



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO
ŠEIMOS EDUKOLOGIJOS IR VAIKO TEISIŲ APSAUGOS
PROGRAMOS (621X20007)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

**EVALUATION REPORT
OF *FAMILY EDUCOLOGY AND PROTECTION OF CHILD
RIGHTS (621X20007)*
STUDY PROGRAMME
at KLAIPEDA 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>Šeimos edukologija ir vaiko teisių apsauga</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621X20007
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Edukologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (0); iššęstinė (3)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Edukologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	07-04-2006

INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme	<i>Family Educology and Protection of Child Rights</i>
State code	621X20007
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Educology
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Level of studies	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (0); part-time (3)
Scope of the study programme in credits	120 credits
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master in Educology
Date of registration of the study programme	07-04-2006

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

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2. Curriculum design.....	6
3. Staff	7
4. Facilities and learning resources	8
5. Study process and student assessment	9
6. Programme management	10
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	11
IV. SUMMARY	13
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	16

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Childhood Pedagogy (CPD) of the Faculty of Pedagogy (PF) at Klaipeda University (KU) implements the study second cycle programme of *Family Educology and the Protection of Child Rights (FEPCR)*. The faculty also implements doctoral studies in Educology. Most programmes in the Faculty of Pedagogy have undergone external evaluation within the last five years.

The FEPCR programme was implemented in 2010. It is rooted in a previous graduate programme of Childhood Pedagogy which was implemented during the period 1994 to 2009. The Self Evaluation Report (SER) gives a number of reasons for the revision of this programme. The reasons for these revisions are mainly connected to Lithuanian societal needs concerning pre-school and primary education, the increasing number of children from social risk families and the need for schools and their staff to understand social problems and create environments to ensure the protection of child rights. According to the SER the programme aims at integrating education and social services.

The programme can be offered at both fulltime and part-time level and there are no principal differences between these two. Admission to the programmes began in 2010 and to date has only admitted students to the part-time programme (120 ECTS over the period of three years) and hence the SER refers to this part-time programme.

The admission requirement for the programme is a Bachelors degree without any subject specifications. The most recent admission was in 2012 when 18 student were admitted, in 2011 a total of 11 students were admitted and in the first year (2010) a total of 7 students were admitted. The drop out rate from 2010 students was high and only three students graduated. This has improved radically for the 2011 and 2012 intake.

The procedure followed in writing this assessment report may be summarised as follows: the expert group received the self-assessment 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 expert group. Each member of the expert group undertook to take responsibility for asking questions related to specific areas of the programme during the visit. One member of the expert group took responsibility for synthesising and summarising the comments of the members of the expert group and preparing a brief exit presentation at the end of the visit. After the visit, the expert group held an evening meeting to discuss the programme and a 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

According to the SER the study programme “trains a qualified teacher/counsellor for work with children”. On the university website, this is expressed somewhat differently. On the website it is stated that the programme aims at training “family and child pedagogues/counsellors” and at the same time prepares students for third cycle level studies. These differences in descriptions highlight the lack of clarity surrounding this programme. No real clarifications of what constitutes the object of enquiry for educology, how this is integrated in the programme or what differentiates educology from education and/or pedagogy, were provided during meetings with staff during the visit of the evaluation team. Neither was the question clarified regarding what these students will actually be able to do after completion of their studies and how these graduates would differ from, for example, a social pedagogue. The use of the word “counsellor” is especially problematic since the amount of ECTS credits included in the programme concerning counselling is very unsatisfactory for developing the knowledge and skills of a professional counsellor. These are among the main problems associated with this programme. In addition, the name of the programme appears to give the impression of higher legal qualifications than are actually provided in the programme.

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 Assessment Report, it is not clear what the programme aims and learning outcomes are since, instead of listing the aims and learning outcomes, a list of competencies are provided., i.e. General competencies, Instrumental, Interpersonal and Systemic competencies, and Professional competencies, Educational, Research, Communication with Family, Protection of child rights and Family and child counselling competencies. Apparently these are derived from a Tuning project and although they contain substantial wording, they do not completely mirror the knowledge forms of The Lithuanian descriptors of study cycles V-2212 from Nov 2011; Knowledge & its application, Research skills, Special abilities, Social abilities and Personal abilities. Since the Lithuanian descriptors are the official descriptors these should be followed.

There appears to be a lot of confusion between the terms Aims, Learning Outcomes, Competences, etc in the documentation. When writing the aims of the programme the evaluation team would expect to find sentences such as:

- To give students an understanding of
 - To give students an appreciation of.....
 - To make students familiar with.....
 - To encourage students to.....
 - To ensure that students know.....
- etc.

Similarly, the Programme Learning Outcomes as written in the Self Evaluation Report did not assist the evaluation team in clarifying what students should be able to do on graduating from the programme, e.g. “to conceptualise with the help of different means of communication in different situations of social life...”. What must students be able to DO in order to demonstrate that they have achieved this? Hence, in writing learning outcomes, it is important to use active verbs, e.g.

- To **assess** the level of behavioural problems.....
 - To **work** as part of a multi disciplinary team of professional in
 - To **liaise** with other professionals in the area of
 - To **analyse** case studies of families that are
- etc.

There is also a problem with the formulation of module learning outcomes which are commonly written in terms of competences rather than as learning outcomes.

When it comes to labour market needs and employability aspects, the SER describes these needs well but as already mentioned, the kind of positions for which these student can apply and also compete for with other graduates is unclear.

Information about the programme is available on the KU website. Sometimes the programme information is in fact presented in a clearer way than in the SER document. However, when describing the profile of the programme certain claims are made, e.g. “graduates will be prepared to...solve effectively their (children and families) educational, psychological, legal and social problems” are given. These claims are not realistic and can be misleading for both students and employers, e.g. the programme does not contain any psychology modules.

2. Curriculum design

The curriculum design meets legal requirements. According to Table 3 in the SER, learning outcomes are spread evenly throughout subjects and semesters. However, on closer inspection, this Table raises a number of questions. The content is focused on the following areas: education, child protection, family education, psychology and the latest development of the programme

involves engagement with topics in the area of legal studies. In addition, the psychology component in terms of counselling activities is very small (only one subject) despite being informed during the visit that many psychological aspects are integrated into other subjects.

The programme management team explained that the latest development concerning the legal content (18 ECTS credits) in the curriculum arose from social problems encountered with an increasing number of families being classified as “at risk”. Legal aspects in the curriculum will receive even more attention in the future development of this programme in order to justify the part of the title “protection of child rights”.

However, the evaluation team observed some different emphases when meeting the management and SER teams. The management team emphasised the future development concerning the legal content while the SER team appeared to be more focused on the counselling content.

The stakeholders explained that kindergartens do not employ psychologists and social pedagogues. Therefore, graduates of this programme are expected to be able to perform as multi-skilled specialists and pedagogues, although they have not received sufficient training to act as social pedagogues in the whole educational sector. Moreover, the evaluation team raised the question about eventually overlapping content of this programme with the programme of Social pedagogy, which is also in the programme portfolio of the same faculty. We received confirmation that some overlapping does take place but that the programme under assessment is more focussed on cooperation with the pre-primary and primary education sectors and organisations, e.g. kindergartens.

The Pre-primary and primary education sectors appear to be very crucial in terms of designing the curriculum of this programme. Teachers confirmed and highlighted the need for specialists who will be able to work as team members, mediators, and collaborate with families and other stakeholders.

This Master’s level programme is needed to improve the qualifications of specialists who are working in pre-primary and primary education institutions. Therefore, the legal content, research skills, abilities to work with families, etc. create the need for a multi-skilled specialist.

Students have observed that some repetition of content occurs, e.g. in using SPSS for those who have graduated from the bachelors programme but this is not a real problem.

3. Staff

The programme meets legal requirements in that it is provided by a sufficient number of teachers holding PhDs in various disciplines and with qualifications that are relevant to the programme. The teacher student ratio is 1:9. The majority of teachers have completed their

doctoral studies at Klaipeda University but there are a few exceptions. Teacher mobility (outgoing) exist on a regular basis with a number of teachers working abroad every year. The professional profiles are relevant for the content of the programme and adequate to ensure the provision of the programme.

The evaluation team was impressed by the enthusiasm displayed by the teaching staff concerning their work in the programme and also by the fact that overall the teaching staff were satisfied with their working conditions. This is a very good “mark” both for teachers as a group and for management. All this was clearly verified when meeting the students. Conditions for professional development are good but need to be more directed towards issues such as learning outcomes, aligned teaching and learning and student centred learning. This will improve the areas where we have seen room for improvement, i.e. Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes and Curriculum Design.

The research areas in which teachers are involved are, according to their CVs, relevant to the programme. However, there is no active research reported within the field that constitutes the profile of the programme, i.e. the protection of child rights. In addition, there are no international publications listed. This in itself does not necessarily mean that the research, which is carried out is of a lower than average quality, but publishing in international journals *will* definitely improve the quality of the research. In addition publication of research at international level can contribute to the international knowledge base in important areas to do with children and adolescents in a changing society.

4. Facilities and learning resources

According to the SER the Faculty of Pedagogy has 27 classrooms, including 2 with 32 computerised workplaces, 1 specialised classroom (up to date computers with relevant software programmes installed, multimedia facilities installed), 8 classrooms with multimedia facilities installed (including 4 amphitheatres), and specialised rooms (for Psychological Counselling, Educational Innovations, Women’s Studies, and Career Counselling Centres, etc.), methodological labs, a modern library, and a conference hall seating 50 people. Altogether, the Faculty of Pedagogy has 1,220 workplaces available. In the period of 2011-2013, updating work was carried out on the facilities was done with the aid of EU Structural Support Funds and this work is ongoing.

The site visit confirmed that the premises, teaching and learning equipment and teaching materials were sufficient for the relatively small number of FEPCR students. Both teachers and students expressed satisfaction with the facilities and learning resources. The library resources were very impressive including a large amount of literature in the English language. As

mentioned in the SER and also observed when looking at student theses, teachers need to find ways to increase students' use of both research databases and literature published in the English language. One way would be to introduce assignments written in English and with requirements of a set number of references from international journals. Another way would be by making use of reading, commenting, presenting and discussing relevant articles published in the English language in seminars.

When it comes to arrangements for students' practice, the programme has a large number of bipartite agreements with local employers/organisations. When meeting representatives for the social partners these were very positive towards the students from this programme. They were very satisfied with the contacts they had with Klaipeda University and were genuinely positive about the value of the programme.

5. Study process and student assessment

The admission requirements for the programme specify a bachelor degree in any subject and with no entrance examinations or special requirements. The entrance score is derived from two parts of the bachelor degree; 70% of the score come from marks during studies and 30% from the bachelor thesis. Students can also obtain extra points for their entrance score if they have written a research paper. In a situation where there is competition for places, priority is given to students who have (a) produced a scientific publication and (b) have higher score on their bachelor thesis. After admission, students who have a bachelor degree in a subject other than educology will have to study additional lectures and accumulate a total of 30 ECTS credits. These admission requirements are very clear. However, considering the programme aims, the evaluation team considers that more attention needs to be given to the study background of students of this programme in order to guarantee that students have sufficient prior knowledge in relevant fields, e.g. psychology, sociology and education. Extra lectures of 30 credits may not be sufficient to make up for this shortfall.

Students are encouraged to participate in young researchers conferences. Seminars are also held every month to acquaint students with the opportunities of participating in different international programmes, projects and studies abroad. There are 12 bilateral Erasmus exchange agreements. However no student from the programme has gone abroad in the Erasmus program and the programme has had only two incoming international students (Poland and Azerbaijan). The reasons for these low mobility figures may probably be explained by the fact that this is a part-time programme where students have jobs and often also family responsibilities. A recommendation is therefore to find short term mobility options that are convenient for these types of students groups, perhaps in combination with bringing in international lecturers.

Considering the area of student support, Klaipeda University ensures an adequate level of both academic and social support including career support. This was clearly evidenced by the students who expressed their great satisfaction both with the teaching, the communication with teachers and the feedback they received from their teachers. The latter is a very good “mark” indeed, since this is a field where students in general often express criticism.

The assessment of student achievements appears to be orientated towards the aims and the intended learning outcomes but the mode of assessment appears to be mainly confined to written forms of assessment. A recommendation here is to introduce a greater variety of assessment methods and most importantly to ensure that the assessment is aligned with the learning outcomes and with the teaching and learning activities. In this is done, then the mode of assessment will give students the opportunity to provide evidence that they have achieved the intended learning outcomes. The assessment is based on a ten-point criteria-based scale and a cumulative grade. All the conditions concerning the assessment scale are publically available and, in general, the assessment system is very clear.

Only three students had graduated from the programme at the time of this evaluation. Two of these were currently working in schools. In view of the small number of graduates, it is difficult to evaluate this aspect of the programme. In addition, as already pointed out, there is a lack of clarity about the career options for these graduates and the types of positions for which they are eligible to apply.

The gender situation is heavily biased towards women, and the evaluation team suggests that a strategy be developed to make the programme more attractive to male applicants, e.g. when advertising the programme show photographs of male students in the workplace.

6. Programme management

There are three bodies that are responsible for decisions and implementation of the programme: the Senate and the Rectors Office, the Council of the Pedagogy Faculty and the Child Pedagogy Department. The roles between these three levels seem very clear according to the SER, and this was confirmed at the site visit. At Departmental level there is also a Programme Committee with clearly allocated responsibilities for each member. During the visit by the evaluation team, the teaching staff confirmed that sufficient time was allocated for the various tasks. This Programme Committee also includes the Head of Child Rights Protection Service of the Social Department of Klaipeda who is responsible for regular improvement of practices and assurance of feedback between the department and employers. The Department

implements long-term observation of the study programme and its management at the level of students, academic staff, and administration.

Departmental meetings are used for discussions of this programme, since students and social partners are invited to these when the need arises. The evaluation team recommends that a better solution would be to have regular Programme Committee meetings in order to include student and employer representation on a regular basis.

Surveys are carried out with students, graduates and employers on a regular basis and the results are used for improvement of the programme.

Data on student academic progress, statistics on student dropout rates, statistics on student and teaching staff mobility, data on the feedback of student surveys that assess the content of academic subjects and the quality of teacher performance are collected and analysed on a regular basis by the Department of Childhood Pedagogy and the Student Department.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations concern the programme, the staff and the students.

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

- The Programme Aims, Programme Learning Outcomes and Module (Course) Learning Outcomes must be clearly written.
- All information about the programme on the university website must be aligned with programme documentation.
- The career options available for graduates of this programme must be clarified.

2. Curriculum Design

- Consideration should be given to the merging of this programme with the existing social pedagogy programme at Klaipeda University in order to form one specialisation in the area of the protection of child rights. This will also mean changing the name of the programme. In view of the vagueness surrounding what constitutes the object of enquiry for Educology and how this is integrated in the programme, a recommendation is also made to end the use of this term.
- The programme's aim to train counsellors should be removed unless the emphasis in the programme is heavily increased in this area in combination with more focussed admission requirements.

- The emphasis on the legal studies aspects in the content of the curriculum needs to be approached with caution as graduates would not be qualified as legal specialists

3. Staff

- Professional development of staff needs to be more directed towards issues such as alignment of teaching and learning with the learning outcomes and also with assessment paying particular attention to student centred learning
- Institutional support is needed to encourage teachers to publish in international journals. Discussions should be initiated on what the hindrances are and how these can be eliminated, e.g. these hindrances may be related to national and/or institutional policies, lack of time, lack of sufficient language proficiencies or other reasons.

4. Facilities and learning resources

- Increase students' utilisation of electronic databases of international literature in the English language and also international publications in the English language, e.g. introduce assignments written in English and with requirements of a set number of references from international journals.

5. Study process and student assessment

- Admission requirements should be more focused on undergraduate qualifications that will guarantee that students have sufficient prior knowledge in relevant fields, e.g. psychology, sociology and education.
- Introduce a greater variety of assessment methods to ensure that the assessment is aligned with the learning outcomes and with the teaching and learning activities.
- In order to increase mobility try to find short-term options that are convenient for part-time students with jobs and family responsibilities.

6. Programme Management

- Whilst Departmental meetings are used for discussions of this programme and both students and social partners are invited to these when the need arises, it is recommended that a better solution would be to have regular Programme Committee meetings in order to include student and employer representation on a regular basis.

IV. SUMMARY

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.

The Aims and Learning Outcomes of the programme are not clearly defined and there is confusion in the use of terminology – particularly in the distinction between Aims, Learning Outcomes and Competences. The program learning outcomes and module learning outcomes are vaguely formulated in terms of competences rather than being written as learning outcomes. The name of the program does not give accurate information about the programme itself and it is not clear how graduates of the programme differ from graduates in social pedagogy. Information that is available on the university website needs to be aligned with programme descriptions in the Self Evaluation Report. It is difficult to distinguish this programme from a programme in social pedagogy. The programme will serve the Lithuanian public and labour market needs better when clarity is provided about the learning outcomes, the content, the qualifications and career pathways of graduates of this programme.

2 Curriculum design

It appears that there is overlapping of content of this programme with the programme of social pedagogy, which is also in the programme portfolio of the same faculty. The programme being evaluated in this report appears to be more focussed on cooperation with the pre-primary and primary education sectors and organisations, e.g. kindergartens.

The pre-primary and primary education sectors appear to be very crucial in terms of designing the curriculum of this programme. Teachers confirmed and highlighted the need for specialists who will be able to work as team members, mediators, and collaborate with families and other stakeholders.

This Master's level programme is needed to improve the qualifications of specialists who are working in pre-primary and primary education institutions. Therefore, the legal content, research skills, abilities to work with families, etc. create the need for a multi-skilled specialist. Over-emphasis of the legal content (18 ECTS credits) may give rise to expectations of future graduates that they would be qualified to work as legal experts in the field of child protection.

The curriculum design has to ensure a balance between social pedagogy, psychology and legal aspects in order to meet demands of stakeholders who give a value to multi-skilled specialists in the pre-primary and primary education sectors.

3 Staff

All legal requirements are fulfilled regarding teaching staff, number of staff and their qualifications are adequate and staff turn over is low. The evaluation team was impressed by the enthusiasm displayed by the teaching staff concerning their work in the programme and also by the fact that overall they were satisfied with their working conditions. This is a very good “mark” both for teachers as a group and for management. Conditions for professional development are good but need to be more directed towards issues such as learning outcomes, alignment of learning outcomes with teaching and learning and also with assessment. The research areas in which teachers are involved are, according to their CVs, relevant to the programme. However, there is no active research reported within the field that constitutes the profile of the programme, i.e. the protection of child rights. In addition, there are no international publications listed.

4. Facilities and learning resources

The visit of the evaluation team confirmed that the premises, teaching and learning equipment and teaching materials were adequate for the efficient running of the programme. Both teachers and students expressed satisfaction with the facilities and learning resources. The library resources were very impressive including a large amount of literature in the English language.

When it comes to arrangements for students’ practice, the programme has a large number of bipartite agreements with local employers/organisations. When meeting representatives for the social partners these were very positive towards the students from this programme. They were very satisfied with the contacts they had with Klaipeda University and were genuinely positive about the value of the programme.

5 Study process and student assessment

Admission requirements are clear but, since the main entry requirement is a bachelor’s degree in any subject but these requirements need to be reviewed in terms of students’ prior knowledge in relevant fields for this programme. The organisation of the study process generally supports the achievement of the learning outcomes but a wider variety of assessment methods is recommended. The assessment system is clearly defined but the mode of assessment seems to be confined mainly to written forms of assessment. Students have the opportunity to participate in research projects and also in mobility programmes. However, mobility figures are low and the possibility of short-term mobility options should be investigated. Both academic and social support is well provided, students express great satisfaction with this. Future career options for these students are unclear due to the close proximity of this qualification to degrees in social

pedagogy. There is also a gender problem with the programme as it does not appear to attract male applicants.

6. Programme management

Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of programme implementation are clear. This process does involve stakeholders, and the outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme. It may be advisable to have regular Programme Committee meetings instead of using department meetings for these issues, in order to be able to include student and employer representation on a regular basis. Graduates and stakeholders are in general very satisfied with the programme.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme Family Educology and Protection of Child Rights (state code – 621X20007) at Klaipeda 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	3
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:	15

*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

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
ŠEIMOS EDUKOLOGIJA IR VAIKO TEISIŲ APSAUGA (VALSTYBINIS KODAS –
621X20007)**

2013-07-31 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-295 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Šeimos edukologija ir vaiko teisių apsauga* (valstybinis kodas – 621X20007) vertinama teigiamai.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	15

* 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

Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai apibūdinti neaiškiai, kyla nesusipratimų dėl terminų naudojimo, ypač, kaip atskirti tikslus, studijų rezultatus ir kompetencijas. Programos studijų rezultatų ir modulio studijų rezultatų kompetencijos suformuluotos neaiškiai, vietoj to, kad būtų aprašytos kaip studijų rezultatai. Programos pavadinimas neatskleidžia tikslios informacijos apie

pačią programą, be to, nėra aišku, kuo šios programos absolventai skirsis nuo socialinės pedagogikos absolventų. Universiteto tinklalapyje pateikta informacija turi atitikti Įsivertinimo suvestinėje pateikiamus programos aprašus. Šią programą sunku atskirti nuo socialinės pedagogikos programos. Programa Lietuvos visuomenės ir darbo rinkos poreikius tenkins geriau jei studijų rezultatai, turinys, kvalifikacija ir programos absolventų karjeros galimybės bus aiškiau išreikštos.

2. Programos sandara

Pasirodo, šios programos turinys iš dalies sutampa su socialinės pedagogikos programos turiniu, kuri taip pat dėstoma tame pačiame fakultete. Šiose išvadose vertinama programa yra labiau susijusi su bendradarbiavimu tarp priešmokyklinio ir pradinio ugdymo sektorių bei organizacijų, pvz., vaikų darželių.

Priešmokyklinio ir pradinio ugdymo sektoriai yra itin svarbūs planuojant šios programos studijų turinį. Dėstytojai patvirtino ir pabrėžė, kad trūksta specialistų, kurie gebėtų dirbti grupėje, kaip tarpininkai ir galėtų palaikyti ryšį su šeimomis bei kitais socialiniais dalininkais.

Ši magistro studijų programa reikalinga tam, kad būtų keliama priešmokyklinio ir pradinio ugdymo institucijose dirbančių specialistų kvalifikacija. Todėl teisinis turinys, mokslinių tyrimų įgūdžiai, gebėjimas dirbti su šeimomis ir kt. sukuria įvairių gebėjimų turinčio specialisto poreikį. Per didelis dėmesys teisiniams dalykams (18 ECTS kreditų) gali sudaryti įspūdį, kad absolventai ateityje turės pakankamai kvalifikacijos dirbti teisės ekspertais vaiko teisių apsaugos srityje.

Studijų turinio modelis turi užtikrinti pusiausvyrą tarp socialinės pedagogikos, psichologijos ir teisinių aspektų, tam, kad atitiktų socialinių dalininkų reikalavimus, kurie vertina įvairių gebėjimų turinčius specialistus priešmokyklinio ir pradinio ugdymo sektoriuose.

3. Personals

Visi su dėstančiuoju personalu susiję teisiniai reikalavimai yra įvykdyti, personalo skaičius ir jo kvalifikacija yra adekvati, tačiau personalo kaita yra maža. Vertinimo grupei padarė įspūdį dėstančiojo personalo entuziazmas dėl jų darbo programoje, taip pat ir tuo, kad apskritai jie buvo patenkinti savo darbo sąlygomis. Tai labai geras „ženklas“, tiek kalbant apie dėstytojus, kaip grupę, tiek apie vadovybę. Profesinio tobulėjimo sąlygos yra geros, tačiau jas reiktų labiau sieti su tokiais aspektais kaip studijų rezultatai, studijų rezultatų derinimas su mokymu bei mokymusi, o taip pat su vertinimu. Mokslinių tyrimų sritys, kuriose dirba dėstytojai, vertinant pagal jų CV, yra susijusios su programa. Tačiau nėra pristatoma aktyvių mokslinių tyrimų programos profilio srityje, t.y. vaiko teisių apsaugos. Be to, nėra sudaryto tarptautinių publikacijų sąrašo.

4. Materialieji ištekliai

Vertinimo grupės apsilankymo metu buvo patvirtinta, kad patalpos, mokymo ir mokymosi įranga ir mokymo priemonės yra tinkamos efektyviam programos dėstymui. Dėstytojai ir studentai pareiškė, jog yra patenkinti patalpomis ir mokymosi ištekliais. Bibliotekos ištekliai labai išpūdingi, įskaitant tai, jog joje rasta daug literatūros anglų kalba.

Kalbant apie studentų praktikos planus, šios programos tikslais yra sudaryta daug dvišalių sutarčių su vietos darbdaviais / organizacijomis. Socialinių partnerių atstovai patikino, kad jie yra labai pozityviai nusiteikę dėl šios programos studentų. Jie buvo labai patenkinti su Klaipėdos universitetu palaikomais ryšiais ir nuoširdžiai teigiamai įvertino programą.

5. Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

Priėmimo reikalavimai yra aiškūs, tačiau, kadangi pagrindinis priėmimo reikalavimas yra turėti bet kurios srities bakalauro laipsnį, šiuos reikalavimus reiktų pakeisti ir atkreipti dėmesį į studentų jau turimas su šia programa susijusių sričių žinias. Studijų proceso organizavimas apskritai padeda siekti studijų rezultatų, tačiau rekomenduojame taikyti įvairesnius vertinimo metodus. Vertinimo sistema yra aiškiai apibrėžta, tačiau atrodo, kad vertinimo pobūdis yra daugiausiai rašytinio pobūdžio. Studentams sudaroma galimybė dalyvauti mokslinio tyrimo projektuose ir judrumo programose. Tačiau skaičiai apibūdinantys judrumą yra maži, todėl reiktų iširti galimybes dalyvauti trumpalaikėse judrumo programose. Gerai teikiama akademinė ir socialinė parama, studentai ja yra ypač patenkinti. Tolesnės šios programos studentų karjeros galimybės yra neaiškios dėl to, kad suteikiama kvalifikacija yra labai panaši į tą, kuri suteikiama socialinės pedagogikos programos studentams. Taip pat kyla problemų dėl programoje studijuojančių vyrų ir moterų santykio, kadangi ji nepritraukiama studentų vyrų.

6. Programos vadyba

Atsakomybė už sprendimus ir programos įgyvendinimo stebėseną yra aiški. Šiame procese nedalyvauja socialiniai dalininkai, o vidinių ir išorinių programos vertinimų rezultatai naudojami programai gerinti. Galime patarti šiuos klausimus spręsti reguliariai organizuojamuose Programos komiteto susirinkimuose, o ne katedros susirinkimuose, tam, kad būtų galima reguliariai į juos pakviesti studentų ir darbdavių atstovus. Apskritai absolventai ir socialiniai dalininkai yra labai patenkinti šia programa.

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

Rekomendacijos yra susijusios su programa, personalu ir studentais.

2. Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai

- Reikia aiškiai išdėstyti programos tikslus, programos studijų rezultatus ir modulio (dalyko) studijų rezultatus.
- Visa universiteto tinklalapyje skelbiama informacija apie programą turi atitikti programos dokumentacijoje nurodytą informaciją.
- Šios programos absolventams reikia aiškiau išaiškinti, kokios yra jų karjeros galimybės.

2. Studijų turinio modelis

1. Reiktų apsvarstyti klausimą, kaip sujungti šią programą su Klaipėdos universitete jau dėstoma socialinės pedagogikos programa, tam, kad būtų sukurta viena, su vaiko teisių apsauga susijusi, specializacija. Tam reiktų pakeisti programos pavadinimą. Kadangi edukologijos tyrimo objektas yra iš pažiūros neapibrėžtas ir nėra aiškiai nurodyta kaip jis integruojamas į programą, taip pat rekomenduojame nebenaudoti šio termino.
2. Iš programos reikėtų išbraukti tikslą ruošti konsultantus, nebent programos metu būtų itin sustiprintas dėmesys šiai sričiai, o taip pat būtų labiau akcentuojami priėmimo reikalavimai.
3. Studijų turinyje nereikėtų itin akcentuoti teisės studijų aspektų, kadangi absolventai negalės dirbti kvalifikuotais teisės specialistais.

3. Personalias

1. Personalo profesinis mokymas turėtų būti labiau susietas su tokiais klausimais kaip dėstymo ir mokymosi siejimas su studijų rezultatais, taip pat su vertinimu, konkretų dėmesį skiriant mokymuisi, pritaikytą studentams.
2. Reikia siekti institucijos paramos, kad dėstytojai būtų skatinami skelbti publikacijas tarptautiniuose leidiniuose. Reikia inicijuoti diskusijas, kas tam trukdo, ir kaip tuos trukdžius pašalinti, pvz., šie trukdžiai gali būti susiję su nacionaline ir (arba) institucijų politika, laiko trūkumu, nepakankamu kalbos mokėjimu ar kitomis priežastimis.

4. Materialieji ištekliai

1. Reikia skatinti studentus naudotis elektroninėmis tarptautinės literatūros anglų kalba ir tarptautinių leidinių anglų kalba duomenų bazėmis, pvz., skirti užduotis anglų kalba ir nurodyti reikalavimą naudoti tam tikrą skaičių nuorodų iš tarptautinių leidinių.

5. Studijų procesas ir studentų darbo vertinimas

1. Priėmimo reikalavimai turėtų būti labiau koncentruoti į studentų kvalifikaciją, kuri garantuotų, kad studentai turi išankstinių tam tikrų sričių žinių, pvz., psichologijos, sociologijos ir edukologijos.
2. Derėtų įvesti įvairesnių vertinimo metodų, kad būtų galima užtikrinti, jog vertinimas prilygsta studijų rezultatams ir mokymo bei mokymosi veiklai.

3. Siekiant didesnio judrumo, rekomenduojame rasti trumpalaikių galimybių, kurios būtų patogios išstestinių studijų dirbantiems ir šeimas turintiems studentams.

6. Programos vadyba

1. Nors katedros susirinkimų metu diskutuojama apie šią programą, ir juose esant reikalui kviečiami dalyvauti ir studentai, ir socialiniai partneriai, rekomenduojame verčiau organizuoti reguliarius Programos komiteto susirinkimus, kuriuose nuolat galėtų dalyvauti studentų bei darbdavių atstovai.

<...>

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