



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS "MOKYKLOS PEDAGOGIKA"
(valstybinis kodas – 631X10010)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF "SCHOOL PEDAGOGY" (state code -631X10010)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Vilnius University

Review' team:

1. **Dr. Cathal de Paor (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi,** *academic,*
3. **Hanne Koli,** *academic,*
4. **Dr. Ramutė Mečkauskienė,** *representative of social partners'*
5. **Ms Indrė Jurgelevičiūtė,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator -

Ms Ina Marija Šeščilienė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2017

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Mokyklos pedagogika
Valstybinis kodas	631X10010
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Pedagogika
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Laipsnio nesuteikiančios
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (1)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	60
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Mokytojo kvalifikacija
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2014

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	School pedagogy
State code	631X10010
Study area	Social studies
Study field	Pedagogy
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Non-degree
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (1)
Volume of the study programme in credits	60
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Teacher
Date of registration of the study programme	2014

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process	4
1.2. General.....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information.....	3
1.4. The Review Team.....	6
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	6
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes	6
2.2. Curriculum design	7
2.3. Teaching staff.....	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	9
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment	10
2.6. Programme management	12
III. RECOMMENDATIONS*	14
IV. SUMMARY.....	15
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	18

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

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

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

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: 1) *self-evaluation and self-evaluation report prepared by Higher Education Institution (hereafter – HEI)*; 2) *visit of the review team at the higher education institution*; 3) *production of the evaluation report by the review team and its publication*; 4) *follow-up activities*.

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

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

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

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

1.2. General

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

No.	Name of the document
1.	Examples of Internship (school practise) portfolios
2.	Examples of Portfolios for recognition of prior knowledges and competences of the students

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

The programme *School Pedagogy* is offered by the Faculty of Philosophy in Vilnius University, the oldest and largest institution of higher education in Lithuania founded in 1579. The Faculty comprises seven departments. Presently, the Faculty has 87 staff members, with over 1411 students studying at the Faculty. *School Pedagogy* is a non-degree SP implemented at the Faculty, enabling students possessing a bachelor degree in a subject taught at school to acquire pedagogical education and qualification necessary for work as subject teachers in different types of lower and upper secondary schools. The programme is implemented by the Department of Educology (Educational Sciences) in cooperation with departments from faculties of Philology, History, Chemistry, Mathematics and Informatics, Natural Sciences, and Physics since September 2014.

A previous evaluation of the programme was carried out in 2014. In this process, the programme was accredited for 3 years and 8 recommendations for improvement had been stressed. The mechanisms and responsibilities of the cooperation between the university departments in the implementation of the 'Course didactics' module were to be clearly defined. With regard to practice, it was recommended to differentiate between the practice arrangements for students with and without pedagogical experience. Another recommendation focused on the need to add the didactics descriptions of the specific courses to the 'Course didactics' module general description to make it possible to assess specific study courses. In the modules 'Psychology for schools' and Course didactics, it was also recommended to eliminate the content and study outcomes' certain repetition. The provision of more systematic and precise information on the staff was also recommended. Other aspects of the practice component were also amended and revised following the evaluation. A range of other inconsistencies, which were highlighted by the experts were also amended. As will be discussed below in the analysis, these have been addressed to varying degrees, although, some require further and continuous focused effort. More generally, however, the review panel urges the programme management to use all reports (past and present) to inform ongoing programme development and improvement. Programmes requires continuous development according as needs change and according as new possibilities emerge with regard to curriculum design, resources, partnership with others, and the professional development of staff in the use of pedagogical approaches and methodologies.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. V-41 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 07/04/2017.

- 1. Dr. Cathal de Paor (team leader)**, *Mary Immaculate College, Senior Lecturer, Director of Continuing Professional Development, Ireland.*
- 2. Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi**, *Tallinn University, Institute of Educational Science, Professor of Andragogy, Estonia.*
- 3. Hanne Koli**, *House of Leading & Learning Ltd., Director, Finland.*
- 4. Dr. Ramutė Mečkauskienė**, *President of Association of Lithuanian school principals, Principal of Vilnius Virsuliskiu school, Lithuania.*
- 5. Ms Indrė Jurgelevičiūtė**, *student of Mykolas Romeris University master study programme International Law.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme objectives and learning outcomes, which are publicly announced in the website, are very well defined, including both the generic and subject-specific competences and learning outcomes. Three competence areas (communication, problem solving and learning and performance improvement) form the important generic foundation to the study programme and highlight very clearly what students are expected to be able to perform. The subject-specific competences of the School Pedagogy component (Pedagogy, psychology knowledge and skills; didactics competence; learning environment creation; action research) show in a concrete manner the criteria for each competence area. The quality of the presentation suggests a high level of knowledge regarding the Bologna process and the existence of strong pedagogical leadership for the programme.

The objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the state, societal and labour market needs. These have been developed in collaboration with the social partners who participate in the implementation of the study programme. VU also pays due regard to the needs of the state, societal and labour market needs in an ongoing fashion. This is enabled through collaboration with various actors at all levels.

The programme also corresponds to the mission, operational objectives and/or strategy of the university. The programme is prepared in line with relevant national, European, and university legislation and requirements.

The link with academic and professional requirements is also achieved and well established. The directors of schools, teachers, and mentors actively participate in further developing the studies, for example in improving the pedagogical internship.

The programme is a non-degree programme designed for the university graduates who have already completed the 6th qualification level. Programme objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the type, cycle and level of the qualification.

The title of the programme, its intended generic and subject-specific learning outcomes, the content of the programme and the qualification align fully.

2.2. Curriculum design

The study programme is modular, well balanced, with appropriate provision for the development of methodologies and practical knowledge about teaching. The rationale is well articulated, and represents a good example for similar programmes elsewhere. The structure and design meets legal requirements and regulations, shaped according to the teacher education model in question. The credit allocation corresponds to the programme requirements.

The culture of teaching that has been created is supportive, providing the conditions for optimum student learning. The programme addresses key knowledge with regard to theory, practice and methodologies needed for didactic, all integrated and drawing on problem-based learning. Teaching staff using appropriate approaches and methods, support reflective learning and self-reflection.

The content of subjects aligns with the aims and the learning outcomes. The subject content includes an appropriate treatment of the practical knowledge needed by students, and the development of a well-informed professional identity.

The content of the subjects is consistent with the type and level of the studies. Teaching methods are appropriate and, as students reported during the site visit, these are used effectively and creatively. The small number pursuing the programme poses a challenges for addressing certain areas of content, especially in the area of didactics. Ideally, there should be opportunities for students to work together and learn together in groups, developing team working skills, rather than working on their own. Efforts could be made to organise the didactics modules for individual subjects so that students have more possibilities to collaborate with each other. This could also lead to work on curriculum integration so that students can continue collaborating with other teachers in school, after they complete their studies.

The scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure the intended learning outcomes, although greater use of more recent and foreign sources would enable a more successful realisation of the learning outcomes. Student feedback during the site visit suggests that the study programme

focuses appropriately on their needs and on their active participation, i.e., as opposed to being unduly dictated by the preferences of the university teacher. The subject content is well distributed across modules. The programme includes a theoretical and practical component, with the proportion of contact time and independent work being adequate for this type of the study programme. The total number of individual work is 578 hours but it is not very clear how this amount of independent work organised and supported by teaching staff during the whole study programme

The programme content draws appropriately on knowledge about teaching in Lithuania, but could be further developed to include more references to foreign literature. The opportunity to carry out a thesis enables students to explore more deeply the scientific advances in particular areas. The thesis component benefits from a well-developed quality assurance system. Both students and graduates confirmed that the process of writing the thesis is well organized in terms of supervision. However, a greater use of international sources could enhance the student learning and quality of the finished work.

2.3. Teaching staff

The composition of the teaching staff corresponds to the legal requirements of the Ministry of Education and Science of Lithuania. The proportion of staff having doctoral degrees is very high and this has risen in recent years. In 2014 there were 80 %, while this rose to 88% in 2015. The research interests of university teaching staff correspond to the subject areas being taught.

The SER notes that there are 40 % of teaching staff having pedagogical experience of work at school, while 16 % are working part-time at school. It also reports that all mentors working in the programme have experience of 5 years and more. The teaching staff is appropriately qualified to teach on the programme and to ensure successful achievement of the learning outcomes. Progress has also been made in attracting teaching staff from abroad, with visiting lecturers from three countries contributing to the programme so far.

There is an adequate provision academic staff members to service the programme – a total of 20 staff for the period in question. The proportion of academic staff to students in the study programme is optimal, when compared the numbers of candidates and admitted students. Teaching staff consists not only of permanent staff, but also staff for didactics modules, as well as a mentor for each student, to provide individualised support and detailed feedback. During the site visit, the programme teaching staff referred to various teaching methods they use. The students also expressed their satisfaction with the studies and with the quality of the school supervision.

There are no difficulties with regard to staff turnover, with almost no changes being reported in staff turnover within the period in question.

Vilnius University gives a particular emphasis to the improvement of the teaching staff competence and professional development. The professional development of staff is organised by Department of Educational Sciences in cooperation with Pedagogical Centre. Various activities for professional development of staff are used: Staff participation in international events is also enabled and encouraged, for example, Erasmus + exchange programmes

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The premises for studies is adequate both in their size and quality. A range of different rooms are available for lectures, seminars, and workshops, with a plentiful supply of the usual technological equipment, for example, PC, multimedia projector, speakers, internet connections, etc. The total number of seated workplaces in the Faculty is 1041. There are two computer classrooms well equipped for students' needs and for workshop activities, while wifi is also available. The two conference rooms are used for other meetings such as the defence of the final thesis.

The teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are adequate both in size and quality. There are five multipurpose laboratories in the Faculty divided into research rooms: four are designated for student use and six are reserved for scientists. For the implementation of some subject didactics modules (e.g. Chemistry, Physics, Biology) specialized laboratory and computer equipment is needed, which is available in the other faculties.

The university has access to a wide range of schools to facilitate the practical teaching component. The SER reports that the university has thus far signed co-operation agreements with 72 school, representing different kinds, including specialized schools and socialisation centres. Students conduct their practical teaching in schools of lower and upper secondary education, as well as other educational institutions whose activities comply with the aims of the Study Programme.

The university has a plentiful supply of academic sources available to students to support their studies. These include textbooks, books, journals and databases). The Old University Library is conveniently situated on the same campus as the Faculty of Philosophy, thereby ready access to the majority sources needed for studies and research. There are also plentiful spaces for reading and for group meetings. A separate library of pedagogical literature (about 2000 copies) donated by Open Lithuania Fund is kept in Education Policy Centre. Students also have access to

teachers' lecture notes and learning aids through Moodle. There is also remote access via VPN available from home to e-materials, as well as access via Wi fi.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

Entrance requirements are transparent, with candidates admitted in accordance with the relevant rules of admission for second-cycle studies. Entrance scores take into account the final thesis grade, weighted averages of grades and the results of the motivation test. The various admission requirements are accessible on the VU website. There is a certain consistency in the number of admitted students each year.

The studies are organized in a way that makes it possible for students to continue working and to gain a teaching qualification at the same time. However, during the site visit, students remarked that timetables could be more structured and announced a bit more in advance. Information on the studies is easily accessible on the university website, and there is also a special internet platform, where students can ask further questions about the programme.

However, once challenge with regard to programme organisation relates to the small numbers of students involved. It means, for example, in the case of the didactics modules, that there are very few students studying at the same time with one teacher. This creates difficulties around financial viability, but it also poses a challenge from a pedagogical point of view. The development of competence and deep understanding in subject didactics requires collaboration and discussions between students and teachers. There is a need therefore to organize the subject didactics so that students have more possibilities to collaborate with each other. There are many issues in common across different subjects which could be addressed together regardless of the subject. This could also help in the development of multidisciplinary approaches in their own teaching that they can use in their own classrooms.

As it is currently organised, students seem to be in a disadvantage in the didactics classes in not having sufficient opportunities to work and learn with other students on didactic and methodological issues. Instead they were inclined to view methodology and didactics as being simply about 'information' or 'methods'. They also revealed how they often studied alone for such courses, whereas they knew it would be more advantageous to have interaction with other students in sharing and constructing new knowledge about curriculum and practical teaching.

It is also relevant to add here that students' understanding of their own learning process was weak. There was no evidence that they realised the importance of enhancing their own learning, and considering their own growth as learners. This means that although the programme is laid out in terms of worthwhile competences and learning outcomes, students did not have an opportunity to engage with these. Providing greater opportunities for students to develop and

demonstrate these through appropriate performance assessment tasks is needed. A greater use of portfolio learning could help address this weakness, requiring students to reflect on their own learning journey, and identifying the progress they are making, and how they envisage overcoming challenges encountered.

Students have plenty of opportunities to take part in artistic or sports activities within University. However, participation in research is affected by the fact that most of the students are working and do not have time for that.

Students' participation in Erasmus+ mobilities is also hampered by their other programme commitments. Despite that, most of the students expressed an interest in the Erasmus+ programme. As an alternative, students and alumni suggested the idea of visiting other schools within Lithuania, or at least taking modules in different universities.

There is a good level of academic support available to students, and access to a range of student services, including provision of information on career possibilities. Students are represented on the programme management committee, while they also report that they frequently communicate with their university teachers and seek additional help where necessary. The use of technology such as Moodle helps to promote communication between students and teaching staff. There is also a relatively wide range of social support provided, including state loans, accommodation availability for students, as well as plus special VU grants according to study and research fields. A psychological counselling service is also available.

The cumulative assessment system, which combines results from the compulsory final examination and other assessment components is conducive to maintaining a consistent student effort throughout the semester. During the site visit, students and graduates confirmed the use of a variety of methods: discussions, presentations, essays, creative and interactive tasks. These involve a blend of individual and group work. Relevant information for students is provided in module descriptions and also in the beginning of each semester by academic staff. Appropriate arrangements are in place to facilitate repeat assessments.

The university has a long tradition in teacher education and enjoys a favourable opinion among social partners with regard to the quality of the graduates. The number of alumni working in the field of studies is very high and during the visit, social partners commented very favourably on the programme. The SER reports that in 2015 and 2016, a total of 54 % and 43% of graduates respectively were working as subject teachers. Graduates are also involved in the ongoing development of the programme, through participation in seminars, conferences and roundtable discussions. However, the number of graduates opting to continue with studies in a Master's programme is rather low.

The study programme has helped address key needs identified at state level. For example, one way is responding to the shortage of teachers in particular curriculum areas, such as Physics. According to subject fields most students admitted to the programme in 2014-2016 are graduates of Physics (18 students), Lithuanian language (18 students) and History (13 students). On the other hand, there are not enough graduates of Chemistry, Mathematics and Informatics attracted to this programme, although as explained during the site visit, students from these fields also have the option of undertaking minor studies in pedagogy.

A fair learning environment is provided and due regard given to relevant rules and regulations for Studies of Vilnius University, for example, Code of Academic Ethics of Vilnius University. Appropriate arrangements are in place to facilitate student appeals in the case of student dissatisfaction with assessment results, although no applications have been made to date.

2.6. Programme management

The Study Programme Committee is accountable to the Faculty Council for the programme implementation and reports to it at least once a year. The Committee is composed of fifteen members (seven from the Philosophy Faculty, seven from other VU faculties and one social partner). However, the involvement of staff from various faculties spread across the campus requires careful co-ordination, so that the student experiences a coherent programme. The SER notes two weaknesses in relation to this: ‘the complicated organisation of interfaculty meetings, difficult to find time suitable to all, and, ‘Complicated alignment of different needs of the teaching staff at different VU faculties’ (p. 45). There is therefore a need to ensure that students receive similar preparation, regardless of the subject they have chosen for the didactics module. The co-ordination of the thesis could also benefit from greater consistency in the use of the thesis guidelines, as well as in the moderation of the assessment.

Students are surveyed for their views on programme modules at the end of each semester, enabling them to give feedback on the curriculum, and teaching, learning and assessment arrangements. The results are discussed at the Education department. However, there is a need to monitor student views more carefully. For example, one student reported to the panel that some students did not have a successful experience with their mentors. If the quality assurance system was working more effectively, action could have been taken to rectify the problems.

The quality assurance (QA) outcomes are discussed by the SPC and where significant changes are required, these are proposed to Faculty Council. However, there is a need to further ensure that outcomes of QA lead to more precise actions that can be easily identified. For example, one of the recommendations from the previous panel referred to the need to give greater attention to the integration of teaching staff of Subject Didactics modules into processes of internship

supervision. When asked how this recommendation was used to improve the programme, the SER team responded that more meetings were held, but no detail was provided on what these meetings achieved.

The Study Programme Committee includes one social partner, while a student representative is invited to attend meetings where the outcomes of quality assurance activities are discussed, for example, round table discussions aimed at SP quality improvement.

Mentors are involved in formal assessment of student internship and representatives of social partner institutions are members of the final theses defence board. Mentors are provided with comprehensive information regarding the tasks to be carried out with students (including assessment criteria). However, while training events are provided for mentors, social partners would welcome greater levels of contact with the Faculty and Department beneficial, as well as greater opportunities for professional development, thereby ensuring that such stakeholders could contribute more effectively to the evaluation and improvement process.

The involvement of stakeholders such as other universities providing similar programmes would also be of benefit in enabling students to meet and learn with a greater number of students. For example, in many subject areas, the numbers of students is very low. A greater number of students would ensure that the learning process could be more rewarding for everyone involved (especially students, and teachers), and would also represent better use of financial and human resources. Programme management referred to possible collaboration with Vilnius College. The panel believes that there is a need to deepen and extend collaboration with universities providing similar Pedagogy programmes.

The quality assurance of the programme is managed by the Study Programme Committee, which is supported by the Administration of Studies, based on the provision of the Quality Manual.

Information about the programme, including the purpose, learning outcomes, content and admission requirements is accessible on the internet to all prospective students, academic community and the society at large. The SER notes that Articles presenting the SP are published in media. The panel commends such promotion, but believes that more promotion of teaching as a profession is needed. Programme management and staff can play a lead role here in raising the profile of teaching emphasising the moral purpose of teaching and working closely with social partners in doing this.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS*

The programme management and team should:

- ensure that guidelines for the completion of the programme assignments are applied consistently across the various faculties and departments contributing to the programme.
- use the quality assurance system to monitor closely all aspects of the student experience, so that timely action can be taken to rectify any difficulties.
- continue to develop the partnership with schools and mentors, including the provision of professional development on a continuous and regular basis
- explore ways to develop collaborations and partnerships with other universities providing similar teacher education programmes.
- work with social partners in promoting the programme, but also in promoting teaching as a profession more generally, emphasising its moral purpose and the crucial role teachers play in the well-being of society (cultural, economic, etc).
- organise the didactics modules for individual subjects so that students have more possibilities to collaborate with each other in learning about curriculum and assessment.
- place greater emphasis on developing the students' ability to reflect on their own learning process and progress as a learner, i.e., thinking about their own learning trajectory at a metacognitive level, and how they are developing the competences inherent in the intended learning outcomes.
- develop greater use of grade criteria, linked to the learning outcomes, describing in detail the standards expected at varying levels of achievement in each of the assessment tasks, across all modules as well as in their practical teaching
- explore ways of enabling students to participate in learning mobility, either to other countries as part of programmes such as Erasmus+ or to other schools and universities within Lithuania.

IV. SUMMARY

The university has a long tradition preparing teachers and education professionals and a demonstrated commitment to making a valuable contribution to the quality of education and schooling in Lithuania. The programme in question meets an important need in the country's education system, although its short duration, and the small numbers of students involved leads to a significant challenge in ensuring that students develop the knowledge, skills and competences needed for their future roles as transformative change agents in education.

The programme objectives and intended learning outcomes are well-defined, linked to important state priorities and societal needs. They correspond to the mission of the university, and are linked to the relevant academic and professional requirements. There is appropriate alignment between programme title, qualification, intended learning outcomes, and programme content. The SER shows that the programme team have considered how these outcomes align with various frameworks. Ongoing programme revision involving the university teachers should further enhance the precision in the formulation of the outcomes, so that they are more meaningful for learners and enable achievement criteria to be more readily identified.

The curriculum and programme structure is in line with requirements, and there is an appropriate coherence and balance between subject modules, geared towards the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The programme content reflects important trends and advances in educational and schooling knowledge. However, the number of students taking didactics modules can be very small. Further efforts could be made to combine these, or at least part of them, so that students have more possibilities to collaborate with each other, rather than working on a one-to-one basis with the university teacher and/or school-based mentor. A greater emphasis could be placed on developing the students' ability to reflect on their own learning process and progress as a learner, and how they are developing the competences inherent in the intended learning outcomes. This could be enabled through a greater use of a journal or portfolio approach.

The profile of the teaching staff is in line with legal requirements, in terms of qualifications and experience. There are opportunities available for the professional development of staff necessary to implement the programme, although these can always be enhanced. Areas worthy of special attention in the professional development of university teachers include the use of formative assessment, greater integration of the theoretical knowledge of teaching with subject didactics and practical teaching skills, and enabling students to set challenging goals for themselves and high standards for their work. The professional development of mentors is also a priority, so that

the students have access to high quality mentoring that builds on what they are learning in university, and so that the school-university partnership is developed to its full potential.

The premises for studies are adequate, and there is an appropriate availability of teaching and learning equipment, as well as the necessary teaching materials and resources. The vast library is worthy of special mention. The programme provides adequate arrangements for students' practice. However, while the arrangement for the practical component with schools and other educational institutions seems to work satisfactorily, there is a need to further develop the link between the taught modules and the practical component undertaken in schools. There would also be benefits in students being required to undertake practical teaching in more than one school, and thereby learn from the guidance of more than one mentor. There are criteria available showing the standards expected at varying levels of achievement (excellent, very good, good, etc), and these should continue to be developed.

The programme operates on a consistent and transparent basis, having the necessary procedures, for example, in relation to entrance, appeals, etc. Students are encouraged to participate fully in the life of the university, including events related to their studies as student teachers. There is an opportunity to undertake mobility abroad, although students are not included to do so, due to other commitments. The arrangements for assessment are clear, and enable students to demonstrate their achievement of the learning outcomes in a fair manner. Social partners reporting a high level of satisfaction with the level of student preparedness, and the contribution they make to the educational mission of their institutions. The programme therefore makes an important contribution to the current and future development needs of the country. However, there is a need to introduce greater co-ordination to the thesis supervision process, so that supervisors share good practice in supervision approaches, and also moderate the grades being awarded to ensure that standards are applied appropriately. Students would also benefit from having more opportunities to collaborate together on learning tasks, as well as in group reflection while they undertake their practical teaching, under the guidance of a skilled facilitator.

There is a committed and competent management team in place, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. There is an effective quality assurance system in place to collect relevant information about programme implementation, and the experience of students. The programme relies on the contribution of a range of university teachers from across the faculty. This helps create a rich learning experience, but requires careful co-ordination so that there is an appropriate coherence between the various contributions and that it does not lead to a disjointed approach, for example in the thesis supervision. Closer collaboration with other universities (e.g., sharing of knowledge and resources) would also be of benefit in enabling students to meet and learn with

a greater number of students. This is all the more important given that, in many didactic subject areas, the numbers of students is very low.

Finally, the increasing complexity and diversity of needs encountered in classrooms, and the crucial importance of schooling for the future well-being of society means that teachers need access to high quality professional development. The work commenced in programmes such as this need to be complemented with ongoing access for teachers to professional development throughout their professional careers. The university has a key leadership role to play in promoting and raising the profile of teaching as a career in society, in attracting high-calibre entrants to the profession, and in supporting on-going renewal and innovation in schools.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *School pedagogy* (state code – 631X10010) at Vilnius University is given positive evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	4
2.	Curriculum design	4
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	3
6.	Programme management	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:	Dr. Cathal de Paor
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi
	Hanne Koli
	Dr. Ramutė Mečkauskienė
	Indrė Jurgelevičiūtė