



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto
SOCIOLOGIJOS PROGRAMOS (612L30003, 61205S102)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *SOCIOLOGY* (612L30003, 61205S102)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Vytautas Magnus University

Grupės vadovas: Team Leader:	Prof. Jukka Gronow
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Doc. Viktoriya Sereda Dr. Vladislav Volkov Prof. Vida Kanopienė Saulius Olencevičius Monika Kavaliauskė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2012

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Sociologija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	612L30003, 61205S102
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Sociologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (4), iššęstinė (6)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	240
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Sociologijos bakalauras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1989; Atnaujinta registracija: 1997-05-19 Įsakymas 565; Atnaujinta registracija: 2003-11-11, Nr. 2-253; Atnaujinta registracija: 2009-08-31, Nr. 1-73

INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme	<i>Sociology</i>
State code	612L30003, 61205S102
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Sociology
Kind of the study programme	University studies
Level of studies	first
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (4), part-time (6)
Scope of the study programme in credits	240
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Bachelor of Sociology
Date of registration of the study programme	1989; renewed registration: 1997-05-19 Order 565; renewed registration: 2003-11-11, No. 2-253; renewed registration: 2009-08-31, No. 1-73

© 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	5
3. Staff	7
4. Facilities and learning resources	8
5. Study process and student assessment.....	9
6. Programme management	10
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	10
IV. SUMMARY	12
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	14

I. INTRODUCTION

Vytautas Magnus University (hereinafter – VMU) is quite unique in Lithuania due to the fact that it has been established only when Lithuania became independent with intensive collaboration with Lithuanians from USA and Australia. Also the main uniqueness of VMU is the spirit of “liberal arts” university.

Sociology programme was taught in the university from its establishment (1989), therefore it has a quite long tradition and history at VMU.

The site visit was undertaken on 10th of October 2012. The expert team was led by Prof. Jukka Gronow and the other expert team members comprised of Ass.Prof. Viktoriya Sereda, Dr. Vladislavs Volkovs, Ms. Monika Kavaliauskė, Prof. Vida Kanopienė and Mr. Saulius Olencevičius. A later meeting was held to discuss the programme further and write the report.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme aims have an interesting component which according to the self-evaluation report is in need of improvement: the consolidation of the sociological identity in the national context and the development of an attractive image of sociology. The Report also states that these tasks have already been acknowledged and carried out by using public relations and expanding expert-based knowledge. It would be interesting to know how one can know that the image of sociology has improved.

Therefore, one of the programme aims should be not only to increase the awareness about sociology in Lithuania, but to encourage students after graduating from Sociology already in the BA level to be more active in society with solving its problems and expressing their opinion on various public issues.

In the self evaluation report VMU stated that “**the general aim** of the Undergraduate Sociology study programme is to prepare qualified sociologists capable of analyzing social processes of diverse institutions in society, identifying socially oriented problems, introducing possible tools for solving those problems and applying sociological knowledge in various areas in accordance with scientific and ethical principles”. After meeting with sociology BA students it was obvious that students understand the broad aim of Sociology as field of science, also they see themselves active in the future in quite diverse organizations and they are quite eager to apply their knowledge in reality. Therefore, it can be stated that the main general aim of Sociology BA programme is implemented in practice.

In self evaluation report the programme objectives are quite clear and practical, however, one of them (“To develop the skills in carrying out empirical research applying different qualitative and quantitative research methodologies and apply the empirical data in professional activities”) is not fully achieved as a lot of students complained about the lack of quantitative research methods and the practical skills to apply them in the practice. The same complaint came from the interviews with social partners. However, it is not the programme objective that has to be corrected, but more efforts and more changes need to be implemented in order to improve the situation in practice in the study programme.

The learning outcomes of Sociology BA programme were stated clearly, however, the question is whether they are not too high and difficult to achieve for BA level students. The examples would be “9. Develop the skills of impartial interpretation and evaluation of social phenomenon; 10. Develop the ability to apply the theoretical and practical training by identifying and examining social issues and by finding the most optimal practical solutions to solve social problems.” These outcomes are more relevant to the MA level, where students should really learn how to solve social issues. In the BA level they should be mainly introduced to social problems identification.

Authors of Sociology programme BA self evaluation report have stated their fields of improvements very correctly, naming that “the programme aims and learning outcomes areas to be improved: (1) it is important to strengthen the participation of social partners in the process of monitoring and implementation of the expected learning outcomes of the programme. [...]. (2) It is important to develop cooperation with foreign universities seeking the integration [...] into the European higher education area [...]. (3) The problem of the consolidation of sociological identity in the national context.” Experts of self evaluation group agree with these self-critical statements and therefore did not evaluate this part of Sociology BA programme with highest marks.

The expert group agrees in general with the following statements:

- the programme aims and learning outcomes are well defined, clear and publicly accessible;
- the programme aims and learning outcomes are based on the academic and/or professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market;
- the programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered;
- the name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other.

2. Curriculum design

The scope of the study programme in credits is 240 ECTS and its length 4 years. The structure and the content of the Sociology Undergraduate programme are in line with all the legal requirements. The evaluation group has expressed their concern that the students might be confused with the rather complicated curriculum design of the Sociology BA programme. However, during the interviews with the students and teachers we learned that the 1st course students have an introduction seminar about which subjects to choose. Sometimes when the students want to choose some subject, the department of sociology provides some additional consultations. In addition, during the first two weeks of the autumn term in September students can freely decide what selective subjects to choose. It would, however, help the students in making their choices if the course descriptions included more precise information about the expected use of a particular course as part of fulfilling the general programme aims. Many course descriptions are quite short and in some cases give the impression of repeating and overlapping with other courses.

The studies are divided into four levels, A, B, C and D. C is the “real” sociological part of the studies. A group consists of common university subjects. It looks like English language takes the major part of these. B group is the most original one in this programme: students are required to choose at least one subject from each field, that is fields totally other than social sciences, like humanities or natural science. Students see these subjects unique to VMU and have obviously chosen various courses from all kinds of fields according to their needs or interest.

However, one could imagine two kinds of problems with studies like these: first, students are not very motivated since they cannot see their relevance to their major subject (cf. relatively high dropout rates during the first years of study) sociology, and reading just one relatively short course in each subject gives after all a rather little and superficial knowledge, just a taste of the subject. Furthermore, the group of D studies is mainly comprised of languages. Looks like one can pass both B and D by studying mainly English. However, during the meeting the students told that they choose subjects related to their interests that they think are useful to them after finishing BA, and even if they would be interested in for instance some rare languages (ex. very specific and demanded from the society like Japanese or Korean languages).

For the experts' group it was not clear why some courses are obligatory and why some of them are elective. Programme teachers explained that in the end the studies committee decides what courses are obligatory, which selective, and what changes should be made. Also they pay attention to the demand from students. However, students confirmed that due to small groups, students often have little to choose and must go to the same lecturers and take the same elective courses, which they see as a drawback.

The expected learning outcomes of these other than sociological studies during the first years (group A and B) are very high:” to get a broad basic education due to the VMU’s unique system of liberal studies, develop openness to the world and acquire the fundamentals of liberal thought and high quality of studies.” Considering the relatively small amount of time dedicated to these subjects and their rather – possibly – scattered nature these reclamations sound a bit “far out.”

Another option would be that students could choose minor subjects from among the other social sciences which could give them a wider view of the society and deepen their understanding of the modern society and its problems. In this programme, only psychology and anthropology are represented from these studies areas that are closer to social sciences. The reasons for the visible presence of anthropology seem to be mostly quite practical. Anthropology seems to be a particularly important subject at Vytautas Magnus (cf. also several anthropology courses in the MA programme).

The Administration and the teachers explained that in the future they want to incorporate even more anthropology courses into the sociology BA programme, due to the fact that they have a programme in anthropology in MA, and because of the availability of experienced teachers. However, the expert group expressed the concern that the students might have great difficulties in understanding what sociology really is if the discipline social anthropology gets even more weight in the study programme.

More specifically the sociology studies in the programme seem to cover most of the usual topics. However, here are some critical comments concerning specific courses:

Philosophy. The curriculum has not very detailed information about the role of this course in the development of sociological thinking. The content of the subject has not information about the philosophers of XX-XXI centuries (only such names were mentioned as Plato, L. Feuerbach, K. Marx, F. Nietzsche).

Psychology of personality, Social psychology. The curriculum does not have detailed information about the role of these courses in the development of sociological thinking. Especially for these courses it would be very important, since Psychology of personality and Social psychology have much common themes, ideas, and scholars with sociology.

Social Relations. The design of this course is described as “an introduction to the discipline of sociology.” And the contents of the course are very close to the general topics in sociology without actually concretizing the specific topic of “social relations” in society.

Social Anthropology, Current Issues of Social Anthropology. The curriculum does not have very detailed information about the role of these courses in the development of sociological thinking which would be important because of the large share of these courses in subjects’ group C. The design of the course „Current Issues of Social Anthropology” is different from other courses. It does not offer any information about the structure of the topics.

Qualitative Social Science Methods. The design of the course is different from other courses. It has not any information about the structure of topics.

Political Sociology. The course’s description mentions the names of some scholars of the political sociology (Marx, Weber, Habermas) without mentioning for instance the representatives of liberal, neoliberal, communitarian, conservative etc. thoughts.

Sociology of Economics. The design of the course does not include detailed information about the titles of the concrete lectures and seminars.

Social Problems. The design of the course does not have information about the titles of its concrete lectures and seminars.

Sociology of Media and Communications. The design of the course does not have information about the titles of the concrete lectures and seminars.

Social Theory. It is difficult to understand what the genuine sociological essence of this course is, because most of its topics overlap with the philosophy of recognition, philosophy of knowledge etc. (for instance such as „The limits of cognitions. Rationalism, empiricism, relativism. Problematics of objectivity. Evolution of science. Science, ideology and utopia”).

The self-assessment report also refers to the need of improving the students’ practice. This issue was observed during the meeting with the teachers and later with students. The main problem are the practice places/organizations, because students often go to various public organizations like schools, hospital, religious groups and even to their own department of sociology, instead of going for instance to business organizations, to market research companies, public governmental institutions and other companies. More orientation to business companies might help the students later to find a job more easily.

3. Staff

The Department of sociology has a really qualified staff, which is quite young in age, but with doctoral or even professor’s degrees. During the meeting it seemed that the staff is really confident with the subjects they teach, has the ability at least once a year to go to conferences, and some of them been to foreign universities for longer visits. The department of sociology attracts also foreign teachers to teach short intensive courses. The students are very satisfied with this initiative. However, the amount of the visiting teachers should be increased in the BA level, as it is currently more dedicated to MA level students. During the last year the teachers have written altogether 4 monographs, which show that teachers not only concentrate on teaching but also on research activities.

The academic staff participates actively in international scientific conferences, writes scientific articles, some of which are published in international journals, some in national journals. The publishing amount and quality is above the average standard in Lithuania. The staff is very involved in international and national research projects. They have received big grant from the Lithuanian research council, which proves that the qualification of the staff is high, as this grant is provided only for very qualified and promising research groups and topics. The staff of the department of sociology participated in a FP7 project, which is quite rare in the field of

social sciences in Lithuania. Therefore, it can be stated that their research activities are on a really high level.

After the interviews with the administration and teachers it is obvious that the staff of sociology department managed to combine its research activities, projects, writing articles with other kind of academic work, like teaching and students consultations. The ability to balance their activities is very important since the students benefit from it at least indirectly: they can see how active person can balance their different work tasks and even their personal life.

What is very important, the VDU has a working motivation system according to which, depending on their published articles, projects, initiatives per year teachers can increase their salary by 15-25%. Teachers can also study foreign languages free of charge, which helps them to speak and write English language very well in order to be able to participate in projects, conferences and etc.

On the other hand, the self-assessment report “complains” that the distribution of the total workload of the teachers between their pedagogical and academic activities is not balanced. The complaint that teachers do not have time enough to dedicate to their research activities is quite commonly met in many university departments of the world. In order to really determine whether the teaching work load of some of the teachers is unusually excessive at Vytautas Magnus would demand more detailed analyses and more detailed data not available to this expert group.

The Department of sociology has 12 Phd students. These Phd students can act as advisors for BA level students. PhD students also teach during seminars, when they are enrolled in the university as assistants and are paid accordingly which is a very good motivational factor for PhD students to be involved in the university life and to become later regular teachers.

4. Facilities and learning resources

Faculty of Social Sciences at Vytautas Magnus University is located almost in the centre of Kaunas which makes the faculty easily accessible by public transport, but the parking of cars is a more complicated problem. However, no complains were expressed by the VMU teachers or students. Faculty premises are shared with the faculty of humanities, foreign languages institute and main library of the whole Vytautas Magnus University. Therefore, students of Sociology programme can very easily use not only the ordinary library resources of their own faculty, but also the resources of the whole university, which is very convenient for such a programme as sociology which quite often needs interdisciplinary literature sources.

The students of sociology can use reading and computer rooms, electronic databases and borrow specific sociological literature also directly from the department of sociology. Big part of the literature is in English as students are encouraged to use English literature from the very first course. Working hours of the library are convenient (from 8 to 18 from Monday to Friday and from 9 to 16 on Saturdays, whereas one reading room even works up to 21 during working days, up to 18 on Saturday, and during terms even from 9 to 16 on Sundays).

Students expressed some minor complains that sometimes there are not enough of some specific books for particular lectures, but usually they solve this problem with copying required pages and sharing among each other.

The auditoriums are various in size (from smallest with round table to big auditoriums), but all are equipped with computer and Multimedia. Also specific classrooms exist for computer related courses, where the computers are equipped with SPSS programme and other relevant programs. The Department of Sociology has one small classroom of their own in their department which they use for intensive lectures (especially visiting professors) or for lectures for small students groups.

5. Study process and student assessment

As Vytautas Magnus University is a public organization supervised by the Ministry of Education and Science, it should maintain equal admission requirements for all students. However, VMU requires particular English language skills, which eliminates students without adequate English language skills. Obviously, this problem is not relevant only for the programme of sociology, but for all programmes at the university.

Decreasing number of students due to the birth rates and other factors: 2-3 years drop is estimated to be up to 20%. Therefore university strategy is not to grow, but to maintain its present situation and increasingly to internationalize its studies. However, the university is also introducing major and minor degree programmes in which sociology is becoming quite popular, therefore introducing more students to sociology which could also act as a future recruitment channel to students.

Students evaluate different subjects of sociology programme every semester by answering questionnaires and usually the courses directly related to sociology and the sociology department receives at least 8-9 points out of 10.

The economic support to BA level sociology students is really high compared to other universities in Lithuania. The scholarships were reduced last year, but still stayed much above the average national level. Students are understandably very satisfied but they confessed that these scholarships could have a negative impact on their motivation to get involved into additional activities (like research, Erasmus exchange, etc.). Quite significant amount of students (30-40%) cannot get a place in a dormitory and therefore they have to rent a place to live for market prices which might lead to financials problems and necessity to work instead of studying.

Students do not participate in students' conferences, only some of them participate in research projects as assistants. Students themselves indicated that they lack motivation, but this might also be a result of their relatively good economic position which might decrease their motivation to look for other activities and concentrate instead on their studies and student life during the free time. Students should be actively encouraged to participate and get involved in students conferences and other similar activities.

Some of the students have participated in Erasmus mobility programme, but most of them are not interested because they do not want to leave their family, friends or jobs for half a year. Therefore, the staff of sociology BA programme should put more efforts in explaining to the students the great possibilities and benefits that the Erasmus offers for their professional qualification and future work opportunities.

Students did not have any complains about their knowledge assessment. They however indicated that some courses are more difficult, some are easier, but regarded the situation as natural and were generally quite satisfied with the situation. Also, the motivated students are

really eager to put many efforts into their studies just to get better marks and a higher scholarship. On the other hand, the marks of the students seem quite low (page 28 in the report).

Students entering VMU must know English language quite well. However, during the interview with students it seemed that some of them are not really all that good in English in order to be able to express their thoughts without problems. If some have after all quite poor English language skills it can be questioned whether these students are really able to read all the material for courses in English.

Regarding students' competences in sociology, it seemed that they know the basics quite well, and for instance know the difference between sociology and anthropology, as well as have quite a good idea of what they can do after finishing their bachelor degree.

Obviously bachelors of sociology have difficulties finding adequate jobs and therefore the providers emphasize the programme as a preparation for further master studies and further professional development. This reminds of the situation in many other countries, including the Nordic ones where the normal length of sociology, as well as many other, studies was about 5,5 years (for a master's degree). Therefore, bachelors have difficulties in competing with these old Masters or Candidates as they were called in some countries. By far not all that many Bachelors who graduate from Vytautas Magnus do in fact continue their studies in sociology in Vytautas Magnus or in other universities at Lithuania.

6. Programme management

Study committee is organized by the faculty administration and the department of sociology. It seems that the study committee works quite well, students even told that their recommendations about courses are regularly evaluated in the committee. However, the study committee should pay more attention to the difference and relative share of the obligatory and elective courses and to reconsider which should go to which group. Some of the most valuable courses in the sociology study field seem to be now elective.

Department of sociology together with the faculty administration are considering about involving more anthropology issues and courses into the bachelor level studies in the sociology programme. The reasons are the availability of a master programme in anthropology and the competences of the existing lecturers. However, the experts group has serious doubts whether this would be the best option for the further development of sociology studies.

Involvement of stakeholders is at present quite low, especially from the business sector. Stakeholders should have more systematic influence on the evaluation and development of the study programme, as well as be more actively involved in organizing the practice part.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To elaborate more precisely the identity of the programme in order to better tune its learning outcomes and programme content.
2. If programme aims are compared with competences - certain issues mentioned in aims are missing in the description of competences. Need to elaborate competences and also to tune them to stakeholders' needs.

3. To take measures and make it possible for students to choose among the elective courses regardless of their number.
4. To take measures to increase the number of students.
5. To compare all courses taught both at BA and MA level and avoid repetitive topics or courses.
6. To reconsider what should be the right share of Social Anthropology courses in the programme curriculum and to open it more to other special fields of sociology.
7. To reconsider the allocation of the courses to core or elective parts in the programme.
8. To add more courses of statistical methods.
9. To add more critical approaches and methodological discussion into the contents of the non-methodological courses.
10. To make Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods courses more advanced in their content.
11. To develop further the university intranet (like MOODLE) system.
12. To develop further students foreign language proficiency, especially their ability to communicate and write academic texts in English.
13. To encourage students to participate in international exchange programmes and take measures to activate students' participation in conferences and publications.
14. To involve more actively stakeholders into the process of programme assessment and alteration.
15. To take measures to guarantee the respective disciplinary identities among the professors coming from separate academic disciplines in their teaching and research practices.

IV. SUMMARY

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme aims and learning outcomes are well defined, clear and publicly accessible and they are also based on the academic and professional requirements, public needs and needs of the labour market. What is more, in the best tradition of “liberal arts” the programme offers its students a wide variety of courses to choose from. However, the main negative aspects of the programme are mostly related to the somewhat ambiguous identity of the programme. Its close relation to social anthropology, understandable taking into account the local circumstances at the university, creates also problems to the disciplinary identity of the programme since several courses are simply “borrowed” from anthropology.

2. Curriculum design

The structure and the content of the Sociology programme are in line with all the legal requirements. However, the most serious challenge for the programme in the future is to take serious measures in order to increase the number of the students in the programme. Here, a more convincing realization of the programme aims could be of assistance, together with a serious reconsideration of the importance and place of all the separate study units in the whole profile of the programme. Such measures might on their part help making the programme more attractive and competitive in the eyes of both the students and the stakeholders.

Students expressed strongly the need of a good course in quantitative, statistical methods.

3. Staff

The programme has many obvious positive aspects. It has a qualified and dedicated teaching staff which is big enough to manage the teaching load. The administration creates good opportunities for the teaching staff of promoting both its scientific and pedagogical competence. The research record of the academic staff is very good and it is involved in many important research projects. The students appreciate the open atmosphere of the department and the whole university as well as the willingness of their teachers to help and consult them when needed.

4. Material resources

The teaching facilities, library and access to the computers, data sets and the internet as well as other infrastructure are very good. The students appreciate the open atmosphere of the department and the whole university as well as the willingness of their teachers to help and consult them when needed.

5. Study process and student assessment

A wide variety of grades is used in evaluating the students’ performance, for instance their BA theses. The organization of the students’ practice was in generally well organized and in line with the study aims. In this light it was a bit surprising that the students were not encouraged to participate more in scientific seminars or conferences. The courses are often closely related to the research topics and fields of the teachers.

The stakeholders hold the graduates of the programme in high regard as far as their professional competences are considered.

Students' lack of interest in international exchange is quite alarming in the university which has otherwise an international profile even though this problem might be at least partly difficult to solve on the departmental or faculty level alone.

6. Programme management

The programme management is professionally and well organized. However, the stakeholders' involvement in the assessment and renewal of the programme could be made stronger and more systematic.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme Sociology (state code – 612L30003, 61205S102) at Vytautas Magnus University higher education institution 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	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Staff	4
4.	Material resources	4
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	3
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	3
	Total:	20

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas:
Team Leader:

Prof. Jukka Gronow

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Doc. Viktoriya Sereda

Dr. Vladislav Volkov

Prof. Vida Kanopienė

Saulius Olencevičius

Monika Kavaliauskė

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto studijų programa *Sociologija* (valstybinis kodas – 612L30003, 61205S102) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	4
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	4
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	20

* 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 numatomi studijų rezultatai

Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai yra puikiai apibrėžti, aiškūs ir viešai prieinami. Jie taip pat pagrįsti akademiniais ir profesiniais reikalavimais, visuomenės ir darbo rinkos poreikiais. Be to, laikantis geriausios liberalių mokslų tradicijos, programoje siūloma daug įvairių dalykų. Tačiau pagrindiniai programos trūkumai daugiausia susiję su neaiškiu programos tapatumu. Jos artimumas Socialinei antropologijai, kuris suprantamas atsižvelgiant į universiteto vidaus aplinkybes, kelia problemų dėl programos dalykų tapatumo, nes kai kurie dalykai yra paprasčiausiai „pasiskolinti“ iš Antropologijos.

2. Programos sandara

Sociologijos programos struktūra ir turinys atitinka visus teisinius reikalavimus. Vis dėlto, didžiausias iššūkis programai ateityje yra imtis rimtų priemonių, siekiant didinti studentų

skaičių programoje. To pasiekti padėtų įtikinamesni programos tikslai, taip pat reikėtų rimtai apsvarstyti atskirų dalykų svarbą ir vietą visoje programos sandaroje. Šios priemonės galėtų padėti padaryti programą patrauklesne ir konkurencingesne tiek studentų, tiek socialinių dalininkų atžvilgiu.

Studentai labai išreiškė norą studijuoti puikiai parengtą kiekybinių statistikos metodų dalyką.

3. Personalas

Programoje yra daug akivaizdžiai teigiamų aspektų. Programą dėsto ypač kompetentingų ir atsidavusių dėstytojų kolektyvas, kuris yra pakankamai didelis, kad susidorotų su dėstymo krūviu. Administracija suteikia puikių galimybių dėstytojams kelti savo mokslinę ir pedagoginę kvalifikaciją. Dėstytojų tiriamosios veiklos patirtis labai gera; jie dalyvauja daugelyje svarbių tyrimų projektų. Studentai vertina atvirą katedros bei viso universiteto mikroklimatą, taip pat dėstytojų norą padėti ir prireikus teikti konsultacijas.

4. Materialieji ištekliai

Mokymo bazė, biblioteka, galimybė naudotis kompiuteriais, duomenų bazėmis ir internetu bei kita infrastruktūra yra puikios būklės. Studentai vertina atvirą katedros bei viso universiteto mikroklimatą, taip pat dėstytojų norą padėti ir prireikus teikti konsultacijas.

5. Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

Studentų mokymosi rezultatai, pvz., jų bakalauro darbai, vertinami įvairiais pažymiais. Studentų praktika apskritai gerai organizuojama ir atitinka studijų tikslus. Todėl šiek tiek nustebino faktas, kad studentai nebuvo skatinami daugiau dalyvauti moksliniuose seminaruose ir konferencijose. Studijų dalykai dažnai glaudžiai susiję su dėstytojų tyrimų tematika ir kryptimis.

Socialiniai dalininkai aukštai vertina programos absolventus dėl jų įgytų profesinių kompetencijų.

Universiteto studentų menkas susidomėjimas tarptautiniais mainais kelia didelį susirūpinimą, nes universitetas yra tarptautinis, tačiau šią problemą iš dalies gali būti sunku išspręsti vien katedros ar fakulteto lygiu.

6. Programos vadyba

Programos vadyba profesionaliai ir puikiai organizuota. Tačiau reikėtų padidinti ir padaryti sistemingesnį socialinių dalininkų dalyvavimą vertinant ir atnaujinant studijų programą.

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Tiksliau suformuluoti studijų programos tapatumą, siekiant geriau suderinti numatomus studijų rezultatus ir programos turinį.
2. Lyginant programos tikslus su kompetencijomis, pastebima, kad tam tikruose tiksluose minimi aspektai neatsispindi kompetencijų aprašyme. Reikia detalizuoti kompetencijas, kad jos atitiktų socialinių dalininkų poreikius.

3. Imtis priemonių ir leisti studentams rinktis pasirenkamuosius dalykus, nepaisant studentų skaičiaus.
4. Imtis priemonių studentų skaičiui didinti.
5. Palyginti visus bakalauro ir magistrantūros studijų programų dalykus ir stengtis išvengti pasikartojančių temų ar dalykų.
6. Apsvarstyti, kokia būtų tinkama Socialinės antropologijos dalykų dalis programoje, ir į programą įtraukti daugiau kitų specialių sociologijos krypties dalykų.
7. Apsvarstyti dalykų suskirstymą į studijų pagrindų ir pasirenkamuosius dalykus.
8. Įtraukti daugiau dalykų apie statistikos metodus.
9. Į nemetodologinių dalykų turinį įtraukti daugiau kritiškų metodų ir metodologinių diskusijų.
10. Šiuolaikiškai atnaujinti Kokybinių tyrimų metodų ir Kiekybinių tyrimų metodų dalykų turinį.
11. Toliau vystyti universiteto intraneto (pvz., MOODLE) sistemą.
12. Toliau tobulinti studentų užsienio kalbos įgūdžius, ypač jų gebėjimą bendrauti ir rašyti akademinis tekstus anglų kalba.
13. Skatinti studentus dalyvauti tarptautinių mainų programose ir imtis priemonių suintensyvinti studentų dalyvavimą konferencijose ir rengiant publikacijas.
14. Aktyviau įtraukti socialinius dalininkus į programos vertinimo ir keitimo procesą.
15. Imtis priemonių, siekiant skirtingas akademinės disciplinas dėstantiems ar jų tyrimus vykdančioms dėstytojams užtikrinti atitinkamą studijų dalykų tapatumą.

<...>
