STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Šiaulių universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
TARPKULTŪRINIS UGDYMAS IR TARPININKAVIMAS
(valstybinis kodas – 621X20029)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS
––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION AND MEDIATION* **(***state code***
*– 621X20029***)**
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Siauliai 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

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	*Tarpkultūrinis ugdymas ir tarpininkavimas*
Valstybinis kodas	621X20029
Studijų sritis	socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	edukologija
Studijų programos rūšis	universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	nuolatinės (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	edukologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2004 m. kovo 1 d.

———————————————————

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	*Intercultural Education and Mediation*
State code	621X20029
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 (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master in Education Studies
Date of registration of the study programme	1 March 2004

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, the following additional document has been provided by the HEI before the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	List of final thesis of Master study programme "*Intercultural Education and Mediation*", 2015.

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

The Programme "*Intercultural Education and Mediation*" (IEM) is implemented by the Humanities Faculty of Siauliai University and monitored by the Department of Philosophy and

Anthropology. The programme was established in 2004 and accredited for three years in 2013. The programme is full-time with 120 ECTS credits over duration of two years.

The administrative back up for the evaluation team on-site was very good. All arrangements were in place, the meeting room ideal; the different groups arrived on time and coffee/tee available, etc.

The work of the Review Team can be summarized as follows: The Self-Assessment Report (SAR) was received in July 2015. The Team members prepared a preliminary report in which questions to be followed up during the visit. The entire Review Team performed the on-site evaluation on 21 October 2015. The team members took responsibility for asking questions related to specific areas and one member was responsible for summarizing and synthesising the comments. The team leader gave a brief exit presentation at the end of the visit. After the visit, the team had a one-day meeting to discuss this and two other programmes and agree on the further development of the reports. All further discussions took place via e-mail to complete the final draft of the report.

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.

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

The 2013 evaluation stated that there was confusion between the terms Aims and Learning Outcomes in the documentation. The Review Team understood that programme staff had since undertaken a full review of the interface between programme aims and learning outcomes, and of the content of learning outcomes (e.g., see SAR, p.6). This had produced programme aims and learning outcomes which are generally clear, and they are publicly accessible on the University website at www.su.lt. These programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and qualifications offered. Review of the interface between programme aims and learning outcomes has ensured that the name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualification offered are generally compatible with each other.

On the other hand, continuing work will be required to ensure that the overall focus of the programme establishes and sustains the most complete link with academic and professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market. The purpose of the programme is clearly to prepare students to apply the most modern interdisciplinary approaches to the complex, changing intercultural dimensions of society (see SAR, p.7).

In developing interdisciplinary approaches, the Review Team appreciated the challenges facing programme staff in harmonizing competences developed by several fields: educational science, social anthropology, sociology, psychology, foreign languages and other sciences. A programme involving a range of academic disciplines and university departments must give particular focus to addressing these particular challenges. This will ensure the interdisciplinary coherence necessary to meet the academic and professional requirements of students.

Both the SAR and the group of teachers met by the Review Team underlined that the decreasing number of students is the main challenge facing the programme. Therefore, the challenge of cooperation within the programme is not given the same attention. The Review Team respects the focus on recruitment issues, but still thinks interdisciplinary collaboration and cooperation to meet the academic and professional requirements of students ought to be given more reflection.

Also on the overall focus of the programme, the Review Team addressed the international aspects of the programme several times in discussions. If an understanding of "intercultural mediation" means working with different groups inside and outside the country, the current attention on religious groups inside the country is too narrow. From the perspective of students, there should be more attention to the international issues, whereas the teachers

argued for the advantage of concentration on the intercultural issues inside Lithuania. Comparing with equivalent programmes elsewhere there is room for improvements according to international aspects of the programme. The group of social partners argued for more adjustment to current changes in Europe, meaning considering international issues fully in the programme.

In the Review Team's view, this enhanced emphasis on international aspects beyond Lithuania will strengthen the capacity of the programme to meet the academic and professional requirements of students, and the ongoing public needs and labour market needs of Lithuanian society. International developments will have a continuing impact on the intercultural dimensions of Lithuanian society, including in ways which cannot yet be fully anticipated. Enhanced awareness of international contexts will increase the abilities of students to respond flexibly and creatively to such developments. This will further ensure that the content covered, and the qualification offered, by the programme meet the aims of its 'intercultural' name as fully as possible.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design meets legal requirements. The study subjects are spread evenly and are not repetitive. Altogether 15 subjects must be accomplished before the Masters-thesis. The broad approach is argued for as intercultural studies are and must be broad. Both staff and students are very enthusiastic about the programme, the need for it in Lithuania and justifying the present composition of the programme. Therefore, in general terms, a genuine attempt has been made to achieve a broad curriculum in which the content of subjects is consistent with a Masters level programme on intercultural education, and is appropriate, with sufficient scope for the achievement of intended learning outcomes. A genuine attempt has also been made to draw on the inputs of available staff who are able to provide content reflecting relevant latest scholarship from their disciplines.

However, further continuing development is strongly recommended to ensure curriculum content and curricular experiences of students fully provide maximum possible 'international' experiences and insights relevant to intercultural education.

For example, this includes attempting to further diversify the international profile of the programme's students. There is at present willingness by the University to subsidise the programme. A key argument is that the main challenge is the decreasing number of students. The Review Team appreciates this, however the programme needs enhancement to recruit students and by that survive. This recruitment, for obvious reasons, also needs to be international. A few examples of international students in the programme do not make up for this. Interaction with a broader group of international students will enrich the international dimensions of the curricular

experiences of Lithuanian students, and of the international students themselves. In the meantime, the practice students get from organizing intercultural events with different social groups and ethnic minorities is good, but restricted. As presented to the Review Team this appears somewhat one-sided and limited.

The name of the programme *Intercultural Education and Mediation* gives international readers connotations of a curriculum crossing borders and making itself relevant both inside and outside Lithuania. The arguments given about intercultural inside Lithuania being more valuable than an international approach do not seem valid in an international context. On the other hand, there are arguments given for the need of the programme due to the current situation in Europe, with immigration and migration challenges. To ensure the learning outcomes and the scope of the programme, international perspectives need to be a substantial part of the programme. As a very fair amount of the required reading lists are in English language, the admissions requirements might have to be considered once more. Internationalisation requires a shared language.

The academic staff with reference to what is normal in Lithuania did not agree with the Review Team's questions that there seemed to be too many subjects before the Master's Thesis. However, members of the SAR said that the university is moving to module organisation, but it is still not there. The SAR group also appreciated some students wanting to go deeper into some topics and fewer modules might be a result of this. From a student perspective, making an emphasis on intercultural aspects during the first year and emphasis on the Thesis during the second year would be more appreciated. The Review Team judged that such development might further enhance the curricular coherence, international focus and practical experience provided to students. This could strengthen the consistency of the curriculum with a Master's programme in intercultural education. Beyond this, a joint programme with a foreign university seems reasonable and may meet several of the challenges listed above. This could underpin possible compulsory stays abroad for students, like an Erasmus exchange.

The Review Team sees the recommendations on 'Curriculum design' as constructive suggestions for further development and enhancement of an essentially satisfactory programme, and not as 'critical shortcomings' in the programme.

2.3. Teaching staff

A teaching staff provides the study programme according to the legal requirements. More than half are professors and all lecturers have a doctor's degree. 14 lecturers, 12 full time, deliver the programme, among them are 8 educational specialists, 2 philosophers, 2 philologists, 1 psychologist and 1 historian. The students report an easy access to teachers for feedback on

their work. Therefore, generally the qualifications and number of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes, and staff turnover appears to be able to ensure an adequate provision of the programme.

On the other hand, there are aspects of the staffing situation which should be the subject of further ongoing development. Few lecturers have research interests directly based in intercultural education and mediation, as compared to interests which can be related to this area of study in a more general way. The teachers may recognize international experience (mobility, international projects), but not necessarily have extensive involvement in this. After the visit, it is still not clear what steps will be taken to improve this. Interdiciplinarity is considered a strong feature of the programme as delivered by lecturers from several disciplines. The Review Team still asks if this is a collection of different specialists rather than a programme being genuinely interdisciplinary. It seems there is a clear shortage of lecturers who have practical experience in mediation or intercultural education, though the SAR mentioned a couple of lecturers, one is an English language teacher at the Gymnasium, another works as a researcher at Gender Equality Centre at Siauliai University. When asked by the Review Team, no example was given of how lecturers cooperate in creating joint study modules (although this is mentioned, without examples, in the SAR, par. 3.2.1). As for the research capacity, it seems the programme relies heavily on a visiting professor. Internal research capacity must be a part of the strategic plan. The Review Team finds that evidence of program cooperation in research is lacking. When asking about cooperation, the answers were overall about formal organisation in meetings, not evidence on effects and results of the cooperation.

It is not clear from the SAR how the institution supports professional development and no satisfying answer was given to this during the visit. A professional development plan was not presented. Staff say they are encouraged from the Dean, but that is not enough.

The SAR claims that research output quality and quantity is good: 5-13 publications in the Lithuanian and foreign languages published in international databases within 3 years. However, based on the analysis of CVs, it gives an impression that articles are usually published in journals of local importance. Annex 8 indicates that staff took into consideration to improve the research output in international journals. However, the measures they have taken to improve institutional support for internationalisation of research are more of a declarative nature. It is not clear what specific actions have been taken to improve international research output and international mobility and what was achieved compared to the previous evaluation phase. Graduates express the need for teachers from outside Lithuania and generally for more internationalisation of the programme.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The premises for studies are generally excellent. The Review Team was impressed by the facilities and learning resources. The library was exceptionally good, modern, even with a room for childcare, which deserves the label excellent. University staff gave high-profile prominence to the library as a resource for this Programme. Rooms and buildings are accessible for students with disabilities and this is a good improvement since the last evaluation. The students have good access to databases and Moodle seems to be working very well, in both Lithuanian and English. Especially students emphasize the need for flexibility in their work as students underlined the advantage of a well working Learning Management system (LMS). The Faculty also have extensively refurbished lecture rooms and rooms for group work with round tables. There are also smaller rooms in the library to work in for both students and academic staff.

From the reading lists, the Review Team sees that a lot is in English language and this is necessary for a programme seeking to be international in appearance, content and recruitment. However, after meeting students and graduates the Review Team has some concerns about the language issues as some students have problems reading in English. A requirement of a certain level of English could be considered necessary for admission.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The SAR reports that the admission requirements are well founded, and the Review Team concurred with this. Students who do not have the BA-diploma in educational study fields have to pass the necessary subjects during the first year of studies. This information is publicly available on the university website. One student went abroad with the student mobility programme, according to the SAR. The number is not critical considering the small number of students admitted, five in each year 2013 and 2014.

As for academic and social support to students, the general impression is that this is good. Students feel they are heard and information about the study programme, career options etc. are available.

On opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes, during the visit it was mentioned that one student is doing fieldwork in Greece and another in Denmark. This is good, and more international fieldwork should be encouraged from this positive start. The Review Team had contact on Skype with the one student in Greece for a minute, but then the technology failed. Most of the literature presented in the syllabuses is foreign, which is positive evidence of engagement with international research.

On the assessment system of students' performance, most of the syllabus includes clear assessment characteristics, which generally indicates that approaches to assessment have been systematically developed.

On the other hand, there are however some internal inconsistencies in some syllabuses. For example, the syllabus of Cultural Semiotics under the title "Assessment of knowledge and skills " this kind of percent is given: <…>exam – 50 percent, two semiotic analyses – 25 percent, individual work – 15 percent, practical work – 10 percent". In the same syllabus in the table of "Plan of individual work task and their weight for the final grade" the percent is different: exam – 50, two semiotic analyses – 20, individual work 10 percent and practice work 10 – percent" and this does not equal to 100%. This kind of internal inconsistency is also in other syllabuses namely Theory and Analysis of Cultural Collision in Discourse, Religious Pedagogics and Civic Education, Post-seculary culture and Religion. These internal inconsistencies must be eliminated. This will ensure that the general strengths of the approaches to assessment have been accurately and fully applied in every case.

Some syllabuses include "non-traditional tasks". When asking about ''non-traditional tasks'', the answers from students were events and group work, not especially untraditional. These kinds of tasks need to be specified more completely in the syllabuses. Social partners could contribute to developing such tasks.These further developments will ensure that the very positive aim of including ''non-traditional'' tasks within the programme is achieved as fully as possible.

Academic honesty and the ways of its assurance are given a paragraph in the SAR (par.5.12). The focus seems to be on honesty. Some students mentioned it would be childish to cheat. There is clearly a strong collective commitment to the values of academic honesty across the programme. Internationally the concept plagiarism is perhaps more specifically used. To prevent plagiarism the skills and competence in academic writing must be part of the teaching. This seems to be the best way to enhance the writing competence and thus prevent plagiarism. Such an emphasis on plagiarism specifically will enhance the programme's already strong commitment to academic honesty more generally.

More widely, the assessment system of students' performance seemed generally clear and adequate in other respects, and details are publicly available. This is positive evidence of systematic development of approaches to assessment.

On the extent to which the organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes, according to the SAR, all students have the opportunity to apply the knowledge and skills during the studies. Some of the students work in educational institutions, other students work in international

companies, some of the students work as project coordinators. The syllabuses also show that more than 50% of time devoted to subjects includes independent work. It is also worth noting that 20% of all the graduates study in doctoral studies or have already graduated from them. This number is quite high. These examples are all evidence of systematic development of the relationship between programme provision and the achievement of the learning outcomes.

The time for individual work time is meant for search of sources and literature, data processing and analysis and reading of literature. This commitment to such tasks indicates that the students are encouraged to participate in research and applied research activities. This is all good, but since there are several modules each semester, there is a certain stress on this individual work time. More specifically on research in relation to the final master thesis, the Review Team was presented with positive evidence of developments here (see SAR, par.5.7). Theses were on interesting topics, aligned with the aims and intended learning outcomes of the programme. There was a systematic approach to assessment of the theses, and work was generally assessed as of a good standard, or even better.

A few students have been enrolled in the Erasmus programme in recent years, which is good. The question about mandatory international exchange seems relevant, as a way of achieving further enhancement of student international mobility from this promising start.

The employment possibilities for the graduates seem to be good. This fact was underlined in several conversations in addition to highlight the need for this type of education in the current situation. The Review Team agrees that this type of education programme is valuable and needed.

2.6. Programme management

Study quality assurance and process are regulated by SU Statute, study guidelines and international quality system.

The management responsibilities of IEM (*Intercultural Education and Mediation*) program are allocated among several management layers:

1) Department of Philosophy and Anthropology monitors the programme.

2) Committee of Assessment of Humanity Sciences (CASPHS) coordinate the implemented study programmes, study subjects, order them, select and certify them.

3) Committee of IEM Programme Assessment (IEMCPA) (monitors the quality of the programme; responsible for relations with employers and social partners, and practice placements; designs the programme in terms of programme goals, LOs).

4) On the level of the Faculty of Humanities, the IEM programme quality is ensured by CASPHS and IEMCPA. CASPHS together with the Dean's office conduct the supervision of the programme.

5) On the institutional level, the study quality is monitored and analysed by SU Council of Strategic and Quality Management.

Decision-making responsibilities and monitoring functions are spread-out over several management units, which raises the question about the clarity of responsibility and accountability of the programme management. It is not clear who is ultimately responsible for monitoring the quality of the programme. On the question who "owns" the programme, the answer was, the programme committee is the main actor in the programme, though department handled day-to-day management. During the visit, the impression was that the division of roles of the programme leader versus the programme coordinator (in the SAR called programme moderator) is not quite clear. The actual programme management ought to be formalized in a written way.

Based on the SAR, all sorts of data is collected and analysed. However, there is little quantitative or qualitative examples provided, except a generalizing conclusion that everybody is satisfied with the programme. (SAR 6.5)

A weakness seems to be that teachers are not involved in programme management. The evaluation of teaching is not sufficient; there is no self-evaluation or cooperation among teaching staff according to this. It was emphasised that the main task of the programme is collaboration with the social partners and unfortunately, there are limitations for choosing partners in the community area. A long list of social partners is provided and almost every religious group or minority in Siauliai has been asked to contribute. The programme committee should clarify and consider what the role of social partners is in the programme management.

2.7. Examples of excellence

The University library, and the high-profile emphasis given to this as a resource by relevant University staff, is considered by the Review Team excellent. It appears with high quality and universal design as modern, open and very positively inviting students and employees in, even with a room for childcare. There are rooms for cooperation for the students, digital equipment up to date and it seems very well organized. The library is also accessible for the wider community of Siauliai. The overall impression of the library is an exceptional good quality. More widely, the overall quality of the fully refurbished Faculty of Humanities rooms is also excellent.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Programme aims and learning outcomes**
- Continuing internal evaluation, drawing on feedback from students and staff, is required to ensure that the programme meets its overall aim of preparing students to apply modern

interdisciplinary approaches to the complex, changing intercultural dimensions of society.

- A main focus of this ongoing evaluation should be meeting the internal challenges of achieving genuine interdisciplinary coherence through full co-operation of staff from different disciplines.
- International issues need to become more visible in the programme.

2. Curriculum design

- More focus on the international side of intercultural mediation is crucial to recruit international students.
- International cooperation is desirable and making a joint programme with a foreign university seems reasonable.
- As a fair amount of the reading lists are in English, the admission requirements on English language competence ought to be considered once more.
- The Review Team strongly recommend more committed cooperation among teaching staff in the delivery of the programme to secure that the overall aims are consolidated and delivered within courses.
- The programme ought to consider a compulsory stay abroad like an Erasmus exchange.

3. Teaching staff

- The programme needs a professional development plan for teaching staff. This needs to be a joint effort from all departments involved in the programme. The documentation of pedagogical competence must be given a priority. There is a lot of international research and development work done in this field and therefore it is possible in this programme and institution.
- The Interdiciplinarity of the programme needs more attention and action thorough cooperation between teachers from different disciplines.
- The lack of programme cooperation in research needs attention and enhancement.
- The output quality of research seems sufficient in quantity, but the internationalisation must be more than declarative. An action plan is needed in this area with the institutional support written into the plan.

4. Facilities and learning resources

- To maintain excellence the programme committee must be sensitive to all constructive feedback.

- The Review Team urges the University at all levels, including Faculty, Department and Programme, to ensure that there is maximum student use at all possible times of the excellent library facilities.

5. Study process and students' performance assessment

- The admission requirements are clear, but competence in English must be considered meeting the challenges in the reading lists and in internationalisation.
- "Non-traditional tasks" need to be clarified so that the students know what they are supposed to do.
- To maintain and develop the strong connection between fieldwork and study, the social partners should take more part in the development of the programme.
- To give students a good training in academic writing, the topic of preventing plagiarism ought to be part of this.

6. Programme management

- It is demanding to monitor a programme spread-out over several management units, and there is a need to clarify who is ultimately responsible for monitoring the quality of the programme.
- The roles ought to be formalized in a written way.
- Evaluation of teaching needs to be improved.
- Teachers should be more involved in the programme management.

.

.

IV. SUMMARY

1. **Programme aims and learning outcomes**

   The staff and students involved in the programme are undoubtedly very positive. The Review Team finds that the learning outcomes in the different modules are consistent with the type and level of studies and qualification at Masters-level.

   After the visit, the Review Team finds it necessary to mention that the focus of the programme is not quite clear. This seems to be a consequence of a joint programme with too little cooperation among staff delivering it. A comment made by staff during the visit was that an aim in "the intercultural mediation" is to be able to work with people of different groups in and outside the country. The internationalisation according to this appears as the weak part of the programme. It ought to be possible to make this qualitatively better when integrating sources within the programme.

2. **Curriculum design**

   The curriculum design meets legal requirements. As all staff, students and alumni are enthusiastic about the programme, it certainly appears as important in the present situation in Lithuania. The decrease in student numbers is however critical. After the visit, the Review Team finds that there seems to be too much effort to defend the programme in the current situation. The lack of curriculum coherence, international experience and focus is challenging. The focus should be on necessary enhancement of the programme to recruit more students, in particular international students. The Review Team recommends a joint programme with a foreign university.

3. **Teaching staff**

   Teaching staff according to the legal requirements provides the study programme. As the number of students is very limited, the teachers have time to offer good support to all students. In the current situation, this appears as sufficient. The concern of the Review Team is how the challenges in achieving coherence are met, especially since the programme seems to be a collection of different specialists rather than interdisciplinary. The teaching staff need a transformation from being primarily individual teachers to appear as a group of teachers jointly responsible for the interdisciplinary study programme. More emphasis on international mobility and research ought to be a part of this.

4. **Facilities and learning resources**

   Universal design is certainly a priority and the premises for studies are generally excellent. Generally, the facilities and the access to learning resources impressed the

Review Team. The library was especially remarkable and, therefore, it is crucial to ensure maximum use of these excellent facilities by students. A challenge is the amount of reading material in English and the competence of the students. It seems difficult to secure this without a certain level of English required for admission.

5. **Study process and students' performance assessment**

Enrolment to the IEM Masters-study programme meets the legal requirements. Information is easy accessible on the website and in publications. There is a need for reviewing the syllabus according to learning activities and assessment. The decrease of student numbers is challenging, though this is also a consequence of demographic changes, further decrease in student numbers will clearly threaten the viability of the Programme.

6. **Programme management**

The study quality administration is regulated by the internal system of study quality, which functions on several levels at Department and Faculty. On the institutional level, the study quality is monitored and analysed by SU Council of Strategic and Quality Management. Decision-making and monitoring functions are spread out over several units, and thus, responsibility and accountability of the programme management need to be clarified further. Teachers ought to be involved fully in the programme management.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Intercultural Education and Mediation* (state code – 621X20029) at Siauliai 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	4
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	2
	Total:	**15**

*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

ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
TARPKULTŪRINIS UGDYMAS IR TARPININKAVIMAS **(VALSTYBINIS KODAS –
621X20029)**
2016-04-27 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-103 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Šiaulių universiteto studijų programa *Tarpkultūrinis ugdymas ir tarpininkavimas* (valstybinis kodas – 621X20029) 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	4
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	**15**

* 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)

<...>

2.7. Išskirtinės kokybės pavyzdžiai

Vertinimo grupė puikiai vertina universiteto biblioteką ir atitinkamų universiteto darbuotojų šiam ištekliui teikiamą didelį dėmesį. Biblioteka – aukštos kokybės, universalaus dizaino, moderni, atvira ir patraukli studentams ir darbuotojams, joje yra netgi vaikų priežiūros kambarys. Taip pat bibliotekoje yra atskirų patalpų studentų grupių darbui. Skaitmeninė įranga atnaujinta, o pati biblioteka atrodo gerai organizuota. Biblioteka atvira ir plačiajai Šiaulių bendruomenei. Bendras įspūdis apie biblioteką – išskirtinai aukšta kokybė. Apskritai atnaujintų Humanitarinių mokslų fakulteto patalpų kokybė yra puiki.

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

1. Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai

Studijų programos personalas ir studentai neabejotinai nusiteikę labai pozityviai. Vertinimo grupė mano, kad skirtingų modulių studijų rezultatai atitinka magistrantūros studijų rūšį, pakopą ir kvalifikacijų lygį.

Po vizito universitete vertinimo grupė nori paminėti, kad nevisiškai aiškus studijų programos tikslas. Taip gali būti dėl jungtinio studijų programos vykdymo (keliais valdymo lygmenimis) pobūdžio ir menko studijų programą vykdančių dėstytojų bendradarbiavimo. Per vertinimo grupės vizitą personalas pakomentavo, kad „tarpkultūrinio tarpininkavimo" tikslas yra gebėjimas dirbti su skirtingomis asmenų grupėmis šalyje ir už jos ribų. Todėl tarptautiškumo aspektą priskirtinas programos silpnybėms. Turi būti įmanoma pagerinti šio aspekto kokybę, integruojant studijų programos išteklius.

2. Programos sandara

Studijų programos sandara atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus. Kaip ir visas personalas, studentai ir absolventai apie studijų programą atsiliepia entuziastingai; ji neabejotinai svarbi dabartinėje Lietuvos situacijoje. Tačiau studentų skaičiaus mažėjimas kelia nerimą. Vertinimo grupės nuomone, pernelyg stengiamasi apginti studijų programą esamomis sąlygomis. Problema yra jos nuoseklumo, tarptautinės patirties ir sutelktumo stoka. Reikėtų susitelkti į studijų programos stiprinimą, siekiant pritraukti daugiau studentų, ypač iš užsienio. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja parengti jungtinę studijų programą kartu su kuriuo nors užsienio universitetu.

3. Personalas

Studijų programą vykdantis personalas atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus. Kadangi studentų skaičius labai mažas, dėstytojai gali skirti pakankamai laiko ir reikiamą paramą visiems studentams. Šiuo metu to pakanka. Tačiau vertinimo grupei kelia nerimą klausimas, kaip susidorojama su nuoseklumo iššūkiais, ypač turint omenyje tai, kad susidaro įspūdis, jog studijų programą tiesiog vykdo skirtingų sričių specialistai ir ji nėra tarpdalykinė. Personalas turėtų veikti ne individualiai, o kaip komanda, bendrai atsakinga už tarpdalykinę studijų programą. Reikėtų labiau akcentuoti tarptautinio judumo ir tyrimų aspektus.

4. Materialieji ištekliai

Universaliam dizainui neabejotinai skiriamas didelis dėmesys, o studijoms skirtos patalpos – puikios. Apskritai materialieji ištekliai vertinimo grupei padarė didelį įspūdį. Ypač įspūdinga pasirodė biblioteka, todėl būtina užtikrinti, kad studentai maksimaliai išnaudotų jos teikiamas galimybes. Iššūkis – literatūros šaltinių anglų kalba kiekis ir studentų anglų kalbos mokėjimo lygis. Spręsti šį klausimą sudėtinga, kol į priėmimo reikalavimus neįtrauktas atitinkamas reikalavimas dėl anglų kalbos mokėjimo lygio.

5. Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

Priėmimas į magistrantūros studijų programą *Tarpkultūrinis ugdymas ir tarpininkavimas* atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus. Informacija lengvai prieinama interneto svetainėje ir leidiniuose. Reikėtų persvarstyti kai kurių dalykų turinį pagal mokymosi veiklą ir vertinimą. Nerimą kelia studentų skaičiaus mažėjimas – nors tai viena iš demografinių pokyčių pasekmių, jei studentų ir toliau mažės, kils akivaizdi grėsmė studijų programos vykdymui.

6. Programos vadyba

Studijų kokybės valdymas reglamentuojamas vidine studijų kokybės sistema, veikiančia katedroje ir fakultete keliais lygmenimis. Instituciniu lygmeniu studijų kokybę prižiūri ir analizuoja Šiaulių universiteto Strateginio ir kokybės valdymo tarnyba. Sprendimų priėmimo ir stebėsenos funkcijas įgyvendina keli padaliniai, todėl reikėtų aiškiau apibrėžti studijų programos vadybos atsakomybę ir atskaitomybę. Į studijų programos vadybos procesus reikėtų labiau įtraukti dėstytojus.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai

• Siekiant, kad studijų programa būtų įgyvendinamas pagrindinis jos tikslas – parengti studentus, taikančius šiuolaikinius tarpdalykinius metodus sudėtingiems ir kintantiems visuomenės tarpkultūriniams aspektams, reikalingas tęstinis vidinis vertinimas, atsižvelgiant į studentų ir personalo atsiliepimus.

• Šis tęstinis vertinimas turėtų būti sutelktas į vidinių sunkumų siekiant tikro tarpdalykinio nuoseklumo įveikimą, glaudžiai bendradarbiaujant įvairių disciplinų dėstytojams.

• Studijų programoje reikėtų labiau akcentuoti tarptautinius klausimus.

2. Programos sandara

- Būtina labiau akcentuoti tarptautinį tarpkultūrinio tarpininkavimo aspektą, siekiant pritraukti studentų iš užsienio.

- Kadangi pageidautinas tarptautinis bendradarbiavimas, būtų protinga parengti jungtinę studijų programą su užsienio universitetu.

- Kadangi didelė dalis studijų literatūros yra anglų kalba, reikėtų persvarstyti priėmimo reikalavimus, susijusius su anglų kalbos mokėjimo lygiu.

- Vertinimo grupė labai rekomenduoja didesnį dėstytojų, vykdančių studijų programą, bendradarbiavimą, kad bendri tikslai būtų įtvirtinti ir atsispindėtų dėstant dalykus.

- Studijų programos vykdytojams reikėtų apsvarstyti galimybę numatyti privalomą studijų užsienyje laikotarpį, pvz., per „Erasmus" mainų programą.

3. Personalas

- Turi būti parengtas studijų programos dėstytojų profesinio tobulėjimo planas. Jį rengiant turėtų prisidėti visi studijų programą vykdantys padaliniai. Prioritetinių klausimų sąraše turėtų būti pedagoginės kompetencijos. Šioje srityje vykdoma daugybė tarptautinių tyrimų ir plėtros projektų, todėl tai įmanoma ir šioje studijų programoje bei institucijoje.

- Reikėtų daugiau dėmesio ir realių veiksmų skirti programos tarpdalykiškumui, bendradarbiaujant įvairių disciplinų dėstytojams.

- Reikia atkreipti dėmesį į studijų programos vykdytojų bendradarbiavimo atliekant tyrimus stoką ir spręsti šį klausimą.

- Mokslinių tyrimų rezultatų kokybė atrodo pakankama, kalbant apie tyrimų skaičių, tačiau tarptautiškumas turi būti ne tik deklaratyvus. Reikia parengti šios srities veiksmų planą ir į jį įtraukti institucijos paramos klausimą.

4. Materialieji ištekliai

- Norėdamas išlaikyti aukštą lygį, studijų programos komitetas turi greitai reaguoti į visą konstruktyvų grįžtamąjį ryšį.

- Vertinimo grupė skatina universitetą visais lygmenimis – fakulteto, katedros ir studijų programos – bandyti užtikrinti, kad studentai maksimaliai naudotųsi puikiais bibliotekos ištekliais.

5. Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

- Priėmimo reikalavimai aiškūs, tačiau reikia atsižvelgti į anglų kalbos mokėjimo lygį – jis turi atitikti literatūros sąrašo ir tarptautiškumo aspekto nulemtus reikalavimus.

- Reikia aiškiau apibūdinti „netradicines užduotis", kad studentai žinotų, ko iš jų tikimasi.

- Kad būtų galima išlaikyti ir stiprinti sąsajas tarp praktikos ir studijų, rengiant studijų programą turėtų labiau dalyvauti socialiniai partneriai.

- Norint ugdyti studentų akademinio rašymo įgūdžius, reikėtų įtraukti plagijavimo prevencijos temą.

6. Programos vadyba

- Vykdyti studijų programos stebėseną, kai ji vykdoma per kelis valdymo padalinius, nelengva, todėl būtina išsiaiškinti, kas galiausiai atsakingas už studijų programos kokybės stebėseną.

- Šias funkcijas reikėtų įforminti raštu.

- Taip pat reikia patobulinti dėstymo vertinimą.

- Į studijų programos vadybos procesus reikėtų labiau įtraukti dėstytojus.

<...>

_____

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)