



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Šiaulių universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
KŪNO KULTŪROS IR SPORTO EDUKOLOGIJA
(valstybinis kodas – 621X20027)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF PHYSICAL AND SPORT EDUCATION
(state code – 621X20027)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Siauliai University

Expert team:

1. **Dr Christiana Rosenberg-Ahlhaus (team leader)**, *academic*,
2. **Prof. Dr Francisco Carreiro da Costa**, *academic*,
3. **Dr Frances Murphy**, *academic*,
4. **Dr Dalia Lapėnienė**, *representative of social partners*,
5. **Ms Olga Stremauskaitė**, *student representative*.

Evaluation coordinator -

Ms Barbora Drąsutytė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2015

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Kūno kultūros ir sporto edukologija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621X20027
Studijų sritis	socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	edukologija
Studijų programos rūšis	universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	nuolatinė (2), iššęstinė (2,5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	edukologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2003 m. birželio 30 d.

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Physical and Sport Education</i>
State code	621X20027
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Education Studies
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second cycle
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2), part-time (2,5)
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	June 30, 2003

© 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	8
2.3. Teaching staff.....	10
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	11
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment	11
2.6. Programme management	14
2.7. Examples of excellence	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 programme evaluation is negative such a programme is not accredited.

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

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

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

1.2. General

The Application documentation submitted by the HEI follows the outline recommended by the SKVC. Along with the self-evaluation report and annexes, the following additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	Final theses for years 2013-2014

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

The visit to SIAULIAI UNIVERSITY, Department of Physical Education and Sports Education Studies, Faculty of Education was held on 29 April, 2015, complying with the agenda previously established.

The study programme of **Physical and Sport Education** at Siauliai University is located in the Department of Physical Education and Sport Education in the Faculty of Education. The Faculty comprises four departments (Educology, Education Systems, Psychology, Physical Training and Sport Education), and also includes a number of relevant research centres such as the Educational Research Scientific Centre; Scientific Centre of Natural Sciences Education and the Research Laboratory of Sports Training. The Department of Physical and Sports Education Studies is responsible for the study programme of Physical and Sports Education.

This report was prepared and structured according to the rules expressed in the Methodological Guidelines developed by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (SKVC). The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) provided the basis for the initial report, with clarification sought during the visit. The SER was found to be well grounded, detailed, and informative, although at times it was difficult to fully understand some key material, in particular some designations used in English.

The visit was carried out in a climate of huge cordiality and transparency. All the necessary information was immediately provided when asked. All meetings took place in an atmosphere of collaboration and intellectual honesty.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was assembled in accordance with the *Expert Selection Procedure*, approved by Order No 1-55 of 19 March 2007 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education, as amended on 11 November 2011. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 29 April 2015.

- 1. Dr Christiana Rosenberg-Ahlhaus (team leader)**, *lecturer and researcher at the Department of Sports Science and Physical Education of the University of Konstanz (Universität Konstanz), Germany.*
- 2. Prof. Dr Francisco Carreiro da Costa**, *professor at the Faculty of Physical Education and Sport of Lusophone University of Humanities and Technologies (Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias), Portugal.*
- 3. Dr Frances Murphy**, *Senior Lecturer in Education (Physical Education) at St Patrick's College Dublin, Ireland.*
- 4. Dr Dalia Lapėnienė**, *head teacher of Kaunas Jonas and Petras Vileišiai Lower Secondary School, lecturer at Lithuanian Sports University, Lithuania.*
- 5. Ms Olga Stremauskaitė**, *undergraduate student in Psychology at Vilnius University, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

The programme was evaluated in 2009 and it was given full accreditation. The previous review team regarded the programme as a strong programme supported strongly by students, graduates and employers. The strong sides included – *inter alia* – the good quality of the final research papers of students, and the quality of the teaching staff. However, the evaluation also included some recommendations: to express more succinctly and without repetition the aims, objectives and student learning outcomes; to reduce the range of disciplines to be studied in order to enable students to select areas in which to specialise and become expert; to consider how best to address students' concerns; to place a higher priority on protecting research time for MSc programme tutors; continue to develop sports science laboratories.

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

According to SER, the programme aims to prepare highly qualified second level specialists capable:

- 1) *“to perceive and assess critically global and national tendencies of physical training and sport development, in accordance with them to organize their own and subordinate employees' pedagogical activity;*
- 2) *to manage creatively different age and mastery learners' physical (self-)development in employing interdisciplinary knowledge and modern research methods“.* (SER, pag. 6)

It is also stated that the programme aims to educate highly qualified specialists able to work in sport/physical education settings and also in a wider educational and society settings, that is entrepreneurs capable of creating workplaces for themselves and for others, and that may successfully work with both learners striving for high results in sport and people whose objectives are recreation, health and quality of life.

The intended learning outcomes are organized into five major groups: “knowledge, its application”, “abilities to conduct researches”, “special abilities”, “social abilities”, and “personal abilities” (SER, pag. 7). For each group of learning outcomes, the skills that graduates should have developed at the end of the programme are listed. The learning outcomes are presented and explained in a consistent and comprehensive way. The SER describes in detail the documents and sources that were taken into account to define learning outcomes, specifically: international directives; national and statistical documents; demand of the labour market; the

surveys of employers, graduates and students; and recommendations made by the previous review team. It is also mentioned that "*deep-rooted traditions of physical training and sport in Šiauliai city and in all region of North Lithuania*" (SER, pag. 8) were taken into consideration.

The aims and learning outcomes are adequate to a master degree, are clearly defined, and appear to have been set taking into account the needs of the labour market and employers. In fact, the meeting with partners allowed the evaluation team to establish that the needs and aspirations of the partners were considered in the definition of the profile of the post-graduate to educate, and also that needs have been shaped in the learning outcomes. However, in the translation into English, some expressions used make difficult the full understanding of some learning outcomes. (Some examples: "*most modern educational knowledge*"; "*creative application of the most modern techniques and strategies*"; "*modern methodological conceptions*", etc.). The meaning of these expressions has been clarified during the visit to the institution. However, the review team recommend a more detailed description of these learning outcomes, making them better understood by readers of the English documents (mainly by foreign students and employers).

The programme also aims to create the possibility for students to specialize in two areas of professional intervention: "*Educology of Physical Training and Management of Sport Education*" (SER, pag. 9). The specific learning outcomes of each field of study are not discriminated. For a better understanding of the competence profile of each of the field of study, it would have been convenient to have defined, first, the general outcomes, and then the specific learning outcomes of each field of study. This way of presenting the learning outcomes will make more explicit the program's identity, and will allow people to better understand the professional profile intended of each specialty. However, this aspect does not remove consistency both to how learning outcomes are defined and to the curriculum.

The intended learning outcomes are specified in each course description together with the purpose of the course unit and the programme competences to be developed. The programme has adopted a very consistent way of presenting its aim and learning outcomes throughout the programme documents – furthermore, they are publicly accessible at the Institute's website.

Also the practices of the programme implementation, as evidenced by the SER and interviews, indicate that the name of the programme, learning outcomes, and subjects taught and competencies offered are mostly aligned. It should be emphasised, that the institution has conducted a highly professional work in the establishment and definition of the aims and learning outcomes of the study programme, properly applying the principles recommended by the curricular theory.

2.2. Curriculum design

The structure of the Programme is described in point 21 of the SER (p. 9). The Programme is implemented in *full-time* and *part-time* study modes. The duration of the full-time studies is 4 semesters, while the duration of the part-time programme is 5 semesters. The volume of ECTS per year for the full-time students is 60 and 45 for the part-time students. The curriculum provides education in two specialties and is organized as follows: curricular units mandatory and common to both specialties (70 ECTS), specific curricular units of each of the specialties (20 ECTS for each speciality), and master final thesis (30 ECTS). The distribution of credits and other aspects of curriculum design comply with general legal requirements of Lithuania.

The purpose of the mandatory curriculum units, according to SER, is *“to expand the interdisciplinary knowledge and skills, to assess and select critically the knowledge, in substantiating its functional relation while making the decisions in complex educational situations. It is strived that the subjects comprising the group of these subjects would highlight the issues of topics under analysis, and would allow to perceive the importance of scientific researches while substantiating the facts, tendencies, etc. It is supposed that the knowledge and abilities gained in this way would allow a master in educology to operate efficiently in constantly changing environments”* (pag. 10). The curricular units that make up the compulsory curriculum are as follows: “Philosophy and Sociology of Education”; “Sport Psychology”; “Policy of Physical Training and Sport”; “Research Methodology 1”; “Theories of Physical Training and Sport Educology”; “Research Methodology 2”; “Theories and Models of Health Education”; “Management of Physical Training and Sport Projects”; and “Research Methodology 3”.

Furthermore, the curricular units for the two specializations aim *“to acquire shaping knowledge of Educology of Physical Training and Management of Sport Education that is applied while solving the issues of physically active persons”* (SER, pag. 10). The specific curricular units of Physical Training Educology Specialization are: “Modelling of Physical Training Content”; “Technologies of Physical Training Self-development”; and “Technologies of Movement Training”. Finally, Sport Education Management Specialization consists of the following curricular units: “Management of Sport Organizations”; “Management of Human Resources”; and “Sport Training Management”.

The curriculum has changed in many respects since the accreditation in 2009. Amendments to the curriculum structure resulted from recommendations made in 2009 by the review team. Transition to the ECTS credit system, suggestions received from stakeholders, and respect for the most current scientific knowledge was also taken into account (SER, pag.10). On the whole, the general structure of the study programme seems adequate. The inclusion of a research

curricular unit in the first, second and third semester seems a good curricular decision allowing the students to adequately prepare for research activity. This is undoubtedly a very strong aspect of the curriculum.

From a formal point of view the study plan was designed in compliance with the steps and best practices recommended by the curricular theory. The SER clearly demonstrates the consistency between aims, learning outcomes, curricular units, and teaching methods (see Table 7). This care in demonstrating this consistency should be underlined because it is not common to observe this approach in the university pedagogical culture. Another aspect that should be highlighted is the way the curricular units are described. The description structure of each curricular unit provides accurate and complete information about the learning objectives, and about the contribution of each curricular unit for the achievement of the learning outcomes of the study programme. The structure of the curricular units also allows to examine the degree of consistency between contents and learning outcomes, and between teaching methods and learning outcomes. It is mentioned in the SER (pag. 12) that the description of curricular units needs to be improved in order to provide more detailed information. Only a high degree of self-demand and a willingness to continuously improve the process can justify the expression of this need. Another aspect that needs to be rethought and that is mentioned in the SER (pag. 12), is teaching methods. Indeed, the descriptors of all curricular units indicate the same teaching methods. To analyse and discuss with the staff what kind of teaching methods are more adequate for the achievement of the learning objectives is an important issue to be taken into account in the management of the teaching-learning processes. As stated in SER (pag. 12) *“It is supposed that some methods are more favourable to implement one type of study subjects, whilst other methods are more favourable to another type of study subjects”*.

In paragraph 41 of the SER is referred that *“The lecturers pay considerable attention to the actualization of students’ teaching/learning, the substantiation of volume of students’ individual work necessary to achieve learning outcomes, the methods of students’ achievement assessment”* (SER, pag 16). Still talking about the description of the curricular units, we would like to draw attention to the number of books recommended to students. If we consider only the mandatory curricular units, 79 is the number of books suggested. Considering the time available, students do not have enough time to read all those books. So, the review team would propose that each curricular unit displays only the literature that the students must consult in order to succeed in the curricular unit.

2.3. Teaching staff

Compared to the previous evaluation period, the scientific capacity of teachers involved in the study programme has increased significantly at the academic level. The staff of the department comprises four associate professors, four doctors/lecturers and three lecturers. Two visiting teachers also collaborate with the study programme (from Klaipėda University and Lithuanian Sports University).

Teaching staff delivering the study programme meet the general requirements for Master's programmes, and the legal requirements. Thirteen teachers have a doctoral degree, and four Professors are responsible for the following subjects: Philosophy and Sociology of Education; Management of Physical Training and Sport Projects; Theories and Methods of Health Education; Research Methodology 1, 2, 3; Sport Psychology; and Final (Master) Thesis. The qualifications of the teaching staff are sufficient from the point of view of ensuring learning outcomes.

The SER argues that lecturers in theoretical subjects of the programme are active scientists who take an active part in international and national scientific academic activities and publish both nationally and internationally. It is also said that, compared to the previous evaluation period, the participation of teachers in research activities and in international conferences increased significantly. In paragraph 48 of the SER (pag. 17) are listed the activities carried out by teachers. Although the review team was able to testify that this increase has happened, a review of staff publications (Annexe 3) indicates that many teachers continue to publish their research mainly in their mother language.

The higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme by supporting its participation in teaching seminars and scientific meetings, both at Lithuania and abroad. Although staff participation in scientific meetings abroad has improved significantly since the last evaluation, the institution should continue to pay attention to this issue. The institution recognizes the need for *“a more active use of available international relations for joint comparative scientific researches in the area of physical training and educology, in involving master students as well”*. (SER, pag. 21)

The teacher student ratio in the study programme, between 2009 and 2014, ranged from 1.1 (2010) and 1.9 (2012). This is a ratio that creates excellent pedagogical conditions for the achievement of learning outcomes, of course if teachers do not teach too much in other programme. The teaching workload was analysed and discussed with teachers. Teachers reported

that the time devoted to teaching is 1/3 of the total workload. According to teachers, the time devoted to teaching does not limit their research activity.

All members of the review group share the idea that staff is a group of very enthusiastic teachers and have an impressive level of identification with their institution and their students. The students pointed out that they are very satisfied with their teachers and with the support received from them.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The institution has appropriate and adequate physical facilities, providing good teaching and research conditions to the study programme. There are sufficient rooms and sufficient computers with adequate software for the students who have also their own space for meetings and free-time activities.

Library services of the university are mostly sufficient, including the access to academic journals, books, electronic databases and reading rooms. There are numerous books available in English, but in view of its intact conservation status, there continues to be little evidence that they had been used by students. The teachers are active in developing the collections of the library.

Significant improvements have been made in the Laboratory of Sport Education Research. The Laboratory is housed in a large space with 137 m² (the former one was 21m²), and has received modern and expensive research equipment. The available space and the new equipment allow improving the quality of research as well as increasing the level of service to the community.

Teaching staff have space for their individual work and for meeting students.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The entry requirements in the study programme are properly explained, as well as parameters and criteria used to shortlist candidates. The entry score for the master is composed of the arithmetic mean of the grades of the diploma supplement. People with a bachelor's degree from other fields of study or who do not have university degrees can be admitted after carrying out additional studies. The persons who do not have one of the bachelor diplomas in education and fostering field (pedagogy, educology, andragogy, education and fostering) group or in sport field, during additional studies, have to pass the following subjects: *Basics of Pedagogy, Psychology, Theory of Physical Training, Didactics, Sport Theory, Didactics* (SER, pag. 23).

Additional 2 points are added to general competitive score to the applicants who graduated with a university major in the study field group of Education. The applicants who completed a

subject of the study programme in a non-formal way are awarded 1 point. People with relevant scientific publications or who have been engaged in research projects or conferences benefit from 0.5 point. The applicants who have presented research reports in educology, pedagogy or sociology are provided with 0.3 point.

The programme met the maximum of applicants in 2012 (27), a number that has been decreasing since then (11 in 2014). In order to ensure the survival of the study programme, the review team recommends a greater effort in publicity, involving students in its promotion.

Some students fail to submit their Master thesis on time. Graduation efficiency in the past two years is about 74%. The reasons given for the abandonment of the programme or its non-completion are as follows: (1) incompatibility of studies with work; (2) non-implementing of the agreement; and (3) academic debts (SER, pag.24). The programme should develop measures to improve the situation.

Each semester consists of 16 weeks, with four weeks dedicated to examinations. Because most students work, the lectures occur on average in periods of 10 days each month, on Fridays and Saturdays. Students reported being very satisfied with this organizational model of the study programme. Because most of students work, this organization model provides them with the necessary time to carry out the work and tasks prescribed by the teachers of each subject.

The assessment of students is carried out through continuous assessment and examination. The programme has developed a principle of cumulative assessment where the final grade of the curricular unit is composed of several evaluations during the curricular unit. The examination is required in the theoretical and theoretical-practical subjects and cannot be worth less than 50% of the final mark. This assessment model is suitable. It contributes to the quality of the assessment as it reduces the effect of the possible inconsistencies (ensuring better reliability) and also gives space for assessing many types of learning outcomes.

The assessment criteria are described in detail in the descriptions of the curricular units, which gives students guidelines for preparing to exams and assignments and – for all – an opportunity for considering the alignment of intended learning outcomes and assessment criteria

Students have confirmed receiving feedback from teachers on their achievement level orally or in written way, depending on the teacher or curricular unit. According to the feedback received students have the opportunity to improve their work. The continuous assessment is not applied to final theses. The requirements for final theses are regulated and are available on the Internet. The programme has developed a document about requirements for written assignments and final theses. It includes very useful information for students as well as for staff on assessing students' performance. During the period under assessment, the weighted mean of final theses assessment was 7,49 point and ranged from 5 to 10.

The final theses seem to meet the required levels for a master's degree. The review team is however of the view that students are not discussing the results with the desired depth. The majority of students describe the results without performing an interpretation and discussion of them. We would recommend those responsible for the programme and teachers to reflect on forms of action among students, which could improve the discussion of results in final theses (for example, through a better mobilization of the literature used in reviewing the state of the art).

As for the opportunity given to students to take part in international exchange programmes, no student participated in a mobility programme during the period under evaluation. The fact that students work is cited as the main reason for non-participation in mobility programmes.

There is no clear strategy to use ICT in teaching, but it seems to be relatively casual. However, employing virtual instruments would support, for example in the form of video conferencing, the internationality of education, instrumental to enhancing the comparative approach to subjects being taught, and compensate students for the lack of international experiences.

The programme provides students with the opportunity to acquire practical and professional skills in research activity and to take part in scientific meetings. In the academic year 2013/14 five students participated in scientific conferences, and two students have published research articles. To provide students with a stronger international background is an issue that needs to be considered. Proper use of the full potential of information and communication technologies can mitigate any economic or otherwise limitations.

One aspect that should be emphasized is that topics of final master theses are determined based on issues proposed by social partners (SER, pag. 29). The social partners have confirmed to have been asked about the issues and problems to investigate, also referring that they provide all the possibilities for students to conduct research activities in their institutions.

When asked by the review team about the next set of changes that students would like to see in order to further develop the study programme, the following points were raised: (a) a need for more balance in theory-practice, linking theory and practice in the interests of employment; (b) a need to have classes from professional experts for topics in which their teachers do not have field experience; (c) a need for more information on children and youth pedagogy. The introduction of a Seminar in the third semester, in each of the specialties, inviting experts who are professionals in the field to talk about topics selected by students, could be an opportunity to satisfy students' expectations for more practical knowledge.

The graduates of the Institute have a strong position in the labour market. Only a small part of graduates after finishing the studies have got employed not according to specialty (7 graduates

– 17,5 per cent) (SER, p. 30). Both graduates and partners confirm this in their respective interviews.

2.6. Programme management

Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated. The programme quality management is carried out on four levels: University level; Faculty level; Department level; and Lecturer level. The Faculty mainly controls the quality of the programme, and if it meets the market needs. The department, through the head of the study programme and the Committee of the Study Programme, coordinates the implementation of the study programme and proposes changes that could improve it. Finally the Lecturers assure the implementation of the objectives raised for a study subject, conduct scientific-research activity, prepare and publish research reports (SER, pag.31- 32).

Students, graduates, and social partners are interviewed using questionnaires on the programme. It is also stated that other data collection strategies such as roundtable discussions and focus group interviews are used. It is also mentioned that lecturers undertake an annual self-assessment of their teaching and research. This process also contributes to making changes and improvements in the programme. The evaluation team has verified during the meetings that the information on the programme is collected. However, the review team did not find any evidence that the information collected subsequently has an impact on improving processes.

We would recommend a closer link between the Committee of the Study Programme and teachers in order to achieve greater coordination and harmonization of modes of pedagogical performance. (For example, standardising the norms of presentation of bibliography, the structure of scientific papers, etc.). A more effective coordination, avoiding different rules and pedagogical criteria among teachers, will create a stronger educational *ethos* that will strengthen the students' socialization process.

Reading all the documents available, and from interviews, the evaluation team get the idea that the management system is not just a formal organisation, and that it really works. However, the review team is of the opinion that the use of the collected information on improving the study programme can be improved.

2.7. Examples of excellence

The design of a programme is a decisive element for its quality and its relevance for the society. The Physical and Sport Education programme is formally very well designed. The study programme has been set up by using the Tuning approach. It must be remembered that following Tuning methodology for each study programme there should be a degree or qualifications profile that clearly defines the aims and purposes of the programme. Further clarity can be obtained by

formulating these aims in the form of intended learning outcomes (statements of what the graduates should know, understand and be able to do), expressed in terms of the subject-specific and generic competences to be achieved. Curriculum design and student assessment should be coherent with this degree profile. The curriculum design process should consider the academic content and level to be reached but it should also consider that one major goal in higher education is to promote autonomous learning and autonomous learners – which has implications for teaching and learning methods and the overall student workload in terms of ECTS credits. Curriculum design should consider the employability of graduates and the development of citizenship as well as their academic and intellectual training. All the principles pointed out before are enshrined in the SER and they were confirmed during the visit made to the institution.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The programme may reconsider a reorganization of the presentation of the learning outcomes, describing first the learning outcomes common to both areas of specialisation and explaining then the specific learning outcomes for each area of professional expertise.
2. The programme may consider that each course description for each subject could display only the literature that the students are required to consult, avoiding the unclear presentation of a large amounts of recommended literature.
3. The programme must continue an internationalisation strategy which would include creating conditions not only of mobility for teachers, but also of publication of their research in English, beyond the Lithuanian and Russian.
4. The programme should explore the potential of ICT, namely video conferencing, aiming to provide international experiences for students, and overcome the difficulties of student mobility.
5. The programme may consider providing more contact to students with experts with recognised professional experience in each field of expertise.
6. The programme must continue to equip the Laboratory of Physical Training and Sport Education. Given the obvious satisfaction of the staff with the quality of the improved laboratory the Team recommends that additional improvements to the laboratory which would further enhance staff and student research should be determined by the staff themselves. This could be viewed as part of the ongoing requirements of any university department to keep up to date with most recent developments in the field driven by the research interests of the staff, students and social partners.

IV. SUMMARY

Physical and Sport Education is a second cycle study programme in the field of Education, implemented by the Faculty of Education, at Siauliai University. Since its last external evaluation in 2009, the programme has improved some of its aspects and continues to carry on its path that retains the earlier strengths.

Strengths:

The institution has conducted a highly professional work in the establishment and definition of the aims and learning outcomes of the study programme. Learning outcomes are adequate and clearly defined, and subjects taught and competencies offered are mostly aligned. The curriculum is very well designed and organised, with a strong emphasis on research and providing the opportunity for students to specialize in two areas of professional expertise. Course descriptions show all necessary information and are exemplary documents for conveying information about the course and its links to learning outcomes. Most of the teaching staff are research-active, very motivated, enthusiastic, and deeply committed to students. Students report that members of staff are very supportive of their work. The programme is strongly supported by students, graduates and employers. The management system is formally very well organised. Facilities and learning resources are adequate and mostly functional for teaching and studying. Library services of the university are very good, providing reading and group work rooms, access to academic journals, books, and electronic databases.

Weaknesses

The number of students interested in and applying to the programme is declining. While pursuing different learning objectives, all courses use the same teaching methods. The institution recognises the need to improve the use of teaching methods by teachers, but it does not have an institutional plan to overcome the weaknesses detected. The level of internationalization of the programme is virtually non-existent. The institution recognises the need to improve its internationalisation in many respects, but it does not have an internationalisation strategy that covers all major aspects of the programme including staff, research, publication as well as teacher and student exchange, etc. There is no clear strategy to use ICT in teaching and to use it

as a supporting measure, for example in the form of video conferencing, teaching the comparative aspects of relevant courses together with international partners.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Physical and Sport Education* (state code – 621X20027) 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	4
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	19

*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 Christiana Rosenberg-Ahlhaus
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. Dr Francisco Carreiro da Costa
	Dr Frances Murphy
	Dr Dalia Lapėnienė
	Ms Olga Stremauskaitė

ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *KŪNO KULTŪROS IR SPORTO EDUKOLOGIJA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621X20027) 2015-06-19 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-159 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Šiaulių universiteto studijų programa *Kūno kultūros ir sporto edukologija* (valstybinis kodas – 621X20027) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	4
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	19

* 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

Kūno kultūros ir sporto edukologija yra antrosios pakopos (magistrantūros) edukologijos studijų krypties programa, vykdoma Šiaulių universiteto Edukologijos fakultete. Nuo paskutiniojo išorinio vertinimo, atlikto 2009 m., kai kurie šios programos aspektai patobulinti; programa ir toliau tobulinama išsaugant ankstesnes stiprybes.

Stiprybės:

Universitetas labai profesionaliai parengė ir apibūdino studijų programos tikslus ir numatomus studijų rezultatus. Studijų rezultatai apibrėžti tinkamai ir aiškiai, o studijų dalykai ir

kompetencijos iš esmės dera tarpusavyje. Programos sandara labai gera – daug dėmesio skiriama moksliniams tyrimams, studentams užtikrinama galimybė rinktis iš dviejų profesinės kompetencijos sričių specializacijų. Dalykų aprašuose pateikta visa būtina informacija; tai pavyzdinis dokumentas, skirtas informacijai apie dalykus perduoti, susiejant juos su numatomais studijų rezultatais. Daugelis dėstytojų aktyviai dalyvauja mokslinių tyrimų veikloje, yra labai motyvuoti, entuziastingi ir įsipareigoję studentams. Studentai praneša, kad dėstytojai jiems daug padeda. Šią programą labai palaiko studentai, absolventai ir darbdaviai. Vadybos sistema labai gerai organizuota formaliai. Materialiųjų išteklių yra pakankamai, iš esmės jie tinkami mokymo ir mokymosi veiklai. Universiteto biblioteka teikia labai geras paslaugas – yra skaityklos ir grupiniam darbui skirtos patalpos, užtikrinama galimybė naudotis akademiniais žurnalais, knygomis ir elektroninėmis duomenų bazėmis.

Silpnybės

Mažėja šiomis studijomis besidominčių ir norinčių stoti studentų skaičius. Nors atskirais dalykais siekiama skirtingų studijų tikslų, visi dalykai dėstomi taikant tuos pačius metodus. Universitetas pripažįsta, kad dėstytojams reikia tobulinti mokymo metodų naudojimą, tačiau nėra parengęs plano, kaip įveikti nustatytus trūkumus. Ši programa faktiškai nėra tarptautinė. Universitetas pripažįsta, kad tarptautiškumą reikia didinti įvairiais aspektais, bet neturi strategijos, kuri apimtų visas svarbiausias šios programos puses, įskaitant personalą, mokslinius tyrimus, publikacijų skelbimą, dėstytojų ir studentų mainus ir t. t. Nėra aiškios strategijos, kaip mokymo procese naudoti IRT ir kaip pasitelkti jas kaip pagalbines priemones, pavyzdžiui, vaizdo konferencijų forma, mokant kai kurių dalykų lyginamųjų aspektų kartu su tarptautiniais partneriais.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Būtų galima persvarstyti numatomų programos studijų rezultatų pateikimo tvarką: pirmiausia – apibūdinti abiem specializacijos sritims bendrus numatomus studijų rezultatus, paskui – paaiškinti konkrečius kiekvienos profesinės kompetencijos srities studijų rezultatus.

2. Kiekvieno dalyko apraše reikėtų nurodyti tik tą literatūrą, kurioje studentai privalo ieškoti informacijos, o ne pateikti didžiulius rekomenduojamos literatūros kiekius.
3. Turi būti toliau kuriama programos tarptautiškumo strategija, kuri apimtų ne tik dėstytojų judumo, bet ir jų mokslinių darbų skelbimo anglų kalba (ne tik lietuvių ir rusų kalbomis) reikalavimą.
4. Įgyvendinant programą reikėtų naudotis informacinių ir ryšio technologijų (IRT) galimybėmis, būtent – vaizdo konferencijomis, kad studentai įgytų tarptautinės patirties ir būtų įveiktos studentų judumo kliūtys.
5. Įgyvendinant programą reikėtų suteikti studentams daugiau galimybių bendrauti su specialistais, turinčiais pripažintos profesinės patirties kiekviename kompetencijos srityje.
6. Įgyvendinant programą būtina ir toliau aprūpinti įranga Sportinio ugdymo tyrimų laboratoriją. Atsižvelgdama į tai, jog dėstytojus akivaizdžiai tenkina patobulintos laboratorijos kokybė, ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja dėstytojams patiems nuspręsti, ką dar laboratorijoje patobulinti, kad toliau gerėtų personalo ir studentų tyrimų kokybė. Tai būtų galima laikyti nuolatinių reikalavimų, kad visos universiteto katedros neatsiliktų nuo pastarojo meto pokyčių su dėstytojų, studentų ir socialinių partnerių mokslinių tyrimų interesais susijusioje srityje, dalimi.

<...>

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)