



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETO
EDUKOLOGIJOS PROGRAMOS (612X10011)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *EDUCATION* (612X10011)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at SIAULIAI UNIVERSITY

Grupės vadovas: Dr Declan Kennedy
Team Leader:

Grupės nariai: Prof. Lena Adamson
Team members: Prof. Eyvind Elstad
Dr Daiva Lepaitė
Student Donatas Piragis

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Edukologija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612X10011
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Pedagogika
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4); iššėstinė (5,5)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Pedagogikos bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	17-02-2004

INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme	<i>Education</i>
State code	612X10011
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Pedagogy
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Level of studies	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (4); part-time (5,5)
Scope of the study programme in credits	240 credits
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Pedagogy
Date of registration of the study programme	17-02-2004

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2. Curriculum design.....	7
3. Staff.....	9
4. Facilities and learning resources.....	10
5. Study process and student assessment	10
6. Programme management.....	12
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	12
IV. SUMMARY	14
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.

I. INTRODUCTION

The programme Education Studies (with specialisation of *Family Pedagogy and Child Rights Protection*) is offered by the Faculty of Education of Siauliai University (SU). In the Self Evaluation Report (SER) submitted to the evaluation team, the qualification is described as a “Bachelor of Pedagogy; Social Pedagogue”, i.e. an undergraduate degree and corresponds to the first cycle of the Bologna Process. Clarification of the qualification was obtained during the visit and it is clear that graduates of the degree are qualified as social pedagogues rather than as teachers. The evaluation team discovered in the meetings with the administration staff, the self assessment team and members of faculty that the formal qualification listed in the documentation does not exist anymore and that all graduates since 2012 will be awarded with pedagogues’ qualification. This change reflects the current state of Pedagogues’ training Regulation (2012-05-15 order No. V-827). Students who are undertaking the course at present also confirmed that they are aware of this change. Moreover, these students do not consider themselves preparing for a career in teaching but rather as obtaining a recognised professional qualification to work as social pedagogues. That was also confirmed by the Self Evaluation Report as activities of graduates from this programme are more related to the field of social pedagogy than to a career in teaching.

The programme leads to a bachelor degree in pedagogy, is of four years duration for full time students and five years duration for part time students. The ECTS credit system was applied to the programme in 2012 and 240 ECTS credits are accumulated by students over the duration of the programme.

The Faculty of Education of Siauliai University clearly has great experience and expertise in the area of teacher education and other areas of education and offers degrees at bachelor, masters and doctoral level. An external international quality assessment of the programme was carried out in 2010 and the programme was accredited for three years. As a result of this quality assessment it was decided that the situation whereby two qualifications (teacher and social pedagogue) were offered within the programme should be changed and now only one specialised programme *Family Pedagogy and Child Rights Protection* is offered.

This preliminary report is based on the Self Evaluation Report on Education Studies (specialisation: Family Pedagogy and Child Rights Protection) provided by Siauliai University (dated October 2012) and on the data gathered by the evaluation team during the on-site assessment visit on 22nd May 2013. It is clear that a lot of work has been put into preparing the Self Evaluation Report. However, the evaluation team had to work extremely hard to try to make sense of the huge volume

of material supplied. The Self Evaluation Report was overloaded with too much descriptive information and not sufficient analysis, clarity or evaluation was evident in the Self Evaluation Report.

The administration backup received by the evaluation team was excellent. All the necessary arrangements were in place to ensure that everything went very smoothly during the visit, e.g. the meeting room was ideal, each group arrived on time, coffee/tea were readily available, lunch was provided, etc.

The procedure followed in writing this Evaluation Report may be summarised as follows: the evaluation team received the Self Evaluation Report in April 2013. A Preliminary Report was then prepared in which various matters to be discussed during the visit were highlighted by the members of the evaluation team. Each member of the evaluation team undertook to take responsibility for asking questions related to specific areas of the programme during the visit. One member of the evaluation team took responsibility for synthesising and summarising the comments of the members of the evaluation team on the day of the visit and preparing a brief exit presentation at the end of the visit. After the visit, the evaluation team held an evening meeting to discuss the programme and another follow-up meeting (duration of one day) to discuss the evaluation of this programme and two other programmes, the assignment of marks and the drawing up of a first draft of the final report. Further discussions took place via e-mail to produce the final draft of the report.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

It is clear that a lot of work has been put into the section describing the programme aims and learning outcomes. A great deal of writing is used and this needs to be shortened and made more concise. There is confusion in this section and in subsequent sections in the use of terminology, e.g. aims, purpose, learning outcomes, competences, etc. This confusion is particularly evident in the section where a list of Learning Outcomes is required but a list of competences is given.

One of the key “Action Lines” of the Bologna Process is the adoption of a system of easily readable and comparable degrees, i.e. it should be clear to anybody reading a description of the degree programme what are the aims and learning outcomes of the programme. This description should be clearly understood by staff, students, external evaluators, social partners, etc. Hence there is a need for simplicity and clarity. From reading the documentation supplied in the Self-Evaluation Report none of the members of the evaluation team had a clear idea of the aims and programme learning outcomes of this programme due to the vague way in which they were written. The aim of the programme as stated in paragraph 18 (page 6) consisted of a very long and broad sentence which

was difficult to understand clearly. However, as the expert group discussed the programme with the staff, students and stakeholders, the aims of the programme became a lot clearer. In fact, we were very impressed by the aims that emerged out of the discussions some of which could be summarised as:

- To give students an understanding of the essential areas of social pedagogy and...
- To give students an appreciation of the work of the social pedagogue and ...
- To enable students to experience the important role of the social pedagogue in society through placement opportunities and...

etc.

Similarly, the Programme Learning Outcomes as written in the Self Evaluation Report did not assist us in clarifying what students should be able to do on graduating from the programme, e.g. e.g. “to cognise educational phenomena”. What must students be able to DO in order to demonstrate that they have achieved this? However, it was clear from the discussions with the students, alumni and stakeholder that this programme had some really excellent Programme learning outcomes. Some of these that emerged from the discussions are:

Programme Learning Outcomes

- To **assess** the level of behaviour of students experiencing difficulties in their lives and...
- To **work** as part of a multi disciplinary team of professional in
- To **refer** problem children to the appropriate authorities and liaise with these authorities on behalf of the child and to.....
- To **liaise** with parents, school directors, social workers and other professionals to help solve problems in the area of....

etc.

There are some good examples of Module (Course) Learning Outcomes in the course descriptions, e.g. students will be able to:

- **Conduct** psychological assessment ...
- **Acquire** skills of planning, organisation.....
- **Define** key concepts and terms of the science of psychology.
- **Evaluate** psychoanalytic, humanistic and socio-cognitive theories of personality.....
- **Explain** the importance of the community’s formation, development,

However, good examples are rare in the Self Evaluation Report and many of the statements under the heading of “Learning Outcomes” in the Self Evaluation Report need to be re-written using the appropriate guidelines in the literature, e.g. the use of active verbs in writing learning outcomes. A considerable amount of confusion appears to have been caused by the Tuning Project, e.g. when asked to list learning outcomes, a list of competences was given in the Self Evaluation Report. It is important to remember that it is not necessary for universities to become involved in the Tuning Project in order to be compliant with the Bologna Process. Members of faculty from universities all

over Europe are grappling with the challenges raised by the Bologna Process. It was most impressive and refreshing to hear one senior member of staff commenting that “we are still learning”. This is true of many universities in which inservice training on the writing of Programme Learning Outcomes, Module Learning Outcomes, Constructive Alignment, etc. has not been provided.

It is also important to ensure that the Learning Outcomes, Teaching and Learning Activities and also Assessment are aligned with each other, i.e. that constructive alignment exists in the programme.

From the information contained in the Self Evaluation Report and the discussions held during the visit it is clear that this programme is in line with the requirement of the Dublin descriptors of Cycle 1 of the Bologna Process, are based on the professional requirements, public needs and needs of the labour market. It is also clear that the programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered. There was extensive discussion during the visit regarding the confusion about the name of the programme reflecting the qualification and career opportunities of graduates. Hopefully, this confusion will be rectified in the near future.

2. Curriculum design

From the documentation supplied and the information received during the visit, it is clear that the curriculum design meets the legal requirements in Lithuania and that the contents of the modules are appropriate for achieving the programme learning outcomes. However, it is difficult to get an appreciation of the structure of the programme due to the lack of clear summary tables or a diagram outlining the overall structure of the programme in the documentation supplied. The situation regarding electives is not clear from the documentation and it emerged during the discussions with staff that some are missing from the documentation. From an analysis of the documentation, it does appear that the study subjects (modules) are consistent with the type and level of the studies and are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The scope of the programme is definitely sufficient to ensure the achievement of the learning outcomes and the content of the programme reflects the latest achievements in this area.

Despite the problems identified, it is clear that the curriculum design incorporating pedagogical, psychological, legal, socio cultural aspects, etc. is well balanced and there is great credit due to the programme team in ensuring a good overall balance in the programme structure.

It would be helpful if the programme could show how the Programme Learning Outcomes map on to the module (course) learning outcomes, i.e. how the programme Learning outcomes are reflected in the module learning outcomes.

The evaluation team considers that the word “Education” in the programme title gives rise to a lack of coherence with the current state of the curriculum design. Moreover, taking into account the general classification of study field in Lithuania (2010-02-19 order No. V-222 from the Ministry of Education and Science) Education studies can be considered only in the second cycle while pedagogy or teacher training studies is meant to be as a first cycle studies.

The main challenge that needs to be addressed in the curriculum design is to give the programme a clear identity in the area of social pedagogy.

The evaluation team realises that the curriculum design of this programme is facing permanent changes and adjustments to the national regulation, especially in the field of teacher training. Therefore, the curriculum we have received in the Self Evaluation Report and the curriculum since 2012 are slightly different concerning the subdivision of different parts that are needed in order to fulfil the requirements of the bachelors degree in Pedagogy, professional qualification of pedagogue (60 ECTS credits) and training in the specializations (Family pedagogy and child rights). Family pedagogy and child rights are considered to be as a distinctive feature of the curriculum. This is also related to the field of social pedagogy. The self evaluation team confirmed that the curriculum is constructed in the following way:

- pedagogical studies consist of 60 ECTS credits.
- social pedagogy studies – 90 ECTS credits.
- university electives – 45 ECTS credits.
- specialisation studies (family pedagogy and child rights) – 30 ECTS credits.
- general university studies – 15 ECTS credits.

This allocation of credits is meeting the legal requirements with a total of 240 ECTS credits. On the other hand, the electives do not appear to be fulfilling the criteria of electives *per se*. There was a great lack of clarity in the documentation regarding the situation about electives and the evaluation team was left wondering if authentic electives actually existed in the programme.

During the visit, the evaluation team was informed that discussions were still taking place about changing the title of the programme and some action will be taken in order to formalise a qualification of social pedagogue.

In terms of the content of the programme, students expressed a desire to study in more detail the area of behavioural and emotional problems of children with special needs. The need for more

practical training was highlighted as well as practice in working with families at risk. These issues are very important and urgent in the field of social pedagogy.

In short, it was very difficult for the evaluation team to get a clear picture of the structure of the programme from the poor quality of the documentation supplied in the Self Evaluation Report. However, from the clarification obtained during the visit, it does appear that overall the programme is well balanced. The curriculum demonstrates good identity with similar programmes for training graduates in the area of social pedagogy. Hence, a change of title of the programme must be considered by the programme management team.

3. Staff

This programme is still in transition and working for a new identity. The members of staff are clearly committed to the programme, are working hard and are enthusiastic in their teaching. The evaluation team were impressed by this enthusiasm and commitment to the programme.

The programme is taught by 32 full-time teachers. It appears that the programme meets legal requirements in terms of the number of staff, the qualifications of the staff and the staff turnover being adequate to ensure that the learning outcomes are achieved and that there is good provision for running the programme in an efficient and effective manner. The international links that exist are very impressive. The Teaching Staff are well qualified to teach their specialist areas. The institution creates conditions for the professional development of staff but there is a clear need to specifically direct this towards the Bologna Process and in particular towards writing programme learning outcomes, module learning outcomes and constructive alignment. A considerable amount of confusion appears to have been caused by the Tuning Project in terms of understanding of the requirements of the Bologna Process and the distinction between terms such as aims, learning outcomes, competences, etc.

An analysis of the research publications shows very little research publications in international publications and this is definitely an area for improvement. When discussing this matter with the staff they pointed out that publishing in international publication involves costs that have to be paid by them personally. This must be a misunderstanding as publishing in international journals is free. In addition, the evaluation team would like to point out that there is a great difference between journal publications and conference proceedings and these cannot be considered as being of equal status. Overall, the area of publications in international journals is definitely an area for improvement. It does not appear that the University has a strategy to support its staff in carrying out research. It would have been helpful if the Self Evaluation Report had indicated the research areas and research funding obtained.

4. Facilities and learning resources

The faculty is well equipped with adequate lecture rooms, rooms with special equipment relevant for special education (for instance numeracy didactics and science didactics), group discussions and library. Rooms are mainly accessible also for students with movement disability. All facilities and equipment appear to be adequate in size and quality of provision.

The evaluation team was very impressed with the library facilities. The library provides access to international and national journals. We found several textbooks of relevance for special pedagogy. However, when it comes to the newest textbooks of the field there is room for improvement. The students require more copies of the relevant textbooks that are on the recommended reading list.

The library staff are most helpful to students and staff and provide adequate help and provide very good support to the students. The group discussion rooms are a great feature of the library and the students are very fortunate to have this facility available.

The computer equipment is of a good standard. Teachers and students have good access to useful technologies and facilities for pedagogical practice and training. When it comes to pedagogical use of interactive didactic technology, it appears that there is room for some improvement, e.g. the use of special pedagogical simulations at the campus area. The access to the learning resources is generally good and mainly adequate, but we would like to have seen evidence of greater usage of the electronic teaching and learning resources. A design of clear expectations of academic work could influence students at this programme to improve their academic achievement. This is a major challenge for a study programme entitled "Education". A challenge for the staff would be to try to foster greater use of relevant technological applications and to provide evidence of this usage, e.g. in project work and theses.

5. Study process and student assessment

The admission requirements are of a good standard for the selection of students. There is clearly a gender problem in the programme as it does not appear to attract male students. This issue clearly has to be addressed and a strategy put in place to try to attract more male students.

The assessment system is traditional and needs to have more variety, e.g. in the area of practical placement it appears that no visits to the teaching practice site are made by members of faculty and no evaluation of the students' performance in the workplace is carried out. Most of the assessment appears to be in written form and in poster presentations.

The organisation of the overall study process appears to be good and ensures an adequate provision of the programme in terms of delivery and also in terms of the achievement of the learning

outcomes. Feedback from the students indicates that it would be helpful if extra emphasis could be placed on achieving learning outcomes in the areas of English language, writing official documents and working with children with disabilities.

Students reported that they were happy with the provision of mobility programmes. However, on examination of the documentation regarding the numbers of students engaged in mobility programmes, it appears that the numbers are quite small. Perhaps different strategies could be planned to increase this number, e.g. small time periods of training spent in other countries, summer camps, etc.

From speaking to students, it was clear that there is a good level of academic and social support available. Individual study plans appear to be working well. Students are involved in conducting research and in attending conferences. Students collaborate with lecturers in writing scientific articles in local journals.

The field of employment of graduates is very impressive, e.g. care homes, child protection, schools, municipalities, social pedagogues, social workers, etc. It is clear that the programme is succeeding in many of its aims and that students are benefitting in terms of the knowledge, skills and attitudes developed during the programme.

When examining a sample of theses, the evaluation team found that the chosen topics were relevant topics but that this sample mirrored a rather narrow age range for their studies - mostly teenagers. Also, it was difficult to find any international references. The methods that were used were predominantly quantitative (questionnaires) with descriptive statistics as sole method of analysis. The evaluation team would like to see a greater emphasis on critical thinking in the theoretical parts of the theses.

The assessment system of student performance was not clear to the evaluation team. Students described assessment situation as very flexible both in terms of format and in terms of how much individual assignments are counted in the final assessment of a semester. The assessment team wondered if this system of assessment contained too much flexibility. Most assessments seemed to be in the written format, sometimes poster presentations, but no other examples were mentioned, e.g. communication skills. It does not appear that any assessment of students' performance when on placement in the work place is carried out. Feedback on examination performances appears to be simply in the form of grades. When students were asked if they would like to have more individual feedback, the majority of the group indicated „yes“. Whilst it may not be feasible to give individual feedback to large groups, perhaps class feedback could be given in the form of what was answered well, difficulties encountered, common mistakes made, etc.

6. Programme management

There appears to be a very good system in place of programme management. The documentation supplied during the visit showed a clear structure of programme management and responsibilities of the various members of staff.

Information and data on the implementation of the programme and evaluations are collected and used for improvement of the study. It is the evaluation team's impression that the internal quality assurance measures are present, function well and are adequately used. However, it would have been helpful if evidence could be supplied of the *regular* collection of information and data on the implementation of the programme and the analysis of these data. This would help to ensure that the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient. Overall the students and social partners expressed satisfaction with the system in place to allow them to give feedback and to be consulted about the management of the programme so that this feedback can be used for the improvement of the programme. In the feedback received during the visit, it was great to hear that a good sense of partnership existed between staff, students and social partners. The outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used to improve the programme and the roles and responsibilities of staff and administrators at the different levels seem to be quite clearly allocated.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.

- The programme aims and learning outcomes need to be clearly written according to the guidelines in the international literature.
- The presence of constructive alignment should be shown in the programme, i.e. that the Learning Outcomes, Teaching and Learning Activities and also Assessment are aligned with each other.

2. Curriculum design

- Provide a clear summary table or a diagram outlining the overall structure of the programme, i.e. showing the year, title of module covered in each year and number of ECTS credits associated with each module.
- Include details of all elective modules in the summary table.
- Show how the Programme Learning Outcomes map on to the module (course) learning outcomes.

- The programme needs to be given a clear identity in the area of social pedagogy. Hence, consideration should be given to changing the programme title to *Pedagogy* or *Family Pedagogy* in order to reflect the current status of the curriculum design.
- Integrate issues on children with special needs into the content of relevant subject areas

3. Staff

- Provide additional continuing professional development training to staff on the Bologna Process and on the writing of programme learning outcomes, module (course) learning outcomes and constructive alignment.
- Develop a strategy to improve the research culture (as reflected in publications) of the Department, e.g. identify research areas and implement a system to assist staff in publishing in international journals.

4. Facilities and learning resources

- Provide more copies of the relevant textbooks that students have to read, i.e. the recommended reading expected of all students.
- Foster greater use of relevant technological applications and provide evidence of this usage, e.g. in project work and theses.

5. Study process and student assessment

- Develop a strategy to address the gender problem in the programme.
- Plan a strategy to increase the number of students on mobility programmes, e.g. small time periods of training spent in other countries, summer camps, etc.
- In the theses, encourage students to make use of international publications and to use a wider variety of research techniques and research instruments.
- Clarify the system of assessment in operation and incorporate a wider variety of assessment techniques which are less traditional and more modern and innovative.

6. Programme management

- Provide evidence of the *regular* collection of information and data on the implementation of the programme and the analysis of the data collected.

IV. SUMMARY

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.

The aims of the programme, the Programme Learning Outcomes and the Module (Course) Learning Outcomes are vaguely written in the Self Evaluation Report and are not in accordance with the guidelines in the international literature. Despite these shortcomings, it is clear from our discussions during our visit and from studying the Self Evaluation Report that the type and level of studies and the level of qualification offered are satisfactory and that a lot of good learning outcomes are actually being achieved. It was wonderful to hear such positive feedback from the students and social partners and it was clear that many really good learning outcomes were being achieved. Hence, it would be good for the faculty to “celebrate” this achievement by expressing the Aims, Programme Learning Outcomes and Module Learning Outcomes clearly in the documentation.

2. Curriculum design

It is clear from the evidence gathered during the visit that the curriculum design meets the legal requirements in Lithuania and that the contents of the modules are appropriate for achieving the programme learning outcomes. The Self Evaluation Report was overloaded with too much descriptive information and not sufficient analysis, clarity or evaluation. This problem made it very difficult for the evaluation team to get an appreciation of the structure of the course due to the lack of clear summary tables or a diagram outlining the overall structure of the programme. The situation re electives is not clear from the documentation and it emerged during the discussions with staff that some are missing from the documentation. Despite the problems identified, it is clear that curriculum design incorporating pedagogical, psychological, legal, sociocultural aspects, etc is well balanced and there is great credit due to the programme team in ensuring a good overall balance in the programme structure. There is a clear need for improvement in order to ensure coherence between the programme title, the curriculum design and the qualification awarded.

3. Staff

The members of staff are clearly committed to the programme, are working hard and are enthusiastic in their teaching. The evaluation team were impressed by this enthusiasm and commitment to the programme.

It appears that the programme meets legal requirements in terms of the number of staff, the qualifications of the staff and the staff turnover being adequate to ensure that the learning outcomes are achieved and that there is good provision for running the programme in an efficient and

effective manner. The institution creates conditions for the professional development of staff but there is a clear need to specifically direct this towards the Bologna Process and in particular towards writing programme learning outcomes, module learning outcomes and constructive alignment.

An analysis of the research publications shows very little research publications in international publications. Hence, the area of publications in international journals is definitely an area for improvement. It does not appear that the University has a strategy to support its staff in carrying out research.

4. Facilities and learning resources

The faculty is well equipped with adequate lecture rooms, rooms with special equipment relevant for special education (for instance numeracy didactics and science didactics), group discussions and library. Rooms are mainly accessible also for students with movement disability. All facilities and equipment appear to be adequate in size and quality of provision.

The evaluation team was very impressed with the library facilities. The library provides access to international and national journals. The evaluation team found several textbooks of relevance for special pedagogy. However, when it comes to the most recently published textbooks in the field there is room for improvement. The students require more copies of the relevant textbooks that are on the recommended reading list.

The computer equipment is of a good standard. Teachers and students have good access to useful technologies and facilities for pedagogical practice and training. When it comes to pedagogical use of interactive didactic technology, it appears that there is room for some improvement, e.g. the use of special pedagogical simulations at the campus area. The access to the learning resources is generally good and mainly adequate, but we would like to have seen evidence of greater usage of the electronic teaching and learning resources. A challenge for the staff would be to try to foster more use of relevant technological applications and provide evidence of this usage, e.g. in project work and theses.

5. Study process and student assessment

The admission requirements are of a good standard for the selection of students. There is clearly a gender problem in the programme as it does not appear to attract male students.

The assessment system is traditional and needs to have more variety, e.g. in area of practical placement it appears that no evaluation of the students' performance in the workplace is carried out. Students reported that they were happy with the provision of mobility programmes but the participation rate is low. Students are involved in conducting research and in attending conferences. Students collaborate with lecturers in writing scientific articles in local journals.

The field of employment of graduates is impressive and it is clear that the programme is succeeding in many of its aims. The topics covered in the theses are relevant topics but they cover a rather narrow age range, lack international references and there is a need to use a wider range of research techniques and research instruments.

The assessment system of student performance was not clear to the evaluation team. Students described assessment situation as very flexible both in terms of format and in terms of how much individual assignments are counted in the final assessment of a semester. Most assessments seemed to very traditional.

6. Programme management

There appears to be a very good system in place of programme management. The documentation supplied during the visit showed a clear structure of programme management and responsibilities of the various members of staff.

It is the evaluation team's impression that the internal quality assurance measures are present, function well and are adequately used. However, it would have been helpful if evidence could be supplied of the *regular* collection of information and data on the implementation of the programme and the analysis of these data. In the feedback received during the visit, it was great to hear that a good sense of partnership existed between staff, students and social partners. The outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used to improve the programme and the roles and responsibilities of staff and administrators at the different levels seem to be quite clearly allocated.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme Education (state code – 612X10011) at Siauliai University is given **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by fields of assessment.

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

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas:
Team Leader:

Dr Declan Kennedy

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. Lena Adamson

Prof. Eyvind Elstad

Dr Daiva Lepaitė

Student Donatas Piragis

**ŠIAULIŲ UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
EDUKOLOGIJA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612X10011, 61207S134)
2013-06-25 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-249 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Šiaulių universiteto studijų programa *Edukologija* (valstybinis kodas – 612X10011, 61207S134) vertinama teigiamai.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	14

* 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

1. Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai

Įsivertinimo suvestinėje neaiškiai aprašyti programos tikslai, programos studijų rezultatai ir modulio (dalyko) studijų rezultatai, taip pat jie neatitinka tarptautinėje literatūroje pateikiamų

gairių. Nepaisant šių trūkumų, iš apsilankymo metu kilusių diskusijų ir išstudijavus Įsivertinimo ataskaitą, tapo aišku, kad studijų tipas bei lygis ir suteikiamos kvalifikacijos lygis yra patenkinamas ir kad realiai yra pasiekiami daug gerų studijų rezultatų. Buvo puiku išgirsti tiek daug teigiamų studentų ir socialinių partnerių atsiliepimų, taip pat buvo aišku, kad buvo pasiekta daug tikrai gerų studijų rezultatų. Taigi fakultetui vertėtų pažymėti šį pasiekimą dokumentacijoje aiškiai aprašant tikslus, programos studijų rezultatus ir modulio studijų rezultatus.

2. Programos sandara

Iš apsilankymo metu surinktų įrodymų tapo aišku, kad studijų turinio modelis atitinka Lietuvoje keliamus reikalavimus, ir kad modulių turinys yra tinkamas programos studijų rezultatams siekti. Įsivertinimo ataskaitoje pateikiama per daug aprašomosios informacijos ir trūksta analizės, aiškumo ar įvertinimo. Dėl šios problemos vertinimo grupei buvo sunku įvertinti kurso struktūrą, nes nebuvo pateiktos aiškios suvestinės lentelės ar diagramos, nurodančios bendrąją programos struktūrą. Dokumentacijoje neaiškiai išdėstyta situacija dėl pasirenkamųjų dalykų ir, kaip paaiškėjo diskusijų su personalu metu, kai kurie iš jų į dokumentaciją iš viso nėra įtraukti. Nepaisant įvardytų problemų, yra aišku, kad studijų turinio modelis, kuris apima pedagoginius, psichologinius, teisinius, sociokultūrinius ir kitus aspektus, yra gerai subalansuotas, o programos darbuotojai daug prisideda prie to, kad būtų užtikrintas palankus bendras programos struktūros balansas. Atsiranda poreikis geresnėms sąlygoms, kad būtų užtikrinta sąsaja tarp programos pavadinimo, studijų turinio modelio ir suteikiamos kvalifikacijos.

3. Personalas

Personalo nariai yra aiškiai atsidavę programai, sunkiai dirba ir į savo dėstymą žiūri su entuziazmu. Vertinimo grupei paliko įspūdį jų entuziazmas ir atsidavimas programai.

Akivaizdu, kad programa atitinka teisinius reikalavimus dėl personalo skaičiaus, kvalifikacijos ir personalo kaitos, kad būtų pasiekiami studijų rezultatai, ir kad programa aprūpinama pakankamai, kad galėtų būti efektyviai ir veiksmingai vykdoma. Institucijos sukuria sąlygas personalo profesiniam tobulėjimui, tačiau kyla aiškus poreikis jas susieti su Bolonijos procesu, o ypač su programos studijų rezultatų bei modulio studijų rezultatų rašymu ir konstruktyviu atitikimu.

Mokslinių tyrimų publikacijų analizė parodo, kad dėstytojai skelbia mažai mokslinių publikacijų tarptautiniuose leidiniuose. Taigi, publikacijų skelbimo tarptautiniuose leidiniuose klausimą be abejo reikia spręsti. Nepanašu, kad universitetas turėtų strategiją, kaip padėti personalui vykdyti mokslinius tyrimus.

4. Patalpos ir studijų rezultatai

Fakultetas turi pakankamai tinkamai įrengtų auditorijų, auditorijų su specialia įranga, tinkamų specialiajam ugdymui (pavyzdžiui, skaičiavimo ir mokslo didaktikai), grupinėms diskusijoms ir bibliotekai. Auditorijos taip pat prieinamos ir judėjimo negalią turintiems studentams. Visų patalpų ir įrangos dydis bei kokybė yra tinkama.

Vertinimo grupei paliko įspūdį bibliotekos patalpos. Bibliotekoje teikiama prieiga prie tarptautinių ir vietos leidinių. Vertinimo grupė rado kelis vadovėlius, susijusius su socialine pedagogika. Tačiau kalbant apie naujausius šios srities vadovėlius, jų reiktų daugiau. Studentams reikia daugiau tų vadovėlių, kurie įtraukti į rekomenduojamų perskaityti sąrašą.

Kompiuterinė įranga atitinka gerus standartus. Dėstytojai ir studentai turi gerą prieigą prie naudingų technologijų ir pedagoginei praktikai bei mokymui tinkamų patalpų. Kalbant apie dialoginės didaktikos technologijų naudojimą pedagoginėms reikmėms, matosi, kad jas reikia gerinti, pvz., universitete naudoti specialiųjų pedagoginių sąlygų imitavimo programas. Apskritai, prieiga prie mokymosi rezultatų yra gera ir daugiausia adekvati, bet mes būtume norėję pamatyti įrodymų, kad elektroniniai dėstyto ir mokymosi ištekliai yra naudojami dažniau. Personalui būtų buvęs iššūkis pasistengti įsisavinti daugiau naudos iš atitinkamų technologinių programų ir teikti įrodymus, kad šie yra naudojami, pvz., projektuose ir baigiamuosiuose darbuose.

5. Studijų procesas ir studentų vertinimas

Priėmimo rezultatai atitinka gerą studentų atrankos standartą. Programoje vyrauja problema dėl moterų ir vyrų skaičiaus, nes čia nepritraukiama pakankamai studentų vyrų. Vertinimo sistema yra tradicinė ir galėtų būti įvairesnė, pvz., kalbant apie praktikos atlikimą, pasirodo, kad studentų darbas praktikos atlikimo vietoje nėra vertinamas. Studentai atsakė, kad juos tenkina judrumo programų pasiūla, tačiau dalyvavimas jose yra mažas. Studentai įtraukiami į mokslinių tyrimų vykdymo ir konferencijų lankymo veiklą. Studentai bendradarbiauja su dėstytojais, kai rašo mokslinius straipsnius vietos leidiniuose.

Absolventų įdarbinimo galimybės yra gana įspūdingos, todėl aišku, kad gyvendinami daugelis programos tikslų. Baigiamuosiuose darbuose atskleidžiamos susijusios temos, tačiau jos apima gana siaurą amžiaus intervalą, juose trūksta tarptautinių nuorodų ir turi būti naudojamas platesnis mokslinių tyrimų metodikų bei mokslinių tyrimų instrumentų spektras.

Vertinimo grupei buvo neaiški studentų darbo vertinimo sistema. Studentai nurodė, kad vertinimo situacija yra labai lanksti tiek formato atžvilgiu, tiek individualų užduočių skaičiumi kurių įvertinimai sumuojasi galutiniame semestro vertinime. Dauguma vertinimų buvo labai tradiciniai.

6. Programos vadyba

Įgyvendinama labai kokybiška programos vadybos sistema. Iš apsilankymo metu pateiktos dokumentacijos matyti, kad programos vadyba turi aiškią struktūrą, ir kad visi personalo nariai turi aiškias atsakomybes.

Vertinimo grupei susidarė įspūdis, kad yra įgyvendinamos, gerai funkcionuoja ir adekvačiai naudojamos vidinės kokybės užtikrinimo priemonės. Tačiau būtų naudinga, jei būtų pateikti įrodymai, jog informacija ir duomenys apie programos įgyvendinimą ir šių duomenų analizavimą yra renkami *reguliariai*. Apsilankymo metu buvo malonu girdėti atsiliepimus, kad vyksta naudingas bendradarbiavimas tarp personalo, studentų ir socialinių partnerių. Vidinio ir išorinio programos vertinimo rezultatai naudojami programai tobulinti, o personalo ir administracijos vaidmenys ir įsipareigojimai įvairiais lygmenimis atrodo yra aiškiai paskirstyti.

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai

- Programos tikslus ir studijų rezultatus reikia aiškiai išdėstyti pagal gaires ir tarptautinę literatūrą.
- Programa turi atspindėti konstruktyvų suderinimą, t.y., kad Studijų rezultatai, Mokymo ir mokymosi veikla bei Vertinimas yra suderinti tarpusavyje.

2. Programos sandara

- Reikia pateikti aiškią glaustą lentelę ar diagramą, parodančią bendrą programos struktūrą, t.y. nurodant metus, kasmet dėstomo modulio pavadinimą ir kiekvienam modeliui skiriamą ECTS kreditų skaičių.
- Glaustoje lentelėje reiktų pateikti detalų visų pasirenkamų modulių aprašą.
- Reiktų parodyti, kaip programos studijų rezultatai atsispindi modulio (studijų dalyko) studijų rezultatuose.
- Programai reiktų suteikti aiškią socialinės pedagogikos tapatybę. Todėl vertėtų apsvarstyti galimybę pakeisti programos pavadinimą į Pedagogika arba Šeimos pedagogika, tam, kad būtų atspindėta dabartinio studijų turinio modelio padėtis.
- Reiktų integruoti klausimus apie specialiųjų poreikių turinčius vaikus į susijusių dalykų turinį.

3. Personalas

- Personalui reikėtų vesti papildomus nuolatinio profesinio mokymo kursus apie Bolonijos procesą, apie tai, kaip rašyti programos studijų rezultatus, modulio (dalyko) studijų rezultatus bei apie konstruktyvų suderinimą.
- Reikėtų sukurti strategiją, kaip gerinti katedros mokslinių tyrimų kultūrą (kaip atsispindi publikacijose), pvz., nustatyti mokslinių tyrimų sritis ir įgyvendinti sistemą, kuri padėtų personalui skelbti publikacijas tarptautiniuose leidiniuose.

4. Materialieji ištekliai

- Reikėtų parūpinti didesnę kiekį studentams privalomų perskaityti atitinkamų vadovėlių kopijų, t.y. iš visų studentų reikalaujamų perskaityti vadovėlių.
- Vertėtų gauti daugiau naudos iš susijusių technologinių programų ir teikti įrodymus, kad jos naudojamos, pvz., rašant projektus ir baigiamuosius darbus.

5. Studijų procesas ir studentų vertinimas

- Derėtų sukurti strategiją, kaip subalansuoti programą studijuojančių vyrų ir moterų skaičių.
- Reikėtų suplanuoti strategiją, kuri padidintų judrumo programose dalyvaujančių studentų skaičių, pvz., trumpi mokymo laikotarpiai kitose šalyse, vasaros stovyklos ir kt.
- Reikėtų skatinti studentus rašant baigiamuosius darbus naudotis tarptautiniais leidiniais ir naudoti daugiau mokslinių tyrimų technikų bei mokslinių tyrimų instrumentų.
- Vertėtų išaiškinti veikiančią vertinimo sistemą ir į ją įtraukti įvairesnių vertinimo technikų, kurios būtų mažiau tradicinės ir modernesnės bei inovatyvesnės.

6. Programos vadyba

- Reiktų teikti įrodymus, kad informacija ir duomenys apie programos įgyvendinimą yra renkami *reguliariai*, ir kad surinkti duomenys yra analizuojami.

<...>

Paslaugos teikėja patvirtina, jog yra susipažinusi su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso¹ 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)

¹ Žin., 2002, Nr.37-1341