



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Lietuvos Edukologijos universiteto  
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *FILOSOFIJA IR ETIKA* (valstybinis  
kodas - 6121MX005 (iki 2017 m. - 612V50005))**  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT**  
**OF *PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS* (state code - 6121MX005 (till 2017  
- 612V50005))**  
**STUDY PROGRAM**  
at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences

**Experts' team:**

1. **Prof. Massimo Leone (team leader)** *academic,*
2. **Assoc. Prof. Solveiga Konkova,** *academic,*
3. **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Werner J. Stueber,** *academic,*
4. **Prof. Tomas Kačerauskas,** *academic,*
5. **Mr. Motiejus Ramašauskas** *students' representative.*

**Evaluation coordinator -**

***Mr. Pranas Stankus***

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba  
Report language – English

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

|  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Studijų programos pavadinimas                        | <i>Filosofija ir etika</i>          |
| Valstybinis kodas                                    | 6121MX005 (iki 2017 m. - 612V50005) |
| Studijų sritis                                       | Humanitariniai mokslai              |
| Studijų kryptis                                      | Filosofija                          |
| Studijų programos rūšis                              | Universitetinės studijos            |
| Studijų pakopa                                       | Pirmoji                             |
| Studijų forma (trukmė metais)                        | Nuolatinė (4), iššęstinė (5,5)      |
| Studijų programos apimtis kreditais                  | 240                                 |
| Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija | Ugdymo mokslų bakalauras            |
| Studijų programos įregistravimo data                 | 2012-01-16, No.SVA-14               |

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAM

|   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| Title of the study program                          | <i>Philosophy and Ethics</i>      |
| State code  | 6121MX005 (till 2017 - 612V50005) |
| Study area  | Humanities                        |
| Study field   | Philosophy                        |
| Type of the study program                           | University Studies                |
| Study cycle   | First                             |
| Study mode (length in years)                        | Full-time (4), part-time (5,5)    |
| Volume of the study program in credits              | 240                               |
| Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded | Bachelor in Education science     |
| Date of registration of the study program           | 2012-01-16, No.SVA-14             |

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

## CONTENTS

|   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>   | <b>4</b>                           |
| 1.1. Background of the evaluation process.....                              | 4                                  |
| 1.2. General.....   | 4                                  |
| 1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information..... | 4                                  |
| 1.4. The Review Team.....   | 5                                  |
| <b>II. PROGRAM ANALYSIS.....</b>  | <b>5</b>                           |
| 2.1. Program aims and learning outcomes.....                                | 5                                  |
| 2.2. Curriculum design .....  | 6                                  |
| 2.3. Teaching staff .....   | 7                                  |
| 2.4. Facilities and learning resources .....                                | 8                                  |
| 2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....                | 9                                  |
| 2.6. Program management .....   | 10                                 |
| 2.7. Examples of excellence * .....   | <b>Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.</b> |
| <b>III. RECOMMENDATIONS* .....</b>  | <b>11</b>                          |
| <b>IV. SUMMARY .....</b>  | <b>12</b>                          |
| <b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>  | <b>13</b>                          |

## **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 program SKVC takes a decision to accredit study program either for 6 years or for 3 years. If the program evaluation is negative such a program is not accredited.

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

The program 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 program **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   | Previous Evaluation Report 2011 |
| 2   | Summary of Legal Requirements   |
| 3   | SER 2017 + Annexes              |

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

The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) produced by the BA study program in Philosophy and Ethics at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences is sufficiently well written and

provides quite a satisfactory overview of the program's context, resources, aims ("acquisition of competence in research on ethics education, [...] based on the demand for creation and development of system and traditions of research in philosophical ethics education in Lithuania, encouragement of young researchers to conduct research in the content of ethics education and, thus, respectably integrate into the context of world ethics education research", SER, p. 9), and learning outcomes.

#### **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 8 November, 2017.

- 1. Prof. Massimo Leone (team leader)**, *Professor of Department of Philosophy, University of Torino, Italy;*
  - 2. Assoc. Prof. Solveiga Konkova**, *Professor of Philosophy and Sociology institute, Latvian Academy of Science, Latvia;*
  - 3. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Werner J. Stueber**, *Former Rector, German Technical Trainers College, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia;*
  - 4. Prof. Tomas Kačerauskas**, *Head of Philosophy and Communication Department at Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Lithuania;*
  - 5. Mr. Motiejus Ramašauskas**, *student of Kaunas University of Technology study program Media Philosophy.*
- Evaluation coordinator – Mr. Pranas Stankus.**

## **II. PROGRAM ANALYSIS**

### **2.1. Program aims and learning outcomes**

The Self-Evaluation Report (SER) produced by the BA study program in Philosophy and Ethics at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences is sufficiently well written and provides quite a satisfactory overview of the program's context, resources, aims ("acquisition of competence in research on ethics education, [...] based on the demand for creation and development of system and traditions of research in philosophical ethics education in Lithuania, encouragement of young researchers to conduct research in the content of ethics education and, thus, respectably integrate into the context of world ethics education research", SER, p. 9), and learning outcomes.

The potential professional profile of the program's graduates, however, appears therein as sketchily described, so that experts during the visit and interviews sought to gather more evidence about how the program specifically trains students for the labour market (and in particular for the production of media discourse, which is a domain emphasized by the SER itself). During the interviews, it became clear to the evaluation team that the BA program under examination benefits from an extensive networks of social partners, including some alumni,

which provide current students good opportunities for training and work in various professional fields, including some media outlets.

The critical point raised by the previous evaluation was also made the object of further inquiry, since the SER would provide little information on how shortcomings in pedagogical training have been tackled and, hopefully, eliminated in recent years. Interviews with all the stake-holders made it clear that the BA program's management has sought, over the last years, to renovate and improve its teaching methods, providing, for instance, more occasions for internships and participation in international mobility.

Interviews underlined the very good professional qualifications of the teaching staff and the constant renewal of study methods. The BA program concentrates on philosophy and ethics and relies on a dedicated career centre in order to provide students information from the national labour centre. In the Lithuanian context, there appears to be a shortage of teachers of ethics, which is mandatory (in alternative to religious studies), whereas philosophy is elective. The program, therefore, plays a central educational role in training teachers of ethics in Lithuania. The teaching load could not be precisely quantified during the visit, but appears as probably excessive (like in most Lithuanian similar programmes). The interview emphasized the need to advertise for the master's program of the same university as the natural prosecution of the BA program under examination.

The evaluation team reached the conclusion that program objectives and intended learning outcomes are well defined and clear, since they cater to a professional field, that of the teaching of ethics and, to a minor extent, philosophy in Lithuanian secondary schools, which no other similar program currently caters to; these objectives and outcomes, moreover, make the object of intensive public communication through mostly traditional means (leaflets, brochures) and websites.

Furthermore, program objectives and intended learning outcomes correspond to the mission, operational objectives, and strategy of the Institution, which plays a relevant role in satisfying the Lithuanian demand for training in ethics and philosophy, mostly for future teachers of these disciplines in the secondary school system.

Program objectives and intended learning outcomes are, therefore, linked with academic and professional requirements, meaning that they take into account the national regulation for the training of ethics teachers and at the same time provide participants with insights and instruments deriving from academic research in this field.

## ***2.2. Curriculum design***

The program follows the model of studies established at the Lithuanian University of Educational Studies: students are trained for the acquisition of Bachelor of Philosophy and Ethics and the professional qualification of teacher. The program structure agrees with the existing legal national regulations of Higher Education in Lithuania in general as well as with the those for the training of teachers in particular. It also fits The Descriptor of the Study Procedure at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (2014), the Description of Procedure of Study Program Renewal and Quality Assessment at LEU (2015), the Regulations of the Study Program Committees of LEU (2013), and some others.

The program was updated in 2016, and the parts of the curriculum are enough balanced. The curriculum is well designed and matches the planned outcomes of the program. Subjects of study are taught consistently. The advantage and uniqueness of the program is its close connection with the preparation of teachers, and the inclusion of specific courses in philosophy of education in the curriculum is suitable for this purpose. The study plan reflects flexibility and multi-applicability. Courses on current philosophical topics are included. The particular courses

on philosophy and ethics of cinema, bioethics, postmodern ethics, and some others are also entirely appropriate. The content of subjects and methods of study corresponds to the type and cycle of studies and are sufficient to achieve the learning outcomes. The bachelors' final theses reflect a good level in the students' preparation and ability to conduct interdisciplinary research in the field of philosophy and ethics. The alumni and social partners of the program vouch for the fact that its students are taught the ability to conduct rational analysis and critical thinking, creativity and team working. A minor suggestion could be that more attention could be paid to the history of the Lithuanian philosophy, which is especially important for school teachers of ethics.

The content of the program reflects the latest academic achievements (also of the works of contemporary Lithuanian scholars). There is also sufficient evidence that the latest artistic achievements (especially in cinema) are taken into account in the program.

The program privileges students-oriented curricula, which have been revised in January 2017 also thanks to increased familiarity with previous shortcomings. The program presents a wide array of courses, addressing several urgent present-day ethical issues (bioethics, ethics and media, philosophy and sustainable development, etc.). Interviews also provided evidence that the program improved its educational segment since the last evaluation: contents, methods of assessment, and methods of study. Overall, meetings with students and alumni showed a high level of satisfaction.

### **2.3. Teaching staff**

As stated in the previous SER (2011), the teaching staff not only meets the relative legal requirements in place for lecturing in the field of teachers' education at the Bachelor level but demonstrates a high level of qualification across the board. Teaching staff is in line with the respective Ministry's Order No V-825 of 2015 concerning the *Descriptor of the study Field of Philosophy*, seventy percent of study field subjects are taught by persons who have a doctoral degree, and at least sixty percent of them carry out scientific work. In detail, eight out of ten of the program's teaching staff hold a PhD., as documented in the SER (cf. P 433 ff). And research activities are given documentary evidence of likewise, meeting the prescribed requirements.

Apart from the academic and research background this also entails practical teaching experience on secondary school level for a number of staff members. Hence, substantial practical experience gained in the very realm the study program is primarily geared towards, i.e., educating teachers of Philosophy & Ethics for secondary school level, is available and certainly filters down on curriculum development. Likewise, individual research interests, the relative publications, and the areas of teaching are well aligned. Moreover, a "good balance of philosophical subjects and subjects relating to professional competence" has rightfully been highlighted by the previous evaluation team. LEU apparently plays a major role in developing curricula for teaching professions on the national level. The latter constitutes a noteworthy asset and accounts for writing among others textbooks, monographs, and methodological hand-outs. The apparent high involvement and dedication of many of the staff is also clearly reflected in such endeavours as introducing guided self-study to encourage independent learning, thus, fostering a genuine interest in philosophical thinking as such. The evidence given is convincing.

The teaching load was considered to be too high by several of the teaching staff, who spoke out on this issue during the site visit. Furthermore, the rise in such load was seen as a result of downsizing staff, which, in turn, allegedly derives from the low enrolment numbers of students. In stark contrast, however, the self-evaluation (cf. SER, p. 25, 2.3.3) holds that the teaching load is considered "optimal" and in line with the respective "Recommendations for the Duration of Working Time and Structure of Load" approved by the Ministry in charge. Although

both aspects, the teaching load as well as the alleged “downsizing of staff”, could not be substantiated in neither way, it appears recommendable to clarify matters internally to render information to this regard more reliable. Unfortunately, details on the ratio between teaching staff and students was not elaborated on sufficiently; this upon the background that allegedly ten teachers in total seem to compose the academic staff of the department within the Faculty.

As recommended by the previous evaluation exposure to new teaching methods, predominantly as regards the use of new didactic technologies has begun; although it seems that this has not occurred systematically but rather as a result of individual initiative and less in a structured and systematic way.

The on-going turnover of staff, underlined in the previous evaluation report, has remained an issue of concern, attributed to unsecure career perspectives as a direct result of an on-going government-led debate on potentially merging LEU with other institutions of higher education, for structural adjustment reasons, subject to substantiation since speculations are rampant. In any way, the staff thought it necessary to express concern in this regard during the site visit, forecasting a potentially demotivating impact on the staff’s morale.

The absence of a more formal structure of staff development, raised during the previous evaluation, has remained. In a narrow sense, staff development occurs when drawing on a newly established fund (seconding international research activities, scientific awards, and participation in conferences and seminars), which undoubtedly contributes lastingly to the staff’s qualification and development. But the question remains to which extent the university provides a formal structure for such development, including internal career perspectives.

Little has been said about the presence of international visiting professors and sabbaticals of LEU staff spent abroad. In general, more could have been said in regard to international exposure of staff and students.

#### ***2.4. Facilities and learning resources***

The premises of the program seem to be suitable and adequate for their purposes. There is sufficient number of lecture and seminar rooms for various kinds of audiences, they are mostly well located, and their quality enables efficient and productive teaching and learning. The facilities are provided with appropriate teaching and presentation equipment, and the computer equipment available is sufficient for all the present teaching purposes.

Some of the software listed in the SER (including SPSS, Kokybinis, and Promethean Planet) is more suitable for the pedagogical than for the philosophical field. Neither teachers nor students, however, confirmed that they use these electronic resources in their philosophy studies. Similarly, it is not clear how many philosophical books are between the declared 710,614 copies of teaching resources. The interviewed staff claimed that all of them are philosophical. However, the director of the library specified that only a small part of them are pertinent to philosophy.

The library has spaces reserved for various kinds of research activities. Its collections seem to meet good European standards. The main Lithuanian and some international philosophical journals are available in the reading room. Yet, there are no recent issues of some of them (e.g., the latest issues of *Santalka: filosofija, komunikacija* and *Creativity Studies*). In the library, there are enough workplaces but most of them were empty during the visit. The rooms of the library are not renovated. The new library is under construction since 2004, but it is not completed yet. Probably, the renovation of pre-existent buildings and rooms has not been undertaken because of the university’s unclear future (vague governmental projects of merging with other universities). The staff and the social partners feel insecure, too. This insecurity seems to partly stem from insufficient information from the government, partly from the demographic situation (declining number of students).

Students can make use of a workplace for consulting bibliographic materials. More office space, however, is needed for research projects.

According to the SER, the library holds the main electronic databases of philosophical publications. There is, however, no access to Scopus and Clarivate Analytics. The interviewed teachers also mentioned Elsevier, Taylor & Frances, and other databases. The director of the library was very well informed about the electronic resources and the philosophical journals. Teachers and students, yet, hardly make any use of such databases for their work. In most cases, students do not use the electronic resources in order to access the most recent or cited philosophical texts in their final works. Lists of references in the students' dissertations do not adopt a unified style. The program has the advantage that many of the textbooks used in Lithuanian schools are prepared by the teachers of the LEU.

In summary, on the plus side, the premises, facilities, and equipment of the program are suitable and sufficient for its purposes; furthermore, the library collections and electronic databases are adequate, and the library spaces functional; many of the textbooks used in Lithuanian schools, moreover, are prepared by the teachers of LEU, thus offering a unique viewpoint for LEU students. On the minus side, databases have not been used enough; some rooms should be renovated; and more office space is needed for meeting.

### ***2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment***

The evaluation team was, overall, positively impressed. The admission requirements are fairly general and clearly stated in the curriculum. The University does its best to attract as many students as possible using Open Door events, mass media channels, social networks, etc. Many students attended the meeting and expressed high satisfaction with the program; most declared that their expectations were more than fulfilled. Students particularly praised the fact that the program does not only teach the basic history of philosophy but encourages them to improve their analytic thinking and discussion skills. Professors, who have a close relationship with the students, are judged by them as quite flexible and constantly in search of how to better draw students to philosophy, also through the regular introduction of new courses. As a result, students analyse not only philosophical texts but also various works of art, like paintings or movies. The interviewed students had no complaints about the university's library, declaring that most of the publications they need can be found in the available electronic databases.

At the end of the year head of the department of philosophy and teaching staff meet students and discuss the future courses of studies, system of assessment, etc. Students are also consulted during individual consultations with the teachers and the administration. Moreover, LEU has a functioning Career Centre where the students can be consulted on the matters concerning their career prospects. Most of the students are happy with their representatives, stating that if they are not satisfied with something, their representatives can easily contact the faculty and fix the problems if it's possible. However, there doesn't seem to be information on the appeal system in the curriculum.

The academic honesty is regulated by the Statute and Code of Ethics of LEU. The students are informed of the document by the teachers during the studies, emphasizing the value of academic honesty and explaining the characteristics of plagiarism.

Students are encouraged to take part in academic and applied research activities. Annual scientific conference is held where students can deliver presentations, students' papers are published on <http://etikai.lt> (the association of ethics teachers) and there are possibilities to organize national ethics competitions for school pupils.

The evaluation system is quite clear and regular – there were no complaints concerning it. Students have a possibility for the additional feedback from professors to ensure the maximum progress and achievement.

The university relies on a great number of social partners from various fields and companies, including news websites, media companies, etc. Most of them are LEU alumni themselves and are happy to offer internship opportunities to students of the program.

On the other side, the evaluation team found that there are problems with the students' mobility and exchange. None of the students who came to the meeting had taken part in the Erasmus program nor expressed the wish to have done so. This may be due to the fact that most students are working part-time and it would be a great inconvenience, to them, to leave for a full semester. The paucity of available exchanges with partner universities was not an issue. The program's internationalization seems to have improved as regards visiting students, mostly from China or Kazakhstan. Courses in English, however, are not sufficient, so that incoming students cannot easily follow most lectures and must rely on private communication with professors.

In summary, on the plus side, students are encouraged to analyse various media and not only classical philosophical texts; moreover, they seem satisfied with the teaching staff and the available resources at the university. On the other side, the program's level of internationalization could be improved.

## **2.6. Program management**

A formally sound and sufficiently differentiated system to ensure quality is in place and also extensively illustrated in the SER 2017. Apparently, it includes also an effective mechanism to recruit staff by means of competition and regular re-assessment.

As regards the collection of students' feedback, the program distributes to students questionnaires whose structure is unified at the university level (a sample was provided to the team during the interview with the program's management staff); such questionnaires are circulated after every term; students are asked to assess the quality of the teaching staff; the committee of studies receives this feedback, which is subsequently publicly conveyed to the staff members. The questionnaires are anonymous but not compulsory; the team recommended the program's management to distribute such forms electronically, so as to enhance the impartiality of their evidence, and to render it compulsory, so as to increase their statistical relevance.

Whether the recommendation of the previous evaluation to pay more attention to the outcomes of internal and external evaluations has sufficiently been taken into account could not be convincingly cleared during the site visit: conflicting statements by senior management, teaching staff, and students seem to indicate that fine-tuning the study program depends to a large degree on individual person's commitment and less on a structured approach. Furthermore, students hold the *SP Committee* in low esteem, considering it to be rather a hub of like-minded friends than an effective and truly representative body.

Given the manifold specialization areas of the program, such as media, psychology, etc., a stronger outreach to advertise the program and its unique features is recommended. It does not suffice the need that students can recur to the respective Ministry's webpage in order to compare study programmes and universities prior to enrolment. More and decisive public relation work could lead to an increase in the number of students, stabilize the ratio between teaching staff and students, and consequently bring about more job security.

In view of the fact that many students do not opt for teaching positions in schools but use their respective specialization areas to orient themselves differently and with diverse outlooks, social partners could become more involved in terms of becoming a "hub" to link the world of work with students and graduates.

### **III. RECOMMENDATIONS\***

- (1) University should re-assess teaching loads;
- (2) Continue systematically refreshing courses for teachings staff on methods and state-of-the-art use of new didactically relevant technologies;
- (3) Stabilize the international component of teaching (guest professors and teaching assignments abroad, e.g., by drawing on the newly established fund);
- (4) A decisive effort towards more public relation work to advertise the unique features of the program and attract more students;
- (5) More involvement and a more diverse spectrum of social partners to link the program with the professional world in order to support students in their manifold professional orientation;
- (6) Strengthen representative bodies such as the SP Committee and their functioning to increase their standing particularly among students and consequently contribute to genuine and active “stakeholder-mindedness”.

#### **IV. SUMMARY**

Among the positive features of the program, the following are paramount: (1) unique features of the study program in terms of focus areas; (2) teaching staff's practical experience gained in secondary school and development of teaching material on national level, allowing integration of hands-on experience; (3) Recruiting staff by means of competition and regular re-assessment; (4) high satisfaction demonstrated by students during interviews; (5) Excellent relations with alumni; (6) good balance, in the curriculum design, between pedagogy and ethics teachings.

Among the areas of possible amelioration, the evaluation team would particularly indicate the following ones: (1) low consideration of the SP Committee among students; (2) insufficient outreach in terms of public relations; (3) relatively weak international component of study program in terms of international teaching staff; (4) scarce evidence of secondary literature in dissertations; (5) excessive teaching load (although impossible to quantify precisely on the basis of the documents and interviews).

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study program *Philosophy and Ethics* (state code – 6121MX005 (till 2017 - 612V50005)) at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study program assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

| <b>No.</b> | <b>Evaluation Area</b>                             | <b>Evaluation of an area in points*</b> |
|------------|--|---|
| 1.         | Program aims and learning outcomes                 | 3                                       |
| 2.         | Curriculum design                                  | 4                                       |
| 3.         | Teaching staff                                     | 3                                       |
| 4.         | Facilities and learning resources                  | 3                                       |
| 5.         | Study process and students' performance assessment | 3                                       |
| 6.         | Program management                                 | 3                                       |
|            | <b>Total:</b>                                      | <b>19</b>                               |

\*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:<br>Team leader: | <b>Prof. Massimo Leone</b>                |
| Grupės nariai:<br>Team members: | <b>Assoc. Prof. Solveiga Konkova</b>      |
|                                 | <b>Assoc. Prof. Dr. Werner J. Stueber</b> |
|                                 | <b>Prof. Tomas Kačerauskas</b>            |
|                                 | <b>Mr. Motiejus Ramašauskas</b>           |

**LIETUVOS EDUKOLOGIJOS UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ  
PROGRAMOS *FILOSOFIJA IR ETIKA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS - 6121MX005,  
612V50005) 2017-12-19 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-244 IŠRAŠAS**

&lt;...&gt;

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Filosofija ir etika* (valstybinis kodas - 6121MX005, 612V50005) vertinama **teigiamai**.

| Eil. Nr. | Vertinimo sritis                                 | Srities įvertinimas, balais* |
|----------|--|------------------------------|
| 1.       | Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai | 3                            |
| 2.       | Programos sandara                                | 4                            |
| 3.       | Personalas                                       | 3                            |
| 4.       | Materialieji ištekliai                           | 3                            |
| 5.       | Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas                   | 3                            |
| 6.       | Programos vadyba                                 | 3                            |
|          | <b>Iš viso:</b>                                  | <b>19</b>                    |

\* 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)

&lt;...&gt;

**IV. SANTRAUKA**

Be kitų teigiamų programos savybių, pirmą kartą yra šios: 1) studijų programos unikalumas svarbiose srityse; 2) praktinė dėstytojų patirtis, įgyta dirbant vidurinėje mokykloje ir rengiant metodinę medžiagą nacionaliniu lygiu, kuri gali būti integruota studijų procese; 3) darbuotojų priėmimas į darbą konkurso būdu ir reguliarius pakartotinis vertinimas; 4) didelis studentų pasitenkinimas, išreikštas pokalbių metu; 5) puikūs ryšiai su absolventais; 6) programos sandaroje išlaikyta gera pedagogikos ir etikos dėstytojų pusiausvyra.

Iš galimai tobulintinių sričių vertinimo grupė ypač išskiria šias: 1) mažas Studijų Programos komiteto autoritetas tarp studentų; 2) nepakankamas viešųjų ryšių mastas; 3) santykinai silpnas studijų programos dėstytojų tarptautinis elementas; 4) nepakankamas bibliografinių šaltinių naudojimas rengiant baigiamuosius darbus; 5) per didelis dėstytojų darbo krūvis (nors remiantis dokumentais ir pokalbiais tikslų krūvį nustatyti neįmanoma).

&lt;...&gt;

**III. REKOMENDACIJOS**

1. Universitetas turėtų peržiūrėti dėstytojų darbo krūvį;

2. Toliau sistemingai rengti dėstytojų kvalifikacijos kėlimo kursus naujų didaktinių technologijų metodikos ir pažangaus naudojimo temomis;
3. Stabilizuoti tarptautinį dėstytojų elementą (kviestiniai profesoriai ir į užsienį dėstyti išvykstantys dėstytojai, pvz., pasinaudojant naujai įsteigto fondo lėšomis);
4. Ryžtingos pastangos labiau plėtoti viešųjų ryšių veiklą siekiant informuoti apie unikalias programos savybes ir pritraukti daugiau studentų;
5. Aktyvesnis įvairesnių socialinių partnerių dalyvavimas programą susiejant su profesiniu pasauliu, siekiant padėti studentams daugialypio jų profesinio orientavimo srityje;
6. Stiprinti atstovaujančiuosius organus, pvz., SP komitetą, bei jų funkcijas ir didinti jų autoritetą, ypač tarp studentų, taip pat skatinti tikrąją, aktyvią, į socialinius dalininkus orientuotą mąstyseną.

<...>

---

Paslaugos teikėjas patvirtina, jog yra susipažinęs su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė,  
parašas)