



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO IR ŠIAULIŲ
UNIVERSITETO

**JUNGTINĖS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *KINEZITERAPIJA*
(618B31001)**

VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT

OF *PHYSICAL THERAPY* (618B31001)

STUDY PROGRAMME

at KLAIPĖDA UNIVERSITY AND ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader:

Doc.dr. Valerie Lesley Dawson

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. dr. Herman Van Coppenolle

Mara Kulša

Doc.dr. Milda Žukauskienė

Tomas Sinevičius

Mindaugas Vilius

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Kineziterapija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	618B31001
Studijų sritis	Biomedicinos mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Reabilitacija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4 m);
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240 ECTS
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Kineziterapijos bakalauras, kineziterapeutas
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2011-05-20

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Physical Therapy</i>
State code	618B31001
Study area	Biomedical studies
Study field	Rehabilitation
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full time (4 years);
Volume of the study programme in credits	240 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Physical Therapy, Physical Therapist
Date of registration of the study programme	2011-05-20

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

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	4
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	4
2. Curriculum design	6
3. Staff	8
4. Facilities and learning resources	10
5. Study process and student assessment.....	11
6. Programme management	12
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	14
IV. SUMMARY	16
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	18

I. INTRODUCTION

The external evaluation procedures of the rehabilitation study field Joint Bachelor Degree Study Programme of Physical Therapy (618B31001) at Klaipeda and Siauliai universities were initiated by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education of Lithuania. The degree awarded and/or professional qualification (according to the main data of the study programme in self-evaluation report) is a Bachelor of Rehabilitation, Physical Therapist.

The Evaluation Team (hereafter ET) involved in this evaluation included three physiotherapy educators (one from the UK, one from Latvia and one from Lithuania), an expert in Applied Physical Activity from Belgium, a Lithuanian physiotherapy student and a Lithuanian social partner.

The Self Evaluation Report (hereafter SER) presented by the two universities and the two site visits on 1-2 April 2014 allowed the ET to gather relevant information to discuss and prepare this report. During the visits different meetings took place; with administrative staff, the staff responsible for preparing the SER, teaching staff, students, graduates and social partners, as well as employers. The ET evaluated various support services (classrooms for practice, library and computer facilities) and familiarised themselves with students' final work, and other documents requested during the visit.

The SER starts with a detailed introduction to the two universities involved in the Joint Bachelor Degree in Physical Therapy (PT) programme, their provision of programmes of study and the issues pertinent to such a joint programme, recognised and managed by two different universities. Information is presented to show the depth and breadth of the curriculum design and evaluation process. Strengths and areas for improvement are included in each main section.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

Aims and Learning Outcomes (LOs) are set within the context of health care in Lithuania (SER, page 10) –*“high qualified physiotherapists who are ready for practical professional activities and scientific research at community, regional, national and international*

levels..” and also with reference to EU legislation (SER, page 9 ...”European Qualifications for Life Long Learning and Dublin Descriptors).

The aim of the programme is *“to educate high qualification physical therapists, who are ready for practical professional activities and scientific researches at the community’s, region’s, national and international levels; who are able to act in indefinite and complex situations, practically applying knowledge, values and skills working individually and in groups with patients of different age and with different ailments, cooperating in a specialists’ team, committing to people’s rights and professional ethics”* (SER, page 10) – it is appropriate according all national and international documents, although it was not easy to view it in the text. However, a detailed chart has been provided to show links between LOs and study programme (SER, Table 4) which makes this correlation clearer. LOs are also available to students in the programme handbook and on the universities’ websites, confirming that they are publically available.

The ET would like to mention, that there is an inconsistency in the use of the concepts: “physiotherapy” (physiotherapist), “physical therapy” (physical therapist) and “kinestherapy” (kinestherapist in the SER (page 8), title (pages 11-12) and description of subjects and study plan (pages 15-16). In the international context the terms physiotherapy and physical **therapy** are considered to be synonymous and are used as bearing the same meaning. However, the list of professions regulated by the European Commission names a profession of “physiotherapist”. World Confederation for Physical Therapy (WCPT) defines physiotherapy as an internationally acknowledged health care profession (WCPT, 1995: 22). The ET would suggest to unify the concepts and use one term, that of “physiotherapist” and “physiotherapy”. The ET comes to this conclusion following assessment of the documents presented by the University, following the meetings that were held with the staff and finally corroborated by the meetings with graduates and social partners.

Aims and LOs from such a joint programmes organised by two universities offer students the “possibilities to acquire more knowledge, abilities and experience than... one university can provide” – SER, page 5). ET thinks this makes the programme be different among all other physiotherapy programmes in Lithuania. KU already has a Bachelor’s level Occupational Therapy programme providing them with knowledge and expertise in rehabilitation education – (SER page 6).

SER writers followed EU legal (SER, page 9) and international professional norms in developing LOs by grounding the programme in World Confederation of Physical Therapy (WCPT) norms (SER, page 5). The SER indicates that an assessment of need was carried out of numbers of physiotherapists needed in the region. Social partners also expressed the need for more

physiotherapists at degree level in this region. They said at the meeting that there was a lack of PTs in these regions of Lithuania and they were interested to be involved in this programme because they wanted to employ those graduates. Despite this, the ET had some doubts about the number of students. It is not clear how the universities decide how many students should be admitted to the programme. During the site visits it became clear that SU, where there are better material resources and conditions, accepts fewer physiotherapy students than KU where learning facilities are not as good and not so spacious. It was also found, that almost all students pay for their studies.

Aims and LOs are consistent with type of studies (eg A1 “...to know the fundamentals of biomedical sciences necessary for attaining the professional aims of PT” and C1 “...establish PT diagnosis based on evaluation and interpretation of information and examination” and level of studies (eg. A3 “”apply scientific theories in the practice and research of PT” and C3 “systematic performance of PT programmes”) and level of qualification offered. (SER, Table 4)

The name of the programme “Joint Bachelor Study Programme in Physical Therapy” makes it clear that two universities are involved in the provision of a similar qualification also that there are LOs and content common to both universities. What was not fully clear in the beginning from the SER - if that two separate groups of students, one based at KU and the others at SU, are following the same programme of study. This became obvious and was confirmed during the visit of the ET to both universities and the discussions with teachers and students.

2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design meets legal requirements, agreed by both universities according to current requirements for study programmes. Curriculum design also fulfils the requirements in “Description of General Regulation for degree awarding at first cycle and integrated study programmes” approved by the Lithuanian Minister of Education and Science (2010).

Study subjects appear to be evenly spread through the eight semesters, with basic sciences (eg. Anatomy and Biochemistry in Semester I and Physiology and Biomechanics in Semester II, followed by specific physiotherapy subjects, such as Fundamentals of Physical Therapy and Massage in Semesters III and IV) although it is not entirely clear what is the order of courses in each semester. Table 5 (SER page 14-16) is incomplete only showing the 4 semesters in Years I and II. It was necessary to look at the more detailed information provided in Appendix 6 to gain a complete picture of the programme design for all 4 years. The ET would recommend making it clear in the curriculum document what is the order in which courses are

taught to show how students' knowledge and skills are developed and also to show progression of learning through the whole programme.

Students reported that there is very little repetition of subject matter, even when teachers come from one university to the other to teach core subjects. This demonstrates good co-ordination between the two universities.

However, it is not clear in the SER if the student experience at both universities is comparable. This was still not clear after meeting with all the people concerned (teachers, administrators, students and social partners) at the two universities.

The overall content of courses is consistent with bachelor's level of study. However, there seems to be an excessive amount of time and credits allocated to Hippotherapy (4 credits) compared to credits allocated to courses such as Orthopaedics, Traumatology and Physical Therapy (5 credits) and Rheumatology and Physiotherapy (3 credits). Where Hippotherapy is taught in the rest of Europe, it is not usually considered a core subject, but an elective course. The ET recommends reducing the credit hours for Hippotherapy if it remains a core course or making it an elective course.

The place and the purpose of the Alternative courses in the curriculum is not totally clear. In the SER it is stated, that Alternative course units correspond to the content of the field of study; students will be able to choose them in the fifth and seventh semesters (see Tables 4-5) (SER, p.16). But table No.4 shows only the links between the Outcomes of the Study Programme and Subjects, and there are no Alternative courses mentioned in table No. 5 at all. And this doesn't show how these Alternative courses can be chosen. For instance, can it happen that some students choose Fundamentals of Occupational Therapy and some Fundamentals of Social work? If so, according to SER (p. 12) Outcomes of the study programme D3 (will be able to work in an interdisciplinary team cooperating, creating team work atmosphere and taking social responsibility), there is a link with course Fundamentals of Occupational Therapy, but no link with course Fundamentals of Social work (and some others from Alternative course list). This needs to be clarified and deserves further explanation. The ET also has some doubts about the "weight" of Alternative courses – courses like Fundamentals of Occupational Therapy, Fundamentals of Social work are a part of separately existing Professions and has more "weight" comparing with course Compensatory Aids (this should be included into curriculum and to deal with compensatory aids is a part of Physiotherapist work) or courses like Non-traditional Methods of Treatment or Fundamentals of Ayurveda. So, the ET has some doubts if some Alternative courses are appropriate for this programme at all.

The content and methods appear to be appropriate to achieve LOs. LO A1 “*to know the fundamentals of biomedical sciences necessary for attaining the professional aims of physiotherapy*” is achieved through subjects such as Anatomy, Biomechanics, Physiology and Pathology. LO B2 “*to collect, analyse and critically evaluate information related to patients and clients*” is achieved through such subjects as Information Management and Methods and Statistics of Scientific Research. LO C3 “*to critically evaluate the results of applied physiotherapy*” is achieved through a variety of clinical settings in which physiotherapists practice and through the Final Thesis.

The overall scope of the programme is intended to “encompass the most important professional knowledge and abilities” (SER, page 17) and includes general subjects, and subjects specific to physiotherapy. However, subjects such as Evidence Based Practice and Patient Education are missing from the programme of study. Also, there seems to be little emphasis placed on study practice and learning in the various placements. The ET would strongly recommend that these subjects be reconsidered in the study programme.

Overall, the content of the programme reflects the latest achievements in science, art and technologies. The fact that this is a joint programme between a biomedical and a special education/disability university allows the curriculum offered to be broader in both teaching and research, to the benefit of student learning. The SER shows that most teachers are research active in the area of rehabilitation, but limited in physiotherapy itself. Inclusion in the curriculum of subjects such as health Management, Health Law and Bioethics demonstrate that subjects taught are current. As already mentioned, the ET expected to see Patient Education and Evidence Based Practice to have more focus. The move towards Problem Based Learning and use of mixed teaching methods involving virtual learning environments indicates the use of current educational technologies.

3. Staff

The study programme meets legal requirements as indicated on page 18 of the SER that the Law of Higher Education in the Republic of Lithuania ensures that at least 50% of modules/subjects should be taught by associate professors or professors.

The SER also describes the academic staff levels in the two faculties involved in the joint programme to indicate human resources available. Teacher work-loads and staff/student ratios specified by both universities indicate this.

Qualifications and research interests of teaching staff listed in the SER are adequate to ensure most LOs. KU teachers specialise in physical medicine, whilst SU teachers specialise in

social sciences and special education. However, it would be appropriate to have additional physiotherapy specialist teachers, especially at KU, to ensure core knowledge and skills in physiotherapy are well covered. Teacher curriculum vitae provided in Appendix 2 of SER show that only two physiotherapy teachers are at KU, while there are 10 involved at SU.

There is a range of teaching staff at each university providing basic scientific, research and applied therapeutic skills. This is achieved by means of some teachers travelling to the other university to provide classes for students. However, there are a limited number of physiotherapy specialists at KU (two people) to teach basic physiotherapeutic knowledge and skills, as indicated in the SER.

As the programme has only been running since 2011, staff turnover does not seem to be a problem. The SER indicates that teachers on this programme have between 10 and 30 years teaching experience, which could be sufficient to ensure an adequate provision of the programme.

Teaching staff have access to scientific journals, seminars and conferences in Lithuania. A Quality Assurance programme within the university structure helps to assure and improve quality of study programmes and there are career development plans for new teachers. The Evaluation Team would recommend that both universities enable teachers to improve their English language skills to facilitate sharing of knowledge and skills with students from English language sources in addition to Lithuanian sources.

There is evidence given (SER, Appendix 2) at SU of teaching staff being involved in research in movement disorders field and disability studies and at KU of staff involved in biomedical research fields. The list of research interests includes cardiovascular kinestherapy, rehabilitation of neurology patients, inclusive education for children, soft tissue rehabilitation, rehabilitation of mentally ill patients and educational technologies, all of which are appropriate and important for physiotherapists to learn. Employment of teachers considers the scientific publications and research activities of applicants (SER, page 18), so such research activity demonstrates teaching is based on current knowledge. Still ET would like to come to conclusion that it would be very beneficial to physiotherapy teachers actively participate in the education conferences of European Region of World Confederation of Physical Therapy (ER-WCPT) in order to give the Study programme Team better understanding of best practice in European physiotherapy education.

4. Facilities and learning resources

There is adequate provision of access to data bases and on-line learning at both universities (although the number of work stations is quite small for 50+ students at KU). There is a Distance Learning Room in each university for students to access materials from classes taught off site.

Physiotherapy skills rooms are available at each university. As ET saw during the site visit, they are adequate at SU but limited at KU, both in size and location. Practical teaching rooms at KU are based away from the main campus necessitating students and staff to spend time travelling to the place for teaching and self- study using practical equipment. The 50+ students at KU are divided into two groups for practical training. Teachers and students said that the rooms were not big enough for such numbers and ET site visit confirmed this. The ET would recommend that larger and closer practical classrooms be found to facilitate better student development of essential practical skills.

Laboratory equipment in physiotherapy skills rooms is adequate in both universities but facilities at KU need to be located closer to the main campus to encourage student self-study use. The SER (page 21) also mentions a new centre at KU for Distance Learning and social partner bases being used for practical activities.

Computer equipment is available but, as already mentioned work stations at KU are very limited for 50+ students. This limits the number of students who can access databases and other on-line materials at any time. As the SER (page 22) makes the point that both universities have enough internet access to international scientific databases, the ET would recommend increasing the number of work stations at KU.

Students mentioned that they could choose to do placements at KU or at SU, although there is no reference to this in the SER. Certain specialist placements are only available at SU (Hippotherapy and Nordic walking) and students wishing to access such placements from KU would need to travel. It is not fully clear which university would then be responsible for supervision and monitoring of KU students on SU placements. Students at KU commented that there were a limited number of places for placements for student at KU but there is no evidence for this in the SER. In fact, there is very limited information in the SER about the management of practical placements. The ET would recommend that arrangements for students' practical placements at both KU and SU be documented more clearly and more thoroughly.

Both universities have a wide choice of scientific books and journals but ET site visit demonstrated quite limited numbers of titles and limited copies specific to rehabilitation and

physiotherapy, many in English, that necessitates students to be fluent in that language. Students also commented to ET that there was not enough material available in the Lithuanian language.

5. Study process and student assessment

The admission requirements provided in the SER (pages 24 and 25) appear to be clear and appropriate. The ET has to mention that there is no justification for the number of admitted students in the SER. Nor was this clarified during the meetings with academic personnel. The SER only stated that stakeholders from Šiauliai and Klaipėda emphasised the lack of specialists with university education in the Western region of Lithuania (SER p. 6, 8-9). The statement “it is necessary to additionally educate over 4000 physiotherapists in Lithuania” (SER p. 9) is too general and includes no date when this estimation was done. Other questions need to be asked, such as ‘how many specialists are needed in this region’ and ‘what will be the situation after two years when the first graduates are able to work?’ Additionally there are three more Universities and six Colleges in Lithuania in addition to Siauliai and Klaipeda) offering physiotherapy education. To compare Lithuania with neighbouring countries with similar size populations; there are two Higher Education Institutions in Estonia and two in Latvia involved in physiotherapy education. Therefore the number of students expected and accepted and expected on the programmes at KU and SU should be carefully evaluated and substantiated.

The SER (page 6) states that the analysed study programme is “oriented towards problem-based learning (PBL) and corresponds today’s needs” but there is no evidence of the PBL process in courses descriptions etc. However, teachers at KU expressed the wish to change their teaching methods and move towards PBL in both physiotherapy and occupational therapy study programmes. The ET would like to encourage this move and thinks it is necessary for physiotherapy study programme.

Students are encouraged to participate in regional and national student scientific conferences. SER (page 26) states that the “development of students’ scientific research abilities is integrated into module studies from the first year of studies”. No numbers of students participating are given but examples of student participation mentioned include publishing best student research in the scientific faculty journal “Social Welfare” at SU and student participation in Faculty of Rehabilitation students’ international summer camps at KU, also mentioned by teachers at KU.

As yet, only two students on this programme have had the opportunity to participate in student mobility programmes (SER, page 27) as the programme has only been running since 2011 but teachers at SU indicated that they were looking for partners for Erasmus and Erasmus+.

Both universities appear to provide adequate levels of academic and social support (SER, page 27 – 28). However, it would be appropriate to employ more physiotherapy specialists at KU (see comments in paragraph under “Staff” in this Report).

Overall, assessment of student performance is similar at both universities and seems clear, adequate and publicly available. The SER also shows that assessment criteria are published at the beginning of each semester. This statement was confirmed by comments from students at SU. According to the SER, assessments are 50/50 cumulative marks and examinations. Cumulative marks are gained from case studies, projects, presentations etc. There is little evidence in the SER about the assessment of practical placements. The ET would recommend that this information is made available to all interested parties.

At the meeting with the students the ET gained the impression that the assessment of learning outcomes in some subjects is not so appropriate. Most of students both in SU and KU indicated that one of the assessment criteria is attendance. This could mean that if attendance is excellent they can get additional points (scores) for this that contribute to the final mark. The ET does not think that this shows real achievement of learning outcomes.

As the programme began in 2011 there are not yet any graduates from the programme. It is difficult to see any reference in the SER in relation to management of placements (such as student numbers at each location) or assessment of student performance on placement.

Social partners indicated at the meetings that they were satisfied with the performance of students on placement and that the students met social partners’ expectations but gave no student numbers involved at each placement.

Social partners participated in student assessment and some were also teachers on the programme. There is very little information about the organisation and management of practical placements, so it is not clear how many students are or have been on the placement. The ET recommends that this information be made available and clear.

6. Programme management

It is not clear from the SER that this project consists of two parallel programmes (one at each university) involving both students and teachers in academic mobility. This only became clear to the ET during the site visits and meetings. During ET site visits ET observed one teacher at both university locations and comments from SER writers, teachers and students indicate that some subjects are taught at both universities simultaneously, some teachers travel to the other university to teach their subject to both sets of students and on some occasions students

experience a mixture of virtual and academic mobility. The physical distance between the two universities involved makes it difficult to ensure parity between the two programmes.

According to the SER, responsibilities and monitoring are clearly allocated in each university. Table 1 in SER outlines responsibilities for the production of the SER and also a timetable for their work (Page 7, 8). According to the SER (page 31) study quality is ensured by a joint quality management group that meets every 3 months and is accountable to the university senates through the deans, heads of departments. Attempts have been made to ensure parity of teaching hours, courses and assessment methods between the two universities but it is not clear if there is similarity of student experience between KU and SU as students at SU expressed greater satisfaction with their education than students at KU at meetings with the ET.

Data are collected from regular student feedback student satisfaction being evaluated by surveys in the middle of each semester and by interview and focus group at the end of each semester (Table 12 on SER). The SER indicates that LOs data is analysed at the end of each semester Subject teachers also feedback to programme leaders and study quality centre at the end of each semester and social partners are surveyed, interviewed and take part in Focus Groups at the end of each academic year.

As this programme began in 2011 only internal evaluation is available. Even so, this data is being used to implement changes in programme delivery, according to SER writers, teachers and students at both universities. Quality of the study programme is assured by the internal study quality management system of each university and also the joint study quality management system. Students commented to ET that they were not sure how internal evaluation of the study programme was used to make changes to the programme.

Social partners said they were involved when the programme was set up, currently involved in teaching, assessment and feedback about student performance on placement. They have also been involved in preparations for writing the SER. Page 33 of SER mentions that feedback from social partners is discussed at department and faculty levels.

According to the SER, SU has a Centre for Quality Assessment, whose members have been involved in the development of this programme (see Figure 1 and Table 12 on SER). Students at SU were satisfied that they were getting value for money but students at KU were less satisfied because of limited lab/practical room size that made practical classes and self-study difficult and limited work stations in the library to access databases and other learning resources. The Evaluation Team would also recommend that both universities join and become active participants in the European Network of Physiotherapists in Higher Education (ENPHE) - it would be valuable for exchanging educational developments, facilitating mobility of staff and

students between physiotherapy educational institutions, stimulating the development of a European dimension in physiotherapy educational curricula and etc.

In conclusion, ET congratulates the initiative to start a joint study programme but also thinks that a stronger management and supervision of carrying out this programme is needed. Regarding the programme has no graduates, it is difficult to evaluate the programme in all areas but some improvements mentioned in this Report, also according the feedbacks from stakeholders, should be considered in Study Programme Committee.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Evaluation Team commends the provision of a joint bachelor degree in physiotherapy as an example of the European spirit of cooperation. We recommend the programme continues to develop in terms of educational theory and practice.
2. The Evaluation Team recommends that Tables in the SER give a clearer indication of the order in which courses are taught in order to show an academically coherent progression of student learning through the programme.
3. The Evaluation Team recommends that the two universities ensure that there is parity of student experience between the two sites in terms of teaching and learning facilities.
4. The Evaluation Team recommends that the practical physiotherapy facilities at Klaipeda be expanded to be adequate for 50+ students, also that these facilities be located closer to the main campus if possible.
5. The ET recommends that the programme team demonstrates clear substantiation that the number of students admitted is required to meet the needs for physiotherapists in the region.
6. The Evaluation Team recommends a reconsideration of credits allocated to physiotherapy core subjects mentioned in Curriculum, to better reflect best physiotherapy practice in Europe.

7. The Evaluation Team recommends that both universities join and become active participants in the European Network of Physiotherapists in Higher Education (ENPHE) and that physiotherapy teachers actively participate in the education conferences of European Region of World Confederation of Physical Therapy (ER-WCPT) in order to give the Study programme Team better understanding of best practice in European physiotherapy education.

IV. SUMMARY

A joint programme involving two universities separated by both distance and philosophy (one a biomedical university, the other emphasizing disability and movement disorders) has much to offer its students. Such a programme encourages the spirit of European cooperation and both universities are to be congratulated on their forward thinking. Additionally, such a programme offers students a wider perspective on impairment and disability than a biomedical university alone can offer and can produce a multi-skilled professional to meet the varied needs of patients.

The problems posed in managing such a joint programme are enormous, requiring constant communication at all levels between the universities. All forms of communication are needed to ensure parity of teaching and assessment and similarity of student experience if both groups of students are to receive a comparable degree and teachers are assured of equal fulfillment of aims and learning outcomes at both universities and achievement of similar standards.

There are issues involved in planning a curriculum that consists of two parallel groups of students at universities separated by some distance in which some teaching involves both students and teachers travelling and also some Distance Learning. These challenges need careful consideration, in terms of human and physical resources.

Any university bachelors' study programme needs a variety of different professionally qualified teachers in order to achieve the learning outcomes. Whilst accepting the need for basic sciences and social sciences specialist teachers, it is essential that the core subjects of physiotherapy be taught by physiotherapists with appropriate theoretical and practical knowledge to ensure that the professional standards of the World Confederation for Physical Therapy be met allowing the currency of a physiotherapy qualification from KU and SU to be accepted elsewhere in Lithuania and outside the country.

Adequate resources are essential to meet student learning needs and develop appropriately qualified health professionals. The need for equally adequate resources at KU and SU is important to ensure that students' learning experiences are comparable at both universities and that the degree awarded is consistent between the two universities.

Study process for any physiotherapy study programme needs to ensure that core professional subjects are given enough emphasis in the credit rating system of the curriculum, whilst less central but interesting and useful courses are given less emphasis. Physiotherapy being a practical profession as well as research based needs to demonstrate that sufficient

emphasis is placed upon the quality of learning during practical placements and how that learning is assessed.

It is important in the management of study programmes that the structure of the programme is clear to all involved in order that students' learning develops in an educationally coherent fashion and allows students to structure their learning in such a way that they become knowledgeable and skilful in their chosen profession, in this case physiotherapy. The programme is still relatively new, having started in 2011 and there is time to develop more robust programme management strategies before the next evaluation.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The joint study programme Physical Therapy (state code – 618B31001) at KLAIPĖDA UNIVERSITY AND ŠIAULIAI UNIVERSITY 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Staff	2
4.	Material resources	2
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	2
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	2
	Total:	13

*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:

Doc.dr. Valerie Lesley Dawson

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. dr. Herman Van Coppenolle

Mara Kulša

Doc.dr. Milda Žukauskienė

Tomas Sinevičius

Mindaugas Vilius

**KLAIPĖDOS IR ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETŲ PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS JUNG TINĖS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS KINEZITERAPIJA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 618B31001)
2014-07-18 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-409 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos universiteto ir Šiaulių universiteto jungtinė studijų programa *Kineziterapija* (valstybinis kodas – 618B31001) vertinama teigiamai.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	2
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	13

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

2 - Patenkinamai (tenkina minimalius reikalavimus, reikia tobulinti)

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

4 - Labai gerai (sritis yra išskirtinė)

<...>

IV. SANTRAUKA

Dviejų universitetų, kuriuos skiria ir atstumas, ir koncepcijų skirtumai (vienas yra biomedicinos mokslų universitetas, kitame daugiau dėmesio skiriama negaliai, judėjimo sutrikimams), jungtinė programa gali daug ką pasiūlyti studentams. Tokia programa paremia europinio bendradarbiavimo dvasią, abu universitetai yra sveikintini dėl tokio pažangaus mąstymo. Be to, ši programa studentams suteikia galimybę plačiau susipažinti su sutrikimais ir negalia, negu tai galėtų pasiūlyti vien biomedicinos mokslų universitetas, taip pat gali parengti įvairių įgūdžių turinčius specialistus, tenkinančius įvairių poreikių pacientus.

Problemos, kurių patiriama vadovaujant tokiai jungtinei programai, yra didžiulės, jas spręsdami abu universitetai turi nuolat palaikyti tarpusavio ryšius visais lygmenimis. Siekiant užtikrinti vienodą mokymą ir vertinimą, kad abiejų grupių studentai (jei jiems ketinama suteikti tokį patį laipsnį) įgytų vienodos patirties, o abiejų universitetų dėstytojai siektų tokių pačių tikslų ir mokymosi rezultatų bei būtų laikomasi tų pačių standartų, reikalingi visų formų ryšiai.

Rengiant programos turinį, skirtą dviem lygiagrečioms universitetų, kuriuos skiria tam tikras atstumas, studentų grupėms, susiduriama su svarbiais klausimais – kai kuriais mokymo tikslais ir dėstytojams, ir studentams tenka pakeliauti, numatomas nuotolinis mokymas. Sprendžiant šiuos uždavinius reikia kruopščiai apsvarstyti ir žmogiškuosius, ir fizinius išteklius.

Norint pasiekti bet kurio universiteto bakalauro studijų programos mokymosi rezultatų, reikalingi įvairių sričių profesionalūs ir kvalifikuoti dėstytojai. Nors pripažįstama, kad pagrindinių ir socialinių mokslų dėstytojai specialistai yra reikalingi, labai svarbu, kad

pagrindinius kineziterapijos dalykus dėstyti pakankamai teorinių ir praktinių žinių turinys kineziterapeutai, siekiant užtikrinti, kad būtų laikomasi Pasaulinės kineziterapijos konfederacijos profesinių standartų, leidžiančių KU bei ŠU įgyti kineziterapijos kvalifikacijai atitikti keliamus reikalavimus ir būti pripažįstamai ir Lietuvoje, ir užsienyje.

Tam, kad būtų tenkinami studentų mokymosi poreikiai ir rengiami reikiamos kvalifikacijos sveikatos specialistai, esminės svarbos turi tinkami išteklių. Norint užtikrinti panašią studentų mokymosi patirtį ir KU, ir ŠU ir kad abiejų universitetų suteikiami laipsniai nuosekliai derėtų, abiejuose universitetuose turi būti vienodai pakankamų išteklių.

Per bet kurios kineziterapijos studijų programos studijų procesą reikia užtikrinti, kad programos kreditų sistemoje būtų pakankamai pabrėžiami pagrindiniai profesiniai dalykai, o ne tokiems svarbiems, bet įdomiems ir naudingiems kursams svarbos būtų teikiama mažiau. Kadangi kineziterapija – tai ir praktinė, ir mokslo veikla grindžiama profesija, reikia parodyti, kad užtekinai svarbos teikiama ir mokymosi kokybei mokomosios praktikos metu, ir tam, kaip tas mokymas yra vertinamas.

Valdant studijų programas yra svarbu užtikrinti, kad programos struktūra būtų aiški visiems joje dalyvaujantiems, kad studentų mokymasis švietimo požiūriu būtų nuoseklus, studentai galėtų susikurti tokią savo mokymosi struktūrą, kuri padėtų jiems tapti profesionaliais ir kompetentingais pasirinktos profesijos, šiuo atveju – kineziterapijos, specialistais. Ši programa dar palyginti nauja, pradėta vykdyti 2011 m., tad iki kito įvertinimo dar yra laiko sukurti tvirtesnes programos valdymo strategijas.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Ekspertų grupė gerai vertina sudarytą galimybę įgyti jungtinį kineziterapijos bakalauro laipsnį kaip europinio bendradarbiavimo pavyzdį. Rekomenduojame toliau plėtoti šią programą, jos teorinių ir praktinių studijų aspektus.
2. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja savianalizės suvestinės lentelėse aiškiau nurodyti, kokia tvarka yra dėstomi kursai, kad būtų matoma akademinio požiūriu nuosekli studentų mokymosi pagal šią programą eiga.
3. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja abiem universitetams užtikrinti, kad studentų mokymo ir mokymosi patirtis abiejose mokymosi vietose būtų vienoda.
4. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja išplėsti Klaipėdoje esančias praktinei kineziterapijai skirtas patalpas, kad jos būtų tinkamos daugiau kaip 50-čiai studentų, taip pat, jei įmanoma, šias patalpas perkelti arčiau pagrindinio pastato.
5. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja, kad programos personalas aiškiai pagrįstų, kad priimamų studentų skaičius yra reikalingas regiono kineziterapeutų poreikiui patenkinti.
6. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja persvarstyti programos turinyje pagrindiniams kineziterapijos dalykams skiriamus kreditus, kad būtų tiksliau atspindėta geriausia Europos kineziterapijos praktika.
7. Ekspertų grupė rekomenduoja abiem universitetams prisijungti prie Europos kineziterapijos aukštųjų mokyklų tinklo (ENPHE) ir tapti aktyviais jo dalyviais, o kineziterapijos dėstytojams siūlo aktyviai dalyvauti Pasaulinės kineziterapijos konfederacijos Europos regione (ER-WCPT) švietimo konferencijose, kad studijų programos dėstytojai geriau suprastų geriausią Europos kineziterapijos mokymo praktiką.

<...>

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)