



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO**  
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *EDUKOLOGIJA***  
*(valstybinis kodas – 612X20001)*  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT**  
**OF *EDUCOLOGY* (state code – 612X20001)**  
**STUDY PROGRAMME**  
**at KLAIPĖDA UNIVERSITY**

1. **Prof. dr. Jesus Maria Angélica Fernandes Sousa** (team leader), *academic.*
2. **Prof. dr. Sven Erik Hansen**, *academic.*
3. **Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi**, *academic.*
4. **Mrs. Romualda Juozaitienė**, *social partner's representative.*
5. **Mr. Gytis Valatka**, *students' representative.*

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language - English

Vilnius  
2014

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Edukologija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612X20001
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Edukologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (4), iššestinės (6)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Edukologijos bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2003 m. liepos 4 d. Nr. Įsak. – 986

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Educology</i>
State code	612X20001
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Educology
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (4), part time (5)
Volume of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Educology
Date of registration of the study programme	July 4th 2003 m, No. 986

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

# CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1. Background of the evaluation process .....	4
1.2. General .....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information .....	4
1.4. The Review Panel .....	5
<b>II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes .....	5
2.2. Curriculum design .....	7
2.3. Teaching staff .....	9
2.4. Facilities and learning resources .....	10
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment .....	11
2.6. Programme management .....	13
<b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE * .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>V. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>19</b>

## I. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. *Background of the evaluation process*

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

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

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: 1) *self-evaluation and self-evaluation report (further – SER) prepared by the HEI*; 2) *visit of the review panel to the HEI*; 3) *preparing the evaluation report by the review panel and its publication*; 4) *follow-up activities*.

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

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

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

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

### 1.2. *General*

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

No.	Name of the document
	None

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

This report evaluates the undergraduate programme of *Educology* established by the Faculty of Pedagogy (PF) and administered by one of its 6 Departments: the Department of Educology (ED). The Department of Educology was created in 1991 and is responsible for and implements full and part-time undergraduate programmes of Educology and part-time graduate programmes of Educology and of Career Designing. Its teachers also work for other study programmes of the Faculty.

The graduates are awarded a Bachelor's Degree of Educology.

The programme was registered on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2003 and the previous external assessment was carried out in 2008, fully accrediting it for 6 years.

The programme's self-evaluation schedule and the preparation of the self-evaluation report (hereinafter SER) began in June 2013, before the formal establishment of a self-evaluation group, comprising eight members. This group is headed by Prof. dr. hab. Ona Tijūnėlienė, Professor of the Department of Educology, and includes a social partner and a student.

The writing activities closed with a presentation of the drafted SER at a meeting with academic staff, students and social partners in December 2013 and the revision for the final SER in January 2014 (there was a lapse here, saying it was January 2013).

#### **1.4. The Review Panel**

The review panel was completed according *Description of Experts' Recruitment*, approved by order No. 11/11/2011 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *29th October, 2014*.

- 1. Prof. dr. Jesus Maria Angélica Fernandes Sousa (team leader)**, *Professor of Education at University of Madeira, Portugal.*
- 2. Prof. dr. Sven Erik Hansen**, *Professor of Education, at Åbo Akademi University, Finland.*
- 3. Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi**, *Professor of Andragogy at Tallinn University, External examiner of the Quality Assessment Council of Estonian Higher Education Quality Agency (EKKA), Estonia.*
- 4. Mrs. Romualda Juozaitienė**, *Consultant of Adult Education and Self-esteem Development, Lithuania.*
- 5. Mr. Gytis Valatka**, *Phd student of Vilnius University (Sociology), Lithuania.*

## **II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS**

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

The aim of the programme is

*to train a highly qualified educologist – educator of people of different age who would possess basic university education complying to the intended learning outcomes of the first cycle study programme that would predetermine successful educational activity of a formal and non-*

*formal character in different social structures (in different institutions, organizations, and other) (SER, p. 5).*

The aim is short and clear, but the focus on the relationship between the aim expressed and the concept of Educology and how the concept is integrated into the programme would clarify it better.

We find another definition when relating the above description with the KU's aims:

*provide an individual with research-based higher university education in compliance with the contemporary level of cognition and technologies and with the qualification of higher education and to train a comprehensively educated, ethically responsible, and creative personality (SER, p. 6).*

These aims are developed and transferred to a wide set of articulated intended learning outcomes, being accessible in the AIKOS system, in the University website, study fairs, Open Door Days, in the media, and in different types of advertising booklets. They are also grounded on particular strategic education documents, at international, national and institutional levels (SER, p. 6). SER also makes use of publications at European level to justify the need to graduate people; the panel appreciated the solid discourse founded on scientific forecasts about labour market in the future, the needed competences and the needs of the society. *Horizon 2020* is mentioned in the SER to justify the utmost importance of social sciences for all innovations.

*"The programmes of education and training seek to provide people with opportunities to learn and to train the most important universal abilities; those of critical thinking, problem solution, creativity, teamwork, knowledge of other cultures, and communication" (SER, p. 7).*

The *Klaipeda Region Development Plan 2007-2013* and the presently drafted *Klaipeda Region Development Plan 2014-2010* aiming at emphasising that *"the opportunities provided in the region to acquire education at all levels reduces social exclusion."* Making allusion to the concept of the knowledge society, they defended the consolidation of the regional identity through the development of social sciences, and consequently through this study programme. During the visit, social partners confirmed the importance of the study programme for the improvement of the Region in terms of its openness and the creation of a knowledge society.

A special mention is also due to the comparative studies with similar undergraduate education studies implemented in York and Birmingham (England), Dublin (Ireland), and Cambridge (USA) Universities aiming at broad career opportunities.

*The graduates from those programmes can work with children, youth, and senior people in the fields of social protection, social inclusion, vocational training, charity, etc. Education studies in the said universities are interdisciplinary: students take courses of education, psychology, sociology, social policies, and other (SER, p. 7).*

After nominating other programmes more or less in the same scientific area in KU, the SER conveys the idea of no duplication with them, saying that *„they can do educational work in non-formal educational institutions, public and private institutions, organisations, and enterprises, as educators, elders in rural or city administrative districts, or heads and lecturers of educational courses“*(SER, p. 7).

The aims are expressed as intended learning outcomes which are articulated with the four blocks mentioned in the *Descriptor of the First Cycle Study Outcomes*, approved by the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania: *Knowledge and its application (A); Research abilities (B); Special abilities (C); Social abilities (D); and Personal abilities (E).*

One by one the outcomes express relevant ambitions, showing the self-assessment group is aware of important issues in the education of these educators, such as:

*A3. The acquisition of the fundamental knowledge of the social sciences and the humanities, of a human being as an integral and permanently self-educating individual, and of the opportunities of his socio-educational, psychological, cultural, and professional development.*

*C1. The ability to plan formal and non-formal educational activity of different age people.*

*D1. The ability to create a constructive interaction with people in different educational environments by disseminating relevant educational socio-cultural information.*

*E2. The ability of independent, analytical, and critical thinking and creative solution of socio-educational problems in the contemporary challenging society.*

*E3. The ability to consolidate one's own, as educator, personal moral values and the need for continuing self-education; the understanding of the moral responsibility for the outcomes of one's own activity and its impact on the society. (SER, pp. 5-6).*

This kind of statements evidences the consistency with the type and level of studies offered in compliance with the contemporary concerns of a global society aiming at the integral development of human beings.

But together, the learning outcomes appear as over detailed and unclear (for instance, to reach *the contemporary level of cognition*). One can ask whether this amount of outcomes on the whole can be reached and whether anybody is able to handle them in practice.

In short, the panel consider the programme aims and learning outcomes are generally well defined, clear and publicly accessible, based on academic requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market and consistent with the type and level of studies offered; the name of the study programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other and are soundly justified. However it would be of benefit for the quality of the programme and for carrying it out in practice to crystallize and simplify the description of learning outcomes.

## ***2.2. Curriculum design***

The curriculum design meets legal requirements. Since 2010, the extramural study form has been implemented as a part-time study form and since September 2011, the ECTS credit system has been applied at KU.

The number of credits corresponds to the duration of a first cycle degree study programme, with 240 ECTS both for full-time and part-time formats. For the part-time programme under analysis, 11 semesters are organized, having each one from 15 to 25 ECTS, instead of 30.

The subjects and ECTS are evenly distributed along the semesters in the curriculum design for full-time studies: 6 subjects and 30 ECTS. But for the part-time format, under assessment, the fluctuation in the number of subjects per semester (4 subjects in semesters 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7; 5 subjects in semesters 2, 4 and 10; then 6 subjects in semester 8; and finally 2 subjects in the last semester) may cause different levels of efforts from the students, related to the number of assessments. It is understandable that the last one, greatly dedicated to the Final Thesis has fewer subjects. But the previous ones could be more evenly harmonized in terms of number of subjects and ECTS.

Study field subjects are given 187 credits, general university subjects have 21 credits, and the remaining 32 credits are dedicated to Practice, with 18 credits; Physical Education, with 6

credits; and free-choice electives, with 8 credits. There is a great number (16) of subjects formally entitled as “*Introduction to*”.

For general university subjects, students have Foreign Language 1 and 2 (English 1 and 2, German 1 and 2), 2 electives of general university education to be chosen from other study fields (the Humanities, Arts, or Bio-Medical Sciences), and Philosophy, Sociology and Law, considered necessary for the training of the social educator.

The panel is pleased to see that the recommendations of the previous external assessment were fruitful, in terms of more investment in foreign languages and the increase of practice in Educological Practice and Andragogical Practice, and even the practicum of Contemporary Education Technologies.

The ambition behind the stating of the learning outcomes (Table 1) is appreciable and reflects the staff’s effort to live up to the new design of changing emphasis on students’ achievements. As already mentioned in the previous point, one by one the outcomes express relevant expected outcomes but together they appear to be too many and difficult to handle in practice. Some are also quite wide and diffuse in scope and therefore difficult to assess. The evaluation panel however notes that the approach of learning outcomes is relatively newly introduced and suggests that the approach in the next revision should be simplified and made more transparent. Table 4 tries to provide a detailed and supposed exact illustration of accomplishment of learning outcomes by the courses. The panel however doubts about the realism in constructing this kind of mechanical diagrams of complicated human processes.

The proportion of contact versus independent hours of work seems to be adequate for this level of university studies according to the Bologna philosophy, which focuses on learning and the learners’ work, rather than on teaching and teacher’s work.

The study methods seem adequate for each type of courses:

*In the studies of the courses of the theoretical unit, students acquire the initial knowledge of educology and train their cognition abilities. That is why the said courses are more frequently taught by means of oral (lecture, discussion), visual/demonstration, and reflective practical methods. The feedback is ensured by independently prepared reviews of the research literature sources and individual and group independent work assignments: essays, creative projects, etc. To train the practical skills, the methods of case study, problem solution, and analysis of acquired experience are applied (SER, p. 17).*

Foreign authors and references should be included in the programmes in order to enlarge the views of the students and confront them with other realities.

The procedure of writing, defending and assessing the Final Thesis is regulated by the *KU Study Regulations (2010)*, the *Descriptor of General Requirements for KU Student Independent Papers and Art Works (2010)*, the *Procedures of Typing and Binding the Final Thesis* of the Faculty of Pedagogy, KU, and the *Regulations of the Bachelor’s Final Thesis in the Undergraduate Studies of Educology* developed and approved by the ED (2013).

In short, the panel considers that the curriculum design meets legal requirements, but the study subjects could be more evenly spread, and with more foreign literature; the themes are not repetitive, the content of the subjects, in general, is consistent with the type and level of the studies, their methods are appropriate and diversified, and the scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure the intended learning outcomes; the content of the programme reflects reasonably the latest achievements in this scientific area, mainly in Lithuania.



### **2.3. Teaching staff**

Altogether 31 teachers constitute the academic staff of this study programme. From the PF, 6 come from the Department of Educology, 3 from the Department of Psychology, 4 from the Department of Childhood Pedagogy, 6 from the Department of Social Pedagogy, 2 from the Department of Physical Education and 1 from the Department of Catechetics. From other Faculties, 2 come from the Humanities and 2 from Social Sciences. And there is a visiting professor from the Lithuanian University of Educological Sciences, in Vilnius.

The description of staff participation in research, projects, and scientific activity directly related to the evaluated study programme was carefully written, giving an excellent idea of their scientific activities: first, in general, and afterwards, by teachers individually.

In the period of 2004-2009, the academic staff of the study programme conducted research on different themes related with problems of educology as a holistic science of education, according to the SER (p. 19).

A special mention is due to the joint projects of KU, Vytautas Magnus University, the Lithuanian University of Educological Sciences, and Šiauliai University, under the name of *Education Quality Management* and *Career Designing*. Also worth noting is that many teachers are members of national and international research societies and associations and two members of the staff are independent experts of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania. The academic staff took part in numerous national and international projects related to the aims of this study programme.

Some teachers took part in national and international projects related to the aims of this study programme. Out of 31 teachers of the programme, only 10 took part in academic exchange programmes (in Argentina, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Great Britain, Iceland, Norway, Spain, Sweden and Uruguay). No teachers have arrived from abroad under exchange programmes over the last 5 years.

In 2005-2009, in collaboration with researchers from Latvia and Estonia, they implemented an international project and wrote a collective monograph *History of Education and Pedagogical Thought in the Baltic Countries up to 1940: an Overview*. In 2010-2013, the second stage of the project was implemented, and the second book published: *History of Education and Pedagogical Thought in the Baltic Countries 1940-1990*. However, during the visit, the panel confirmed that teachers' involvement in long term international research networks is scarce to improve international research participation as well as publishing.

The individual descriptions of teachers should be praised by the panel, for the great care of presenting in a synthetic way each one's CV, underlining the particular traits and activities developed in direct connection with the subjects each one is responsible for.

The ratio of teachers and students of Educology is very low (in 2008-09, 1:0,8; in 2009-10, 1:1,52; in 2010-11, 1:2,16; in 2011-12, 1:2,61; in 2012-13, 1:2). A problem of financial viability may be raised, unless teachers work hard in other study programmes. The panel therefore considers the situation as serious and asks for the institution's attention to finding solutions to the problem. It is urgent to think about management solutions.

The SER states that the professional development observes the *KU Statute (2012), Descriptor of the Procedures of Attestation and Competition for Tenure of KU Academic Staff, Research Fellow, and Researchers (2012)* and *the Regulations of KU Research and Study Promotion Fund (2009)*. Every 5 years, KU academic staff may be exempted from academic work for no longer than one year for conducting research or for research or professional development. According to our discussions the possibility for sabbatical research leaves appeared to be an intention, unfortunately not a reality.

The turnover of staff is well explained. The greatest changes took place in the context of internal academic positions. Beyond the financial aspect, this fact can give another sort of motivation to the staff, in terms of self-fulfilment, which is beneficial for the academic activities environment. The panel met during the site visit a committed and collectively oriented, competent and professional teaching staff. The panel's view of the staff was confirmed both by students and by graduates. Particularly the staff's flexibility and willingness to listen to and meet the students' questions and needs was emphasized. The staff members also showed reports and course books they have written showing an appreciable ambition to contribute to the development of the course literature.

On the other hand the panel also could notice that the staff is facing a challenging imbalance between a heavy teaching work load and an ambition to do and fulfil research requirements. A check of the publications reveals that the staff has limited possibilities to get involved in research on an international arena and to publish in peer reviewed journals.

In short, the panel consider that the study programme is provided by staff with an appropriate profile in compliance with the legal requirements, that the number and the qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes, that the teaching staff's turnover is stimulating to ensure an adequate provision of the programme, that the teaching staff of the programme is competent and highly committed and to at least some extent involved in research directly concerned with the study programme. A challenge but a necessary step further for the institution is to improve the staff's concrete possibilities to conduct research not only on an domestic arena but more widely internationally and to become acting and active members of a global research community.

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

The panel was offered possibilities to scrutinize the facilities and learning resources and made the following observations:

The panel could confirm that the classrooms are reasonably adequate both in their size and quality, and meet the requirements of hygiene and work security with modern audio and video equipment. Wireless internet, data-show projectors, TV and interactive boards are available. Available multimedia and computer equipment correspond to the needs of the programme, including the needs for extensive teleconferencing and interactive distance learning activities.

All lectures take place in the building of the PF, but students may use premises in other divisions of the university, such as the conference hall, two classrooms with 250 seats each and others which can be used for lectures, scientific conferences, defences of final theses, etc.

The library is reasonably well equipped and the staff gave an impression of being competent, committed and service minded. The services provided are computerized and students have

possibilities to order and to use databases via their lap tops. An opportunity to work at home within university's network has to be mentioned, as a big advantage and improvement for students' mobility. Students confirmed the panel's view and pointed out the good service they receive from a competent, flexible and service oriented library staff. PF is provided with methodological resources (textbooks, books, periodicals, and databases), 52 databases are subscribed by the university with free access for teachers and students. In a project teachers and students were trained for *The Use of e-Research Information Sources (databases): Information Sources of Social Sciences*. The Methodological lab regularly receives specialist literature. Methodological aids (such as copies, CD, e-versions, video materials, etc.) are stored here. This is the place where final theses can be consulted by students too. Nevertheless when taking into account that the supply of journals, databases is quantitatively restricted and that one or two course books are available in lecture and seminars rooms the question is how to secure that the students continuously are provided with the latest scientific knowledge.

Concerning practice sites, agreements were signed with the following institutions:

*11 pre-school institutions, 17 progymasiums, 10 gymnasiums, 1 secondary school, 1 primary school, 1 school- kindergarten, 7 vocational schools, 5 art, sport, and special schools, Centre of Spiritual Assistance to Youth, KU Central Library, a public library, a youth centre, a language centre, an old people's home, a children's home, a music school, an art school, a conservatoire, a Vision Training Centre, a special school, a Child Rights Protection Agency, the agency All Lithuanian Children, a charity and support centre, a Family and Child Welfare Centre, children and youth clubs, and the Third Age University (SER, p. 25).*

In short, the panel consider that the premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality, that the teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are also adequate both in size and quality, and that the teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible. Finally the panel encourages the management body to take measures in order to further improve the learning resources, particularly the library, to reach an international standard.

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

Students' admission is carried out in accordance with the *General Rules of the Lithuanian Association of Higher Schools for Joint Admission* and the admission rules approved by the KU Senate. Secondary education is necessary for a student to be admitted. The EET appreciated that the test of motivation is compulsory, according to an Order of the Minister of Educations and Science of the Republic of Lithuania.

The panel was impressed with the number of applicants to this programme and the reduced number of admitted students (Table 8, page 28).

Students are encouraged to participate in joint research together with teachers and to present papers in conferences and student forums, this way practising their research skills. An example of a strong participation of students is the conference *Practice of Students of the Faculty of Pedagogy: the Situation, Opportunities, and Development*, in which they presented communications and participated in discussions about practice in Lithuania and abroad. The Student Representative Body, whose active members ESP students are, organize different events in accordance with the common plan of events.

There are various forms of students' support. Information about the study programme is available in the website and the Department organizes meetings on relevant issues of their

interest. Each group has an academic curator and the teachers receive students for consultancy. The Faculty of Pedagogy has a Psychological Counselling Centre. Students choose research topics according to their interests, as well as on teacher's recommendations. Bachelor thesis meets legal requirements, although, international and relevant literature (articles) should be used more widely.

Students' assessment is regulated by the *KU Study Programmes* which is available in the library and on the KU Internet website. The assessment is cumulative, assuring „*more comprehensive and objective assessment of student achievements*“, the SER says (p. 27).

In the first lesson, students are informed about the types of independent work assignments, the schedule of their completion, and their impact on the final grade. Students are also informed about the form of the exam, its content, duration, and assessment criteria.

The final thesis is assessed by taking into account

*the quality of the structural parts of the final thesis (an introduction, the analytical part, the concluding part, and the bibliography); the harmony of the aim of the paper, the objectives, the methods, the ways of analysis, and the conclusions; the novelty of the sources of literature; fluent description of the empirical part and the analysis and interpretation of the data; the clarity of the conclusions and their compliance with the aims are assessed, as well as the ability to consistently and logically present the thesis to the Qualifying Committee, to answer to the questions of the reviewers and the members of the commission, and participation in discussions (SER, p. 27).*

The ratio of the time allotted for contact hours and independent work hours presented here in Table 11 (SER, pp. 28-29) seems to be inadequate and contrary to what is presented in the previous Table 3 (SER, p. 10). The students' working hours are not to be equally divided by these two sorts of work.

Erasmus bipartite collaboration agreements in the field of Educology were signed with universities of Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Spain, Iceland, Latvia, Poland, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, and Germany (13, instead of 15 countries, as written in the SER, p. 29). Despite satisfying formal prerequisite very few students take the opportunity to go abroad. Reasons are related to work and family situation but the administration is encouraged to take the issue of students' low participation in exchange programmes into a consideration.

The SER claims that during the assessed period (2009-2013), 66 students from the full time programme graduated. From these, only 4 are looking for jobs (SER, p. 29).

Measures are taken against students' academic misconduct but it would be motivated to stress this issue for instance by arranging an obligatory detecting system of plagiarism for all work and to have the students to sign agreements when starting their studies.

In summary, the panel considers that the admission requirements are well founded and explained, that students are encouraged to participate in research and applied research activities, that students are reluctant to use the opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes, that the higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support, and that the assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available.

## 2.6. Programme management

Since 2011, KU has the *Descriptor of the Conception of the KU System of Management of the Internal Study Quality* the aim of which is to have the internal quality assurance at KU. Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the programme are clear (SER, pp. 28-32) and are assured by the following levels of quality assurance:

*The level of the University:* The Senate and the Rector's Office (Vice-Rector of Science and Studies, the Department of Studies). KU study quality assurance is guaranteed by the Study Quality Committee constituted by the Rector's Order which includes 12 members from all the Faculties and responsible administrative staff. The Study Quality Committee belongs to the KU Department of Studies. It is assisted by the Academic Committee of the KU Senate.

*The level of the Faculty of Pedagogy:* the Council of the PF KU, the Dean and the Dean's Office.

*The level of the Department:* The Department of Educology and its Head are directly responsible for the content of the study programme of Educology and its implementation.

For the management of the main processes, the responsibility is distributed between the KU Senate, the Council of the PF KU, and the Dean's Office.

The management of the study programme of Educology and study quality assurance is regulated by documents mentioned in the SER (page 30).

Data for the analysis of the study programme are formally and informally collected in the meetings and through the survey questionnaires to be used as feedback for the improvement of the programme management. Students keep in touch with their academic curator, being informed about the changes in the programme. The information about changes in programme can also be spread in Moodle platform.

The participation of a 2nd year student in the self-assessment group is indicative of the openness to the inclusion of students' views.

Social partners systematically participate in the assessment and improvement of the quality of the programme. The SER says that „*social partners take part in internal and external self-assessments of the study programme, the practices are discussed, etc. In those and other events, the employers express their opinion about the level of qualification of the programme graduates.*” (SER, p. 31).

So there is a strong cooperation with employers and professional associations which is partially attested by the participation of the Director of the Centre of Pedagogue Education and Culture in the self-evaluation group. Social partners provide assistance to students who write final theses and create conditions for them to conduct research in their enterprises, institutions, and organisations, such as the Klaipėda County Police Department, the Territorial Labour Exchange, the Armed Forces and the Navy, the Department of Education of the City of Klaipėda, comprehensive schools of the city, vocational schools, and the Centre of Pedagogue Education and Culture.

The panel conducted a session with social partners and was impressed by the strong support the programme gets from different stakeholders. Social partners also accentuated their possibilities

to influence the program, for instance by offering possibilities for engaging in research projects, for engaging mentors and for developing practice for students.

For the improvement of the quality of studies, students' feedback is crucial and the panel could note that students and graduates emphasized their good possibilities to express their opinions about the programme and about arrangement related to the conduction, regardless the statement in the SER stating that „*the teachers believe that the relationships with the graduates are still insufficient, and the harmony of the EMP content is affected by administrative directives*” (SER, p. 31). Students also gave examples of participation in various kinds of feedback activities and of self-assessment groups and the panel considers their conceptions of being involved is indicative of the openness and inclusion of students' views. In all students, graduates and social partners assured that they are taken into consideration to improve the study programme.

The panel are pleased to see that a special attention was given to the previous external assessment responding to each one of the recommendations made at that time. Table 13. *About The major changes affected by the last external assessment* is very clear and elucidative, deserving to be praised by the present panel.

So there is a functional internal QA system in place for the assessment of the programmes in which data is regularly collected, compiled and analysed.

In short, the panel considers that the responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are well allocated, that information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed, that outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used in general for the improvement of the programme, that evaluation and improvement processes involve stakeholders and that the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient. But the faculty should pay more attention into a wider international orientation, for instance in establishing networks, inviting guest lecturers and researchers and for participating in application for funding from international sources.

### **III. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1.  
To define the learning outcomes in articulation with the programme aims, in a more realistic way;
2.  
To improve the factual possibilities for the teaching staff to get engaged in a systematized plan for professional development, establishing a sound balance between teaching and higher level research activities;
3.  
To create appropriate conditions for the teaching staff to live up to a university's responsibility to actively participate in the international research community, participating in staff mobility, with long term research periods abroad;
4.  
To increase the publications of research results in peer reviewed international journals;
5.  
To more systematically inform and encourage students to participate in exchange programmes and international research networks;
6.  
To invite young research active scholars/teachers from other Lithuanian institutes and abroad for a longer period.

#### **IV. EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE \***

*There is no examples of good practice.*

*\* if there are any to be shared as a good practice*



## V. SUMMARY

Main positive and negative quality aspects of each programme evaluation area.

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

Clear programme aim Ambitious learning outcomes Consistent with the type and level of qualifications offered Grounded on strategic education documents at international, national and institutional levels Solid discourse founded on scientific forecasts about labour market in the future Response to the public needs	Need for a direct link between the aim and the concept of Educology Exhaustive set of learning outcomes Over detailed and therefore unclear outcomes
--	--

### ***2.2. Curriculum design***

Sufficient (more than sufficient) scope to ensure the learning outcomes Logical sequence of courses in the curriculum design Investment in foreign languages Increase of practice Adequate proportion of contact versus independent hours of work Teaching methods appropriate and diversified Reflecting reasonably current achievements in the area	Uneven distribution of courses and ECTS along the semesters Sixteen subjects entitled as “Introduction to” Difficult in practice to handle with too many expected outcomes: mechanical diagrams of complicated human processes Lack of more recent and foreign authors and references
---	--

### ***2.3. Teaching staff***

Joint projects of KU, Vytautas Magnus University, the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, and Šiauliai University, on Education Quality Management (and Career Designing) Research on different themes related to problems of education for personal and professional career Collective monographs on the History of Education and Pedagogical Thought in the Baltic Countries Committed, enthusiastic and intensively working staff	Heavy staff working loads Lack of a high standard international dimension in publications and research Lack of long leaves abroad for research
--	--

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

Adequate classrooms in size and quality Wireless internet, data show projectors, interactive boards, etc. Training for The Use of e-Research Information Sources (databases) Home access to library network and different	Lack of more foreign language literature to reach an international standard in the field of education
--	---

data bases Competent, flexible and service oriented library staff	
---	--

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

Admission according to legal determinations Students encouraged to participate in research activities Erasmus bipartite collaboration agreements signed with universities of many countries Various forms of students support Clear information about the process of assessment Other forms of assessment beyond written tests and exams Open and good relationships with staff Graduate students working in the field	Few students abroad in Erasmus programmes No foreign students
---	--

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

Different levels of responsibility for decisions clearly stated Data formally and informally collected for the quality assurance Inclusion of social partners for the improvement of the programme Strong cooperation with employers and professional associations Students' voices heard Attention given to previous external evaluation	Lack of wider international orientation (networks, guest lecturers, funding for research from international sources) Lack of encouragement for teachers to take active research leaves after 5 years of teaching
--	---

To summarize even more, we can detach two greatest strengths of this study programme, from a systemic point of view:

1. The sub-system of teaching staff, which expressed several expressions of enthusiasm, commitment and professionalism. This strength represents a fundamental potential for further development of the programme and should be taking good care of by the management body.
2. The communication and cooperation among different sub-systems aiming at the same aim (equifinality): departments, teaching staff, social partners, graduates and students, whose voices are listened to and taken into account.

The most visible weakness appeared to be the limited bold venture aiming at involvement in internationally oriented activities, such as study leaves abroad, inviting guest research and lecturers from abroad, encouraging students to participate in exchange programmes and to expand researchers' international publication.

## VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Educology* (state code – 612X20001) at Klaipėda University is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

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

\*1 (unsatisfactory) - there are essential shortcomings that must be eliminated;

2 (satisfactory) - meets the established minimum requirements, needs improvement;

3 (good) - the field develops systematically, has distinctive features;

4 (very good) - the field is exceptionally good.

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Prof. dr. Jesus Maria Angelica Fernandes Sousa
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. dr. Sven Erik Hansen
	Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi
	Mrs. Romualda Juozaitienė
	Mr. Gytis Valatka

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS  
EDUKOLOGIJA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612X20001) 2014-12-03 EKSPERTINIO  
VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-584 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

**VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Edukologija* (valstybinis kodas – 612X20001) vertinama **teigiamai**.

<b>Eil. Nr.</b>	<b>Vertinimo sritis</b>	<b>Srities įvertinimas, balais*</b>
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	<b>Iš viso:</b>	<b>18</b>

\* 1 - Nepatenkinamai (yra esminių trūkumų, kuriuos būtina pašalinti)

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

3 - Gerai (sistemiškai plėtojama sritis, turi savitų bruožų)

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

**V. SANTRAUKA**

Kiekvienos programos vertinimo srities pagrindiniai teigiami ir neigiami kokybės aspektai.

**2.1. Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai**

Aiškūs programos tikslas.	Reikalinga tiesioginė sąsaja tarp tikslo ir edukologijos sampratos.
Numatomi ambicingi studijų rezultatai.	
Programa atitinka siūlomos profesinės	Numatomi studijų rezultatai išdėstyti pernelyg

<p>kvalifikacijos studijų rūšį ir pakopą.</p> <p>Programos tikslai ir numatomi rezultatai grindžiami strateginiais tarptautinio, valstybinio ir institucinio lygmens švietimo dokumentais.</p> <p>Būdingas svarus, mokslinėmis prognozėmis pagrįstas ateities darbo rinkos suvokimas.</p> <p>Atsižvelgiama į visuomenės poreikius.</p>	<p>detaliai.</p> <p>Numatomi studijų rezultatai nėra aiškūs dėl pernelyg didelio detalumo.</p>
--	--

## **2.2. Programos sandara**

<p>Programos apimtis, skirta mokymosi rezultatams užtikrinti, yra pakankama (net pernelyg plati).</p> <p>Studijų dalykai programoje išdėstyti logiškai.</p> <p>Skiriamos investicijos užsienio kalboms mokytis.</p> <p>Didinamos mokomosios praktikos apimtys.</p> <p>Būdinga tinkama kontaktinio darbo ir savarankiškų studijų laiko proporcija.</p> <p>Dėstymo metodai atitinka reikalavimus ir pasižymi įvairove.</p> <p>Atspindėti pakankamai nauji šios srities pasiekimai.</p>	<p>Dėstomieji dalykai ir kreditai į semestrus paskirstomi netolygiai.</p> <p>Šešiolika dėstomųjų dalykų pavadinti „Įvadas į ...“.</p> <p>Sunku įgyvendinti praktiškai dėl pernelyg daug numatomų rezultatų: sudėtingų žmogiškųjų procesų mechaninės diagramos.</p> <p>Trūksta nuorodų į šiuolaikinius ir užsienio autorius.</p>
--	---

## **2.3. Dėstytojų personalas**

<p>Bendri Klaipėdos universiteto, Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto, Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto ir Šiaulių universiteto dėstytojų švietimo kokybės vadybos (ir Karjeros projektavimo) programų projektai.</p> <p>Įvairi mokslinė tiriamoji veikla yra susijusi su švietimo sistemos asmeninio ar profesinio</p>	<p>Dideli dėstytojų darbo krūviai.</p> <p>Publikacijos ir mokslinių tyrimų veikla per mažai atitinka aukštus tarptautinio lygio standartus.</p> <p>Per mažai ilgalaikių kūrybinių atostogų užsienyje.</p>
---	---

<p>lygmens problemomis.</p> <p>Yra kolektyvinių monografijų apie Baltijos šalių švietimo ir pedagoginės minties raidos istoriją.</p> <p>Kupinas entuziazmo, nuoširdžiai ir intensyviai dirbantis personalas.</p>	
--	--

#### **2.4. Materialieji ištekliai**

<p>Studijoms skirtos patalpos yra tinkamos tiek pagal dydį, tiek pagal kokybę.</p> <p>Yra bevielis internetas, vaizdo projektoriai, interaktyvios lentos ir t. t.</p> <p>Vyksta mokymai, kaip naudotis elektroniniais mokslo tyrimų (e-Research) informacijos šaltiniais (duomenų bazėmis).</p> <p>Namuose yra prieiga prie bibliotekos tinklo ir įvairių duomenų bazių.</p> <p>Kompetentingas, lankstus ir paslaugus bibliotekos personalas.</p>	<p>Trūksta daugiau užsienio kalba išleistos literatūros, norint pasiekti tarptautinių standartų švietimo srityje.</p>
---	---

#### **2.5. Studijų eiga ir studentų darbo vertinimas**

<p>Priėmimas vyksta įstatymų nustatyta tvarka.</p> <p>Studentai skatinami dalyvauti moksliniuose tyrimuose.</p> <p>Pasirašytos <i>Erasmus</i> programos dvišalio bendradarbiavimo sutartys su daugelio šalių universitetais.</p> <p>Taikomos įvairios paramos studentams formos.</p> <p>Aiškiai išdėstytas pasiekimų vertinimo procesas.</p> <p>Be testų raštu ir egzaminų, taikomos ir kitos pasiekimų vertinimo formos.</p> <p>Atviri ir geri studentų ir personalo santykiai.</p>	<p>Mažai studentų mokosi užsienyje pagal <i>Erasmus</i> programą.</p> <p>Nėra studentų iš užsienio.</p>
--	---

Antrosios pakopos studijų studentai dirba su studijų programa susijusiose srityse.	
--	--

## 2.6. Programos vadyba

<p>Aiškliai nurodyta įvairių lygių atsakomybė priimant sprendimus.</p> <p>Oficialiai ir neoficialiai surinkti duomenys skirti studijų kokybei užtikrinti.</p> <p>Socialiniai dalininkai įtraukiami į programos kokybės gerinimo darbą.</p> <p>Glaudžiai bendradarbiaujama su darbdaviais ir profesinėmis asociacijomis.</p> <p>Atsižvelgiama į studentų nuomonę.</p> <p>Atsižvelgta į ankstesnio išorinio vertinimo išvadas.</p>	<p>Trūksta platesnio tarptautinio orientavimo (tinklai, kviestiniai lektoriai, mokslinės veiklos finansavimas tarptautinėmis lėšomis).</p> <p>Dėstytojai per mažai skatinami po penkerių darbo metų imti kūrybines atostogas.</p>
--	---

Apibendrinant dar glausčiau, sisteminio poveikio atžvilgiu galima išskirti dvi didžiausias šios studijų programos stiprybes. Tai:

1. Nuolatinis entuziazmas, nuoširdžiu darbu ir profesionalumu pasižymintis dėstytojų kolektyvas. Ši stiprybė sudaro svarbiausią tolesnio programos vystymo potencialą, todėl programos vadovybė šia sritimi turėtų tinkamai rūpintis.
2. Įvairių padalinių – katedrų, dėstytojų personalo, socialinių dalininkų, absolventų ir studentų – bendravimas ir bendradarbiavimas siekiant to paties tikslo (bendro tikslo turėjimas), visų nuomonės išklauskamos ir į jas atsižvelgiama.

Akivaizdžiausia programos silpnybė – riboti bandymai įsitraukti į tarptautinę veiklą, tokią kaip išvykimas studijuoti į užsienį, kviestinių mokslininkų ir dėstytojų iš užsienio pritraukimas, studentų raginimas dalyvauti mainų programose ir mokslo darbų tarptautinių publikacijų plėtojimas.

<...>

### III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1.

Realistiškiau apibrėžti numatomus programos studijų rezultatus atsižvelgiant į sąsają su programos tikslais.

2.

Gerinti dėstytojų realias galimybes sistemingai dalyvauti profesinio tobulėjimo projektuose, kuriant tinkamą dėstyto ir aukštesnio lygio mokslinės veiklos pusiausvyrą.

3.

Sudaryti tinkamas sąlygas dėstytojams dalyvauti ilgalaikę mokslinių tyrimų veiklą užsienyje numatančiose darbuotojų judumo programose ir įgyvendinti universiteto įsipareigojimą įsitraukti į tarptautinę mokslinę veiklą.

4.

Didinti mokslinių tyrimų rezultatų publikacijų skaičių specialistų recenzuojamuose tarptautiniuose žurnaluose.

5.

Reguliariau informuoti ir raginti studentus dalyvauti mainų programose ir tarptautiniuose mokslinių tyrimų tinkluose.

6.

Kviesti ilgesniam laikotarpiui jaunas, mokslinių tyrimų veiklą aktyviai vykdančius mokslininkus / dėstytojus iš užsienio ir kitų Lietuvos mokymo institucijų padalinių.

---

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

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)