers are lacking the necessary pedagogical competences to easily and effectively convey the substance of their lectures. It was repeatedly said that several courses do not attract students due to the form of content presentation and that many teachers are not in command of advanced supportive teaching systems, like e.g. Moodle.

A study of the Course Unit Descriptions (SER, ANNEX No. 1. Course unit Descriptions) reveals that many of these documents describe so many and diverse detailed topics to be covered that serious doubts can be raised whether these enumerations correspond realistically to the actual teaching. Furthermore some of them seem to be unduly foamed by too extended literature lists. Example: Course unit “Social Problems, Needs and Values“ lists 84 titles for compulsory reading (!), a variety of legal texts like the “Civil Code of the Republic of Lithuania” with relevant amendments, the “Social Services Law of the Republic of Lithuania” with relevant amendments et al., plus 9 titles for optional reading.

The SER specifies (page 18) that one ECTS equals 27 hours of student work for both compulsory and optional (elective) subjects. Self-study work hours represent at average 67 % of the total amount of study hours, while the other 33 % are contact hours with teachers. This balance seems to be rather reasonable.

The Bachelor’s thesis is regulated and has to be developed according to procedures adopted by the Faculty of Philosophy (see SER, page 18). The topics for their BA thesis are chosen by students themselves - with involvement of potential supervisors - and supported by a compulsory “Bachelor’s Thesis Seminar”. They are defended at the end of the last term of the programme.

Despite a very reasonable structure of the social policy study programme and the coverage of a large variety of issues - in compulsory as well as in elective courses - the examination of the Course Unit Descriptions (SER, ANNEX No. 1) lead to the assumption that very important and basic issues are not covered sufficiently and would merit more attention - like, for example, “Human, fundamental and social rights - their codification and the possibilities of their

enforcement”, “Causes and prevention of social and socio-economic problems”, “Actors, processes and dynamics of social policy making”, “Impact assessment of social policies, strategies and programmes”, and alike.

On the other hand, approaches to social sciences research methodologies - in particular work on statistics and data analysis - are considered as very good (according to interviews with students, alumni, stakeholders). Also the fact that practitioners “from the field” are brought into the programme for lectures is judged as very positive and should be enhanced

In its objectives and in its content the Vilnius first-cycle study programme “Social Policy”, BA level, largely corresponds to the international standards of social policy teaching. Also the exposure to general trends and international research in the discipline seems to be reasonable - even though an increase and intensification of international contacts and cooperation would still be desirable and certainly beneficial for teaching staff and students.

### ***2.3. Teaching staff***

The SER claims that staff involved in teaching as it is set by the legal requirements in the General Requirements for First-Cycle and Integrated Study Programmes (*Order No V-501 of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania 9 April 2010*). In total, there are 41 staff member, and 35 (85%) of them are employed by Vilnius University as a principal employer. At the moment, the largest proportion of academic staff (33 members, or 80,5 %) (SER, p.19) of the programme hold PhD degree ensuring delivery of major courses in the particular programme.

According to the SER, there are 11 full time professors (27% of total staff) covering 24,45% of the courses in the programme (SER, p.20). At the same time, only 18 teachers (44%) are from the Department of Social Work, while other teachers are from other Departments of the University (e.g., Department of Sociology, General Psychology etc.). It should be noted that Department of Social Work is the main implementing unit for the BA programme. The current ratio of teachers: students is around 1:15 ensuring a scale of economy and efficient work with students where is possible to develop teamwork.

According to SER (annex 2), staff involved in the programme has extensive pedagogical and research experience. During interviews it was found out that in order to enrich and to strengthen the BA programme with experts in the field of social policy, new staff members were recruited. However, the newly recruited professors are employed by the research centre outside Vilnius University – Lithuanian Social Research Centre and their involvement in the BA programme is rather minimal and limited. The newly recruited staff members covers such subjects in the programme like supervising BA thesis and the course “Economic Activation of Population”.

In general, staff is carrying out research related to the subject areas of teaching. However, their research activity and productivity mainly depends from external research funding since there is no Faculty’s research policy defined as it was found out in the interviews. At the same time, in the interviews staff assured that they get necessary support to be participate in the conferences and to cover travel expenses related to conferences where his/her presentation/paper has been accepted. However, staff is in shortage of infrastructural support like office space or support for publishing in open access scientific journals.

The University provides opportunities for professional training (SER, p. 53), but according to the interviews, the staff could take part in them more often. The staff exchange of ERASMUS+ programme is another option for upgrading the professional skills of the staff. However, the participation rate of the staff exchange and staff mobility programmes is rather low due to high teaching workload and rather weak practices to replace the missing teaching during teachers’ mobility. Opportunities to sabbaticals and longer stays in foreign universities as part of mobility programmes are rare due to staff’s teaching workload. During interviews it was also found out that there is over-reliance to one staff member, which endangers the attainment of learning outcomes and the development of the programme in case he or she would consider to leave the programme, even two additional professor were recruited. The current breakdown of workload reflected in staff working hours inventory sheets does not motivate staff to devote time for research and publishing efforts since the remuneration depends mainly from amount of teaching hours. In addition, many of activities performed by the staff are not recorded, thus also not reflected in the payslips. However, in the interviews there were expectations that current remuneration system related directly to teaching activities will be subject to change in the future. The scientific productivity of staff has declined since 2012 as far as number of staff increased substantially while research outputs does not reflect changes. This is directly linked to the current policy of workload management. The current human resource policy (workload breakdown, research policy) endangers development of the programme.

In general, the qualifications of staff is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes, especially research skills. According to SER, the key staff is involved in many nongovernmental and professional organisation enriching the teaching process. At the same time, approx. 11% (or 25 credits) of the programme are covered by the junior staff (lecturers, doctoral students (SER, p.20). In the interviews it was found out teachers are good experts in the subject they research and teach, meanwhile their teaching skills needs to be improved so that they fits to modern challenges of academia including wider application of modern teaching tools.

The programme is in the intensive stage of growth, so there is no staff turnover evidenced. On contrary, the programme recruits new staff members or provides promotion for the current ones. In the interviews it was found out that staff is recruited based on their research fields. However, since field of social policy is expanding, still there is rather significant impact social work impact in the background of staff.

#### ***2.4. Facilities and learning resources***

The environmental and architectural quality of the premises used for the purposes of the Social Policy programme is certainly very high. A historical building located in the central part of Vilnius accommodates the Faculty of Philosophy and all of its departments and centres including the Department of Social Work. In 2005 the building was renovated to suit needs of studies and research of nowadays and also to comply with hygiene and work safety requirements (SER, p. 26) as well as with basic accessibility for disabled people.

The premises provided by the building and available for the Social Policy programme are numerous and of high quality though definitely insufficient since they are shared among all 17 study programmes of the Faculty (<http://www.fsf.vu.lt/studijos>, accessed on 02-11-2017). The programme employs following premises: 19 classrooms, 10 of which are equipped with fixed furniture, seating from 36 to 100 students and primarily used for lectures, and 9 others – with flexibly moving furniture, accommodating up to 38 persons and specially adapted to be used for workshops and seminars; 2 computer classes; 2 conference rooms used for meetings and thesis defences; and 3 rooms with total area of 55,6 sq. m. dedicated for needs of the teaching and the research staff (SER, p. 26). The insufficiency of these premises is significant and was emphasised multiple times during the evaluation. Inadequate number of classrooms was already

stressed in the SER (p. 28) as it had frequently created difficulties in reconciling of compulsory and elective courses. In the teachers view expressed during the interviews, the classrooms were tight and very busy, making lectures and student consultations less convenient. Additionally to this the students pointed out some quality concerns: the classrooms sometimes were cold; and some classrooms were equipped with folding tables, unstable and frequently collapsing by accident and thus dropping down and damaging students' notebooks, tablets or smartphones placed on them.

However the major facilities related problem the programme faces is office space for the teaching staff. The programme employs 41 teachers though only 3 small rooms with less than 10 individual working places in total are available to them as their office space for preparing for courses, conducting research, writing articles and consulting students. This problem was already stressed as a weakness in the SER (p. 28), however the interviews with the teaching staff revealed that its significance was really high. In their view "20 teachers have 5 computers" and the teachers use home or the nearby-located library as their office, however the convenience of this necessity is said to be low. To address the problem the faculty has prospective plans to equip the lacking office space in another building it has recently acquired and intends to renovate, however exact dates yet to be announced.

Teaching and learning equipment available for the purposes of the programme is quality and in many cases sufficient though some shortages are evident. The classrooms and the conference rooms are standardly equipped with a PC computer having office software and internet access, a multimedia projector and audio speakers, which is fully adequate (SER, p. 27). For learning research methods and for students' individual research and written assignments, the programme employs 2 computer classes both having slightly more than 20 computerised work places equipped with MS Office and SPSS Campus Professional (SER, p. 27). With respect to the fact that the programme has been planning to admit 70 students every year and that the number of actually admitted students in the period between 2014 and 2016 is respectively 47, 67 and 22, student access to the computer classes is very limited. This was strongly stressed during the interview with the students what included inadequate availability of computers for individual work and inconvenient scheduling of the classes.

The other technical and digital equipment available for teaching, research and learning is fully in line with the learning outcomes of the programme and with contemporary teaching and learning methods, however some space for improvement still exists. Wireless internet access is available

all around the campus. The faculty has its own research infrastructure administration unit “Human Well-being and Development”, providing all needed equipment for conducting qualitative and quantitative social research, including tablet computers, mobile observation equipment, focus group discussion rooms and equipment, specialised data analysis, educational and supportive software, for instance IBM SPSS Modeler Premium, Adobe Acrobat Professional, MATLAB, HAMLET, MAXQDA, STATA (SER, p. 26-27 and information gathered during the visit). The teachers and the students view this equipment as adequate, however few students stressed that they had experienced problems with online access to some data analysis software, getting software installed on their computers, receiving IT support, and in some classrooms, connecting to wireless internet (the latter issue was being addressed at the moment of evaluation by installing new equipment).

A virtual learning environment is available for integration into the study process (not mentioned in the SER), however its application is inadequately low in scope and coverage. The interviews revealed that using of virtual environment was optional, only few teachers employed it for sharing courses materials, communicating with students and assigning tasks. Some students noted that the teachers did not use the virtual learning environment due to lack of relevant skills. Some teachers pointed to weak IT support preventing from using it as well as from application of other methods of e-learning. Many students saw the virtual learning environment as a convenient tool for learning and wished it could be applied more frequently and wider.

Information resources and facilities available for the students and the teachers of the programme are provided by VU Central library. They are exceptionally good in size and quality. The Faculty of Philosophy has its specialised library-reading room located in the premises of the central library in the same campus. The library provides a number of reading rooms, computerised and individual work places, rooms for group work. Additional facilities and resources are available in the new National Open Access Scholarly Communication and Information Centre located in another campus and accessible on 24/7 basis. The open stack of the Philosophy library-reading room is highly numerous (17 228 titles), very profound (covers all subject areas of social policy as well as educology, philosophy, psychology, sociology and social work), and plentifully supplemented (about 600 additional new titles including books and periodic publications every year). Access to 69 full-text databases, 9 bibliographic data and 1 image (video) database is guaranteed (SER, p. 27). The staff actively recommends new titles and other new information resources for the library to acquire and these recommendations are fulfilled in most cases. In

total, the library resources and facilities are among the best valued by the teachers and the students, and none of them have experienced any problems with them as the interviews revealed.

### ***2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment***

Entrance requirements and rules of the programme are clear and well founded, and can be accessed in the university's information leaflets and the webpage of the Faculty of Philosophy. The applicants have to make a single request with all of their desirable programmes of study at the university. The admission selection procedure is based on choosing the applicants with the best competitive grades, which are comprised of scores based on their final grade or exam results from mathematics or informational technologies (weighting factor 0,2), as well as final results from any other subject (0,2), Matura exam results in history (0,4), and Lithuanian language and literature (0,2) (SER, p. 28). Applicants with a cumulative grade lower than 3 cannot be admitted to the programme. The programme's Self-Evaluation Report (SER) claims that the number of applications and high competitive scores demonstrates interest in the programme, as well as its popularity (SER, p. 28). However, the size of admitted student cohorts has changed throughout 2012-2016 from 55 admitted students in 2012 to 22 in 2016. The regular competition for study places has been steadily decreasing since 2013 (12,63 applications per place) and reached all-time low in 2016 (2,74 applications per place) (SER, Annex no. 5).

The programme's organization of studies consists of two seminars (20 weeks each) every study year. Study time is distributed between lectures, seminars, and independent learning (self-study of mandatory and recommended material). Attendance to lectures is not mandatory, but participation in seminars is compulsory. 67% of study hours are allocated to independent learning (SER, p. 29). Despite such a significant percentage of time allocated to independent learning, students claim that combining employment with studies is problematic due to an irregular schedule of classes throughout the week. Furthermore, several students pointed out that throughout their studies they were not allowed to take elective courses that were included in the official study curriculum. For example, some students were planning to study the elective course Sociology of Education, but never got a chance to take this module. The majority of students claimed that most courses do not use any e-learning methods, which would make the learning process more convenient for the students. For example, the program Moodle is not used in several modules and professors claim to not see any value in its use, although students say they would welcome such action. Furthermore, during the student interviews it was clear that a significant number of the students find several classes in the programme to be taught inadequately (Ex. professors simply read out their material from their own slides while barely



interacting with the students. Additionally, multiple courses are too repetitive). According to the students, this has strongly affected their morale and has led to a lack of motivation to participate in the classes. Both students and alumni have commented that the most concerning issue in the organization of their studies has been the mandatory requirement to conduct an internship in the final semester of their studies. Because of this, students have to combine their internship activities with writing their final thesis. According to students, they were not able to allocate a sufficient amount of time for both activities, and would like to be allowed to conduct their internships during earlier semesters or summer breaks.

Students stated that they are often encouraged to participate in conferences and other various scientific events taking place in Vilnius (where the option might be given to participate in the event instead of a lecture). Several interviewed students also mentioned being encouraged to produce scientific articles and potentially collaborate with their teachers. Students are also encouraged to take part in various extra-curricular activities in the university's choirs, debate club, radio station, and newspaper, as well as different sports programmes at the Health and Sports Centre (SER, p. 30). Students are provided with conditions to participate in the exchange programme Erasmus+. The faculty of philosophy has signed 67 Erasmus+ agreements with HEI abroad, most of which are signed with institutions in Germany (16) (SER, Annex no. 5). However, the student participation in the exchanges is low because in the partner institutions, BA-level courses are usually taught in local language and students have problems finding programmes and courses that they could take abroad.

The academic staff consults students by e-mail and other ITC means. Each teacher allocates at least two hours per week for individual consultations with students for understanding the individually read literature or preparation for written assignments (SER, p. 29). Students periodically receive questionnaires to provide feedback on courses and teachers. The students claim their questionnaires are well received and taken into account, yet they do not know how the feedback system works. The Career Centre of Vilnius University consults students on their future career planning as well. The students are eligible to receive different scholarships for academic excellence or grants to socially disadvantaged students. Dormitories are available to all students during their studies at the university. Priority for accommodation in dormitories is granted to socially disadvantaged students (SER, p. 29).

The programme uses written forms of examination to assess academic progress, depending on the module being taught. These may include a test, written papers, essays, projects, case studies,

reports, etc. The university employs a 10-point assessment scale (minimal positive assessment being 5) and most of the modules use a cumulative grading method. During the first lecture, students are introduced to the assessment criteria and testing procedures (SER, p. 31). After the analysis of individual programme modules provided in the SER, it can be said that the main methods used to assess student achievements are individual work projects, essays, group work, oral presentations, and written mid-term and final examinations. The assignments are composed and formulated so that all the learning outcomes in most of the subjects are considered. However, the assessment of the competence of group-work participation in several courses is questionable. During the interview, students said they are often assessed on group-work participation based on their group discussions. However, according to the students, these discussions are facilitated in a non-inclusive and discouraging manner. Students thus argued that they themselves do not think this evaluation method has been successful. Regarding the final thesis assessment, the programme's alumni and students have expressed that several thesis reviewers have provided their final assessments very late – some even the morning before the thesis defence. This creates many problems, since the student may have enough time to prepare to address the assessment during the defence. It also creates an unequal thesis defence process between the students – some of the students may receive their assessment early and adjust their defence accordingly, while others whose reviewers submitted their reviews late do not have the same opportunity.

Regarding academic integrity, during the first semester of the studies students are enrolled in a compulsory course dedicated to instruct them on a proper didactical guidelines of academic writing. Meanwhile, every student's graduation thesis is uploaded to the Electronic Plagiarism Detection System (EPAS), introduced in 2008 (SER, p. 31). Students whose study performance yielded unsatisfactory academic results are allowed a second attempt within the time designated by the faculty. A student with two academic debts can continue studies on the condition of retaking the failed exams during the first two weeks of the next semester. Furthermore, students can launch an appeal for a non-objective assessment (SER, p. 31).

According to the interview with the senior staff, the programme was designed with the help of qualitative labour market analysis. However, the SER does not provide any statements as to whether the SP programme corresponds to the state's economic, social, and future development needs. Since the SP programme was launched in 2012 there is no substantial information available on the employment of graduates and their professional activities. Nonetheless, the majority of graduates acknowledged that they are familiar with the system, and the interviewed

graduates of the programme claimed that they work in the field directly related to the study programme.

## ***2.6. Programme management***

The composition of study programme committee is described in the SER (p. 32). In addition to academic staff, there is a member representing social partners and also a member representing students. The chairman of the committee has the responsibility to coordinate the work and approve of the implementation of the programme and its changes. The committee analyses the feedback from faculty units, students, graduates, academic staff and social partners. Apart from the cursory description of the work of the committee, the SER does not tell much more about the decision making related to study programmes, but simply specifies that all modifications of the study programme are discussed and approved by the committee, the Faculty Council and the Senate. According to interviews, the Dean decides on the recruitment of the staff of the study programmes and the departments focus more on research activities. Overall, the allocation of responsibilities for decisions and monitoring the implementation of the programme could be more transparent: the processes of the coordination of the content of teaching and the division of labour of teachers are ambiguous; the autonomy of teachers in relation to the authority of committee's is not specified.

The University has a study information system (VUSIS), which has several sub-systems. One of them is for the management of study programmes. The system is an important instrument in processing the operational information necessary in running study programmes, but it is unclear how this operative information system can be used and is used in the development of the study programmes. For example, it is not clear, what are the major reports that can be used for that purpose on regular basis.

The University has a centralized quality assurance system. The University's Administration of Studies is responsible both for the implementation of study programmes and ensuring the quality of the organisational units and their functioning. The University has a quality manual, manual for university lecturer, and regulations of study programmes. The SER does not tell about their content, but offers internet links to them (the documents are all in Lithuanian). The principles of the quality assurance system could be more transparent: for example, the main content of the quality manual and the manual of university lecturers should be available in English; and there should be an informative description, how the principles of the quality assurance system have been applied in practice in the case to the BA programme of Social Policy.

The University has specified general principles of getting feedback and handling it (SER, p 33). At the end of each semester, the university launches questionnaires for BA and MA students focusing on specific course units (modules) and general satisfaction with the studies. According to interviews, there is also a survey for graduates. The study programme committee has also launched its own questionnaire. The systematic procedures provide a good information base for analysis. Each teacher is supposed to analyse the feedback and make improvement in teaching. In practice, the usefulness of feedback surveys suffers from low response rates. Nevertheless, there are examples that the feedback has led to changes, like in providing complementary courses (SER, p. 33). According to interviews, students do not seem to know, how the feedback system works, and what will happen after responding to questionnaires. In general, the feedback system is systematic and works in technical sense, but it is not clear how effectively it is used in improving the programme.

According to interviews, many students are not satisfied with teaching methods. Some teachers tend to 'read the rows on Power Point slides'; there is too much repetition between courses; many students think they are 'wasting their time', if they attend to lectures, because the added value of teaching is low when the materials can be read at home; many wish for more interactive teaching. At the same time, some courses are considered very good. It seems that the difference between courses students consider successes and failures is relatively big. Interviews indicated also that the staff is not sufficiently aware of the options provided by the University to learn more about teaching skills and do not always consider them useful. The programme management should address all these issues and make sure that teachers take part in pedagogical training when appropriate and that there are incentives to develop one's teaching skills.

There are no effective alumni activities among the graduates of the programme. However, the programme could benefit from more active inclusion of alumni to tutoring students, developing the curriculum and supporting their employability in relevant ways.

The quality assurance system should be developed to ensure that the feedback is received also in other forms than surveys (with low response rate). Regular meetings with students and focus groups interviews facilitated by an outside specialist might provide new information for programme development. The results of the feedback and changes based on them should also be communicated to students. Knowing the consequences of giving feedback will probably motivate students to give feedback also in the future.

Social partners are involved in the study programme committee, participate in meetings, and are invited to the committee for defending BA theses, to provide internship and to give lectures. According to interviews, social partners do not meet each other on regular basis and do not know what initiatives have been presented to the programme management and what has been their effect. The staff have recognised the need for more formal contracts with stakeholders to make the collaboration more systematic. There is also need for better coordination of the processes of internship, as sometimes the tasks students are expected to perform are not compatible with the needs or possibilities of the employer. There is also a wish to have more male students, because mere understanding and credible intervention to some social problems relevant for social policies need male perspective.

The programme has analysed its strengths and weaknesses, but it is relative limited (SER, pp. 33-34). However, the recognition of the low participation of social partners in discussing the content of the programme is important. Overall, there is a need to create a broader strategy to develop the collaboration with social partners to generate a more structured and effective dialogue. The strategy should cover contractual basis for different modes of collaboration, the initiatives to modify curriculum, internship processes, possibilities to improve gender balance, joint research initiatives etc.

The information about the study programme is public, relevant and easily accessible on the website of the University. Information about study programme accreditation is also published on the website.

## **2.7. Examples of excellence**

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The programme should clarify, how programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission, operational objectives and/or strategy of Vilnius University.
2. The programme should specify the evidence for the state, societal and labour market needs of social policy specialists and corresponding intended learning outcomes within the framework of national institutionalisation of the social policy.
3. The detailed content elements of the compulsory courses of the study programme - together with their structural arrangements - should be re-examined with care in view of their relevance to promote a good understanding of what social policy is all about.
4. In the planning and coordination contacts between the teachers of the department as well as in negotiations with teachers from other departments attention should be given to the issue whether all social policy issues important for BA level are sufficiently covered by the curriculum or whether changes and different accents are required.
5. While placements (internship) are considered as very important, their timing should be re-considered as the present planning puts them at the end of the programme parallel to students' work on their final thesis and thus makes concentrated attention to both very difficult.
6. Teaching methods of academic staff require close attention and extended opportunities to improve them should be provided - together with effective guidance on how to use advanced electronic teaching and communication systems.
7. The range of external experts "from practice" as invited lecturers should be extended and the importance of their involvement in the programme - including the debate on the programme's conception and core areas - emphasised.
8. More external international experts should be invited as well as experts from the practical placement institutions and from potential employers of graduates.
9. Incentives to motive staff to carry out research should be considered.

10. Teaching skills need to be improved and, consequently, teachers be encouraged to take part in pedagogical training so that their teaching skills better correspond to modern challenges of academia - including wider application of modern teaching tools.
11. Although there are positive developments to solve the problem with the office space, the issue is very significant and should not lose attention until fully solved.
12. Equipping new computer classes could be considered to improve student access both during the courses and for preparing individual assignments.
13. In students' view using a virtual learning environment improves their study process and outcomes. Thus the use of E-learning methods (e.g. Moodle) should be encouraged in all modules of the programme.
14. Consideration should be given to the structure of the weekly class schedules in such a way so that the majority of the courses occur at the same time of the day. This would provide students with a consistent study plan, which would better enable them to manage work and studies.
15. Teachers should compare module content between different study courses throughout the programme to ensure that classes are not too repetitive.
16. The programme administration should seek more coordination with foreign educational institutions engaged in Erasmus+ exchanges that provide BA-level courses that are taught in English language and fit the programme's curriculum.
17. During the final thesis evaluation, the administration should take additional measures to ensure that students are given a sufficient amount of time to properly analyse the reviewers' assessments of their work.
18. Systems for interactive student feedback should be in place and the results and consequences of both this feedback and survey feedback should be made public.
19. An inclusive social partner strategy should be developed for collaboration, including contractual basis for different modes of collaboration, the initiatives to modify curriculum, internship processes, possibilities to improve gender balance, joint research initiatives etc.

#### **IV. SUMMARY**

*The programme aims and learning outcomes show that the clear separation of the learning outcomes of social policy from those of social work is appropriate and very much appreciated by both teachers as well as students. The aim and the learning outcomes are well-defined and clear, optimally informative and succinct and linked to course descriptions.*

However, the programme does not provide information on how programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission, operational objectives and/or strategy of Vilnius University. The programme does not specify sufficiently, how the programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the state, societal and labour market needs.

*The curriculum design implements well the singling out of the “Social Policy” programme from “Social Work” is a good move, which is generally much appreciated by teachers, students and potential employers of graduates. The three options for the studies of social policy at BA level with different degrees of intensity and in combination with other study programmes are very appropriate and can raise the interest of students from various walks for this discipline. The concept of the groups of modules and their components is considered as very helpful for students’ understanding of the programme and their choices. The emphasis on the value and importance of professional practice and the large range of possible placements is a very important feature of the programme. The knowledge and acquired competences of BA students are considered as of high level by so-called “social partners”, including potential employers, and can contribute to an improved visibility and acceptance of this discipline in Lithuania.*

However, the structure and the content elements of the social policy study programme at BA level do not (yet) seem to be fully consolidated and need further consideration. Stakeholders from practice (named “social partners”) have not yet enough structured possibilities to contribute with their expertise to the content and the implementation of the study programme. The pedagogical methods of staff and the use of e-learning and communication possibilities do not correspond to an advanced concept of academic teaching. The timing of essential programme elements - in particular the scheduling of the internship placement parallel to the students’ intensive work on their final thesis - is not at all optimal.



*The teaching staff* is meeting the legal requirements regarding staff. Staff is experienced. By recruiting new professors try to cover learning outcomes. Generally engaged and supportive in teaching.

However, the current human resource policy (workload breakdown, research policy) endangers development of the programmes. Staff is in shortage of infrastructural support like office space or support for publishing in open access scientific journals.

*The facilities and learning resources* encompass high quality of the premises. Technical and digital equipment available for teaching, research and learning is fully in line with the learning outcomes of the programme and with contemporary study methods. Exceptionally good teaching and learning resources and facilities are provided by the library.

However, the office space for the teaching staff is clearly not sufficient. The number of computer classes and computerised workplaces in them is too small to guarantee good access to the students. There is low usage of virtual learning environments and application of e-learning methods.

*The study process and students' performance assessment* leads to the conclusion that the programme provides good conditions for students to participate scientific activities and events. The students claim their feedback and concerns about the programme are taken into account. Programme's teaching staff provides satisfactory and valuable academic support to the students.

However, students find programme's weekly schedule to be hard to combine with employment. Students are provided insufficient information about their elective course selection. Several teachers within the programme do not use any e-learning teaching methods, which limits their outreach. Final thesis evaluators do not always provide their feedback to students with enough time left for them to analyse it before their final thesis defence. Students rarely participate in international mobility.

*The programme management* assessment proves that there is a study programme committee representing academic staff, social partners and students and with the responsibilities of analysing feedback from faculty units, students, graduates, academic staff and social partners. However, the allocation of responsibilities for decisions and monitoring the implementation of the programme could be more transparent. The structure and principles of quality assurance system affecting the quality of the programme are not sufficiently transparent. Teaching skills

seem to vary too much between different courses. The programme management does not coordinate the provision of teaching enough to prevent repetition in the content of the courses. The collection of student feedback is based too much on surveys with low response rates and their results, and corrective measures based on them are not made public to students in an effective way. The involvement of social partners is not sufficiently systematic, effective and transparent neither for the staff and students, nor to social partners themselves. The programme does not take advantage of its alumni's potential to tutoring students, developing curriculum and supporting the employability of graduates.

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Social Policy* (state code – 612L40002) at Vilnius 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	2
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>17</b>

\*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:	Assoc. Prof. dr. Turo Virtanen
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Dr. Dirk Jarré
	Assoc. prof. dr. Iveta Reinholde
	Dr. Marius Kalanta
	Mr. Julius Zubė

**VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS  
SOCIALINĖ POLITIKA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612L40002 (6121JX019)) 2018-02-28  
EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-19 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Vilniaus universiteto studijų programa *Socialinė politika* (valstybinis kodas – 612L40002) vertinama **teigiamai**.

<b>Eil. Nr.</b>	<b>Vertinimo sritis</b>	<b>Srities įvertinimas, balais*</b>
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	<b>Iš viso:</b>	<b>17</b>

\* 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**

Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai rodo, kad aiškus socialinės politikos ir socialinio darbo studijų rezultatų atskyrimas yra tinkamas ir labai vertinamas tiek dėstytojų, tiek studentų. Tikslas

ir studijų rezultatai yra tiksliai apibrėžti ir aiškūs, optimaliai informatyvūs bei glausti ir siejami su studijų dalykų aprašais.

Tačiau programoje neteikiama informacija apie tai, kaip programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai atitinka Vilniaus universiteto misiją, veiklos tikslus ir (ar) strategiją. Programoje nepakankamai tiksliai apibrėžiama, kaip programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai yra susiję su valstybės, visuomenės ir darbo rinkos poreikiais.

Programos sandaroje puikiai atskirtos socialinės politikos ir socialinio darbo programos, tai labai vertina dėstytojai, studentai ir potencialūs absolventų darbdaviai. Trys socialinės politikos bakalauro laipsnio studijų programos pasirinkimai, kurie skiriasi intensyvumu ir tuo, kad programa dėstoma su kitomis studijų programomis, yra labai tinkami ir todėl studentai iš kitų šios disciplinos sričių ja domisi. Modulių grupių ir jų sudedamųjų dalių koncepcija laikoma naudinga tam, kaip studentai suvokia programą ir daro pasirinkimus. Dėmesys skiriamas profesinės praktikos vertei bei svarbai, didelis galimų praktikos vietų pasirinkimas yra labai svarbus programos bruožas. Vadinamieji socialiniai partneriai, būtent potencialūs darbdaviai, aukštai vertina bakalauro laipsnio studentų žinias ir įgytą kompetenciją, taip pat jie gali padėti gerinti šios disciplinos matomumą bei pripažinimą Lietuvoje.

Tačiau bakalauro laipsnio socialinės politikos studijų programos struktūra ir turinio elementai (kol kas) neatrodo visiškai konsoliduoti, juos reikėtų geriau apgalvoti. Socialiniai dalininkai praktikai (socialiniai partneriai) kol kas neturi struktūrinių galimybių savo kompetencija prisidėti prie studijų programos turinio ir jo įgyvendinimo. Personalo pedagoginiai metodai ir elektroninių mokymosi bei ryšio galimybių naudojimas neatitinka pažangaus akademinio dėstymo koncepcijos. Pagrindinių programos elementų atlikimo laikas, ypač praktikos atlikimo ir studentų intensyvaus darbo prie baigiamųjų darbų, visiškai nėra optimalus.

Personalas atitinka jam keliamus teisinius reikalavimus. Personalas yra patyręs. Įdarbinant naujus dėstytojus stengiamasi pasiekti studijų rezultatus. Bendrai paėmus, jie įsitraukia į dėstymą ir teikia pagalbą studentams.

Tačiau šiuo metu galiojanti žmogiškųjų išteklių politika (darbo krūvio paskirstymas, mokslinių tyrimų politika) kelia grėsmę programos plėtrai. Personalui trūksta pagalbinės infrastruktūros

erdvės, tokios kaip biuro erdvė, ar pagalbos skelbiant savo straipsnius atvirosios prieigos moksliniuose žurnaluose.

Materialiuosius išteklius sudaro aukštos kokybės patalpos. Techninė ir skaitmeninė įranga, skirta dėstymui, moksliniams tyrimams ir mokymuisi, visiškai atitinka numatomus programos studijų rezultatus ir šiuolaikinius studijų metodus. Bibliotekoje teikiami išskirtinai aukštos kokybės dėstymo ir mokymosi materialieji ištekliai. Tačiau dėstančiajam personalui skirta biuro erdvė yra visiškai nepakankama. Kompiuterių auditorijų ir jose įrengtų kompiuterizuotų darbo vietų skaičius yra per mažas, kad studentams būtų užtikrinama gera prieiga. Per mažai naudojamosi virtualiomis mokymosi aplinkomis, menkai taikomi elektroniniai mokymosi metodai.

Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas leidžia daryti išvadą, kad programoje teikiamos geros sąlygos studentams dalyvauti mokslinėje veikloje ir renginiuose. Atsižvelgiama į studentų teikiamą grįžtamąjį ryšį ir klausimus, susijusius su programa. Programos dėstantysis personalas studentams teikia patenkinamą ir vertingą akademinę pagalbą. Tačiau studentams sunku suderinti programos savaitinį grafiką su darbais. Studentams teikiama nepakankamai informacijos apie pasirenkamuosius dalykus. Keletas programoje dėstančių dėstytojų nenaudoja jokių elektroninio mokymosi dėstymo metodų, taip apribojama jų teikiama pagalba. Baigiamųjų darbų vertintojai ne visada laiku suteikia grįžtamąjį ryšį studentams, kad jiems pakaktų laiko jį išanalizuoti prieš ginantis baigiamąjį darbą. Studentai retai dalyvauja tarptautinio judumo programose.

Programos vadybos vertinimas rodo, kad įsteigtas studijų programos komitetas, atstovaujantis akademiniam personalui, socialiniams partneriams ir studentams; komitetas yra atsakingas už fakulteto padalinių, studentų, absolventų, akademinio personalo ir socialinių partnerių grįžtamojo ryšio analizę.

Atsakomybės už sprendimus ir programos vykdymo stebėseną paskirstymas galėtų būti skaidresnis. Kokybės užtikrinimo sistemos struktūra ir principai, turintys įtakos programos kokybei, nėra pakankamai skaidrūs. Skirtingų studijų dalykų dėstytojų dėstymo įgūdžiai per daug skiriasi. Programos vadovybė nekoordinuoja dėstymo tiek, kad užkirstų kelią studijų dalykų turinio pasikartojimui. Studentų grįžtamasis ryšys per daug grindžiamas apklausomis, kurių atsakomumo lygis nėra aukštas ir rezultatai menki, o jais grindžiamos taisomosios priemonės nėra studentams efektyviai viešinamos. Socialinių partnerių dalyvavimas nėra

pakankamai sistemiškas, efektyvus ir skaidrus nei personalui ar studentams, nei patiems partneriams. Programoje nesinaudojama tuo privalumu, kad alumnai gali kuruoti studentus, padėti plėtoti programą ir teikti pagalbą absolventams įsidarbinant.

<...>

### III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Programa turėtų išaiškinti, kaip programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai atitinka Vilniaus universiteto misiją, veiklos tikslus ir (arba) strategiją.
2. Programoje turėtų būti įvardijama, kaip ji atitinka valstybės, visuomenės ir socialinės politikos specialistų darbo rinkos poreikius bei kaip atitinkami numatomi studijų rezultatai atitinka nacionalinės socialinės politikos institucionalizavimo aspektus.
3. Reikėtų iš naujo nagrinėti konkrečius privalomųjų studijų programos studijų dalykų turinio elementus ir jų struktūrinę tvarką atsižvelgiant į tai, kaip jie skatina suvokti tai, kas yra socialinė politika.
4. Planuojant ir koordinuojant ryšius tarp katedros dėstytojų ir bendraujant su dėstytojais iš kitų katedrų reikia skirti dėmesį tam, ar visi bakalauro laipsnio lygiui svarbūs socialinės politikos klausimai yra pakankamai nagrinėjami studijų programoje, ar juos reikėtų pakeisti ir akcentus sudėlioti kitur.
5. Nors praktika laikoma labai svarbiu akcentu, reikėtų iš naujo peržiūrėti jos atlikimo laiką, kadangi pagal dabartinę grafiką ji vykdoma programos pabaigoje, tuo pat metu, kai studentai rašo baigiamuosius darbus, ir dėl to susitelkti į abu darbus yra gana sudėtinga.
6. Akademinio personalo dėstyimo metodus reikia atidžiai peržiūrėti ir suteikti daugiau galimybių juos gerinti, taip pat reikia teikti efektyvius nurodymus, kaip naudotis pažangiomis elektroninio dėstyimo ir ryšio sistemomis.
7. Išorės ekspertų kvietimą būti kviestiniais dėstytojais „iš praktikos“ reikėtų praplėsti ir pabrėžti, kaip svarbu, kad jie dalyvauja programoje, įskaitant diskusiją apie programos koncepciją ir pagrindines sritis.
8. Reikėtų pakviesti daugiau užsienio ekspertų, taip pat ekspertų iš institucijų, kuriose studentai atlieka praktiką, bei iš potencialių absolventus įdarbinti galinčių darbdavių.
9. Reikėtų apsvarstyti klausimą dėl iniciatyvų motyvuoti personalą atlikti mokslinius tyrimus.
10. Reikėtų tobulinti dėstyimo įgūdžius ir todėl dėstytojus reikėtų skatinti dalyvauti pedagogikos mokymuose, kad jų dėstyimo įgūdžiai labiau atitiktų modernius akademinis iššūkius, įskaitant platesnį modernių dėstyimo priemonių taikymą.
11. Nors siekiant spręsti biuro erdvės problemą priimami teigiami sprendimai, visgi ši problema yra labai rimta ir jai reikėtų toliau skirti pakankamai dėmesio, kol ji bus išspręsta iki galo.
12. Įrengiant naujas kompiuterių auditorijas reikėtų apsvarstyti klausimą dėl studentų prieigos gerinimo tiek paskaitų metu, tiek jiems rengiant asmenines užduotis.
13. Studentų manymu, virtualioji mokymosi aplinka gerina jų studijų procesą ir rezultatus. Todėl visuose programos moduliuose reikėtų skatinti studentus naudotis elektroninėmis mokymosi priemonėmis (pvz., „Moodle“).
14. Reikėtų perdaryti savaitinių paskaitų grafikus taip, kad dauguma studijų dalykų paskaitų būtų dėstoma tuo pačiu dienos metu. Taip studentams būtų sudarytas nuoseklus studijų planas, pagal kurį jie galėtų geriau derinti darbą su studijomis.
15. Dėstytojai turėtų palyginti visos programos skirtingų studijų dalykų modulių turinį siekdami užtikrinti, kad paskaitos per dažnai nesikartotų.

16. Programos administracija turėtų siekti labiau prisiderinti prie užsienio švietimo institucijų, dalyvaujančių „Erasmus+“ mainų programoje, kuriose bakalauro laipsnio lygio studijų dalykai dėstomi anglų kalba, ir atitinkamai pritaikyti studijų programos sandarą.
17. Vertindama studentų baigiamuosius darbus administracija turėtų imtis papildomų priemonių užtikrinant, jog studentams būtų suteikta pakankamai laiko tinkamai išanalizuoti jų darbų vertinimą.
18. Dialoginį studentų grįžtamąjį ryšį apdorojančios sistemos turėtų veikti, o tokio grįžtamojo ryšio rezultatai ir apklausos rezultatai turėtų būti prieinami viešai.
19. Reikėtų sukurti visa apimančią bendradarbiavimo su socialiniais partneriais strategiją, įskaitant skirtingą bendradarbiavimą nustatančią sutartį, kurioje būtų numatytos iniciatyvos keisti programos sandarą, praktikos procesai, galimybės gerinti lyčių pusiausvyrą, bendrų mokslinių tyrimų iniciatyvos ir kt.