



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto  
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS "PEDAGOGIKA"**  
*(valstybinis kodas – 631X10007)*  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT**  
**OF "PEDAGOGY" (state code -631X10007)**  
**STUDY PROGRAMME**  
at Vytautas Magnus 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

Vilnius  
2017

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

|  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Studijų programos pavadinimas                        | <b>Pedagogika</b>              |
| Valstybinis kodas                                    | 631X10007                      |
| 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                        | <b>Pedagogy</b>                |
| State code  | 631X10007                      |
| 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

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| 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         |
| <b>II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| 2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes .....                             | 6         |
| 2.2. Curriculum design .....  | 7         |
| 2.3. Teaching staff.....  | 8         |
| 2.4. Facilities and learning resources .....                                | 10        |
| 2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment .....               | 10        |
| 2.6. Programme management .....   | 12        |
| <b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS* .....</b>  | <b>14</b> |
| <b>IV. SUMMARY.....</b>   | <b>16</b> |
| <b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>  | <b>20</b> |

## 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.  | Regulations of the Committee for the management of the joint study programme <i>Pedagogy</i> at the Lithuanian University of Educational sciences, Šiauliai University and Vytautas Magnus university |
| 2.  | Information resources statistics and VMU licensed (subscribed) databases recommended to the programme <i>Pedagogy</i>   |
| 3.  | Methodical recommendations EDU-5105 for „Practise of pedagogical assistance 2016/2017“  |
| 4.  | Methodical recommendations EDU-5106 for „Practise of pedagogical cooperation 2016/2017“   |
| 5.  | Methodical recommendations EDU-5107 for „Practise of pedagogical activity   |

|    |   |
|----|---|
|    | 2016/2017“  |
| 6. | Project „Improvement of Qualifications of Teacher Trainers“ implementation scheme (2017-2020) |

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

As of 2016, studies at Vytautas Magnus University are offered by 10 faculties ( Arts, Catholic Theology, Economics and Management, Humanities, Informatics, Law, Natural Sciences, Political Science and Diplomacy, Social Sciences, Music Academy). Aside from the 29 BA and MA full-time degree programmes in English, together all faculties offer over 90 degree programmes, as well as integrated studies of law and postgraduate and doctoral programmes.

Non-Degree Pedagogy Study Programme (hereinafter the Programme) was designed and is implemented at the Department of Education Sciences of the Faculty of Social Sciences at VMU. The Programme was launched in 2014.

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 05/04/2017.

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Dr. Cathal de Paor (team leader)</b>, <i>Mary Immaculate College, Senior Lecturer, Director of Continuing Professional Development, Ireland.</i></li> <li>2. <b>Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi</b>, <i>Tallinn University, Institute of Educational Science, Professor of</i></li> </ol> |
|---|

## **II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS**

### ***2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes***

The Programme objectives – in line with the EQF level 6 descriptor - are described in terms of the knowledge, skills and competencies needed to work as a teacher. The programme is undergoing continued development with a reformulation of programme aim and learning outcomes planned for 2017 -2018. The programme identifies the general competence, the general cultural competence and the professional (teaching/learning) competence that are developed, although the generic competences could be more visible and play bigger role in the programme learning outcomes, for example, learning to learn and think, problem-solving etc. During the review the teachers actively and professionally described the implementation of the programme with real cases and examples. The aims and learning outcomes are presented clearly and publicly on the university website.

Programme objectives and learning outcomes are linked to the social and economic needs of the Republic of Lithuania and Kaunas Region. They take into account the development of labour market needs and provide conditions for the development of an autonomous and responsible teacher.

The Programme was developed on the initiative of Lithuanian University Association for Institutes of Continuing Education and started to be implemented on the basis of a cooperation agreement among three universities: Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (LEUS), Šiauliai University (ŠU) and VMU. The programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission, operational objectives and/or strategy of the higher education school. The learning outcomes of the Programme are described as competences and are directed towards the achievement of the programme's objectives. The outcomes are aimed at training professional pedagogues, capable of working in different types of education institutions. Learning outcomes and its subjects reflect the view, as expressed in the SER, that special attention in teacher education has to be devoted to the development of pedagogical competences especially in the

spheres of pedagogical excellence, individualisation and differentiation of learning content in the development of learner skills, awareness of child behaviour and class management strategies, as well as the acquisition of analytic and reflective skills.

The aim and learning outcomes of the programme are defined in alignment with international and national requirements for the type and level of studies. For example, the programme learning outcomes comply with the 6th level of Lithuanian Qualifications Framework, with the Description of Study Cycles approved by ministerial order.

The title of the programme, intended outcomes, the content of the programme and the qualification to be obtained are well-tuned.

## **2.2. Curriculum design**

The programme, which meets the various legal requirements, was designed based on the principle of *artes liberales* and is implemented by the Department of Educational Sciences of the Faculty of Social Sciences. It aligns with the research and development activities of the Faculty and teaching staff.

The programme well balanced theoretically and practically. However, it comprises many different courses with 3 ECTS allocated to each, something which may lead to a certain fragmentation in the teaching, learning and assessment.

Teaching methods support the learning process of students and their teaching practice at school. Different methods are used with a combination of traditional and innovative approaches. Social partners reported that graduates of the programme use a variety of different methods and innovative approaches in schools, and the use of such innovative teaching practice was highly appreciated by social partners.

The subjects are structured logically and coherently in the programme, with the content related closely to the aims and the learning outcomes. The practical aspects in the programme are well defined through learning outcomes and valued by social partners, graduates and students.

The content of subjects and study methods seem adequate for all subject courses and help to achieve learning outcomes. However, the limited possibilities for offering optional subjects is a difficulty, which could be addressed through greater cooperation with other universities. 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.

Greater emphasis could also 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.

The scope of the programme is sufficient to achieve the learning outcomes, even though the relatively small credit allocation (60 ECTS) means the programme need to be quite intensive to prepare students appropriately. The proportion of contact hours and hours of independent work seems to be adequate. The students report that the implementation of the programme is flexible and support student`s everyday life and work.

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. There is a well-developed quality assurance system behind the final thesis. 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 the staff meets the legal requirements of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania and Regulation of Pedagogue Education (2012) as well as requirements of VMU Study Regulations (2016). A total of ten teachers (67%) have doctoral scientific degrees, while three have undergone the habilitation procedure. The CVs of the teachers demonstrate that they all have education and degrees corresponding to the programme requirements.

The teaching staff have sufficient pedagogical work experience that allows them to perform pedagogical work in the programme effectively. 80% of teachers carry out research activities in the field of the subject taught. One of the reasons for such effectiveness is that 80% of teachers have teaching experience in both work environments - at school and at university. During the site visit, students emphasized the various teaching methods and approaches, which were used by the teachers in the study process, to ensure achievement of the learning outcomes.



The results confirm that the number of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure the learning outcomes.

A total of fifteen teachers teach on the programme, with eight teachers teaching general study subjects and seven teachers teaching methodological subjects (for example, Biology, History, etc.). Two programme teachers combine several study subjects (for example, theoretical subject and pedagogical practice) and in this way ensure the implementation of theoretical principles in pedagogical practice as well as the achievement of learning outcomes.

The data indicates a small ratio of teachers and students, which allows closer teaching relationships, although it raises issues as to long-term viability, and the opportunities for greater collaboration among students.

According to the SER each teacher of a compulsory subject gives lectures to a group of the students consisting of approximately twenty-eight. In the seminars teachers work with smaller groups of eight to ten students, while a teacher of an optional subject works with six to twelve students in the groups. Teachers mentioned, that in some cases, they work individually with a student for additional consultation. Teaching practice is also individualised, with one mentor having perhaps one to three students. The students expressed great satisfaction with the teaching practices as well as with the mentors' support.

The SER shows that teaching staff turnover is very low. For example, during the previous two years of the programme the staff of the compulsory study subjects has not been changed, while some changes have taken place in the optional study subjects. The average age of academic staff is 46 and student note that the variation in age and experience makes the study process more interesting.

The university provides appropriate conditions for teachers' professional development. The teachers show an interest in ongoing improvement for their professional competences. Staff participation at conferences, seminars, courses, and mobility programmes is encouraged. For example, the SER states that in the year of 2015-2016, teachers participated in 12 conferences and 24 seminars. Each year approximately ten programme teachers leave for foreign universities under the Erasmus+ programme, or other academic mobility measures. Teachers are actively involved in conducting research dealing with current issues and innovation in education, and these research fields correspond to the subjects they teach.

#### ***2.4. Facilities and learning resources***

The premises are adequate in terms of its size and quality, providing an attractive and stimulating environment for students, including a well-equipped library. There is a range of different rooms available for lectures, seminars, and workshops, with a plentiful supply of the usual

technological equipment, for example, PC, multimedia projector, speakers, internet connections, while Wi Fi is also available.

The teaching and learning equipment are adequate in size and quality. Other departments within the university support the didactics preparation of students, while the programme also relies on equipment available in schools for the implementation of subject didactics modules. Students report that this works well, although it is important to ensure that similar access to the relevant resources can be guaranteed across all schools.

Students conduct their practical teaching in schools and settings that are fully aligned with the aims of the programme. The Faculty has signed co-operation agreements with a wide range of schools for participation in the practical teaching component. These represent different kinds, including specialized schools and socialisation centres.

There is a plentiful supply of academic sources available to students to support their studies, including textbooks, books, journals and databases. The library includes a plentiful availability of spaces for reading and for group meetings. Students also have access to teachers' lecture notes and learning aids through Moodle.

## ***2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment***

Relevant information regarding entrance requirements is explained in detail on the University's website. Entrants may also apply for verbal or written consultations. Since 2016 application documentation may be submitted electronically. The requirements for admission are published publicly and the review team finds the admission procedure consistent and transparent.

Successful organisation of the study process is ensured by a very detailed description of modules, content, methods, assessment criteria and methods.

The flexibility built into the programme is favourably received by students, with lectures taking place on Fridays and Saturdays. There is a very high level of satisfaction among students with the way the study process is organized: introduction with theoretical knowledge in the beginning of studies prepared them for upcoming Internships. A strong focus on teamwork complements the learning and achievement of the learning outcomes.

Students are encouraged by teachers to participate in various scientific and practical activities during studies, although the intensive nature of the programme limits opportunities. Despite that, for example, in 2014 and 2015, students had the opportunity to participate in the activities of NORDPLUS project 'Comparative Studies in Education with a Focus on Inclusion in a Baltic-Nordic Context (CSEI)'.

Students are provided with possibilities to participate in mobility programmes, although, again, these possibilities are limited due to short duration of the studies and students' other commitments. Students would therefore be more interested in short term Nordplus and Erasmus + projects, in which they are also encouraged to participate. During the site visit, programme management explained that they try to compensate by inviting many visiting foreign lecturers to university and also revealed the plans to implement virtual mobility.

There is a range of support available, to support students in their studies and in their well-being and welfare more generally. Students reported being involved and feeling encouraged to provide suggestions regarding the programme operation, for example, through roundtable discussions, study committees and evaluation questionnaires each semester. The relatively small groups of students also facilitate communication, with a positive learning environment very much in evidence. Students referred to the close and supportive relationships with academic staff and mentors. The use of diaries, which students complete were also praised as a vehicle for learning tool, which not only contributes well to student practice aims, but also support students' preparation for their thesis. Moodle is used to support the learning process and students reported finding it very useful.

Various assessment methods are used to assess students' knowledge and skills, while there is also prominence given to the use of group work. Such tasks are preferred by both teachers and students, since they promote shared learning and reflect the social dimension of learning. There is a well-established feedback system. As explained during the meeting with academic staff, students also participate in peer assessment, whereby they provide feedback to the work of their peers. Such an activity, which involves the use of precise assessment criteria, helps students in their learning.

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. It is noteworthy, however, that the number of graduates opting to continue with studies in a Master's programme is rather low. Partners provided examples demonstrating how the programme builds the self-confidence of students working 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 felt they were able to draw on what they had learned to make a valuable contribution to Lithuanian society. Social partners considered the programme as an important means by which to renew practice in schools, thereby addressing the needs of current and future generations. The SER notes that employability of graduates is 100 percent (p. 24).

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. Various campaigns on ensuring academic honesty within the University have been implemented in line with the VMU Plagiarism Prevention Provisions (2015).

There is a well organised system for managing the appeals process. Students are entitled to submit appeals regarding the procedural violations which occurred while assessing their exams, papers or final thesis. However, as noted during the meetings, students felt they did not have occasion to use these provisions thus far.

## ***2.6. Programme management***

Programme management have clearly allocated roles and responsibilities for monitoring the implementation of the programme, and have put in place various mechanisms 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.

Ongoing improvement and enhancement is supported through the collection of data using internal and external programme evaluation. The quality assurance outcomes are discussed by programme management and changes made where needed. However, the outcomes of such quality assurance activities should be used to identify precise actions that once implemented, can form the basis for follow-up monitoring and evaluation.

Decision-making relating to quality assurance and quality improvement is enabled through the participation of representation from the social partners, as well as students. Representatives of the social partner institutions are also invited to attend other programme events such as the student defence of the final thesis, while mentors are involved in formal assessment of students' practice. As the programme develops, the programme management should further develop the links with social partners, including greater provision for the professional development of mentors. Greater partnership with schools and other institutions in which student conduct their practice would enable such stakeholders to contribute more effectively to the programme and its ongoing improvement.

The faculty works in collaboration with education faculties in ŠU and LEUS in the programme design and this 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. This would enable students to meet and learn with a greater number of students, thereby ensuring 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 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. The internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient, with responsibility lying with programme management, and based on agreed procedures.

### III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The programme management and team should:

- provide greater prominence to the development of generic competences in the learning outcomes so that the programme can target these more systematically
- 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, and the crucial role teachers play in the well-being of society (cultural, economic, etc).
- 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 objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission of the university, and are linked to the relevant academic and professional requirements. The programme meets an important need in the country's education system and is an important part of the university's work in teacher education. The university has demonstrated a commitment to making a valuable contribution to the quality of education and schooling in Lithuania over many years. Objectives and outcomes 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 outcomes, rendering them more meaningful for learners, including prominence for generic competences.

The programme emphasises the importance of the liberal arts, 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 promote skills in curriculum integration so that students can develop an attitude of continued collaboration with other teachers in school, even 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. The students' ability to reflect on their own learning process and progress as a learner, could also be enhanced through a greater use of a journal or portfolio approach, with appropriate assessment and credit allocation.

The legal requirements are observed in terms of qualifications and experience for teaching staff. The professional development of staff necessary to implement the programme is already a priority. However, 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. 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 appropriate availability of teaching and learning equipment, with adequate provision of premises for studies, as well as the necessary teaching materials and resources. Adequate arrangements are in place for students' practice. However, a further development of the link between the taught modules and the practical component undertaken in schools would be beneficial. 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. 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.

The study processes and assessment are very well developed. The arrangements for assessment are clear, and enable students to demonstrate their achievement of the learning outcomes in a fair manner. There is a consistent and transparent approach used, with all the necessary procedures in place. 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, under the guidance of a skilled facilitator, would be beneficial.

The programme management team shows the necessary competence and commitment, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. 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. 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.

Finally, the panel would like to emphasise that 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 – 631X10007) at Vytautas Magnus 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 | 4                                |
| 6.  | Programme management                               | 3                                |
|     | <b>Total:</b>                                      | <b>19</b>                        |

\*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:<br>Team leader: | Dr. Cathal de Paor      |
| Grupės nariai:<br>Team members: | Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi  |
|                                 | Hanne Koli              |
|                                 | Dr. Ramutė Mečkauskienė |
|                                 | Indrė Jurgelevičiūtė    |

