



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Mykolo Romerio universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
Pedagogika
(*valstybinis kodas – 631X10005*)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *TEACHERS TRAINING*
(*state code – 631X10005*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Mykolas Romeris University

Expert team:

1. Dr Eve Eisenschmidt (team leader), *academic*,
2. Dr Cathal de Paor, *academic*,
3. Prof. Dr Inge Johansson, *academic*,
4. Ms Tatjana Kriliuvienė, *representative of social partners*,
5. Mr Ervinas Spūdys, *student representative*.

Evaluation coordinator -

Ms Renata Grinaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2015

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Pedagogika</i>
Valstybinis kodas	631X10005
Studijų sritis	socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	pedagogika
Studijų programos rūšis	universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	laipsnio nesuteikiančios studijos
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	nuolatinės (1)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	60
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	pedagogas
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2013 m. rugsėjo 1 d.

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Teachers Training</i>
State code	631X10005
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Teachers' Training
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Non-degree
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1)
Volume of the study programme in credits	60
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Teacher
Date of registration of the study programme	1 September 2013

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process	4
1.2. General	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information	4
1.4. The Review Team.....	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS.....	6
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	6
2.2. Curriculum design	7
2.3. Teaching staff.....	9
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	12
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment	13
2.6. Programme management	14
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	16
IV. SUMMARY	17
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	19

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 (hereafter - SER) and annexes, no following additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit.

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

The non-degree study programme *Teacher Training* within the field of Teachers’ Training is implemented by Faculty of Social Technology of the Mykolas Romeris University (MRU). The study programme was accredited on 11 May 2012 for a period of three years. Non-degree awarding study programme *Teachers Training* was designed, accredited and registered on April

4, 2012. This study programme was registered and accredited for 3 years without external evaluation. It has been implemented since September 1, 2013. External evaluation of this programme has not been carried out before.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team/external expert team (hereafter EET) was assembled in accordance with the *Expert Selection Procedure*, approved by Order No 1-55 of 19 March 2007 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education, as amended on 11 November 2011. The Review Visit to the HEI was conducted by the team on 5 November 2015.

- 1. Dr Eve Eisenschmidt (team leader)**, *vice-rector for development at Tallinn University, expert of external evaluation at the Estonian Higher Education Quality Agency, Estonia.*
- 2. Dr Cathal de Paor**, *Senior Lecturer and Director of Continuing Professional Development at Mary Immaculate College, Limerick, Ireland.*
- 3. Prof. Dr Inge Johansson**, *professor emeritus in Pedagogy, University of Stockholm, Department of Child and Youth Studies, Sweden.*
- 4. Ms Tatjana Kriliuvienė**, *teacher expert (English as a foreign language), Kuršėnai Laurynas Ivinskis upper secondary school, Lithuania.*
- 5. Mr Ervinas Spūdys**, *student at Vilnius University, Institute of International Relations and Political Science, Public Relations representative at the Students' Union of Vilnius University, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The aim of the *Teacher Training* programme is to provide pedagogical education to graduates of first or second cycle studies to qualify the students that do not have a pedagogical qualification to work in teaching positions in different types of schools and other educational institutions i.e. primary, school-kindergarten, basic, secondary and vocational schools, gymnasiums; and special schools, i.e. special, special-methodological centre, youth, sanatorium, hospital, socialization centre, sports and arts schools (SER, p.6).

The aim of the programme is to prepare qualified teachers who are able to work in a modern educational institution independently, creatively and responsibly while modelling pedagogical activity and applying modern educational technologies (SER, p.6). Learning outcomes (LOs) are organised under two general competences: learning to learn (to become a self-directed reflective teacher) and management of teaching and learning processes. This approach is in the line of recent trends in teacher education where the main focus is on future teachers' readiness for on-going professional development. Important pedagogical competences are highlighted i.e. apply pedagogical knowledge to educational activities, collaborate with educational institutions and community members, and organise professional research. Programme aims and LOs are publicly accessible on the university website and in leaflets, and flyers for the entrants.

Generally the aims and LOs correspond to non-degree teacher training programme, and are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered. The name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other.

However, considering that learners' backgrounds and future perspectives to start their teaching career are very diverse (primary school, language school, gymnasium etc) the learning outcomes are very broad and it is not clear how the learning outcomes are focused in relation to the needs of basic or secondary education or non-formal education. During the site visit the head of the study programme mentioned that implementation of the programme is based on students' individual needs. EET considers this approach very student friendly but also very time and resource consuming. Learners should be aware of their needs and aim their studies based on their personal aims. Mainly individual needs are taken into account during the practice (as 50% of studies is practice). Although during the site visit students and alumni mentioned that the head of the study programme communicates with students very actively still there is a need for more systematic approach for creation of individual learning plan with aims and LOs. Another possibility is to organise the studies by specialisations like teacher training for primary school teachers, vocational schools etc. In that case there could be different call for new applications by year, for example, one year there is call for primary school teacher training, the following year vocational teacher training etc.

According to the SER, the programme responds to the demand on public needs and professional requirements. The SER refers to several documents used in creating the programme aims and LOs like Dublin Descriptors, European and Lithuanian Qualifications Framework, academic requirements of Teacher Training Regulation etc.

The EET agrees that there is a public need for this non-degree programme. It creates possibilities for graduates to become more competitive in the work force and provides them with better

employment opportunities. Also there is a need to educate new generation of teachers because teachers in Lithuania are aging.

The programme is in line with a person's need to participate in lifelong learning and improve acquired competences while continuing studies.

To summarize, the name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualification offered are compatible with each other. The aim of the study programme is clear, but the learning outcomes are not sufficiently clarified for the different professional possibilities that these students will have in the future. Students and social partners are familiar with the programme aims and learning outcomes and consider that they are publicised adequately. The contents and the learning outcomes are consistent with teacher training.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design is in compliance with all of the legal requirements, relating to programme volume, and the subjects of the study field. The content of the subjects is fully consistent with the type and level of studies expected from such programmes, with an appropriate amount of credits being allocated to the subjects of the study field. The programme carries a workload equivalent to 60 credits (1 year's full-time). However, as this is a full-time workload, it poses challenges for students, many of whom are working. This adds significantly to their weekly workload and may have implications for the extent to which they can derive full benefit from the programme. This should be borne in mind in ongoing programme review.

The programme is modular, with general study subjects being introduced at the outset, helping to develop more general competences and basic knowledge. The subjects are spread evenly throughout the programme, and timetabled to help students develop knowledge about theory and practice together. Relevant professional activities in combination with *Teaching Practice* are available in both semesters. The SER notes that *Subject Didactics* is individualized according to the needs of the students. If necessary, studies of *Didactics* for separate subjects are added. In addition, the SER notes that the university can provide professional and competent specialists of *Subject Didactics* from other higher education institutions (SER, p. 11). This is crucial of the effective preparation of confident and competent teachers for the very diverse range of settings that are possible, i.e., different sectors working with children with different needs, and different school subjects, for example, as diverse as teaching oral language in pre-school to teaching advanced science in upper secondary. It requires attention for the individual needs of teachers and for the development of the pedagogical and practical skills they need, which will vary a lot depending on the context (i.e., sector and subject(s) being taught). This needs to be reflected in the design of the study subjects, particularly, *Didactics of the Discipline*.

The content and methods of the subjects are appropriate for the achievement of outcomes in line with level 6 of the European and Lithuanian Qualifications Framework. At this level, graduates need to be capable of solving tasks in the field of education, using a variety of tools and methods; applying theoretical knowledge and adapt constantly to new priorities and needs. However, as discussed above, there is a need to further develop the content in a formal way so that, all graduates, regardless of their background and any prior experience they may have in teaching, can solve tasks in education, applying theoretical necessary for effective teaching, independently and/or in collaboration with other teachers. This is crucial given the complex and ever-changing context in which teachers work.

The content and methods of the programme provide a stimulating experience for the students.

The SER suggest that the use of collaboration, problem-based teaching, critical thinking, assessment methods and methodologies are a major consideration in the programme (SER, p. 12). This was confirmed by students during the site visit. Students also value the flexibility which the curriculum design allows, enabling them to do their Practice according their own individual circumstances. Students can teach in subject areas corresponding to their initial undergraduate degree, but can also gain experience in the teaching of other areas. This reflects the fact that students enter the programme from a variety of backgrounds. This kind of differentiation also extends to the Final thesis of Education Studies, where students can integrate knowledge from various study subjects and from practice, while conducting research on a key issue(s) in their practice.

However, the content of the study subjects (taught subjects and practice) need further development in order to enable students to be fully prepared to, 'work in a modern educational institution independently, creatively and responsibly' (SER, p. 6). This requires greater differentiation of content to cater for the diverse needs of students. Requiring students to create individual learning plans would help to further support this differentiation. Such an exercise would require them to think at the outset of the programme about what priorities they have for their own professional preparation as teachers, and what steps they need to take to develop these during the programme, e.g., choice of practice setting, choice of subjects to be taught, choice of graduation project. They could then develop these further as they go through the programme, altering professional goals, and identifying ways in which they can meet the goals they set.

The annexes in the SER provide detail on each of the individual study subjects, including learning outcomes, a breakdown for contact and independent study time, suggested reading lists, etc. However, the detail provided on the assessment criteria used to determine achievement of each of the learning outcomes can vary between subjects. These should be further developed to support the accurate assessment of students' work, and to help students understand how standards of performance can vary between very weak and excellent or outstanding levels of performance, thereby encouraging students to strive higher each time.

The scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes. Courses target develop students' general methodologies, focusing on particular issues of practice and learning areas. Graduates may work in a range of schools, i.e. 'primary, school-kindergarten, basic, secondary and vocational schools, gymnasiums; and special schools, i.e. special, special-methodological centre, youth, sanatorium, hospital, socialization centre, sports and arts schools' (SER, p. 6). Key professional knowledge is provided early on so that students are as prepared as possible for their Practice, while subjects relating to research are scheduled for later. Practice placements are spread out across both semesters, enabling appropriate progression and increasing levels of challenge for the student, e.g., from initial observation, to teaching independently in Semester 2.

During the site visits, students discussed how they could support each other in group discussion, even though they were coming from different backgrounds and were preparing to teach in different sectors and different subjects. This reflects the collegial and social nature of teaching and learning to teach. However, catering for such a diverse student intake in terms of their prior degree is all the more demanding given the aim of the programme to prepare teachers for a diverse range of practice settings. Further contact time may be needed to enable the programme to further develop key competencies in students. There is also a need to provide more explicit guidance on the requirements for the practice component. This may involve increasing the minimum amount of teaching to be completed by the student so that the experience can be as

developmental and rewarding for the student as possible. The supervision process can be further enhanced by the visits by university teachers to settings to observe student practice, and to share observations with mentors about the progress of the student.

The content of the programme reflects many of the latest achievements in research and practice. The importance of lifelong learning is an important theme in the SER, which emphasises that, 'the programme is in line with a person's need to participate in a lifelong learning process and improve acquired competences while continuing studies (SER, p. 8). It emphasises that the programme aim is to prepare teachers who are able to work with a new generation of learners, not just part of a knowledge society, 'but rather a part of constantly learning one' (SER, p. 8). Many students already bring a range of practical experience with them to the programme as they may have been teaching already. The programme therefore needs to be capable of problematizing some of this existing knowledge so that students can develop an attitude of critical reflection. The programme could also include greater provision for other emerging educational research and provide opportunities for students to develop the required skills and knowledge according to their professional context. These include essential areas such as catering for inclusion, creativity, child development, student motivation, student assessment (both formative and summative), integration, innovative technologies in the teaching and assessment, differentiation, etc.

In summary, the curriculum design is in compliance with all of the legal requirements. However, as this is a full-time workload, it poses challenges for students, many of whom are working. Catering for the individual professional needs of graduates operating in a range of different sectors and subjects is also a challenge. There is a need to think more about how the programme can effectively prepare confident and competent teachers for the very diverse range of settings that students may find themselves in. Requiring students to create individual learning plans would help to further support this differentiation. The content and methods of the programme provide a stimulating experience for the students, with effective use made of collaboration, problem-based teaching, and critical thinking. The scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes, although the detail provided on the assessment criteria used to determine achievement of each of the learning outcomes could be more complete in some cases. The content of the programme reflects many of the latest achievements in research and practice. Many students already bring a range of practical experience with them to the programme as they may have been teaching already. However, further contact time may be needed to enable the programme to further develop key competencies in students. The programme could also include greater opportunities for students to develop new emerging areas knowledge areas according to their professional context.

2.3. Teaching staff

According to the SER, the teaching staff were formed according to their professional qualifications, scientific activities and main research interests. 19 teachers are involved in the implementation of the Programme: 4 professors, 8 associate professors, 3 lecturers with doctoral degrees in education, 4 lecturers with a master's degree in education. As stated in the SER, the programme is provided with the academic staff meeting the regulations in the documents "MRU qualification requirements for teachers and researchers" and "MRU procedure of the selection, evaluation and certification for teachers and researchers". General information about each teacher's pedagogical titles and scientific degrees, teaching experience, research interests, practical work experience in the taught study subject field and the study subjects taught in the program are presented.

As it is stated in the SER, the qualifications and practical experience of programme teachers meet the requirements of the amendment No V-827 of May 15, 2012, to Teacher Training Regulation approved by Order No. V-54 of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania of January 8, 2010: teachers have 18 years of teaching experience and 17 years of practical experience in the subject field of the taught study; 15 of 19 teachers have doctoral degrees in Social Sciences (Education), 20.5 percent of the staff are professors, 43 percent are associate professors, 16 percent are lecturers with doctoral degrees in Social Sciences (Education). 20.5 percent of the staff are lecturers with a Master's degree in Social Sciences (Education) or are now studying for PhD to get a degree in Social Sciences (Education); 80 percent of teachers' research interests are in accordance with the direction of the taught study subject; 10 percent of teachers have managerial or teaching experience in educational institutions or other teaching-related institutions (companies and organizations). Therefore, it may be stated that the qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes.

Programme teachers are work group leaders and members of various European international organizations, Lithuanian Associations of Education, academic programmes and research projects (see Annex 8, Table 6), which help the programme to be further developed and improved.

As stated in the SER, the ratio is 1 teacher of this programme for 1.16 students (22 students and 19 teachers). The teachers working in the programme are also involved in other programmes. Workloads of the teachers are formed and recorded according to the University procedures for teachers' workload formation and accounting approved by the Rector ("MRU workload accounting standards for teacher" and "MRU workload formation and accounting procedures for teachers"). The full workload of the University teacher is 1,530 hours per year, 36 hours per week. It is divided into teaching, scientific and organizational work. Teaching gets 1,000 hours, scientific work – 400 hours and organizational work – 130 hours throughout the year.

The SER didn't provide any information about teaching staff turnover and if it is able to ensure an adequate provision of the programme, so, it had to be clarified during the site meetings. As the EET found out from the meeting with the SER group no turnover took place during the period. All educologists are relatively new and are coming from other institutions like LEU or VU which the SER group consider to be positive.

According to the SER, programme teachers regularly participate in various training courses at university (3 times per quarter (according to the annual plan of the Institute of Educational Sciences and Social Work), teachers of the Institute of Educational Sciences and Social Work organize internal training; a series of seminars called "The Basics of Innovative Teaching", where once a week the Institute teachers conduct seminars for colleagues from other faculties) and outside it (scientific conferences, seminars, open-table discussions, research presentations, etc.). Annex 8, Table 1 and 7 illustrate the teachers' development. Also, programme teachers have attended professional internships in Spain, Slovakia, Finland, Italy, Portugal, Latvia and other foreign universities. During the evaluated period teachers have travelled to 27 internships (Annex 8, Table 8). From the CVs and conversations with the teachers, it seems to the EET that the interests of the teacher researches are more connected with educational policy making not pedagogy, therefore, the EET would recommend that the researchers' attention be focused more on pedagogical issues.

In the meeting with the SER group the EET were assured that the whole staff's meeting is held at

least twice a year. However, the teachers have the official time for small meetings (each other or every Thursday). Moreover, not only teachers but also students can join the meetings.

As stated in the SER, different opportunities for funding from the EU, international programmes and funds, the Lithuanian State Science and Studies Foundation to get funding for the implementation of their projects are encouraged.

The University always supports and helps teachers and researchers in getting financing for their studies, research and other scientific activities. Scientists are informed about the scholarships and support for research offered by the funds and programmes on the website of Research Council of Lithuania.

As the SER states, the teaching staff of the programme is involved in research directly related to the study programme being reviewed. During the meeting with the SER group it was explained that the research work is organised in cooperation with several teachers to save time spent on research, for example, “The Implementation of legal education at school”, “The Assessment of Personal achievement”. During the meeting with the staff, the EET got the evidence that the Institute of Educational Sciences and Social Work and Quality Assurance Committee support the teachers’ research competences (seminars and workshops) on a regular basis inside the university. The teachers mentioned interdisciplinary laboratories as good examples for teachers’ collaboration in different research fields. The programme employs active scientists who carry out research, participate in international scientific conferences, seminars, exchange programmes and internships.

Teachers, participating in the programme, have great experience in teachers’ preparation, development and assessment. Therefore, from the meeting with graduate students it was evident to the EET that the programme has completely met the students’ expectations. The alumni were satisfied with the teachers’ qualifications and relationship with them. The good balance between theory and practice was also mentioned by the alumni.

The programme teachers have been organizing international and national conferences and presentations in them as noted in the SER. Also, teachers give presentations at international conferences in various foreign countries: Ireland, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Iceland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Poland, Portugal, France, Slovakia, Slovenia. Participation in international conferences abroad varies due to the limited financial opportunities to go abroad.

The number of presentations in international conferences held in Lithuania has been noted to decrease from 22 presentations in 2011 to 11 in 2014, and none up to now in 2015. As it was explained by the senior management and administrative staff, the university policy is to work more with foreign partners than within Lithuania. The SER group approved the fact as a national problem, as the university is accredited or assessed with the preference given to the international activities, which should be the matter of discussion on national level. During the evaluated period, the programme teachers have provided 54 abstracts in international and national conferences (Annex 7, Table 5), published 9 monographs of their study and 10 scientific studies where they systematised their scientific expertise (Annex 7, Table 6) and prepared and published 34 textbooks and methodological tools (Annex 7, Table 7). Therefore, it can be said that the programme teachers ensure dissemination of their research internationally.

According to the SER, teachers have initiated, received funding and conducted 8 national research projects (Annex 8, Table 3), 20 national projects (Annex 8, Table 4), have participated

in 8 international research projects (Annex 8, Table 5) which promote the internationalization process while taught courses are enriched with European and global dimensions.

It can therefore be concluded from the SER and site meetings with different target groups that teaching staff meets the legal requirements. The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes and implementation of the programme required for this non-degree awarding study programme. Both the number of the teaching staff and ratio is adequate to ensure learning outcomes. The teaching staff of the programme is actively involved in research, however, the research area is not always directly related to the study programme being reviewed. Also, the EET would encourage more teachers' participation in national events, though the university policy is focused mainly on foreign events. The site visit and meetings with different target groups gave the evidence to the EET that the conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme are ensured both inside and outside the university.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The SER (p.17-19) lists all resources available for students and teachers of the programme. During the site visit the EET team visited classrooms, library and other premises. The teaching staff and students of the programme have access to well-equipped rooms, laboratories, library, IT lab and other areas. There is access to the main international and national databases necessary for learners of this programme. MRU has an excellent library open 24/7. There is also a very good guidance system in the library, with a librarian appointed for every field who is specialised to supervise the students and teaching staff to find needed literature. Also there is access to databases outside of the campus, and EZproxy system has been installed.

There are enough scientific materials of the field (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases). All teachers of the programme have made study materials of the courses available in Moodle environment. During the site visit EET asked about teaching materials (textbooks, workbooks, methodological materials etc.) of the specific fields like primary school, gymnasium etc. The head of the study programme explained that university doesn't have these kind of resources, students can use the resources of the practice institutions. The EET recommends that some sample copies of teaching resources are needed to demonstrate teaching methods to students, prepare lessons and organise micro teaching activities. The EET also recommends to establish special room for didactical studies with modern teaching technology, methodological materials, multi-technical, video and audio tools, students' sample works etc.

MRU has agreements with a number of institutions for students' practice. Annex 12 lists mainly general education schools as practice institutions. Some students do their practice placements at their work places. Alumni mentioned that they found these institutions for practice themselves and these institutions didn't have agreements with the academy. During the site visit some social partners mentioned that student teachers' practical tasks should be better discussed between practice institution and university staff. The EET recommends to choose even less institutions, but to agree the tasks developing strong network of practice institutions.

To summarize, there are good conditions and enough materials to ensure the learning outcomes of the programme. The teaching and learning resources are adequate both in size and quality. A special room for didactical studies with modern teaching technology, methodological materials should be established. The network of practice institutions could be further elaborated to guarantee student teachers' high quality practice.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The SER states that persons with education in any study field can enrol on the non-degree awarding studies if they meet the programme requirements of the admission rules. The competitive score consists of the sum of the arithmetic mean of final exam results and/or the thesis grade multiplied by the weighting coefficient of 0.8. Applicants can be admitted through competition based on competitive scores.

Since any person with education in any study field can enrol on the non-degree awarding studies if they meet the requirements and admission rules, it is difficult for the programme to effectively ensure the achievement of learning outcomes for each student as they have different expectations. The study subjects are closely related, although broad and lack the training of specific didactical skills. Students get to know pedagogy and didactics only on a very general level.

During the site visit the EET was assured that the students feel positively about the programme, however a better workload correspondence to the given ECTS credits should be ensured. The students perform practical tasks and reflect on their work, get consulted individually by the teachers for 4 hours each week face to face or virtually through various internet platforms. During the first cycle of practice they mostly observe the teaching while in the other get to practise by themselves. During the site visit some social partners told that there were occasions where the practice institutions did not know about the skills the students should have been trained.

Given the short duration of the programme, students do not generally participate in student mobility programmes, student organization activities or activities of science.

During the site visit students and graduates referred to the collegial atmosphere and good communication with teaching staff and head of the programme. The students can get consultations for 4 hours each week face to face or via e-mail. Students are provided with psychological, social, financial support, pastoral care or legal assistance in the university.

The EET was assured that students perform various reflections in groups and get individual feedback from the teachers. The final result of the students consists of cumulative assessment and a final exam, the assessment system is publicly accessible on the university's website.

Students take the programme to become teachers, however during the site visit the social partners indicated that the programme should provide the students with more specific didactical and generic skills.

To summarize, the admission to the programme could be revised to ensure the best possible achievement of the learning outcomes. The students are taught generally but a greater understanding of the subjects, didactical and other generic skills would be important. The university provides the students with a sufficient amount of academic and social support. The admission process to the programme could be discussed in order to ensure the best possible achievement of the learning outcomes. More didactical and specific skills could be taught during the programme.

2.6. Programme management

The SER states that the responsibilities are regulated on five levels: (1) *Senate, Rectorate, Study Quality Assurance Committee* are responsible for the formation and implementation of the University's study quality policy; (2) *Faculties, Study Programme Committees*, are responsible for the quality of study programmes and their realisation; (3) *Centre of Academic Affairs* is responsible for the initiation and preparation of legislation ensuring the quality of the studies; (4) *University Teachers* are responsible for the quality of subjects they teach – the achievement of learning outcomes, creative and innovative teaching, quality of study material and their adaption to the latest scientific achievements, the quality of the contact work, meeting the needs of particular students / unclassified students; (5) *Students / unclassified students* are responsible for their personal learning outcomes and the quality of their studies.

This is a holistic quality assurance system from institutional level to individual level for all parties. During the site visit the EET mentioned that the work of the head the Study Programme Committee is highly valued by students, alumni and social partners.

The SER states that professors, students and social partners contribute to the quality assurance of the implementation of the study programme directly; their opinions are taken into account when organizing various surveys, research, discussions, etc (SER p. 9).

Regarding internal quality culture, everyone is responsible for the study quality: from students to the university's highest body – senate. It was mentioned in the SER and also the EET understood during the site visit, that students' individual responsibility is supported in this programme by evaluating their personal needs and planning their own studies. Students' feedback is collected after each study subject. Students evaluate the quality of teaching of the subject, and final year students are asked to evaluate the overall quality of the study programme. Data is stored and used for long-term monitoring of the quality of study programmes. During the site visit the electronical environment of the feedback system was introduced. This environment is created especially for MRU and is a good example of a systematised approach of feedback system. At the moment the environment is only used inside of the university. The EET recommends developing the environment to use it also for data collection from alumni and social partners.

Every academic year all internal self-evaluation results are presented to students. Their opinion is taken into account and, if needed, the programme or study subjects are amended. Internal self-evaluation results are also presented to social partners. During the site visit teaching staff mentioned that there are informal meetings every two weeks for discussing programme development issues. The EET considered Study Programme Committee and teaching staff open-minded and very motivated to improve the programme. The outcomes of internal and external evaluations are used for programme improvement.

The Study Programme Committee cooperates with the Ministry of Education, practice schools, the Education Development Centre, National Agency for School Evaluation (SER p.9). Feedback is collected after student teachers' practice, and informal communication with partners also takes place.

During the site visit it was recognised that the university feels responsible for reducing the lack of qualified teachers in Lithuania by offering possibilities for acquiring teacher qualification for intelligent young people. Social partners mentioned that there should be closer cooperation with practice institutions to prepare them more for mentoring student teachers', to clarify the tasks of all partners.

There is a good atmosphere regarding quality assurance. The implemented internal quality assurance measures demonstrate effectiveness. The EET recommends continuing with the planned system and to support all staff members self-reflection attitude, which is very valuable for ongoing programme development.

To summarize, the responsibilities are clearly allocated. Study Programme Committee is responsible for management of the programme. University has collegial atmosphere among students and staff. The electronic environment of feedback system was introduced. It gives a good basis for systematic programme development. Social partners are involved into programme development. The EET suggests cooperate more systematically with internship institutions to have common understanding of tasks of every party.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To require students to create individual learning plans with aims and learning outcomes at the outset of the programme for their own professional preparation as teachers and to develop these as they complete the programme.
2. To organise the studies by specialisations like teacher training for primary school teachers, vocational schools etc and to consider to call for new application by year like one year there is call for primary school teacher training, an other year vocational teacher training etc.
3. To carry out necessary revision in order to ensure that those students wishing to teach different subjects or in different settings are appropriately prepared for their individual needs in didactics.
4. To increase opportunities, for example, through additional contact time, to further develop particular competences, such as the ability to support children's creativity, student motivation, formative and summative assessment, integration between curriculum subjects, differentiation, and inclusion of children with special educational needs.
5. To introduce greater and more explicit structure to the practice component within the programme design so that students can complete all of the required practice in line with the prescribed workload (observation and independent practice), involving visits by university teachers to settings to observe student practice, and regular contact with mentors.
6. To support the individual needs of students according to their subject and sector, by either allocating additional courses for specific didactic areas, or through increased involvement by expert teachers and mentors from schools/settings in the preparation of students in the didactics of the discipline in university.
7. To provide further detail on the assessment criteria used for some study subjects so that students are encouraged to achieve the highest level of performance possible.
8. With regards to the University policy, a discussion could be started on national level about the requirements for University accreditation, e.g. shift to value national events at least equally with the foreign ones.
9. To focus the researchers' attention more to pedagogical research rather than policy making.
10. To establish special room for didactical studies with modern teaching technology, methodological materials.
11. To elaborate the network of practice institutions to guarantee student teachers' high quality of practice.
12. The admission process to the programme could be discussed in order to ensure the best possible achievement of the learning outcomes.
13. To evaluate the students' workload (specially individual work) to guarantee the correspondence to the provided ECTS credits.
14. More didactical and specific field skills could be taught during the programme.
15. To cooperate more systematically with internship institutions to have common understanding of tasks of every party.

IV. SUMMARY

Mykolas Romeris University shares the responsibility of improving education in Lithuania. The non-degree programme of *Teacher training* is based on labour market needs and is welcomed by the employers and social partners.

The name of the programme *Teacher training*, its learning outcomes, content and the qualification offered are compatible with each other. The aim of the study programme is clear, but the learning outcomes are not sufficiently clarified for the different professional possibilities that these students will have in the future. Students and social partners are familiar with the programme aims and learning outcomes and consider that they are publicised adequately. The content and the learning outcomes are consistent with teacher training.

The curriculum design is in compliance with all of the legal requirements. However, as this is a full-time workload, it poses challenges for students, many of whom are working. Catering for the individual professional needs of graduates operating in a range of different sectors and subjects is also a challenge. There is a need to think more about how the programme can effectively prepare confident and competent teachers for the very diverse range of settings that students may find themselves in. Requiring students to create individual learning plans would help to further support this differentiation. The content and methods of the programme provide a stimulating experience for the students, with effective use made of collaboration, problem-based teaching, and critical thinking. The scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes, although the detail provided on the assessment criteria used to determine achievement of each of the learning outcomes could be more complete in some cases. The content of the programme reflects many of the latest achievements in research and practice. Many students already bring a range of practical experience with them to the programme as they may have been teaching already. However, further contact time may be needed to enable the programme to further develop key competencies in students. The programme could also include greater opportunities for students to develop new emerging areas knowledge areas according to their professional context.

Teaching staff meets the legal requirements. The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes and implementation of the programme required for this non-degree awarding study programme. Both the number of the teaching staff and ratio is adequate to ensure learning outcomes. The teaching staff of the programme is actively involved in research, however, the research area is not always directly related to the study programme being reviewed. Also, the EET would encourage more teachers' participation in national events, though the university policy is focused mainly on foreign events. The site visit and meetings with different target groups gave evidence to the EET that the conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme are ensured both inside and outside the university.

There are good conditions and enough materials to ensure the learning outcomes of the programme. The teaching and learning resources are adequate both in size and quality. The special room for didactical studies with modern teaching technology, methodological materials should be establish. The network of practice institutions could be further elaborated to guarantee student teachers' high quality practice.

The admission to the programme could be revised to ensure the best possible achievement of the learning outcomes. The students are taught generally but a greater understanding of the subjects,

didactical and other generic skills could be encouraged. The university provides the students with a sufficient amount of academic and social support.

The responsibilities are clearly allocated. The Study Programme Committee is responsible for management of the programme. University has a collegial atmosphere among students and staff. The electronic environment for a feedback system was introduced. It gives a good basis for systematic programme development. Social partners are involved in programme development.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Teachers Training* (state code – 631X10005) at Mykolas Romeris 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	2
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	16

*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:	Dr Eve Eisenschmidt
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Dr Cathal de Paor
	Prof. Dr Inge Johansson
	Ms Tatjana Kriliuvienė
	Mr Ervinas Spūdys