

LIETUVOS EDUKOLOGIJOS UNIVERSITETO PSICHOLOGIJOS PROGRAMOS (621S10003) VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT OF *PSYCHOLOGY* (621S10003) STUDY PROGRAMME

at LITHUANIAN UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

Grupės vadovas:

Team Leader:

Prof. dr. Stephen Edward Newstead

Grupės nariai:

Team members:

Doc. dr. Lena Adamson

Prof. dr. Peter Johannes van Koppen Doc. dr. Junona Silvija Almonaitienė

Domas Bukauskas

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba Report language - English

Vilnius 2012

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Psichologija
Valstybinis kodas	621S10003
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Psichologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Psichologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1997 gegužės 19d.

INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme	Psychology
State code	621S10003
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Psychology
Kind of the study programme	University Studies
Level of studies	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Scope of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Psychology
Date of registration of the study programme	19 May 1997

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

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
I. INTRODUCTION	
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	4
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	4
2. Curriculum design	6
3. Staff	6
4. Facilities and learning resources	7
5. Study process and student assessment	8
6. Programme management	9
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	
IV. SUMMARY	12
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	13

I. INTRODUCTION

The Master Study Programme of Psychology (Developmental Psychology), at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (LEU), formerly the Vilnius Pedagogical University, was registered in 1997 and is implemented by three departments from two faculties at LEU: the Department of Didactics of Psychology and the Department of Psychology from the Faculty of Education and the Department of Mathematics from the Faculty of Science and Technologies. The degree awarded is a Master of Psychology.

The present review has been carried out under the guidelines and procedures of SKVC. The assessment report is based on the self-evaluation report (SER), received in January 2014 and on a site visit in February 2014. All members of the assessment group individually prepared draft reports. During the site visit the team had the opportunity to discuss the programmes with faculty administrators, teaching staff, students, graduates and employers. We also visited the library, offices, teaching space and laboratories associated with the programme.

The last evaluation took place in 2011 and the programme was then accredited for three years. The programme was at the time implemented by *the Institute of Pedagogy and Psychology* in *the Faculty of Education*. The SER includes a clear description of the recommendations made by the last expert group. All items have been remedied except one: the name of the programme. The work that has been done is notable; it was a pleasure to read the SER and a pleasure to see that all this was confirmed at the site visit.

After the visit the expert group held a meeting in which the contents of the evaluation were discussed and modified to represent the opinion of the whole group.

The expert team wishes to thank the faculty for the splendid hospitality and for the administration, the staff, the students, and the social partners of the programme for their frank remarks and interesting inputs into the work of the expert team.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

Information about the programme is published and periodically updated at a number of different websites. Students reported that they had good access to information about the programme prior to entry, not just from the web sites but also from prospectuses and other publications. The programme is also advertised in a number of publications and in outside lectures.

The aim of the programme according to the SER is to train a qualified psychologist researcher-practitioner, who, on the basis of developmental theory and research, is able to apply and develop instruments of psychological assessment and strategies of psychological intervention in educational institutions of different levels. The SER gives a comprehensive record of the need for psychologists in educational settings in Lithuania. These needs seem to be especially large in preschool and primary education and geographically in the remote areas of the country.

The programme learning outcomes are structured into five different types of competencies: knowledge and its application, research skills, special abilities, social abilities and personal

abilities. The programme learning outcomes are overall very well defined and clearly written. They also, in many ways, express a clear relation to coming work tasks for graduates, for instance: the ability to formulate insights about the applied value of new scientific knowledge and how to use it in their own professional activities; the ability to work in interdisciplinary teams; how to self monitor and self evaluate the results of their own professional activities; and how to plan their own processes of learning and self improvement in an autonomous manner.

A thorough analysis of the programme in relation to a number of legal and other documents, including EuroPsy, is provided in the SER. The demand for the programme is revised via consulting with the stakeholders: employers, representatives of the Lithuanian Psychological Association and experts in the professional field. This was confirmed in the meeting with the social partners who reported regular meetings with the people responsible for the programme and individual teachers. They also gave examples of changes that had been made in curricula as the result of their suggestions. The social partners had also been actively involved in the preparation of the SER in round table discussions in which parents (of children in the institutions of these social partners) had also been present.

In an analysis conducted by the Education Supply Centre of the Ministry of Education and Science in 2009, some needs were especially mentioned for these type of programmes: improving collaboration with parents, setting of aims and objectives of children's education, educational counselling, preparation and implementation of psychological preventive programmes, and education of the school community on children's development and psychological issues. The programme fulfils most of these needs but could be improved on the subject of preparation and implementation of evidence-based psychological preventive programmes on all levels: family context related promotion and interventions, school context related promotions and interventions.

In addition to knowing about and being able to implement such programmes there is also a need for general theoretical knowledge on issues of efficacy (can an intervention work?) effectiveness (does an intervention work?) and questions of efficiency (what are the costs and consequences of the intervention?). A suggestion here is therefore to include a specific module on these subjects. This is not to say that the programme lacks these parts, but they are currently mostly integrated into other modules and into the practice. The students are also very active on these points, often in their spare time, which of course should continue to be so.

The employment rate for graduates from this programme is high, suggesting that there is a real need in the labour market that these students are filling. Some of the posts they take up are outside the area of psychology, but this is perfectly normal in many European countries and indeed elsewhere.

The programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and qualifications offered. Evidence at the site visit by teachers and students was also given that this MA programme indeed had a more in-depth approach than the BA given by the same department.

The learning outcomes, contents and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other. The official name of the programme is currently Psychology, but in the SER it is named Master Programme of Developmental Psychology. The name of the programme was suggested to be changed in the last evaluation, to something less academic and more easily understood by students and employers in relation to actual future work tasks. This had been discussed and the decision was to delay any alterations until upcoming changes from the Ministry of Education and Science on the organization and naming of programmes were made official.

2. Curriculum design

According to the SER the study plan fully meets the requirements of a) The Description of General Requirements for Master Study Programmes, b) The Description of the Study Cycles, c) the Description of Full-time and Part-time Study Modes, d) EuroPsy Standards, e) the Description of Procedure of Psychological Support Provision. The programme is divided into 56 credits in study subjects, 24 credits in practice, optional subjects 9 credits, and theses 31 credits. The expert team, in consultation with the SKVC Coordinator, formed the view that the programme met legal requirements.

The study subjects are spread evenly and there is no repetition. The syllabus has been revised since the last evaluation when it was far too focused on a) research and the thesis and b) the Vygotskian sociocultural approach. Optional courses of 9 credits have been introduced, which was a recommendation from the last evaluation.

The content of the modules are consistent with both the type and the level of the studies and content and methods are appropriate for achieving the learning outcomes. There is a great variety of teaching methods intended to activate the students in their learning processes, all in line with the Bologna student-centred teaching and learning paradigm shift. There is also a variety of different assessment methods, including peer assessment (an untapped resource in higher education), which is commendable. Assessment criteria on a three-point scale are provided in each course description. This is praiseworthy both in relation to working towards higher reliability between different teachers' gradings, and also to the benefit of students' understanding of what should be achieved. In all, the module descriptions are completely clear, connecting the module LOs with programme LOs, showing fit for purpose assessment methods and assessment criteria, combined with fit for purpose and active teaching methods. In fact the work which has been done here since the last evaluation is impressive. The site visit also confirmed that this work had involved the full teaching team and not just single individuals.

The scope of the programme is sufficient for achieving the learning outcomes. The reading lists for the modules indicate that the content is up to date. The programme reflects the latest achievements in relation to teaching and learning and stakeholder integration, fully aligned with European developments within the Bologna process and promoted/recommended by the European Commission.

3. Staff

The qualifications and competences of the lecturers on the programme meet the requirements of Lithuanian legislation.

The qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure the learning outcomes. There are 19 staff members involved in the programme, all except two with a doctorate. This is an increase (from 14) since the last evaluation. There has also been, with the aid of EU funding, subject based (developmental psychology) CPD for a number of the teachers since the last evaluation according to the meeting with the administration. The majority of teachers are also practitioners, something the students and alumni especially pointed out as positive.

The majority of teaching staff fall into the age group 45 - 64, but there are five teachers in the age group 25 - 35 promising continuity for the future of the programme.

From 2014 there are new regulations at the LUE regarding teachers' workloads. Teaching should never exceed 50% of the total workload regardless of position. This is to ensure that all teachers are also involved in research and other activities. The teacher to student ratio for this programme is 1 to 11. This is rather lower (i.e. more favourable) than in some countries, though the method of calculating the SSR varies from one country to another. The staff were able to explain clearly how the figures were calculated (contact hours divided by number of students) and the team formed the view that the SSR is an appropriate one, although teaching workloads seemed to be on the high side. Despite this, students indicated that staff was readily available if they wanted to consult them. Indeed, students reported that they were able to discuss issues with staff even after they had graduated. The teachers were also positive towards this new workload scheme which brings greater clarity into their workload situation.

There has been a turnover of staff since last evaluation. The recommendation then was to widen the scope and approaches of the programme since it was somewhat too heavily focussed on the Vygotskian perspective. This has been done and the criteria related to this are fulfilled. Turnover has been strategic in order to improve the programme.

Professional development of staff members is supported by the university, by enabling participation in international conferences, visiting foreign universities, exchange programmes, etc., and also arranging seminars and courses themselves. As already pointed out, the teachers are very motivated in developing their teaching methods and competencies and the requirement from the university is to participate at least once a year in some professional development related to teaching and research activities. In all, this has also prompted staff to work together in a more consistent manner than is often the case within higher education. In some modules teacher assistants are also available.

The teachers are expected to carry out research and time is allocated to this. There is enough activity to ensure that students are given a full taste of high level research. The visiting team was informed of two recent funded research projects, one on the psychology of play, one on the measurement of student motivation, both relevant for both programmes under evaluation.

In addition, the LEU has as a strategy for both research and education. Staff are contacted yearly and encouraged to invite international visitors to give short courses, seminars etc. The university has a special budget for this and last year this had the result that 20 % of the staff came from outside the university.

4. Facilities and learning resources

The buildings in which the programme is housed are of reasonable quality but staff all share a relatively small room and indicated that this could on occasions cause problems or delays when they wanted a private discussion with students; but the students themselves indicated that staff were very accessible.

The team visited laboratories for research and/or practical work in cognition and play. These have been opened since the last visit and are important developments for students on this programme. The play laboratory in particular should provide opportunities for interacting with children, and for observing and analysing children's behaviour. The activity of the Research and Training Laboratory for cognitive psychology and psychophysiology research has also been improved. All in all 133 000 LTL (approx. 38 000€)has been spent on this. These developments

were very new when the visit took place and it remains to be seen precisely how they will be used by students, but they could potentially be very effective in improving teaching.

There is an adequate number of computers to meet the needs of these students. One student reported that some of the computers are old and had a tendency to break down, but other students did not recognize this problem.

The practice is a key component of this programme, and the University has excellent links with outside agencies. The team learned that some students had to find their own practice placements but they did not report this as a problem. All the students met by the team had found a suitable practice.

The library is about to move into new premises, and from the outside the new building looks impressive. The current library is on the small side and there are limited numbers of copies of textbooks available. Students get round this by photocopying the necessary parts of books (presumably within copyright restrictions) and by using the extensive online databases available to them where the same conditions apply to staff and students in terms of accessibility etc.

The visiting team did not have time to inspect the psychometric test library in any detail. Given the emphasis on assessment and measurement in this programme, these students need good access to a range of educational tests. Both students and practice supervisors felt that it would be useful to have more hands-on experience with a wider variety of tests.

5. Study process and student assessment

The admission requirements are clear, they consist of the average marks of the study subjects in the study field psychology, and the mark of the Bachelor thesis.

Both the number of applications and subsequently the number of admitted entrants has decreased since the last evaluation. This was explained by smaller student cohorts in the country in general. During the last five years, 23 students graduated from the programme. Dropout rate is a much smaller problem than at the last evaluation: 8 during the past five years as opposed to 19 the previous time. Drop out problems have also been intensively discussed with suggestions of extended time lines, but the overall consensus was that quality has to be safeguarded.

The organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. This was clearly evidenced by students, alumni and social partners at the site visit. The programme is organized in two-week sessions (two weeks at the university and two weeks break), which is appreciated by the students.

Both students and social partners expressed the wish for longer practice. This is often the case but will of course mean less time for academic work. The expert team would rather recommend that these needs, instead of a prolonged practice, be solved with more active learning methods especially with regards to for instance assessment.

Students are encouraged to participate in both research and applied research activities and they publish and present research together with their scientific supervisors. Their engagement in research activities is mainly done in the conduct of their thesis. Many of the theses are of the questionnaire/survey type, but others show a good level of methodological and statistical sophistication. Many theses are conducted outside the university in applied settings, exactly as would be expected in a programme of this kind. Teachers, social partners and the students themselves also reported working in a number of voluntary organizations. The standard of presentation of the theses was variable, and it is suggested that students should be required to

produce their work according to widely accepted guidelines such as those laid down in the APA Publication Manual.

Student mobility is still very low. During 2009-2013 only 2 students spent some time in another university (Turkey and Portugal). During the same period, 36 incoming students have participated in master studies in Psychology, all from Kazakstan. Regarding outgoing students, this is a common problem also in other programmes. One reason, which is often given by students, is that credits abroad are not recognized when coming back, which prolongs their studies. A suggestion here is to develop a strategy to increase the number of students on mobility programmes, e.g. small time periods of training spent in other countries, summer camps, doing practice abroad or even doing their theses work, or part of it, abroad. A letter of intent has recently been signed between LUE and Moscow State University of Psychology and Education, which already implements a second cycle programme of developmental psychology in collaboration with the University of Neuchatel in Switzerland. The intention is now to create a joint programme between these universities which could improve the possibilities for both student and teacher mobility.

The academic and social support is good. There is a wide range of opportunities for participating in extra-curricular activities. Each student is allocated a tutor at the beginning of every new study year, there are a number of different types of scholarships, and both academic and financial support can be provided for disabled students. What impressed the team at the site visit was the very positive attitude from both students and alumni regarding the support they received from their teachers.

The assessment regime is well thought through and compliant with the learning outcome paradigm. As noted in an earlier section innovative assessment methods are used and all assessment criteria are publicly available in advance. Practice supervisors reported that they are given clear guidelines and criteria on how they should assess the practice. Students also reported satisfaction with this.

The employment rate of graduates is good. Most graduates work within the field of the programme. Some of the students that the team met did not, but still reported that the knowledge and competences they had acquired from the programme were very relevant and of use in their current positions. The employers that the team met indicated that the skills and experience the students acquire on this programme are valued in the workplace. The communication skills of the LUE students were particularly pointed out and valued. Employers also appreciated that these students (also during their practice) brought with them new knowledge valuable for the development of these workplaces.

6. Programme management

The programme is according to the Introduction in the SER implemented by three departments from two faculties at LEU: the Department of Didactics of Psychology, the Department of Psychology, both in the Faculty of Education, and the Department of Mathematics in the Faculty of Science and Technologies in LUE. The role of the Department of Mathematics seems minor.

Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated in the university. This is very clearly described in Figure 4 of the SER. References are also made to The European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) and the quality

assurance department is active and up to date in relation to these. The main responsibility for programmes lies with the programme committees. The university regulates the role, function and responsibilities of these committees since November 2013. One student representative has been included in the committee for this MA programme since the last evaluation. In all students are represented at all levels of the university.

In general, there are wide-ranging monitoring processes in place. The two departments work well together in running this programme (as mentioned the third, Department of Mathematics, seemed less involved), the responsibility for which is firmly located in the Committee for the Study Programme. As said at one of the meetings, the programme is not owned by the department but rather by the programme committee. This promotes interdisciplinary work and collaboration between departments and stakeholders necessary for maintaining and developing the quality of the programme. The committee regularly monitors six areas: aims and learning outcomes, curriculum design, teaching staff, facilities and learning resources, study process and student assessment, and programme management. The committee includes students, alumni and stakeholders. A number of the social partners the team met had been regularly involved with the preparation of the self-evaluation report and reported that their views had been listened to and acted upon.

Information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed; this is done via anonymous student questionnaires after each semester and oral feedback from students during semesters. Students confirmed this at the site visit, and also mentioned that discussions during the semester with their teachers could result in immediate changes. Information is also gathered from alumni, employers and psychologists in work places who supervise students during placements; all this was confirmed in meetings with these groups at the site visit.

The outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are discussed during the nearest meeting at the department and used for the improvement of the programme. A number of practical examples were given; the opinions of students and alumni are especially interesting here and are in general favourable to the programme.

One good example of the quality assurance processes which is worth mentioning: the department engages teachers from other Lithuanian universities that train psychologists, as chairpersons for the thesis defence committees.

In sum, the programme has taken due consideration of previous evaluations. Indeed the visiting team was impressed by the extent to which the course has developed since the previous external evaluation, especially with respect to the clear specification of aims and learning outcomes, and the way in which these were reflected in the course syllabuses and innovative assessment processes. Without clear allocated roles, effective and efficient quality assurance mechanisms, support and interest from the administrative parts of the department this would probably not have been as successful. There seems to be good teamwork not just within the teacher group.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Programme aims and learning outcomes: The programme fulfils most of the needs concerning academic and/or professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market but could be improved on the subject of preparation and implementation of evidence-based psychological preventive programmes at all levels: family context related promotions and interventions; school context related promotions and interventions; community interventions; and cross context interventions. In addition to knowing about and being able to implement such programmes there is also a need for general theoretical knowledge on issues of *efficacy* (can an intervention work?) *effectiveness* (does an intervention work?) and questions of *efficiency* (what are the costs and consequences of the intervention?). A recommendation is therefore to include a specific module on these subjects.
- 2. Mobility: Develop a strategy to increase the number of students on mobility programmes, e.g. small time periods of training spent in other countries, summer camps, doing practice abroad or even doing their thesis work (or part of it) abroad, and in general support and promote students to go abroad.
- 3. Mobility: Continue in developing the joint programme according to the letter of intent with the Moscow State University of Psychology and Education.
- 4. Facilities: The workspaces allocated are very small and shared by a large number of staff. If additional space cannot be found, it is essential that staff have adequate facilities for meeting individual students on their own when necessary.
- 5. Study process: Both students and social partners expressed the wish for longer practice. This is often the case but will of course mean less time for academic work. The expert team would rather recommend that these needs, instead of a prolonged practice, be solved with more active learning methods especially with regards to for instance assessment methods.
- 6. Research and applied research:
 - a. Students should be encouraged to present their thesis using a standard format, for example that included in the APA Publication Manual.
 - b. The development of a motivational test for use on intending students is an interesting and exciting project. The test itself and the findings should be made available to an international audience, ideally by publication in a peer-reviewed journal included in the major indexes such as Thomson-ISI. The test concerns the BA programme but will have positive consequences also for the MA in the future given that many BA students plan to continue their studies on the MA programme.

IV. SUMMARY

The programme aims and learning outcomes of this programme are now very well defined, clear and publicly accessible and based on the academic and professional requirements as well as public needs and the needs of the labour market, with the only suggestion to include a specific module on prevention and positive youth development programmes.

The programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered. There is a clear progression both within the programme and between this and the first cycle programme provided by the same department. The learning outcomes, contents and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other and the name is appropriate.

The curriculum design meets legal requirements, the study subjects and/or modules are spread evenly and their themes are not repetitive. The content of the subjects and/or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies, and appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. In all the scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes. The content of the programme reflects the latest achievements in relation to teaching and learning and stakeholder integration, fully aligned with the European developments within the Bologna process and promoted/recommended by the European Commission.

The study programme is provided by staff who meet Lithuanian legal requirements, and the qualifications and the number of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes. Teaching staff turnover and staff development since last evaluation has been strategic to ensure and develop the quality of the programme.

The university creates good conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme. The expert team was impressed by the high interest of staff in developing their teaching skills and hence the quality of the programme in addition to the good teamwork that was expressed at the site visit. The teaching staff of the programme are also involved in research directly related to the study programme being reviewed.

The premises for studies have been improved since the last evaluation especially in relation to laboratory facilities, and a new library is built but is not yet in use, but there is still a rather limited amount of offices for staff. Teaching materials for students are adequate, and accessible on the same terms as for staff and the arrangement for student practice meets all requirements.

The organisation of the study process supports the achievement of the learning outcomes, drop out rates have been lowered and students, alumni and social partners all expressed great satisfaction with the programme and the accessibility and openness of the teachers. Mobility however is still low and the programme is recommended to form a strategy here.

In all, the programme has taken due consideration of previous evaluations. Indeed the visiting team was impressed by the extent to which the course has developed since the previous external evaluation, especially with respect to the clear specification of aims and learning outcomes, and the way in which these were reflected in the course syllabuses and innovative assessment processes. All the evidence indicated that these developments had been effectively put into practice. Without clearly allocated roles, effective and efficient quality assurance mechanisms, support and interest from the administrative parts of the department this would probably not have been as successful. There seems to be good teamwork not only within the teacher group, and this has created an excellent result.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Psychology* (state code – 621S10003) at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by fields of assessment.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	
2.	Curriculum design	4
3.	Staff	4
4.	Material resources	3
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	4
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	4
	Total:	22

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

Grupės vadovas:

Team Leader:

Prof. dr. Stephen Edward Newstead

Grupės nariai:

Team members:

Doc. dr. Lena Adamson

Prof. dr. Peter Johannes van Koppen

Doc. dr. Junona Silvija Almonaitienė

Domas Bukauskas

^{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.

LIETUVOS EDUKOLOGIJOS UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *PSICHOLOGIJA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621S10003) 2014-04-17 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-170 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto studijų programa *Psichologija* (valstybinis kodas – 621S10003) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas,
Nr.		balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	4
3.	Personalas	4
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	4
6.	Programos vadyba	4
	Iš viso:	22

- * 1 Nepatenkinamai (yra esminių trūkumų, kuriuos būtina pašalinti)
- 2 Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)
- 3 Gerai (sistemiškai plėtojama sritis, turi savitų bruožų)
- 4 Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

IV. SANTRAUKA

Studijų programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai dabar yra labai gerai apibrėžti, aiškūs ir viešai skelbiami, pagrįsti akademiniais ir profesiniais reikalavimais, visuomenės ir darbo rinkos poreikiais; vienintelis pasiūlymas – įtraukti specialų modulį apie prevenciją ir pozityvaus jaunimo ugdymo programas.

Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai atitinka studijų rūšį, pakopą ir suteikiamą kvalifikacijų. Matoma pažanga ir šioje programoje, ir lyginant ją su tos pačios katedros įgyvendinama pirmos pakopos studijų programa. Numatomi studijų rezultatai, programos turinys ir suteikiama kvalifikacija dera tarpusavyje, pavadinimas yra tinkamas.

Programos sandara atitinka teisės aktų reikalavimus, studijų dalykai ir (arba) moduliai išdėstyti nuosekliai, dalykai ir jų temos nesikartoja. Dalykų ir (arba) modulių turinys atitinka studijų rūšį bei pakopą ir leidžia pasiekti numatomus studijų rezultatus. Programos apimtis yra pakankama studijų rezultatams pasiekti. Programos turinys atitinka naujausius pasiekimus, susijusius su mokymu ir mokymųsi bei socialinių dalininkų įtraukimu ir yra visiškai suderintas su Europos plėtra Bolonijos procesų kontekste ir Europos Komisijos skatinamais ar rekomendacijomis.

Studijų programą įgyvendinantis personalas atitinka Lietuvos teisės aktų reikalavimus, dėstytojų kvalifikacija ir skaičius yra tinkami numatomiems studijų rezultatams pasiekti. Dėstytojų kaita ir personalo tobulinimas nuo paskutiniojo vertinimo yra esminės priemonės, taikytos siekiant užtikrinti programos kokybę ir jos gerinimą.

Universitetas sudaro sąlygas dėstytojų profesiniam tobulėjimui, reikalingam programai įgyvendinti. Ekspertų grupei padarė įspūdį dėstytojų noras stiprinti dėstymo įgūdžius, taigi ir programos kokybę, taip pat ir bendras darbas, apie kurį užsiminta per vizitą. Be to, programos dėstytojai dalyvauja moksliniuose tyrimuose, kurie tiesiogiai susiję su analizuojama programa.

Nuo paskutiniojo vertinimo studijoms skirtos patalpos pagerintos, ypač laboratorijos įranga; statoma nauja biblioteka, bet personalui skirtų kabinetų vis dar trūksta. Studentai turi pakankamai mokomosios medžiagos, jiems ji prieinama tomis pačiomis sąlygomis kaip ir darbuotojams; studentų praktikos organizavimas atitinka visus reikalavimus.

Studijų proceso organizavimas užtikrina, kad studijų rezultatai bus pasiekti; studentų nubyrėjimo lygis sumažėjo; studentai, absolventai ir socialiniai partneriai išreiškė pasitenkinimą programa ir dėstytojų prieinamumu bei atvirumu. Tačiau judumo lygis vis dar žemas, taigi rekomenduojama kurti strategiją šioje srityje.

Apskritai programoje tinkamai atsižvelgta į ankstesnius vertinimus. Vertinimo grupei didelį įspūdį paliko po ankstesnio išorinio vertinimo įgyvendinti programos patobulinimai, ypač tai, kaip aiškiai nurodyti programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai, kaip jie atspindėti mokomųjų dalykų medžiagoje, ir pažangios vertinimo procedūros. Gauta informacija rodo, kad šie patobulinimai veiksmingai įgyvendinami praktiškai. Tai tikriausiai nebūtų atlikta taip sėkmingai, jei nebūtų aiškiai paskirstytos funkcijos, nebūtų veiksmingų kokybės užtikrinimo mechanizmų, katedros administracinių padalinių pagalbos ir dėmesio. Atrodo, kad laikomasi bendro darbo principo, ir tai būdinga ne tik dėstytojams; dėl to ir rezultatas yra puikus.

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

- 1. Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai: programa tenkina daugelį poreikių, susijusių su akademiniais ir (ar) profesiniais reikalavimais, taip pat visuomenės ir darbo rinkos poreikius, bet galėtų būti patobulinta, turint omenyje įrodymais pagrįstų visų lygių psichologijos prevencinių programų parengimą ir įgyvendinimą: tarpininkavimas ir psichologinė intervencija, susijusi su šeima, tarpininkavimas ir psichologinė intervencija mokyklose, psichologinė intervencija bendruomenėje ir mišri intervencija. Būtina ne tik žinoti apie šias programas ir sugebėti jas įgyvendinti, bet ir turėti bendrųjų teorinių žinių apie *veiksmingumą* (ar įsikišimas gali būti paveikus?), *rezultatyvumą* (ar įsikišimas padeda?) ir *efektyvumą* (kokia įsikišimo kaina ir padariniai?). Todėl rekomenduojama įtraukti specialų modulį šiomis temomis.
- 2. Judumas: parengti strategiją, kaip padidinti judumo programose dalyvaujančių studentų skaičių, pavyzdžiui, trumpalaikis mokymas kitose šalyse, vasaros stovyklos, praktika užsienyje ar netgi baigiamojo darbo rašymas užsienyje ir apskritai studentų raginimas vykti į užsienį bei jų rėmimas.

- 3. Judumas: toliau kurti bendrą programą su Maskvos valstybiniu psichologijos ir pedagogikos universitetu remiantis ketinimų protokolu.
- 4. Materialieji ištekliai: darbui skirto ploto labai mažai, juo dalijasi daug darbuotojų. Jei daugiau ploto neįmanoma rasti, svarbu, kad darbuotojai turėtų tinkamą vietą prireikus susitikti su studentais individualiai.
- 5. Studijų eiga: ir studentai, ir socialiniai partneriai išreiškė norą, kad praktika truktų ilgiau. Tai dažnas atvejis, bet tada mažiau laiko liks akademiniam darbui. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduotų, kad, užuot ilginus praktikos laiką, šis poreikis būtų tenkinamas taikant aktyvesnius mokymosi metodus, ypač, pvz., vertinimo metodus.
- 6. Moksliniai tyrimai ir taikomieji moksliniai tyrimai:
 - a. Studentai turėtų būti raginami baigiamuosius darbus pateikti standartiniu formatu, pavyzdžiui, tuo, kuris įtrauktas į APA publikacijų vadovą.
 - b. Motyvacinio testo parengimas norintiems studijuoti yra įdomus projektas. Pats testas ir jo duomenys turėtų būti labiau prieinami tarptautinei auditorijai, geriausia paskelbti juos recenzuojamame žurnale, įtrauktame į svarbiausius indeksus, pavyzdžiui, į *Thomson-ISI* duomenų bazę. Šis testas taikomas stojant į bakalauro studijų programą, bet, atsižvelgiant į tai, kad daugelis bakalauro programų studentų ketina toliau studijuoti magistrantūros programą, jis bus naudingas ir ateityje.

<>	

Paslaugos teikėjas patvirtina, jog yra susipažinęs su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso¹ 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

¹ Žin., 2002, Nr.37-1341.