



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Šiaulių universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS "PEDAGOGIKA"
(valstybinis kodas – 631X10009)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF "PEDAGOGY" (state code -631X10009)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Šiauliai University

Review' team:

1. **Dr. Cathal de Paor (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi,** *academic,*
3. **Hanne Koli,** *academic,*
4. **Dr. Ramutė Mečkauskienė,** *representative of social partners'*
5. **Ms Indrė Jurgelevičiūtė,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator -

Ms Ina Marija Šeščilienė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Pedagogika
Valstybinis kodas	631X10009
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Pedagogika
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Laipsnio nesuteikiančios
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (1); iššęstinė (1.5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	60
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Mokytojo kvalifikacija
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2014

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Pedagogy
State code	631X10009
Study area	Social studies
Study field	Pedagogy
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Non-degree
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1); part-time (1.5)
Volume of the study programme in credits	60
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Teacher
Date of registration of the study programme	2014

© 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.....	5
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.....	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	9
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment	10
2.6. Programme management	12
III. RECOMMENDATIONS*	14
IV. SUMMARY.....	15
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	17

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

The evaluation of on-going study programmes is based on the **Methodology for evaluation of Higher Education study programmes**, approved by Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereafter – SKVC).

The evaluation is intended to help higher education institutions to constantly improve their study programmes and to inform the public about the quality of studies.

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: 1) *self-evaluation and self-evaluation report prepared by Higher Education Institution (hereafter – HEI)*; 2) *visit of the review team at the higher education institution*; 3) *production of the evaluation report by the review team and its publication*; 4) *follow-up activities*.

On the basis of external evaluation report of the study programme SKVC takes a decision to accredit study programme either for 6 years or for 3 years. If the programme evaluation is negative such a programme is not accredited.

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

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

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

1.2. General

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

No.	Name of the document
1	List of subscribed databases of the library
2	List of final thesis of students of the study programme <i>Pedagogy</i> (full time studies) (including mark, year of defense)

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

Šiauliai University is the biggest university in the Northern Lithuania and belongs both to regional and classical types. The University was founded in 1997 after the merger of Šiauliai Pedagogical Institute and Šiauliai Polytechnic Faculty of Kaunas University of Technology. The university has a community of around 4000 students and 300 academic staff and 59 Study Programmes of the first two cycles (34 Bachelor's and 25 Master's).

The previous evaluation report made a number of recommendations, mainly referring to: compliance with legal requirements: programme structure and presentation: the development of the practice component; designate certain courses such as pedagogical specialization as compulsory, rather than electives; and provide further detail on the subject methodology courses, so that students can be fully informed about the programme aims, intended study results, contents, methods and assessment. As will be discussed below in the analysis, these have been addressed to varying degrees, although, some require further and continuous focused effort. More generally, however, the review panel urges the programme management to use all reports (past and present) to inform ongoing programme development and improvement. Programmes requires continuous development according as needs change and according as new possibilities emerge with regard to curriculum design, resources, partnership with others, and the professional development of staff in the use of pedagogical approaches and methodologies.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. V-41 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 03/04/2017.

- 1. Dr. Cathal de Paor (team leader)**, *Mary Immaculate College, Senior Lecturer, Director of Continuing Professional Development, Ireland.*
- 2. Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi**, *Tallinn University, Institute of Educational Science, Professor of Andragogy, Estonia.*
- 3. Hanne Koli**, *House of Leading & Learning Ltd., Director, Finland.*
- 4. Dr. Ramutė Mečkauskienė**, *President of Association of Lithuanian school principals, Principal of Vilnius Virsuliskiu school, Lithuania.*
- 5. Ms Indrė Jurgelevičiūtė**, *student of Mykolas Romeris University master study programme International Law.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme objectives are described in the following five areas: 1. knowledge and its application, 2. research skills, 3. special skills, 4. social skills, 5. personal skills, with the intended learning outcomes described for each of the areas. However, a greater use of precise educational or pedagogical terms could help enhance the outcomes, and present them in a more meaningful way for students. The intended learning outcomes are clear but could be expressed in more concrete terms thereby enabling achievement criteria to be more readily identified. In this way, the intended learning outcomes can carry more meaning for the student, and be more explicit. This would also help in ongoing work in the writing of grade criteria, i.e., linked to the learning outcomes, describing in detail the standards expected at varying levels of achievement for assessment. This process will require strong pedagogical leadership drawing on a high level of knowledge and skill associated with this process.

The objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the state, societal and labour market needs and presented in the following categories: knowledge and its application: research skills: special skills: social skills: personal skills. They have been developed in the collaboration process with other universities VDU and LEU. The programme is coordinated by LUTSIA, the Association of Lithuanian Universities Implementing Continuing Studies and aims at uniting human and material resources of teacher training universities implementing the first goal of the State Education Strategy for 2013-2022.

The objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission, operational objectives and strategy of the university according to the legislation. However, as noted, given the general formulation used in the writing of the outcomes, it is not always so clear, how they actually correspond to the mission objectives and/or strategy, and do not provide sufficient insight into the pedagogical activities and pedagogical processes being processed.

The objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to academic and professional requirements, for example, as indicated in the Description of Teacher Profession Competence. The programme learning outcomes comply with the 6th level of Lithuanian Qualifications Framework and with the Description of Study Cycles approved by ministerial order. They are also compliant with the outcomes indicated in the Description of Education and Training Fields (2015), for 1st cycle studies.

The programme title, intended learning outcomes, content and qualification are clearly presented and publicly announced on the website. The learning outcomes, title and qualifications are well-tuned, but, as stated above, further work is needed on the formulation of learning outcomes so that they align more completely with the overall aims and purpose of the programme as a teaching qualification.

2.2. Curriculum design

The programme conforms to the various legal regulations, including allocation of credit and workload. The programme structure follows the design agreed as part of the partnership with the other partner institutions (LEU and VDU) and reflects university requirements. The credit allocation (60) is balanced between theoretical and practical parts.

There is an appropriate balance and consistency between modules, with teaching methods and approaches used that involve students and support their learning and the development of competencies. A high level of cooperation takes place between university teaching staff, as reported by graduates and students, thereby providing coherence and continuity. However, it was noted that the number of students taking didactics modules can be very small. Efforts could be made to organise the didactics modules so that students have more possibilities to collaborate with each other. This could also lead to work on curriculum integration so that students develop skills in collaborating with teachers of other subjects in school, and continue to do this, even after they complete their studies.

Programme content aligns with the aims and the learning outcomes. It includes an appropriate treatment of the practical knowledge needed by students, and the development of a well-informed professional identity, all appreciated by teaching staff, students, graduates and social partners. However, a greater use of academic sources, including recent and foreign literature for all course subjects would enhance the learning experience for students and enlarge their understanding. The links between the programme aims, learning outcomes and study subjects are well analysed and presented in the SER. Elective subjects are offered for students from partner universities.

The study subjects are well defined, providing the basis for knowledge, skills and competences, which support achievement of the learning outcomes. However, greater emphasis could be placed on developing the students' ability to reflect on their own learning process and progress as a learner, i.e., thinking about their own learning trajectory at a metacognitive level, and how they are developing the competences inherent in the intended learning outcomes. Such a journal or portfolio approach would enable each teacher student to demonstrate and evaluate the

development of their own competence in accordance with the learning outcomes, and develop a greater understanding of their learning as a process.

Programme scope and volume is sufficient to ensure achievement of the intended learning outcomes, and respond to the labour market needs of teachers. The learning outcomes enable the graduates to conduct teaching and pedagogical activities and continue studies at an MA level. The volumes of contact hours, independent work and practice are well balanced, and regulated by legal requirements. Students and graduates report that the study programme is sufficiently flexible and in line with their needs and expectations.

The programme content reflects the latest advances in academic achievements. However, it could be further developed to draw more on research reported in foreign literature, and students should also have greater opportunities to use this literature. The opportunity to carry out a thesis enables students to explore more deeply the scientific advances in particular areas in education. Both students and graduates confirmed that the process of writing the thesis is well organized in terms of supervision. However, greater use of international sources could enhance the student learning and quality of the finished work as well as greater emphasis on a variety of research methodologies. There is also a need to introduce other approaches to the supervision process (e.g., group or pair supervision), that would complement the one-to-one supervision currently in use. More opportunities for supervisors to meet and discuss the thesis supervision process, share approaches, and also moderate the grades being awarded and ensure that standards are applied appropriately, would be beneficial.

2.3. Teaching staff

The composition of teaching staff in the study programme meets the legal requirements. The teaching staff is appropriately qualified to teach the subjects and their qualifications are adequate to ensure the learning outcomes, with more than half the teachers, delivering the pedagogical studies holding PhDs. The research interests of staff correspond to their relevant subject areas.

The qualifications are adequate to ensure achievement of the learning outcomes. The CVs of the teachers demonstrate that they have the necessary formal education, corresponding to the content of the study programme.

The total number of teaching staff is reported as being 20. On average in 2014 – 2016 a teacher's working load for one post involved 66% pedagogical work and 33% research and methodological activity. The data in the SER (Table 8) indicates a small ratio of teachers and students, which allows closer teaching relationships and helps students to achieve the learning outcomes of the Programme. However, the ratio of teachers and students in the programme

depends on the particular elective subjects in question. This raises issues as to the viability of such small classes.

There is a low turnover of staff, which means there is little or no adverse impact on the provision of the programme. During the last two years since the beginning of programme implementation, the number of teachers has changed slightly. The SER shows that there is a total of 20 teaching staff (Annexe 3.4), while the number of teachers teaching on the programme can be up to 14 (in the second semester).

The university provides appropriate conditions for teachers' professional development that is essential for the implementation of the programme. Staff participation in international events is also enabled and encouraged. The SER shows that teachers conduct research and disseminate their findings in national and international scientific conferences. For example, during the period 2014-2016, a total of 9 teachers visited foreign higher education institutions as part of exchange programmes. These mobilities corresponded to the field of the teachers' research and teaching subjects. However, teachers would benefit from having a greater opportunity to undertake mobilities abroad, and to develop their research interests in ways that can enhance their teaching on the programme. This could also involve collaborative research and teaching with colleagues in other Lithuanian universities. The use of teaching methods such as problem-based learning (PBL) and other collaborative learning strategies is worthy of attention in the ongoing professional development of university teachers.

During the site visit, teachers explained that they also develop their research, pedagogical and subject-related competences through conferences, methodological seminars, national and international projects, as well as different training courses, some of which they organize themselves, based in key issues.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The physical premises is adequate both in their size and quality. A range of different rooms are available for lectures, seminars, and workshops, with a plentiful supply of the usual technological equipment, for example, PC, multimedia projector, speakers, internet connections, while wifi is also available.

There is an adequate provision for teaching and learning equipment. Equipment is available in schools for the implementation of subject didactics modules. This seems to work satisfactorily, although it is not clear, how similar access to the relevant resources can be guaranteed in all cases, i.e., across all schools.

There are co-operation agreements with a wide range of schools and institutions for participation in the practical teaching component. Students conduct their practical teaching in a range of

schools and settings that are fully aligned with the aims of the programme. However, some consideration should be given to requiring students to undertake practical teaching in more than one school, and thereby learn from the guidance of more than one mentor.

Academic sources are available to the students to support their studies, including textbooks, books, journals and databases. Students also have access to teachers' lecture notes and learning aids through Moodle.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

Entrance requirements are explained on the University's website, and the entrance procedures are clear and transparent. The competitive score, which remains similar each year, is composed of the mean of grades in the Diploma supplement and motivational interview. Students drop out is considered to be low, and as noted by students, it is mainly related to financial reasons and self-funded places.

Students positively reflected upon the schedules which are organized in a convenient way and well in advance. Students are encouraged to participate in scientific and other activities. For example, every year Students' research works and scientific conferences are organized in the University (SER, p. 20). However, student involvement in scientific and other activities may be limited due to their lack of time, and other competing commitments.

There is an awareness of the Erasmus+ mobility programme among students, but participation is not so suitable due to their work and family reasons. For this reason, they expressed an interest in having foreign lecturers from different backgrounds. Another worthwhile possibility is to arrange mobilities to other schools and universities within Lithuania. Information about relevant academic matters is available on the University websites, while the programme coordinator is available for consultation for students on the relevant issues.

Students reported a supportive environment for their studies, with opportunities to support each other through the learning activities used by academic staff. However, as noted in the section on curriculum above (2.2), there is a need to organise the didactics modules for individual subjects so that students have more possibilities to collaborate with each other. There is ready access to academic staff, while school-based mentors also help students receive appropriate feedback. A wide range of academic support is available for students. Programme presentation, consultations on the issues of studies (particularly about individual study plans), consultation hours and information sessions are held at least 3 times per academic year, while there are also various student organizations and non-academic activities where students can involve themselves, including psychological support (SER, p. 20).

The system of assessing student achievements is clear, public and appropriate to assess the learning outcomes. The cumulative assessment system combines results from the final examination and other assessment components. This continuity in assessment helps to maintain a consistent student effort throughout the semester. In assessment, more generally, the greater use of clear grade criteria (e.g., rubrics), showing the standards expected at varying levels of achievement (excellent, very good, good, etc) in each of the assessment tasks, across all modules as well as in their practical teaching would also be of great benefit. During the site visit, students and graduates confirmed the use of a variety of methods (discussions, presentations, essays, creative and interactive tasks), involving a blend of individual and group work. Relevant information for students is provided in the module descriptions available at the beginning of each semester. Appropriate arrangements are in place to facilitate repeat assessments. Feedback on students' achievements is provided in written and oral forms, and academic staff are available to provide further clarification as necessary if students find it unclear or unreasonable.

The vast majority of programme graduates are employed as teachers, with social partners of the view that graduates are well trained, demonstrate innovative classroom approaches, including IT skills, and demonstrate a good command of teaching methodologies. All graduates who entered the Programme in 2014 moved into labour market and work as pedagogues (SER, p.20). Social partners also noted that graduates change traditional methods into active ones in such a way that even teachers who have been working in school for a while could learn something from those graduates. Graduates indicated that they are invited to events in the university which is beneficial in maintaining links between the programme and the work of graduates in schools.

The study programme has helped address key societal needs identified at state level. Graduates indicated that they felt well-prepared for their work, and were able to draw on what they had learned to make a valuable contribution in the workplace and in their communities. Social partners considered the programme as contributing to the vitality and renewal in schools, thereby addressing the needs of current and future generations. However, it would also appear that having a greater numbers of students on the programme, and being able to extend it over a longer duration would enhance the learning experience, thereby helping ensure that graduates are better prepared for their future roles as transformative change agents in education.

A fair learning environment is provided and there is appropriate compliance with relevant rules and regulations. Various mechanisms are in place to ensure academic honesty, including administrative procedures involving student declarations, etc. Plagiarism detection software is used, while penalties are applied for cheating in exams and other dishonest behaviour in studies. An interesting initiative, arranged by students themselves, in the Students' Representative

Council is the annual awareness campaign, 'Stop Cheating – Improve Study Quality', (SER, p. 23).

The programme has a well-organised system for managing the appeals process. Students are entitled to submit appeals for any procedural violations which may have occurred during the assessment process. However, students confirmed that no appeals have been submitted to date to their knowledge. Other bodies, such as Dispute Resolution Commission, Staff and Student Ethics Commission are also in place for settling disputes within University.

2.6. Programme management

Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated, and various mechanisms are in place for monitoring and evaluation purposes. For example, students are surveyed for their views on programme modules at the end of each semester, enabling them to give feedback on the teaching, learning and assessment arrangements. The outcomes of internal and external programme evaluation are used for ongoing improvement and enhancement. The quality assurance outcomes are discussed by programme management and changes made where needed. However, the outcomes of the quality assurance activities should be used to identify precise actions that once implemented, can form the basis for follow-up monitoring and evaluation.

Programme management includes representation from the social partners, as well as students, and these participate in decision-making relating to quality assurance and quality improvement. Representatives of the social partner institutions are invited to attend the student defence of the final thesis, while mentors are involved in formal assessment of students' practice. However, during the site visit, social partners expressed an interest in there being greater training events for mentors, and more generally, greater levels of contact with the university. This would enable such stakeholders to contribute more effectively to the programme and its ongoing improvement. The collaboration with LEU and VDU has been in place for some time and offers great potential for exploiting the use of resources more effectively and the sharing of good practice. The panel believes that there is a need to deepen and extend this kind of collaboration, as well as with other universities providing similar Pedagogy programmes. Collaboration with other universities providing similar programmes would be of benefit in enabling students to meet and learn with a greater number of students. A greater number of students, taking didactics modules for example, would ensure that the learning process could be more rewarding for everyone involved (especially students, and teachers), and would also represent better use of financial and human resources.

The internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient, with responsibility lying with programme management, and based on agreed procedures. The university website provides access to relevant programme information, including the purpose, learning outcomes, content and admission requirements. However, at a more general level, the panel believes that more promotion of the programme is needed. Programme management and staff can play a lead role in raising the profile of teaching as a profession, and working closely with social partners in doing this.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS*

The programme management and team should:

- further develop the quality assurance system to monitor more clearly how actions undertaken are addressing the problems being targeted;
- support the thesis supervision process, sharing approaches between supervisors, with particular emphasis also on how assessment results are moderated;
- continue to develop the partnership with schools and mentors, including the provision of professional development on a continuous and regular basis;
- further develop the collaboration with the other two universities in the LUTSIA partnership, so that it brings tangible benefits for teachers and students;
- explore ways to develop collaborations and partnerships with other universities providing similar teacher education programmes;
- support but also require staff to increase research productivity, targeting a certain minimum level of publication in international high level scientific journals;
- work with social partners in promoting the programme, but also in promoting teaching as a profession more generally organise the didactics modules for individual subjects so that students have more possibilities to collaborate with each other in learning about curriculum and assessment;
- consider the use of other models and approaches for thesis supervision, including a combination of individual or pair/group supervision models;
- place greater emphasis on developing the students' ability to reflect on their own learning process, thinking about their own learning at a metacognitive level, and how they are developing the competences inherent in the intended learning outcomes;
- further promote the use of a journal or portfolio to enable each student to demonstrate and evaluate the development of their own competence in accordance with the learning outcomes;
- develop greater use of grade criteria, linked to the learning outcomes, describing in detail the standards expected at varying levels of achievement in each of the assessment tasks, across all modules as well as in their practical teaching;
- explore ways of enabling students to participate in learning mobility, either to other countries as part of programmes such as Erasmus+ or to other schools and universities within Lithuania.

IV. SUMMARY

The programme in question meets an important need in the country's education system and is an important part of the university's work in teacher education. The teaching staff in the university has demonstrated a commitment to making a valuable contribution to the quality of education and schooling in Lithuania over many years, as indicated in the staff profiles in the SER. The programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission of the university, and are linked to the relevant academic and professional requirements. They are well-defined, linked to important state priorities and societal needs, with an appropriate alignment between programme title, qualification, intended learning outcomes, and programme content. However, ongoing revisions should be carried out so that there is greater precision in the formulation of the learning outcomes, rendering them more meaningful for learners. Expressing them in more concrete and explicit terms would enable achievement criteria to be more readily identified in line with the Bologna process.

The programme content and structure meets the requirements, and there is an appropriate coherence and balance between subject modules, geared towards the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Programme content reflects important trends and advances in educational and schooling knowledge. However, given that the number of students taking didactics modules can be very small, further efforts could be made to combine these, or at least part of them, so that students have more possibilities to collaborate with each other, rather than working on a one-to-one basis with the university teacher and/or school-based mentor. This could also lead to work on curriculum integration so that students can develop an attitude of continued collaboration with other teachers in school, after they complete their studies. Greater use of academic sources, including recent and foreign literature for all subjects would also enhance the learning experience for students. There is also a need to further emphasise the students' ability to reflect on their own learning process and progress as a learner, for example, through a greater use of a journal or portfolio approach, with appropriate assessment and credit allocation.

There is full compliance with legal requirements, in terms of qualifications and experience for teaching staff. Management provides opportunities for the professional development of staff necessary to implement the programme. However, this provision could be further enhanced, to focus on areas such as the use of formative assessment, greater integration of the theoretical knowledge of teaching with subject didactics and practical teaching skills, and enabling students to set challenging goals for themselves and high standards for their work. Problem-based learning (PBL) and other collaborative teaching and learning strategies are also worthy of attention. The professional development of mentors is also a priority, so that the students have

access to high quality mentoring that builds on what they are learning in university, and so that the school-university partnership is developed to its full potential.

There is an adequate provision of premises for studies, and there is an appropriate availability of teaching and learning equipment, as well as the necessary teaching materials and resources. Adequate arrangements are in place for students' practice. However, in assessment, more generally, the greater use of clear grade criteria showing the standards expected at varying levels of achievement would also be of great benefit.

There is a consistent and transparent approach used in the programme operation, with all the necessary procedures in place. The arrangements for assessment are clear, and enable students to demonstrate their achievement of the learning outcomes in a fair manner. Graduates go on to use their qualification in the anticipated and expected way, with social partners reporting a high level of satisfaction with student preparedness. The programme therefore contributes to the current and future development needs of the country. While there is an opportunity to undertake mobility abroad, students are not included to do so, due to other commitments. Greater opportunities to collaborate together on learning tasks, as well as in group reflection, for example, during the thesis supervision process, under the guidance of a skilled facilitator, would be beneficial.

An effective quality assurance system is in place to collect relevant information about programme implementation. The various stakeholders, including students are involved and this is used to support ongoing improvement. The programme management team shows the necessary competence and commitment, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. However, there is also a need to further ensure that outcomes of quality assurance activities lead to precise actions that can be easily identified, implemented and monitored. Collaboration with the other two universities in the LUTSIA partnership has been underway for some years, but there is a need to deepen and extend this kind of collaboration, so that its potential is fully realised, and so that it results in tangible benefits for students. This is all the more important given that, in many didactic subject areas, the numbers of students is very low. A greater number of students would ensure that the learning process could be more rewarding and fulfilling for everyone involved.

The increasing complexity and diversity of needs encountered in classrooms, and the crucial importance of schooling for the future well-being of society means that teachers need access to high quality professional development. The work commenced in programmes such as this need to be complemented with ongoing access for teachers to professional development throughout their professional careers. The university has a key leadership role to play in promoting and raising the profile of teaching as a career in society, in attracting high-calibre entrants to the profession, and in supporting on-going renewal and innovation in schools. The partnerships created between the university and schools and other educational institutions is therefore crucial.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Pedagogy* (state code – 631X10009) at Šiauliai University is given positive evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	3
	Total:	18

*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. Cathal de Paor
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi
	Hanne Koli
	Dr. Ramutė Mečkauskienė
	Indrė Jurgelevičiūtė