



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

LIETUVOS EDUKOLOGIJOS UNIVERSITETO
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS ŠVIETIMO VADYBA IR
LYDERYSTĖ (621X20032)**
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

**EVALUATION REPORT
OF EDUCATION MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP
(621X20032)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at LITHUANIAN UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL
SCIENCES**

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader:

Prof. Dr. Peadar Cremin

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Almantas Abromaitis (Student representative)

Prof. Dr. Eve Eisenschmidt

Prof. Knut Steinar Engelsen

Dr. Berita Simonaitienė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Švietimo vadyba ir lyderystė</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621X20032
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis (pagrindinė)	Edukologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Antra
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120 kreditai
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Edukologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2011-06-22 Įsak. Nr. 1-01-84

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Education Management and Leadership
State code	621X20032
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field (major)	Educology
Kind of the study programme	University
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master in Education
Date of registration of the study programme	22 June 2011, Order No. 1-01-84

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

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	4
I. INTRODUCTION	6
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	7
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	7
2. Curriculum design	11
3. Staff	14
4. Facilities and learning resources	19
5. Study process and student assessment	21
6. Programme management	25
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	30
IV. SUMMARY	31
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	34

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This evaluation is conducted in accordance with the Law on Higher Education and Research of the Republic of Lithuania (30 April 2009 No XI-242) which established the “principles of quality assurance in higher education and research” and in accordance with the “Procedure for the External Evaluation and Accreditation of Study Programmes” approved by Order No ISAK-1652 of 24 July 2009 of the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania (*Official Gazette*, 2009, No 96-4083). It takes due cognisance of the Order of the Minister for Education and Science approving the general requirements of the first degree and integrated study programmes (9 April 2010 No V-501) pursuant to Articles 47.8, 48.3 and 48.7 of the Law on Research and Higher Education of the Republic of Lithuania (*Official Gazette*, 2009, No. 54-2140) and also takes due account of the Order of the Minister of Education and Science “Concerning Approval of the Pedagogues’ Training Regulations” No. V-54 of 8 January 2010 and subsequent amendments (12 December 2012 No. V-1742).

An External Evaluation Team (hereinafter EET) has conducted an Evaluation of the Education Management and Leadership Masters in Education Programme (state code 621X20032) at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (LUES). In conducting their evaluation of the Study Programme, EET have acted in compliance with the “Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes” (Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education) as well as being guided by the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*.

The External Evaluation was conducted in the period February 2014 to March 2014 with in-country evaluation taking place during the period 24 to 27 March 2014. The Evaluation included a one-day field visit to LUES on Wednesday, 26 March, 2014.

This report does not paraphrase or re-present the range of information presented in the Report of the Self-Evaluation Group (hereinafter SEG). Instead, it focuses on issues raised in the Self-Evaluation Report (hereinafter SER) as well as raising some issues not addressed in the SER but which came to the attention of EET during the course of the Team’s time in Lithuania, and, specifically, during the course of the field visit.

In addition to its examination of the SER, EET collected information, data and evidence on which to base its conclusions in the course of the field visit through meetings and other means:

- Meeting with administrative staff of LUES
- Meeting with the staff responsible for the preparation of the Self-Assessment Report
- Meeting with teaching staff
- Meeting with students
- Meeting with graduates
- Meeting with employers of those who have graduated from the programme
- Visiting and observing various support services (classrooms, library, computer services, staff developments, laboratories, etc.)
- Examination and familiarization with students’ final works, examination material.

At the end of the field visit, the initial impressions of the team were conveyed to the teaching staff of the programme.

We would like to express our appreciation to the authorities of LUES for the manner in which we were made welcome and for the manner in which our queries and our exploration of various

key issues were addressed in a professional and positive way by those with whom we came in contact at the University.

The EET would like to pay tribute to the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (SKVC) in Lithuania and most especially to Rasa Pauryte for all of the support given to EET before and throughout the visit to Lithuania.

ACRONYMS

EET: External Evaluation Team

LO: Learning Outcome

SEG: Self-Evaluation Group

SER: Self-evaluation Report

I. INTRODUCTION

The full-time Masters programme in Education Management and Leadership (hereinafter “EML programme”) has been on offer since 1 September 2011. It is one of 14 Masters study (and 8 Bachelors) programmes offered by the Faculty of Education at LUES. There are nine departments within the Faculty (Departments of Education, Ethics Didactics, Psychology, Psychology Didactics, Fundamentals of Education, Childhood Studies, Fine Arts, Music and Arts Education).

The Introduction to the SER points out that the Master study programme “Education Management and Leadership” underwent self-assessment two times (after the first year of implementation of the study programme in September 2012 and after the second year of its implementation from June to September 2013) and that the current document is based on the results of the second self-assessment of the study programme which was conducted from June to September 2013. Consequent to an Order of the Rector of LUES, dated 28 September 2012, the following SER was established.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Alona Rauckienė	Introduction Programme management
Prof. Dr. Palmira Pečiuliauskienė	Programme aims and intended learning outcomes Curriculum design
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Linas Jašinauskas	Teaching staff Facilities and learning resources
Dainora Zakutauskienė, Dr. Ramutė Mečkauskienė, Aidana Baravykaitė-Dagienė	Implementation of the study process and student assessment
Rasa Nedzinskaitė	Annexes of the self-assessment report Editing of text and digital version of the self-assessment report

EET notes that more than one year later (on 7 October 2013) a first-year student, Aidana Baravykaitė-Dagienė, was added to this group. If, as is stated above, “the current document is based on the results of the second self-assessment of the study programme which was conducted from June to September 2013”, EET does not understand how a first-year student, added to the group in October 2013, can have had any meaningful role in the evaluatory process. EET’s view on this matter is reinforced by Table 1 and its accompanying text.

EET places on the record its dissatisfaction with the exclusion of the student voice from the process of self-evaluation.

Section 1.10 of the SER notes that whereas there are twelve Masters Programmes on offer in seven different Lithuanian universities, only two of these have Educational Management as a core focus of the programmes. Section 1.10 goes on to explain that

The Master study programmes in Educational Science implemented in LEU are oriented towards training of a specialist in education and didactics of a specific study subject (e.g., specialists in dance education, technology education, theatre education). The Master study programme “Education Management and Leadership” differs from the other study programmes in the complexity and integrity of aims and learning outcomes because it is

targeted at training of specialists in education, who are able to conduct research, manage and act as leaders.

The SER identifies similar programmes but highlights the significant differences between this Masters and three others:

- The study programme ‘Management and Administration of Educational Institutions’ offered in LEU focuses on training of Masters in Management and Business Administration rather than on preparation of Masters in Education.
- The study programme ‘Management of Education Quality’ considers only one aspect in management of education process, i.e. quality management.
- ISM University of Management and Economics launched the study programme ‘Education Leadership’ 23 March 2012 as part of activities of the project ‘Time for Leaders’. The focus of this study programme is business and administration and its graduates are conferred the Master’s degree in Management.

In conclusion, this section notes that the main difference of the study programme ‘Education Management and Leadership’ implemented in LUES is in the complexity and integrity of aims: training of “a specialist in education, a manager, a leader and a researcher”.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

2.1.1 As to whether **the programme aims and learning outcomes are well defined, clear and publicly accessible**, the aim of the study programme “Education Management and Leadership” was outlined in the SER as follows:

The aim of the Master study programme is to train a competent **specialist in education**, who has mastered newest technologies of education and educational research, is able to manage activities and act as a leader under conditions of educational challenges and partnership in various spheres (formal and non-formal education) and at various levels (pre-school, general education institutions, schools of vocational and higher education) of education process”.

Programme-level learning outcomes (hereinafter ‘LOs’) have been assigned to the five categories (Knowledge and its application, Research skills, Special abilities, Social abilities, and Personal abilities) according to the document of the higher education system of Lithuania (Descriptor of Study Cycles of 21 November 2011 (No. V-2212).

There are ten (10) programme-level learning outcomes presented in the SER and EET was surprised to note that only four (4) of them are directly linked to management and leadership (*SR – 1.3, SR – 1.4, SR- 3.2, SR -3.3*). The study programme aims and intended learning outcomes are publicly available (in Lithuanian only) on the website:

http://www.leu.lt/lt/mp_svietimo_vadyba_lyderyste/mpsvil_apie/mpsvil_tikslai_rezultatai.html.

The LOs of the programme are abstract and mostly theoretical (knowledge-based) in their nature. Furthermore, the level of complexity of the LOs is quite high. As a result of these two points, the programme-level learning outcomes are not clear enough and it is difficult to assess their attainability (capacity of achievement). EET considers that the University should re-examine the LOs of this programme.

2.1.2 In relation to the extent to which **the programme aims and learning outcomes are based on the academic and/or professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market**, EET notes that there are no national benchmark statements or descriptions for study fields to use as a base for study programme creation, implementation and evaluation on LOs in Lithuania. Since 2010, SKVC has been running a dedicated project through which it has been developing benchmark statements for nearly 50 different discipline areas in order to cover all subject fields and Educational Sciences field descriptors as well.

The SAG used ‘The Dublin Descriptors’, the ‘National Qualification Framework’ and the ‘European Qualification Framework’ as guides for writing LOs, but those resources are very general and not completely appropriate for the description of ‘Education, Education Management and Leadership’ academic requirements, content and LO examples.

A survey, analysed in the SER and entitled ‘Key Data on Teachers and School Leaders in Europe’ (2013), presents not a LOs approach, but a study subjects approach “the study programmes that train school leaders frequently contain a number of the same study subjects: management, team formation, communication and leadership skills building and educational law”. Other surveys or projects analysed in SER represented the needs of the labour market, the needs of the “specialists, who acquire competences of creators, decision-makers and leaders, gain skills of communication and learning to learn”.

It is obvious that valuable resources were studied, but there was not enough information or instruction on how to write LOs more clearly and relate them more to the educational management and leadership field. The LOs seem to not be fully comprehensible when compared to the labour market demands: the ability to improve each school and the whole education system, to understand changing social, economic and political contexts, and how to lead educational change efforts.

Generic competences or transferable skills (in this case – Social abilities and Personal abilities) have been formulated considering the ‘Dublin Descriptors’, requirements for Level 7 provided in the ‘National Qualification Framework’ and the ‘European Qualification Framework’. The Social Abilities and Personal Abilities of the programme correspond to the requirements of this kind of LO.

2.1.3 As to whether **the programme aims and LOs are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered**, EET considers that the study programme aims and intended LOs are consistent with the type of studies. In some cases, the wording of the LOs is not consistent with the Masters level of studies, for example, “to apply theories of contemporary management, requirements of educational policy and law in the management of the process of education and educational institutions (SR- 3.2)” and “to choose and creatively apply leadership theories in the process of education and management, to apply coaching in the educational practice and in management of educational institutions (SR -3.3)”. The learning outcome “to apply theories” is insufficient for the Masters level; more active and advanced wording for second cycle/Masters level is needed, e.g. to solve problems, to design solutions, to develop new and original ideas, to integrate knowledge and handle complexity and should be clearly set down in the intended learning outcomes for this level.

2.1.4 In relation to the extent to which **the name of the programme, its LOs, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other**, the relationship between LOs and the programme content is not entirely clear. The programme awards an “MA in Education” and the name of the study programme is “Education Management and Leadership”. According to the

description of aims, LOs and content of the study programme, the programme is aimed strongly at developing research skills. In the course of the meeting with members of the SEG, EET was advised that this programme had four components, Manager, Leader, Specialist in Education and Researcher. EET has concluded that the programme LOs are related and linked to the field of education in general, but not to the development of the specific competences expected to be developed while studying in a dedicated Education Management and Leadership programme.

During the meeting with SEG, the method of writing LOs was raised. The leader of the SEG stressed that those who study this programme get a qualification as a ‘specialist in education’ and that this is the major focus of the programme. While discussing the method of writing LOs for this particular study programme, four separate parts of LO’s was emphasized by the LUES team: specialist in educational science, ability to conduct research, ability to manage and ability to act as a leader. In EET’s opinion, the latter two indicate the uniqueness of the programme and meet school needs and so, ought to be at the heart of the programme. EET considers that this focus is clear in the title of the programme, “Educational Management and Leadership”, which seemed to indicate that these two components were the major focus of the programme. Yet, EET finds that only a minority of LOs related to Leadership and Management. This fact caused EET to query the accuracy of the title of the programme.

2.1.5 Strengths, Weaknesses and Actions for Improvement

Strengths according to SER	Comments from EET
<p>1. The study programme is distinctive in terms of complexity and integrity of its aims and LOs because it aims at training of a specialist in educational science, who is able to conduct research, to manage and to act as a leader.</p>	<p>The complexity and integrity of its aims and LOs could, of course, be considered as strength. On the other hand, EET considers that this complexity and the integrity of aims and LOs of the programme: “training of a specialist in educational science, who is able to conduct research, to manage and to act as a leader”, should be changed to emphasise instead the management and leadership focus of the programme.</p>
<p>2. Involvement of employers into evaluation of the study programme aims and LOs http://www.leu.lt/lt/mp_svietimo_vadyba_lyder_yste/mpsvil_apie/mpsvil_apklausos.html.</p>	<p>The involvement of employers with the evaluation of the study programme aims and LOs is certainly one of its strengths. However, in the SER (in the part of Curriculum) there is only one example given of what was suggested by employers (the need for applied study subjects in the study programme, for example, Management of Finances of Budget Institution). EET would like to see more information and analysis about suggestions of employers, and how it was used for the improvement of aim and LOs of this study programme.</p>
<p>3. Attraction of heads of educational institutions with practical experience, young working people, who want to achieve LOs provided in the study programme.</p>	<p>The identified strength of “Attraction of heads of educational institutions with practical experience, young working people, who want to achieve LOs provided for in the study programme” raises doubts and</p>

<p>4. The study programme aims and LOs raise interest among partners from eastern countries – developers of the Master study programme of managerial character from Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abai. Since 2 September 2013 a group of first year students (13 students) from Kazakhstan have been studying the study subject that are related to development of research and managerial competences within the Master study programme <i>Education Management and Leadership</i>.</p> <p>5. The developers of the teacher training study programmes from other universities in the Central Asia are also interested in the Master study programme <i>Education Management and Leadership</i> (http://www.leu.lt/lt/leu_naujienos/universiteto-naujienos/seminaras-mokytoju-rengimas-d4a7.html).</p>	<p>lacks support. These are two very separate target audiences whose needs may be very different and who might benefit from separate programmes.</p>
Weaknesses according to SER	Comments from EET
<p>More active actions of international publicising of the study programme aims and LOs in western European countries.</p>	<p>EET does not see that the issue identified here can be categorised as a weakness of the programme as it has more to do with promotion and public relations and has very little to do with the programme aims and learning outcomes.</p>
Actions foreseen for improvements as suggested in SER	Comments from EET
<p>More active publicity actions in the international space to familiarise partners-teacher trainers from European countries with the study programme.</p>	<p>The last two points of Strengths, the presented Weakness and Action for improvement are not related to study programme aim, LOs, their content and consistency with the level of studies. There are issues of the internationalisation of the programme as well as marketing actions. On the other hand it is a commendable aspiration, which probably will create preconditions for comparison, analysis, learning from other experience and improving LO content, emphasis, character, and consistency with the level of master's degree studies.</p>

Recommendations from EET

EET **recommends** that the coherence of the LOs of the study programme with the requirements of the seventh level of the European Qualification be carefully considered. The content of LO needs improvement; more emphasis on the educational management and leadership is also needed.

2. Curriculum design

2.2.1 The issue as to whether **the curriculum design meets legal requirements** is addressed in Section 2.1 of the SER where it is claimed that the programme was designed in accordance with the ‘Description of General Requirements for Master Study Programmes’ approved by the Order of the Minister of Education and Science of 3 June 2010 (No. V- 826) and ‘On Approval of Description of Study Cycles’ approved by the Order of the Minister of Education and Science of 21 November 2011 (No.V-2212). Table 4 on page 15 of the SER provides an overview of the main study subjects and the volume per semester. The table reveals that the study seems to meet the general requirements with respect to structural demands. However, the SER does not address or provide an overall summary on how the study subjects meet the more qualitative issues like those mentioned in e.g. Paragraphs 16 and 17.2.; how it is secured that the students are exposed to modern methods, latest theories, innovation and integration of knowledge in practical activities (Paragraphs 16.1-16.2), how the students develop their abilities of acquiring knowledge in new and shifting environments (Paragraph 16.3), and in order to understand research results and awareness of ethical issues and social consequence (Paragraph 16.4).

In Section 2.3. the SER provides a description elaborating on the connection between the actual cycle and the study objects. However, it does not explain in depth how it is secured that the contents of this programme are of higher problematic and scientific level than if they were part of a first degree programme (Paragraph 17.1).

The discussions during the meetings at the university, however, revealed a consciousness both among the leaders and the staff about how to meet the qualitative issues in the requirements, mentioned above.

2.2.2 The issue of whether the **study subjects and/or modules are spread evenly, their themes are not repetitive** is addressed in Section 2.2 as well as in Section 2.4. of the SER. Table 5 on page 12 shows how the structure and volume of study objects, at a general level, meets the requirements. This section also comments on where the work with the master thesis and the Course Project as preparation for the master-work are placed in the structure. Table 4 shows that a course in Methodology is placed in the first semester, which is an indication of high consciousness about the importance of getting the students in a Research and Development (R&D)- mode at an early stage.

In Section 2.4, the relationships and progression between the subjects is satisfactorily explained and, furthermore, how the compatibility and integrity of the content is ensured. The SER also explains, briefly, the size of the study subjects (4-6 credits) pointing out that these are consistently oriented towards the level of development of the set special and general competences. There are no comments in the SER about the relative advantages and/or disadvantages of this rather fragmented structure, where five study subjects are studied each semester. However, the meetings revealed that this is a quite common structure at Lithuanian universities which seems to have been accepted without very much debate on the alternatives.

2.2.3 The issue of the extent to which **the content of the subjects and/or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies** is addressed in Section 2.3 of the SER, where it is explained, briefly and on an overall level how this study programme is ascribed to educational science, educational management, the development of leadership skills and methodology of educational research. However, as mentioned in Section 2.2.1, the SER does not explain, in depth and at a meta-level, how consistency with the type and level of the studies is secured.

On the other hand, the descriptions of the study subjects seek to show how the LOs relate to the overall outcome-descriptions at different levels by defining some rather detailed assessment criteria (section 8 in the descriptions).

2.2.4 As to whether **the content and methods of the subjects/modules are appropriate for the achievement of the intended LOs**, this issue is addressed in Section 2.4. of the SER where a detailed description of the semester structure is provided, including a brief consideration of how the different subjects relate to each other. The content of the subject, outcomes and criteria for assessment are also reported in detail in the study subject reports.

In summary, the content and criteria descriptions of the study objects are rather massive and broad and it is difficult to understand how student achievement could be assessed in relation to so many criteria, without becoming very superficial.

Neither the SER nor the discussions held during the institutional visit at the university convinced EET that there was a sufficiently clear connection between all the LOs and the assessment criteria, especially in relation to how the learning outcomes were actually used as a basis for assessing the students. EET asks, therefore, whether a simplified structure could contribute to bringing more coherence as well as more in-depth orientation into the programme?

2.2.5 As to whether **the scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure LOs**, this programme represents four major competence areas: Education, Research, Leadership and Management, which leads to a complex structure of LOs and assessment criteria. The EET questions whether this is too broad a scope for a single study at master level in order for the students to be able to reach all LOs. Only four out of ten programme-level LOs are directly linked to Leadership and Management, which the EET consider to be the main competence area of the study. The EET also considers that more courses and lectures on leadership and management would sharpen the profile of the programme and make it more distinct as well as providing a better fit with the title of the programme.

There are varied professional practices incorporated in the study and, in the course of the institutional visit, in discussion with the administration, the staff and the students, the question was raised as to how the practice contributes to the students' applied research activities. The EET considers the fact that Methodology is placed in the first semester as an important contributor for enforcing the research perspective in the study. This impression was strengthened by the students commenting on the fact that they begin to focus on the thesis at a very early stage and follow it throughout. However, EET was concerned by the extent to which the "plan of the study subject" (in Module on "Scientific-Research Practice" in Annex 1) seemed to be dominated by preparing for and participating in seminars and conference presentations and by observation as opposed to being immersed in the practice of Management and Leadership.

EET agree with the claims from both students and social partners that this programme, in general, could be strengthened significantly by giving space for more practice activities and having a longer time spent on practice.

2.2.6 The extent to which **the content of the programme reflects the latest achievements in science, art and technologies** is addressed in Sections 2.5 and 2.7 of the SER where it is claimed that the study subjects are based on modern theories of education, contemporary educational technologies and recently published literature. During the institutional visit at the university, both the students and the staff claimed that the study in general was updated, using modern methods and recent theories.

It could, however, be elaborated in greater detail in the SER about what is meant by modern theories of education and contemporary educational technologies. The section about recommended literature in the study subject reports show that, with few exceptions, most of the literature is from 2008 or older (generally more than six years old). It also seems like most of the literature used is written in, or translated into, the Lithuanian language. It could then be questioned whether the recommended lists of references should be updated with recent international literature on the different fields, including English-language literature, in order to achieve a greater scope for international orientations. Putting more emphasis on this issue could also give the students greater expertise in the English language, as a preparation for taking part in the international research discourse, which the students to some extent are expected to continue to do after obtaining the Masters qualification.

2.2.7 Strengths, Weaknesses, Actions for Improvement and Recommendations

Strengths according to SER	Comments from EET
<p>Complexity and flexibility of the study process.</p> <p>Content of the study subjects and methods applied ensure attainment of the intended LOs:</p> <p>According to 71% of Master programme students, the applied methods are excellent; 85 % of them think that the content of the study programme will be successfully applied in their practical activities; 79% of the respondents point out that the structure of the content of the study programme is clear and well-understandable.</p>	<p>The SER documents that the students are satisfied with both the content and the study methods. This was also underlined during the meeting which EET had with the students. This is certainly a strong indication of quality. However, this is not sufficient to ensure that the study and courses meet legal requirements and LOs.</p> <p>The complexity of the structure and the broad scope of the content could, of course, be considered as a strength, as done in this summary. On the other side this complex structure, with four (4) main competence areas could also be seen as an obstacle for the students' in-depth studies as required at master level.</p>
Weaknesses according to SER	Comments from EET
<p>According to employers, applied study subjects are the most important ones in the study programme, for example, <i>Management of Finances of Budget Institution</i> (opinion survey of 2013)</p>	<p>This aspect seems to be based on well considered views.</p>

Actions foreseen for improvements as suggested in SER	Comments from EET
During scientific research practice, students perform assignments that are related to issues of financial management of educational institutions.	EET consider this as a logical consequence of the aspect mentioned under weaknesses.
Recommendations from EET	
<p>EET recommends that steps be taken to make the scope of the programme narrower, giving even more attention to what EET perceive to be the main competence areas: leadership and management. EET questions whether it is possible to achieve sufficient quality or coherence at masters level in a programme with four main competence areas. As a consequence, EET recommends a clearer focus on leadership and management, both as regards the LOs and the content, activities and literature used in the courses.</p> <p>Moreover, EET recommends that steps be taken to analyse the coherence between learning outcome, learning/teaching methods and assessment methods in the courses. This requires further analysis of the assessment methods used and whether/how these methods both significantly assess learning achievement in accordance with core aspects of the learning outcome descriptions, and moreover, whether the assessment methods “play together” with the pedagogy of the course and thus contribute to student learning.</p> <p>EET also recommends giving space for more practice activities and allowing a longer time to be spent on practice. Furthermore, EET recommends the inclusion of more updated international literature, including literature written in English, in the courses. This is in order to achieve a greater scope for international orientation.</p>	

3. Staff

2.3.1 The question of whether **the study programme is provided by staff meeting the legal requirements** is addressed, firstly, in Section 3.1 of the SER, which says that the requirements of both 22 July 2010 and 16 May 2011 are met. This section goes on to state that “the research interests of the teachers in the Master study programme meet the study subjects they teach” but it offers no clear specific evidence in support of this statement. Annex 2 purports to show the extent to which the “scientific interests” of staff members match the subjects taught on this programme, although it is silent on whether these are the areas in which people took their doctoral qualifications.

2.3.2 As to whether **the qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure LOs**, the SER does not seem to address this in any comprehensive manner. Instead, in Section 3.3 of the SER, it details the project and international work of just three of the seven members of staff (Prof. Dr. Hab. M. Barkauskaitė, Prof. Dr. P. Pečiuliauskienė and Prof. Dr. Hab. E. Martišauskienė) during the period 2006 to 2008 but why this time-scale is chosen is not explained. The SER also notes that one of these three (Prof. Dr. P. Pečiuliauskienė) went on to work on a Seventh Framework project during the period 2009 -2012. Annex 3 gives details of the pedagogical and academic backgrounds, including research interests, conferences attended and papers published by all fourteen of the staff of the programme and it is clear that, collectively, this group of individuals have a high level of competence. However, as to whether other teachers’ qualifications are appropriate for the achievement of the intended LOs, the SER is silent on this matter.

In the course of the institutional visit, EET noted that there is institutional support for improving teaching standards. The members of the teaching staff (8 persons) who attended the meeting with EET reported that four of them had attended two of the sessions organised monthly by the Quality Assurance Dept for the purpose of teaching improvement.

2.3.3 The issue of whether **the number of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure LOs** is addressed in Section 3.2 of the SER which states, initially, that the programme is implemented by seven professors but then goes on to say that half of the teachers are professors, which suggests a total staff of fourteen. Later in section 3.2, it is stated that, as well as the seven professors, there are six associate professors and two other teachers who are not holders of any pedagogical title (giving a total of fifteen). Annex 2 lists all staff and their rankings, showing that there are seven professors (of whom three are Dr. Hab.), only two associate professors and five others (each of whom has a doctoral degree), giving a total staff of fourteen. From this Annex, EET learned that half of the listed staff are full-time members of staff at LUES but that the other half are part-time staff, some of whom have very significant levels of involvement in other institutions (such as two professors at Vilnius University and the Director of the Forensic Science Centre who is also an Assoc. Professor at Vilnius University).

Section 3.2 of the SER also states that “the teachers working in the study programme are holders of Doctor’s degree in Social Studies” and the evidence in support of this can be found in Annex 2 and, especially, in Annex 3 which gives individual *curriculum vitae*.

While noting that the teachers meet the legal requirement that at least 20% of staff be professors, the SER does not actually say whether the number of teachers is sufficient for the attainment of the intended LOs. There is no indication in the SER of the number of programmes on which these teachers teach nor is there any quantification of their workloads or of the proportion of their time dedicated to the programme under evaluation. In the course of the institutional visit, the EET had an opportunity to ask each of the six LUES staff who attended the meeting how many LUES programme they currently teach on. The answers were: 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2 programmes which means that most of these staff work on two programmes.

The SER does not discuss the extent to which the teachers on the programme have practical and personal experience in educational management, outside of a university setting, in the kinds of institution for which they are preparing programme participants (for example, in business and school settings). While Annex 3 presents considerable detail which gives some insight into the background of the staff, it would have been better if this matter had been explicitly addressed in the SER as EET considers that this has implications for the capacity of these teachers to deliver the appropriate LOs. While an effort has been made to collect data in relation to the “Practical work experience in the area of the taught study subject”, it appears that many respondents replied by giving the number of years that they have been involved with this area rather than quantifying the time they actually spent in a leadership or managerial role outside the University while others would appear to have counted time spent in a managerial or leadership roles within the University as being part of their practical work experience.

2.3.4 The extent to which the **teaching staff turnover is able to ensure an adequate provision of the programme** is addressed in Section 3.6 of the SER. According to the Introduction, this programme has been on offer since 1 September 2011. It is somewhat surprising to learn from Section 3.6 of the SER that, in the short period since its introduction, four of the programme’s teachers have changed. The SER details the changes which were made arising from the departures of two of these staff, who are named, but makes no detailed comment in relation to

the departures of the others other than the statement that “the professional experience of the new teachers in the study programme is not lower than that of the teachers who have left the assessed study programme”.

2.3.5 The manner in which **the higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme** is addressed in Section 3.7 of the SER which presents a very helpful Table (Table 7), giving the details of courses followed in foreign education institutions by eight of the teachers who had made 34 trips during the period 2011 to 2013 to various countries: Azerbaijan, Chile, Cyprus (2), Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany (3), Hungary (2), Iceland, Israel, Italy (3), Kazakhstan (3), Latvia, Netherlands (2), Poland (3), Portugal (2), Romania, Spain (2), Thailand, Turkey and the UK. The SER is silent in regard to the professional development of the other members of staff beyond the eight noted above. [It might be noted here that one of those listed on Table 7 is not a member of the teaching staff of this programme according to Annex 2 and Annex 3. Another, who had been on the staff of LUES, is now a Professor at VU].

Section 3.8 of the SER later identifies this level of international work as a particular strength of the staff, noting that “only two teachers of the study programme did not go on study trips abroad in 2011- 2013. All the others go on trips abroad approximately 3-4 times a year.”

It is implied that all of these trips were for the purpose of taking programmes of professional development, specifically related to this particular programme of studies, despite the information which emerged in the course of the institutional visit (noted above) to show that LUES staff normally teach on more than a single programme. The SER (Section 3.7) states that “the content of professional development problems [programmes?] was related to improvement of competences of a manager, a leader, a researcher and a specialist in education”. However, no evidence is presented in support of this statement and as no further information has been offered in regard to programme content, it is not possible for EET to draw any conclusions in regard to the efficacy of these programmes or their relevance to the programme under evaluation.

EET is concerned that the documentation provided and the views expressed all indicate that there is an assumption that the mere participation in trips abroad is a sound indicator that “**the higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme**”. EET does not feel that this is valid. While Table 7 indicates the areas of professional development pursued by eight of the fourteen programme staff when abroad, it gives no detail of the level of engagement, whether all of the programmes in question were formal programmes of professional development, the length of any of these programmes or of any certification, qualification emerging from participation.

Annex 3 presents very interesting data in relation to the Foreign Language Competence (self-reported) of the fourteen staff of this programme. In light of the range of countries to which staff have been travelling, it is interesting to analyse Annex 3 from the perspective of linguistic competence. EET’s analysis of this data is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Self-reported competence of fourteen staff

Language	Elementary	Intermediate	Excellent	Overall
English	2	7	3	12
French	0	3	0	3
German	2	3	1	6
Latin	1	0	0	1
Polish	4	3	0	7
Russian	0	4	10	14

This table makes it clear that excellence in Russian (10 individuals) far outstrips excellence in any other language with just three people claiming excellence in English and only one in German. Yet EET's analysis of trips made shows that the most frequent visits were to Germany, Italy, Kazakhstan and Poland while, despite the linguistic competence, none at all were made to Russia. There is a clear mismatch between the countries visited and the linguistic competence of the current staff.

EET considers that considerably more needs to be done at LUES, in the context of an aging, albeit experienced staff, who have clear linguistic competence limitations, to ensure that there is ongoing professional development of the kind that could be expected. In particular, EET is concerned that poor standards of English are mitigating against the current staff being up-to-date on current debates in the literature as well as being constrained in their capacity to give guidance to their students on relevant readings in that language. This view was reinforced, in the course of the institutional visit, by the evidence relating to the use of foreign language sources, especially English-language materials, in the students' Masters theses.

2.3.6 Section 3.5 of the SER states that **the teaching staff of the programme is involved in research (art) directly related to the study programme being reviewed**, stating that "all the teachers of the Master study programme carry out national and international scientific projects" and "publish scientific articles in the reviewed journals". As noted above, Annex 3 gives considerable detail on the publications profile of all staff members. Four teachers who have written monographs are named in the SER. In addition to the earlier listing of countries visited, the involvement of staff in international conferences and study trips abroad is noted and, in addition to some of the countries listed above, the following are added: Austria, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Kyrgyzstan, Sweden and the USA. The SER notes that, over a period of five years, "the teachers of the study programme have written about 180 articles" (Details are provided in Annex 3). In regard to the particular programme under evaluation, the SER notes that six of the teachers ("and others") have published methodological aids related to this programme.

However, EET is concerned that relatively little evidence has been presented to show current engagement in writing and presenting on the issues being addressed in the Educational Leadership and Management components of this Masters programme.

2.3.7 Strengths, Weaknesses and Actions for Improvement

Strengths according to SER	Comments from EET
Sufficient academic mobility of teachers. Only two teachers of the study programme did not go on study trips abroad in 2011-2013. All the others go on trips abroad approximately 3-4 times a year.	It is certainly a strength that so many staff are prepared to travel abroad.

Weaknesses according to SER	Comments from EET
<p>A number of teachers do not have a good command of English.</p> <p>Insufficient number of young teachers, who are able to work in the Master study programme.</p>	<p>EET's analysis (above) in regard to linguistic competence confirms the identified weakness. Clearly, in light of the level of publication in English, both in print and on the Internet, having a poor command of English cuts many staff off from the mainstream of scientific publication. It also limits the capacity of this staff to direct students to relevant publications in that language.</p> <p>It is assumed that this comment relates to the age profile of programme teachers, at least five of whom were born in the 1940's while there are only two staff who were born in the last fifty years!</p> <p>EET considers that these are serious problems for the programme, meriting an institutional response from the leadership at LUES.</p>
Actions foreseen for improvements as suggested in SER	Comments from EET
<p>Teachers improve skills of professional and daily English in a non-formal and informal way.</p> <p>To encourage young teachers to improve professionally to enable them to meet the requirements for the teachers in the Master study programme.</p> <p>Attempts to sighs as many cooperation agreements with foreign universities.</p>	<p>EET considers that the proposed "Acton for Improvement" is less than what might be required if speedy progress is to be made on addressing this concern. An immediate target might be to develop a plan to move many of those currently in those in the "Intermediate" level in English into the "Excellent" level through provision of dedicated English Language programmes, as well as through the recruitment of new staff with higher competence in this area.</p> <p>EET considers that there is a need for more succession planning. While there are many very experienced staff, they cannot and will not stay forever! Changes in staff can contribute to improving the quality of programme.</p> <p>It is not clear to EET how "signing cooperation agreements with foreign universities" will help to solve the problems identified. EET acknowledges that the teachers involved in this programme already engage in a very considerable amount of overseas work. EET is concerned that the full potential of international collaborative work and learning from trips overseas is constrained</p>

	by the linguistic competences of staff, with the largest number claiming excellence in Russian while very few make such a claim in relation to English, French German or Polish.
Recommendations from EET	
EET recommends that steps be taken to improve the linguistic competence of staff on this programme, including developing plans to move many of those currently in the “Intermediate” level in English into the “Excellent” level through provision of dedicated English Language programmes, as well as through the recruitment of new staff with higher competence in this area.	

In summary, EET is concerned that limited competence in English (seven staff claim to have English to “Intermediate” level) is limiting the capacity of staff to guide students to the materials now available in English, both in print and on the world wide web.

EET supports SER’s expressed concern about the age profile of staff, finding that more of the current teaching staff were born in the 1940s (5 staff members) than in the last fifty years (2 staff members)!

4. Facilities and learning resources

2.4.1 As to whether **the premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality**, the SER, in Section 4.1, confirms that nine classrooms are used for the delivery of the Masters in Education and Management, including some computer classrooms. Some are equipped with “stationary video projectors, stationary white screens, classic and interactive boards”. Table 9 of the SER details the technical support and multimedia provision that the Faculty offers. There are also some dedicated spaces such as the Laboratory of Psychology, the Laboratory of Childhood Studies (Room 304) and the Laboratory of Fundamentals of Education (Room 303), where learning material and catalogues of the defended Master papers are stored. The SER notes that all of these rooms have been renewed and updated in recent times. In the course of the Institutional visit to LUES, the EET had the opportunity to visit some of these classrooms and to see that the facilities and equipment are sufficient and suitable both in their size and quality for studies.

2.4.2 The issue of whether **the teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are adequate both in size and quality** is addressed in Section 4.2 of the SER which highlights that *Eduroam* is available on campus, the student email system is comprehensive and an Academic Information System (AIS) had been developed. This section of the SER also notes the availability of computer rooms and of computer packages suitable for processing qualitative research data.

2.4.3 The issue of whether **the higher education institution has adequate arrangements for students’ practice** is addressed in Section 4.7 of the SER which notes that agreements have been signed with Vilnius College and with eight General Education Schools to enable the goal of the programme to be achieved. Strangely and worryingly for EET, this section of the SER (4.7) presents a narrower aim for the programme (“to train a specialist in education, who is able to work in higher education and general education schools”) than the one which is discussed in Sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.5 of EET’s report (above). This particular aim makes no reference to the

four components, (Manager, Leader, Specialist in Education and Researcher) that EET was told, in the course of the meeting with members of the SEG, were at the core of the programme, referring to only one of these four. The text of Section 4.7 of the SER makes reference to the fact that “students prepare for work in higher education schools having practice in LEU and Vilnius College”. However, no description of the nature of this work is given. It is not specified whether this element of practice focuses on any of the four components identified above. (Manager, Leader, Specialist in Education and Researcher). In-so-far as there is any reference to management, it comes only in the context of acquiring “skills of managing education of special needs children” specifying that “during practice, students analyse peculiarities of curriculum, environment and human resources management in a school, where up to 30 % of learners are with special needs”.

EET had an opportunity to tease out issues relating to the practice in the course of its meetings during the institutional visit to LUES. Prof. Dr. Palmira Pečiuliauskienė assured EET that the Practical Work Experience can relate to any of the four components (Manager, Leader, Specialist in Education and Researcher). She indicated that some of the practice is done at the LUES or at Vilnius College; that the Management component is done in the schools and that the Leadership component is done in the Ministry. She also assured the EET that practice activity is mandatory in all four settings (so there is no avoiding leadership or management). EET expressed its concern that none of this was made clear in the SER.

2.4.4 In regard to the extent to which **teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible**, for many years, LUES has been engaged in building a new library, funded primarily by the Ministry of Education and Science. Although originally scheduled to have been completed in 2009, delays and/or reductions in funding have meant that the library completion date has been pushed out to 2012, 2013, 2014 or later! Because the new library is still awaiting completion, many books have to be stacked, as opposed to being on open display but, in the meantime, the change in students’ learning habits have lowered the need for reading rooms and the provision of open access computers, as many students possess their own laptops and place much less demand on the University to provide IT facilities. Thus, EET concluded that the premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality. Also, that the teaching materials are adequate and accessible. (The detail of the methodological resources available was given in Sections 4.3 to 4.6 of the SER).

In the course of EET’s visit to the (existing Library), the Librarian advised EET that, while awaiting their new Library, the University has invested further in the current library building, including improving its insulation, reutilising space previously used for cataloguing etc. Books in Faculty libraries have been centrally catalogued and cannot be borrowed, helping to protect book stock. There was evidence of the provision of an online catalogue, electronic databases and e-books on a significant scale for this programme.

2.4.5 Strengths and Weaknesses, Actions for Improvement

Strengths according to SER	Comments from EET
Premises for studies have been renovated, appropriate and sufficient for attainment of the study LOs.	The EET agrees that both of these are strengths of the study programme.
Equipment employed for studies is up-to-date. The numbers of published and electronic sources, related to the study programme, are sufficient.	
Weaknesses according to SER	Comments from EET
Insufficient number of small premises for	EET considers that these seem to be general

<p>individual consultations of students. Technical upgrade is necessary for the centre of modern digital technologies in the University, which is used for virtual conferences.</p>	<p>weaknesses of LUES rather than being specific to the Masters programme in Education Management and Leadership and considers it to be a weakness of the SER that the opportunity for analysis and critique offered by the self-evaluation process has not lead to a more insightful identification of weaknesses of this particular study programme.</p> <p>As set out above, EET is very concerned that the weaknesses in the arrangements for the practice have not been identified as an area needing to be addressed.</p>
<p>Actions foreseen for improvements as suggested in SER</p>	<p>Comments from EET</p>
<p>1 September 2013 the room for consultations of Master programme students was established (Room 323) under the Department of Education.</p> <p>To improve learning facilities of synchronic distant teaching. To organise more lectures of synchronic teaching.</p>	<p>As this action has already been undertaken, EET does not see it as an “action foreseen for improvement”.</p> <p>EET accepts that processes for supporting students in off-campus and distance learning can be improved.</p>
<p>Recommendations from EET</p>	
<p>EET recommends that there be a fundamental review of the arrangements for the practice be and that, as suggested by graduates and by social partners, that there be longer, more frequent, more intensive and more demanding practices, especially directed at the fields of Leadership and Educational Management.</p>	

5. Study process and student assessment

2.5.1 As to whether **the admission requirements are well-founded**, it seems that the authors of the programme have a clear vision of what kind of students they would like to study in it. The motivational part of the entrance grade and the necessity of work experience is worth noting. It seems that the programme has enough applicants to make sure that LUES gets to put their admission requirements to work and pick out the students that are the most suitable for the programme, although the number of students has decreased this year, and the management should be concerned with this. The programme has mostly traditional means of advertising itself like enrolling first cycle students and advertisements in the universities website or newspapers of the university or teacher newspapers of Lithuania.

There seems to be a problem developing with the student drop-out rate. Even though, *de jure*, only a small number of students left the programme, the number of graduates is also small. A large number of the students stopped their studies, because of personal and financial reasons. This issue has to be addressed because the cycle of studies for most of the students is not complete.

The cohort of students on this programme is mostly drawn from former students of LUES. The faculty should expand the scope of students that they are willing to enrol and improve its

methods of advertising. With the current requirements of admission and a steady flow of applicants in the future, the programme can have more talented students and financial success.

2.5.2 As to whether **the organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the LOs**, the study process of this programme gives the impression of disorder. Since the number of contact hours is small, a more detailed plan of students' individual work should be prepared. The study process is split between on-campus sessions of 10 contact days and individual work that the students do at home. On average, the contact period consisted of three lectures or 4.5 hours per day plus individual work. During the period of individual work, students on average spend from 8 to 16 hours of work per week. EET considers that the amount of work that the students do is not enough for a programme to be called full-time, especially in the case of a programme as ambitious as this one. The practices of the programme are a big and important part of the study process. There is a problem in that the practices often lack their main objective – providing working practice time. Instead, they consist mostly of observation and research.

The study process during the periods of individual work could be improved by further incorporating greater use of technology. Further incorporation of Moodle in the everyday work of the teachers could benefit this.

2.5.3 In relation to the extent to which **students are encouraged to participate in research, artistic and applied research activities**, the University is fully capable of ensuring a wide range of after-study, research and applied research activities. There are a lot of artistic and sports activities to choose from. However, for most of these students who are employed (Most full-time) and also studying “full-time”, there are clear challenges in the effective use of time. It was clear to EET that most of the students did not have discretionary time for after-study activities.

Students are also expected to take part in applied research activities, participating in and organising themselves in various scientific conferences. The programme includes compulsory research activity, in a form of scientific-research practise and publicising their work. This is one of the strongest points of this programme. It not only broadens the study experience of the students, it also helps them develop the necessary skills for their final thesis. However, it must be asked how much time these students can afford to dedicate to such activities?

2.5.4 In relation to the extent to which **students have opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes**, EET finds that the situation with regard to involvement in mobility programmes is unsatisfactory. There are opportunities to collaborate with students of foreign Universities. Some foreign students have come to study at LUES via Erasmus and the local students have opportunities to communicate with them through mentor programmes. There was a one-time initiative of taking in a group of students from Kazakhstan. The faculty has also managed to receive a grant for one student to have a working practice in Krakow. But the reality is that students of this programme are, in general, not mobile. They cannot find the time and resources to take on traditional mobility programmes. The faculty has come up with a possible solution to this problem: formulating short term mobility programmes which would last one month. This could be a simple and effective solution of the problem.

EET identified some weaknesses of the programme that have not yet been confronted. The lack of English language skills among the teaching staff is a matter of concern. English is not only the language of the international academic community, it is also the main language of mobility programmes. The social partners of this programme also acknowledged that international practice is something that it lacks. During the evaluation, the evidence showed not only the lack

of student mobility, but a general lack of international profile of the programme, which prevents its students and staff from receiving the full benefits of what the world of academics has to offer.

2.5.5 As to whether and to what extent **the higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support**, EET considers that academic support is very important to programmes aimed at students who do not have a lot of free time (working students etc.). This programme provides a lot of opportunities for students to get consultations using the internet and face-to-face as well. Initiatives to have both career and psychological consulting are a good investment, tending to the academic and social needs of students which are, in a lot of cases, not exclusive.

The faculty displayed a capacity for quickly reacting to student feedback and delivering changes. This is very important for a new developing programme, such as this one. During the visit students gave an example of a change in the schedule being made, in the next semester as a result of their feedback.

Due to the lack of contact hours, an emphasis on the virtual learning environment is desirable. The programme has incorporated the Moodle environment in its learning process, which can be very useful for consulting students and for many other functions. However, during the visit, it emerged that only about half of the lecturers use Moodle daily. Most of the teaching staff that use Moodle, only use it for general functions i. e.: spreading information and assigning tasks for the students, although there were some exceptions to this as well.

2.5.6 In relation to the question of whether **the assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available**, the SER notes that the assessment system of students' performance is based on the recommendation documents of the higher education system of Lithuania. It is a cumulative 10-point system in which the grade depends on the LOs of different subjects. According to the teaching staff of the programme, the assessment of a subject consists of approximately 40 – 50 % for the final exam, 30 % for mid-term examinations and 20 % for other means of assessment. The methods of assessment in the course descriptions give the impression of being outdated. Less examination and more alternative means of assessing students, which also have the potential of contributing to the students' learning, should be considered, as well as a more cumulative approach to the final grade.

Because of its concerns in relation to the practice identified earlier (Section 2.2.5), EET examined the Module on "Scientific-Research Practice" in Annex 1 of the SER which gave a detailed description of the practice. Section 9 of Annex 1 ("Procedure of Student Assessment") placed great emphasis on such activities as reflections on a seminar or conference, preparation and presentation of papers at conferences and seminars, with the entirety of the grading being awarded for such activities rather than for the practice of Management and Leadership. EET was disturbed to note that just under 80% of the practice time was devoted to "non-contact hours (self-dependent studies)". There was no evidence that the staff of the study programme ever observed or made a judgement on the student in a setting where s/he was engaged in developing the skills of Management of Leadership in an applied practical setting.

It is unclear how the fairness of assessment is being determined, and what means of appeal the students have besides the retaking of the exam. A procedure of retaking a failed exam is the only formal way of appealing a grade. Other ways of doing so depend on the goodwill of the teacher. The students of this programme have a good grasp of what their assessment criteria are and, provided with a formal appealing process, they would be able to make sure that they are getting the grade that they deserve. The SER gave little insight into the procedures that are used for

moderating or standardising grades so as to make sure that the grading standards applied by one teacher are similar to those of other teachers both within the institution and across Lithuania (as well as throughout Europe).

One of the most pleasing aspects of this programme is the final theses. They are generally well written and correctly assessed. Lots of applied research is involved in the programme which helps the student prepare for this final exercise and the results are pleasing. The only serious issue with the final thesis is the fact that some of them are not in the field of education management and leadership. In its examination of the final year students' master theses EET was surprised to find that they do not always show a focus on Educational Management and on Educational Leadership. For instance, the EET question, the appropriateness of a thesis entitled "Self-Actualisation Peculiarities of Elderly People, Nursing Home Residents". The fact that students feel free to choose a title which seems to be outside the field of Educational Leadership and Management could have a lot to do with the issue of the programme being too broad in general.

As mentioned in Section 2.2.7, EET suggests that action to be taken in order to analyse the coherence between learning outcome and assessment methods and whether the assessment methods used are appropriate, timely and effective in assessing the extent to which an intended learning outcome has actually been achieved.

2.5.7 As to whether the **professional activities of the majority of graduates meet the programme providers' expectations**, this programme is one of the few that have, not only a clear source of applicants (teachers and graduates of LUES) but also a work setting in which to place its graduates (system of education). That said, this programme is still young and it has only a few graduates. The graduates were all working while studying and are still employed at the same job that they worked in before they applied to this programme. One of the alumni group said that she got a promotion after graduating and two others said that they had broadened their field of work.

The social partners of this programme seem to be closely involved with the programme and are familiar with its issues. They found it hard to pin point how the graduates of this programme will fit into the working force. The main thing that was mentioned repeatedly was that teachers with more leadership skills are required.

During the institutional visit to LUES, the programme gave the impression of a lack of distinctiveness. The graduate placement that it provided overlapped strongly with another programme of education management and no strong case was made to defend this. A graduate of this programme is an educologist with leadership and management skills whereas the other programme provides a diploma of management with an emphasis on education, but the work that they can do after graduating is overlapping.

2.5.8 Strengths, Weaknesses and Actions for Improvement

Strengths according to SER	Comments from EET
1. Involvement students into scientific research activities employing a variety of forms: participation in international and scientific-practical conferences, organisation of conferences, writing and publication of scientific articles.	The involvement of students in scientific research activities is truly a successful part of this programme. The second part (Electronic survey system),

2. Electronic survey system regarding choice of elective study subjects and procedure of organisation of teaching. Electronic feedback.	though valuable, is more of a necessity than a strong point. EET also appreciated the quality of the Masters theses, in general.
Weaknesses according to SER	Comments from EET
Insufficient international mobility of students.	This weakness is accurately highlighted. However, not enough weaknesses are pointed out. Others might include: Insufficient utilisation of the virtual learning environment. Lack of practice. Weak international orientation of the programme.
Actions foreseen for improvements as suggested in SER	Comments from EET
Main obstacle in mobility of Master students is its duration, which is too long (one semester). Search for possibilities of shorter (one month) mobility programmes in foreign higher education institutions.	This would be a simple and effective way of solving at least a part of the problem. Further analysis is required on the reasons for the lack of mobility and the general internationality of the programme. Linguistic capability has not been mentioned as an issue.
Recommendations from EET	
EET recommends further steps be taken with a view to addressing the issue of student mobility. Other means of solving this problem might be considered, such as the use of the Comenius programme as most of the students are currently practising teachers. EET recommends that the assessment criteria be revised to focus on learning outcomes.	

6. Programme management

2.6.1 Both the Introduction and Section 6.2 of the SER address the issue of **responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme**. Responsibilities are regulated on two levels: the organisational and the individual level. On the organisational level, there are four levels of responsibility: the Senate, the Study Committee of the Senate, the Rector's Office and the Division of Academic Quality of the Academic Affairs Office who are responsible for strategic planning. The Office of Academic Affairs evaluates the compliance of the programme with legal requirements.

Different documents regulate the management and the quality assurance of the study programmes. Section 6.1 of the SER states that internal study quality assurance is regulated by several documents of the University e. g. The Strategy for Academic Quality Assurance for 2013-2020 at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (approved by the Resolution of the Senate No. 93 of 17 April 2012); the Description of Study Procedure at LEU (approved by the Resolution of the Senate No. 117 of 20 June 2012); the Procedure for Renewal and Quality

Assessment of LEU Study Programmes (approved by the Resolution of the LEU Senate No. 250 of 13 November 2013) etc.

The SER states that on the Faculty level, the Study Programme Committee is responsible for content of the programme, its implementation and for ensuring internal study quality. It is also mentioned that the Order of the Rector (since 13 November 2013, No 215) regulates the functions of members of the Study Programme Committees.

Table 15 describes the roles and positions of members of the study programme committee. The committee is well composed: three faculty members, one employer, one social partner and one student. The roles of the members of the committee are clear: they carry out monitoring of the quality of the study programme, opinion surveys among students, graduates and employees. As noted earlier, EET would have preferred that the student member be appointed at an earlier stage so as to have a meaningful role in the process of self-evaluation.

EET is positively impressed that the responsibility of every teacher and student is highlighted (Master programmes' students are in charge of the quality of their studies, they obey the requirements of the University community and they provide feedback on the quality of the studies).

EET considers that responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated.

2.6.2 The procedures of how **information and data on the implementation of the programme are collected and analysed** are described in Section 6.4 of the SER. Different measures are used in quality assurance: discussions, expert opinions, periodically conducted students' opinion surveys which are available online¹, self-assessment of teachers' teaching competences, collaboration with social partners etc. Data is stored in the Dean's Office, in virtual space of the Department of Education and is also publicly accessible on the website². Unfortunately, the surveys and the results are available only in Lithuanian but there definitely is a system for feedback collection and analysis.

During the site visit, members of the teaching staff mentioned that they have individual talks with the students. At the end of each course, the teachers collect students' reflections and feedback. Students' expectations are also collected at the beginning of the course and the course programme is modified individually according to students' needs.

The members of the Programme Committee highlighted/appreciated the special website which is established to collect feedback from students, social partners and employers. They also found informal regular meetings with students and teachers to be useful.

The Centre of Quality Assurance has designed a new feedback questionnaire (25 questions) for students. This will be given to every student after every term. This has not been implemented yet. EET also welcomes this approach.

During the site visit, the EET didn't understand how the self-assessment of teachers' teaching competences is organized (which is mentioned in SER). Teaching staff didn't respond to this question.

¹ Available online at: http://www.leu.lt/lt/mp_svietimo_vadyba_lyderyste/mpsvil_apie/mpsvil_apklausos.html

² Available online at: http://www.leu.lt/lt/mp_svietimo_vadyba_lyderyste/mpsvil_apie/mpsvil_programos_vertinimas.html

EET considers that information on the implementation of the programme is collected several ways. Teaching staff highlighted the informal formats of feedback collections. EET recommends implementing more analytical feedback forms to evaluate how course programmes meet the general aims and the intended LOs of the study programme.

2.6.3 How the outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme is not described in SER.

During the institutional visit, students of the programme mentioned that the sequence of the subjects was changed in response to students' requests. The course of Management and Leadership was moved to the first semester. Students also mentioned that the number of lessons per day was reduced.

The teaching staff mentioned that they change the content of the programme according to students' expectations. Since many students are employed on the field, it is easy for them to say whether the material covered is relevant for them.

The EET didn't find any evidence of using the results of external evaluation to improve the programme.

EET considers that continuous improvement of the programme, according to the results of evaluation, is important. EET suggests the use of experts in the field of Educational Management and Leadership for external evaluation.

2.6.4 The manner and extend to which the evaluation and improvement processes involve stakeholders is described in several ways. First, the representative of the stakeholders belongs to the Study Programme Committee. Section 6.3 of the SER states that quality assurance is ensured through close cooperation with stakeholders in different forms: meetings, virtual communication etc. Employers participate in the master thesis' defending process. It was mentioned in the SER that, when the Masters study programme underwent expert evaluation seeking its approval, all the areas and activities of the study programme description received positive evaluation.

EET considers that the stakeholders are involved in evaluation and in the improvement process. EET agrees that involving a more representative group of social partners could give a more diverse picture for programme development.

2.6.5 The basis for effective and efficient internal quality assurance is created by regulations, for example, the Procedure for Renewal and Quality Assessment of LEU Study Programmes (approved by the Resolution of the LEU Senate No. 250 of 13 November 2013). The university also follows the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in European Higher Education.

During the institutional visit, the document "Procedure for Renewal and Quality Assessment of LEU Study Programmes" was translated into English. This document regulates the goals and responsibilities of several actors e.g. the Centre for Academic Quality and the Programme Committee. The aims and activities of quality assurance up to 2020 are also set down.

During the institutional visit, the head of the Centre for Academic Quality mentioned several activities that the Centre is responsible for and carries out. The descriptions of all study programmes are objects of examination for this Centre and each programme is advised. The

experts of the Centre analyse LOs according to the general aims of the programmes. Regular monthly training for teaching staff is organized by the Centre.

EET considers that the steps taken to improve quality assurance are effective. EET is positively impressed by the action taken by the Centre for Academic Quality.

2.6.6 Strengths, Weaknesses and Actions for Improvement

Strengths according to SER	Comments from EET
<p>The quality of the study programme is improved by taking into account the needs of students and employers. Continuous monitoring of the full-time study programme and its evaluation are carried out.</p> <p>The study programme is improved on the basis of not only feedback results received from the students but also on forecast of changes in education society and related academic sphere (opinion surveys of employers regarding forecast of demand for specialists in education management).</p>	<p>EET acknowledges that continuous monitoring and improvement of the study programme takes place.</p> <p>There are several measures implemented to support programme management: Study Programme Committee, QA Department working out regulations to support quality assurance and organizing once a month training sessions for teaching staff (last Wednesday of every month).</p> <p>The teaching staff collect feedback regularly and improve the course programmes according to the feedback received. The expectations of learners are surveyed at the beginning of the course.</p> <p>EET agrees that students, social partners and employers are involved in programme improvement.</p> <p>EET considers that there is a need for more focused analysis on leadership and management issues in the educational system to improve this programme.</p>
Weaknesses according to SER	Comments from EET
<p>Most frequently the social partners from the institutions, where Master programme students have their practices, take part in internal quality assurance processes.</p>	<p>EET agrees that involving more representatives on the group of social partners could give a more diverse picture for programme development and improvement.</p>
Actions for Improvement according to SER	Comments from EET
<p>To ensure active involvement of all the partners who have signed collaboration agreements in the processes of quality assurance as well as distribution of responsibilities.</p>	<p>EET considers that the proposed action gives light shift towards programme improvement.</p> <p>We suggest the use of experts in the field</p>

	of educational management and leadership incl. international experts for external evaluation.
Recommendations from EET	
<p>EET recommends using international benchmarking to improve the quality of the programme, comparing with similar programmes in other universities abroad.</p> <p>EET recommends implementing more analytical, not only descriptive feedback forms, to evaluate how course programmes meet the general aims and intended LOs of the study programme.</p>	

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes:

EET **recommends** that the coherence of the learning outcomes of the study programme with the requirements of the seventh level of the European Qualification be carefully considered. The content of learning outcomes needs improvement; more emphasis on the educational management and leadership is also needed.

Curriculum Design:

EET **recommends** that steps be taken to make the scope of the programme narrower, giving even more attention to what EET perceive to be the main competence area: leadership and management so that there is a clearer focus on leadership and management, both as regards the learning outcomes and the content, activities and literature used in the courses.

EET **recommends** that steps be taken to analyse the coherence between learning outcome, learning/teaching methods and assessment methods in the courses.

EET **recommends** the inclusion of more updated international literature, including literature written in English, in the courses. This is in order to achieve a greater scope for international orientation.

Staff:

EET **recommends** that steps be taken to improve the Linguistic competence of staff on this programme, including steps to move many of those currently in the “Intermediate” level in English into the “Excellent” level through provision of dedicated English Language programmes, as well as through the recruitment of new staff with higher competence in this area.

Materials and Resources:

EET **recommends** that a fundamental review of the arrangements for the practice be conducted, that there be longer, more frequent, more intensive and more demanding practices, especially directed at the fields of Leadership and Educational Management.

Study process and assessment:

EET **recommends** that further steps be taken with a view to addressing the issue of student mobility.

EET recommends that the assessment criteria be revised to focus on learning outcomes.

Programme management

EET **recommends** using international benchmarking to improve the quality of the programme, comparing this with similar programmes in other universities abroad.

EET **recommends** implementing more analytical processes and procedures to evaluate how course programmes meet the general aims and intended learning outcomes of the study programme.

IV. SUMMARY

Main positive and negative quality aspects of each programme evaluation area and main recommendations for the improving of quality of the study programme.

Programme aims and LOs

In the SER and in the meetings during the institutional visit, all actors of this study programme stressed the complexity and integrity of its aims and LOs. In fact, there are four separate elements: education, research, management and leadership. And all those four elements do not work as an integrated sustainable system. Investigation of the programme aims and LOs, curriculum design, as well as study process and assessment, revealed the separation and independence of each element. Even some of the Master's thesis evaded the focus on management and leadership.

It could be stated that programme's focus is more related and linked to the field of education, but not to development of specific competences expected to be developed while studying in the Education Management and Leadership programme. The aim and content of study programme's LO's should be changed to instead emphasise management and leadership focus of the programme.

Curriculum design:

EET notes and are pleased about that both the students and the partners in general are positive to the curriculum of this programme. However, EET is concerned by the breadth of the programme, not giving enough space to the core issues which is considered to be leadership and management. EET also recommends a more conscious approach to the choice of learning and assessment methods in order to meet the learning outcomes, and furthermore, that the programme should provide more space for practice activities and allowing a longer time to be spent on practice.

Staff:

EET is pleased to note that the teachers involved in this programme engage in a very considerable amount of overseas work. EET supports SER's expressed concern about the age profile of staff, finding that more of the current staff were born in the 1940s than in the last fifty years. EET is also concerned that the full potential of international collaborative work and learning from trips overseas is constrained by the linguistic competences of staff, with the largest number claiming excellence in Russian while very few make such a claim in relation to English, French German or Polish. EET is also concerned that limited competence in English (seven staff claim to have English to "Intermediate" level) is limiting the capacity of staff to guide students to the materials now available in English, both in print and on the world wide web.

EET considers that considerably more needs to be done at LUES, in the context of an aging, albeit experienced staff, who have clear linguistic competence limitations, to ensure that there is ongoing professional development of the kind that could be expected. In particular, EET is concerned that poor standards of English are mitigating against the

current staff being up-to-date on current debates in the literature as well as being constrained in their capacity to give guidance to their students on relevant readings in that language. This view was reinforced, in the course of the institutional visit, by evidence relating to the use of foreign language sources, especially English-language materials, in the students' Masters theses.

EET considers that these issues can be addressed through the recruitment of new staff.

Material resources

In the course of the Institutional visit to LUES, the EET had the opportunity to visit some of these classrooms and to see that the facilities and equipment are sufficient and suitable both in their size and quality for studies. EET noted that many classrooms have been renewed and updated in recent times. EET considers that the premises for studies are adequate, both in their size and quality and that the teaching materials are adequate and accessible. However, EET was concerned with arrangements for the practice and feels that considerable improvement could be made, including more frequent, longer and more closely assessed practices.

Study process and assessment:

EET is pleased to note that there seem to be adequate numbers of applicants for this programme. EET notes that research and applied research are a large part of this programme which contributes to the standard of the Masters' theses.

EET notes that LUES is trying to accommodate the needs of students who are working, many of them full-time, but questions whether this Masters should then be classified as being "full-time" also. EET is concerned that the amount of work that the students do is not enough for a programme to be called full-time, especially in the case of a programme as ambitious as this one. EET is concerned at the number of students not completing their studies and at the lack of engagement in student mobility. The international aspect of the programme is insufficiently developed. EET feels that the study process during the periods of individual work could be improved by further incorporating greater use of technology. Further incorporation of Moodle in the everyday work of the teachers could benefit this.

EET is generally satisfied with the quality of work in the final theses although it has concerns about the assessment of the practice and about the extent to which learning outcomes are being assessed. The programme would benefit from a stronger focus on the field of Educational Leadership and Management as well as more real practice in these settings.

Programme management

The programme management is well organised. The continuous monitoring and improvement of the study programme is implemented. Teaching staff highlighted the informal formats of feedback collections. The feedback from learners is collected currently and the course programmes are improved according the learners' needs. Social partners are involved into monitoring system. The quality assurance measures are effective.

EET suggests a greater use of international benchmarking to improve the quality of the programme, and to use more analytical feedback forms to evaluate how course programmes meet the general aims and intended LOs of the study programme.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme Education Management and Leadership (state code – **621X20032**) at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Staff	2
4.	Material resources	3
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	2
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	3
	Total:	14

*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:

Prof. Dr. Peadar Cremin

Grupės nariai:

Team members:

Prof. Dr. Knut Steinar Engelsen

Prof. Dr. Eve Eisenschmidt

Doc. Dr. Berita Simonaitienė

Almantas Abromaitis (Student representative)

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai

Ekspertų grupė (EG) **rekomenduoja** atidžiai apvarstyti studijų programos studijų rezultatų suderinamumą su Europos kvalifikacijų sandaros septinto lygio reikalavimais. Reikia patobulinti studijų rezultatų turinį, daugiau dėmesio skirti švietimo valdybai ir lyderystei.

Programos sandara

EG **rekomenduoja** imtis priemonių programos apimčiai susiaurinti ir dar daugiau dėmesio skirti tam, kas, EG nuomone, yra pagrindinė kompetencijų sritis – lyderystei ir vadybai. Siūloma dėmesį sutelkti į lyderystės ir vadybos studijų rezultatus, turinį, veiklą ir naudojamą literatūrą.

EG **rekomenduoja** imtis priemonių ir išanalizuoti studijų rezultatų, mokymo / mokymosi ir vertinimo metodų tinkamumą.

EG **rekomenduoja** įtraukti daugiau naujesnės tarptautinės literatūros, taip pat literatūros anglų kalba. Tokiu būdu būtų labiau orientuojamasi į tarptautiškumą.

Personalias

EG **rekomenduoja** imtis veiksmų, padėsiančių pagerinti šią programą dėstančių dėstytojų kalbos kompetentingumą, taip pat siekti, kad daugelio dėstytojų, kurių anglų kalbos lygis yra pažengusiųjų, taptų „puikus“. To pasiekti galima vykdant specialias šiam tikslui skirtas anglų kalbos programas, taip pat įdarbinat naujų darbuotojų, turinčių geresnius šios srities įgūdžius.

Materialieji ištekliai

EG **rekomenduoja** atlikti esminę praktikos susitarimų tvarkos peržiūrą, kad praktika būtų ilgesnė, dažnesnė, intensyvesnė ir reikalautų daugiau pastangų, ypač dėmesį sutelkti į lyderystės ir švietimo vadybos kryptis.

Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

EG **rekomenduoja** imtis tolesnių veiksmų siekiant spręsti studentų judumo klausimą.

EG **rekomenduoja** peržiūrėti vertinimo kriterijus, dėmesį atkreipiant į studijų rezultatus.

Programos vadyba

EG **rekomenduoja** pasinaudoti tarptautine lyginamąja analize ir pagerinti programos kokybę, ją palyginus su panašiomis kitų šalių universitetuose dėstomomis programomis.

EG **rekomenduoja** įgyvendinti daugiau analitinių procesų ir procedūrų, kurios padėtų įvertinti, kaip studijų programos atitinka studijų programos bendruosius tikslus ir numatomus studijų rezultatus.

IV. SANTRAUKA

Kiekvienos vertinamos srities pagrindiniai teigiami ir neigiami kokybės aspektai ir svarbiausios rekomendacijos studijų programos kokybei pagerinti.

Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai

Savianalizės suvestinėje (toliau – SS) ir lankantis universitete visi studijų programos dalyviai pabrėžė jos sudėtingumą ir tikslų bei studijų rezultatų (toliau – SR) vientisumą. Tačiau yra keturios atskiros dalys. Tai švietimas, moksliniai tyrimai, vadyba ir lyderystė. Šios keturios dalys neveikia kaip integruota darni sistema. Jos, kaip nustatyta išanalizavus programos tikslus ir sandarą, SR, taip pat studijų eigą ir vertinimą, veikia atskirai ir nepriklausomai. Pavyzdžiui, kai kuriuose magistro darbuose buvo išvengta susitelkimo į vadybą ir lyderystę.

Galima teigti, kad programa labiau orientuota į ir susieta su švietimo kryptimi, bet ne su specialiujų kompetencijų, kurias tikimasi išugdyti studijuojant Švietimo vadybos ir lyderystės programą, ugdymą. Studijų programos rezultatų tikslas ir turinys turėtų būti pakeistas, be to, turėtų būti pabrėžiama programos sritis – vadyba ir lyderystė.

Programos sandara

EG pastebi ir džiaugiasi, kad studentai ir dalininkai teigiamai atsiliepia apie šios programos dalykų turinį. Tačiau EG nerimą kelia programos platumas ir nepakankamas dėmesys pagrindiniams klausimams, t. y. vadybai ir lyderystei. EG rekomenduoja kruopščiau rinktis mokymosi ir vertinimo metodus studijų rezultatams pasiekti. Be to, programoje turėtų būti numatyta daugiau praktinės veiklos, sudarytos sąlygos daugiau laiko skirti praktikai.

Personalas

EG malonu pažymėti, kad šioje programoje dėstantys dėstytojai nemažai veiklos turi užsienyje. EG pritaria SS išreikštam susirūpinimui dėl darbuotojų amžiaus, nes paaiškėjo, kad daugiau darbuotojų gimė 1940-aisiais, o ne per pastaruosius penkiasdešimt metų. EG taip pat nerimą kelia tai, kad neišnaudojamos visos tarptautinio bendradarbiavimo galimybės ir nesimokoma iš kelionių užsienyje, nes tai riboja darbuotojų kalbos įgūdžiai. Didžioji dauguma darbuotojų puikiai kalba rusiškai, ir tik nedaugelis jų gali pasigirti anglų, prancūzų, vokiečių ar lenkų kalbų mokėjimu. EG taip pat susirūpinusi, kad nedidelis anglų kalbą mokančiųjų skaičius (septyni personalo nariai nurodė turintys pažengusiųjų lygį) riboja dėstytojų galimybes studentams vadovautis medžiaga, kuri dabar prieinama anglų kalba tiek spausdinta forma, tiek internete.

EG mano, kad LEU gerokai daugiau turi būti nuveikta dėl amžiaus klausimo. Nors darbuotojai patyrę, tačiau jiems aiškiai trūksta kalbos kompetencijos, todėl reikia užtikrinti nuolatinį profesinį šios srities tobulėjimą, kad būtų pasiektas toks lygis, kokio tikimasi. EG yra susirūpinusi, kad prasti anglų kalbos įgūdžiai riboja dabartinių darbuotojų galimybes naudotis naujausia literatūra, jie taip pat nesugeba pateikti nurodymų savo studentams į atitinkamą literatūrą ta kalba. Šis požiūris buvo patvirtintas vizito universitete metu ir įrodytas šaltinių užsienio kalba naudojimu, ypač anglų kalba, studentų magistro darbuose.

EG mano, kad šiuos klausimus galima išspręsti įdarbinus naujų darbuotojų.

Materialieji ištekliai

Lankantis universitete, EG turėjo galimybę apžiūrėti kai kurias auditorijas ir įsitikinti, kad patalpos ir įranga savo dydžiu ir kokybe yra pakankamos ir tinka studijoms. Daugelis auditorijų pastaruoju metu buvo remontuotos ir atnaujintos. EG mano, kad patalpos studijoms yra tinkamos tiek savo dydžiu, tiek kokybe ir kad mokymo medžiaga yra tinkama ir prieinama. Tačiau EG nerimą kelia susitarimai dėl praktikos atlikimo, todėl mano, kad sprendimą dėl šio klausimo būtų galima pagerinti, be to, galėtų būti numatytos dažnesnės, ilgesnės ir atidžiau vertinamos praktikos.

Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

EG malonu pastebėti, kad pretendentų į šią programą pakanka. EG pastebi, kad didelę šios programos dalį sudaro moksliniai ir taikomieji moksliniai tyrimai, kurie naudingi standartiniam magistrantūros baigiamajam darbui rengti.

EG pažymi, kad LEU stengiasi prisitaikyti prie dirbančių studentų poreikių, todėl daugelis iš jų dirba visu etatu, tačiau kyla klausimas, ar ši magistrantūros programa taip pat turėtų būti priskiriama nuolatinėms studijoms. EG abejoja, ar studentams numatyta tokios ambicingos programos kaip ši darbo apimtis yra pakankama, kad ją būtų galima vadinti nuolatinėmis studijomis. EG nerimą kelia šių studijų nebaigusiu studentų skaičius ir studentų mobilumo stoka. Tarptautinis programos aspektas yra nepakankamas. EG mano, kad studijų eiga savarankiško darbo metu galėtų būti toliau tobulinama numatant aktyvesnę technologijų naudojimą. Situacija pagerėtų, jei dėstytojais kasdieniame darbe aktyviau naudotųsi *Moodle* aplinka.

Apskritai, EG yra patenkinta baigiamųjų darbų darbo kokybe, nors turi abejonių dėl praktikos įvertinimo ir to, kaip vertinami studijų rezultatai. Situacija galėtų pagerėti, jei daugiau dėmesio būtų skiriama švietimo vadybos ir lyderystės kryptims ir realiai praktikai.

Programos vadyba

Programos vadyba organizuojama gerai. Nuolat stebimas ir gerinamas studijų programos įgyvendinimas. Dėstytojai akcentavo neformalius grįžtamojo ryšio rinkimo būdus. Šiuo metu renkami studijuojančiųjų atsiliepimai, o studijų programa tobulinama atsižvelgiant į besimokančiųjų poreikius. Socialiniai dalininkai dalyvauja stebėsenos sistemoje. Kokybės užtikrinimo priemonės yra veiksmingos.

EG siūlo daugiau taikyti tarptautinę lyginamąją analizę, siekiant pagerinti programos kokybę, taip pat daugiau naudoti analitines grįžtamojo ryšio formas, kurios padėtų įvertinti, kaip studijų programos atitinka bendruosius tikslus ir numatomus studijų rezultatus.