



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Lietuvos Edukologijos universiteto  
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS ŠIUOLAIKINĖ FILOSOFINĖ  
ANTROPOLOGIJA** (*valstybinis kodas - 6211NX010 (iki 2017 m. -  
621V50003))*  
**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

---

**EVALUATION REPORT  
OF CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY** (*state  
code - 6211NX010 (till 2017 - 621V50003))*  
**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>Šiuolaikinė filosofinė antropologija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	6211NX010 (iki 2017 m. - 621V50003)
Studijų sritis	Humanitariniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Filosofija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Humanitarinių mokslų magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2009-08-31

---

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAM

Title of the study program	<i>Contemporary Philosophical Anthropology</i>
State code	6211NX010 (till 2017 - 621V50003)
Study area	Humanities
Study field	Philosophy
Type of the study program	University Studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Volume of the study program in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master in Humanities
Date of registration of the study program	2009-08-31

© 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 .....	9
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>12</b>
<b>IV. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT .....</b>	<b>14</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	SER 2017 + Annexes
3	Summary of legal Requirements

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

The master’s study program in Contemporary Philosophical Anthropology at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences provides philosophical education and training with an

original perspective, a specific angle, and quite clear learning objectives and didactic outcomes. The self-evaluation report (SER) appears as sufficiently well prepared, conceived, and written, starting with a summary of that which philosophical anthropology is about (perhaps pleonastic for a readership of experienced philosophers) and proceeding with a description of the program's structure and finalities.

#### **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 master's study program in Contemporary Philosophical Anthropology at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences provides philosophical education and training with an original perspective, a specific angle, and quite clear learning objectives and didactic outcomes. The self-evaluation report (SER) appears as sufficiently well prepared, conceived, and written, starting with a summary of that which philosophical anthropology is about (perhaps pleonastic for a readership of experienced philosophers) and proceeding with a description of the program's structure and finalities. Excerpts from students' interviews providing positive feedback about the program are presented as evidence. Overall, the SER is convincing as regards the peculiar cultural profile of this philosophical curriculum.

During the experts' visit, interviews with staff and students systematically perused into the feedback provided by the latter, so as to extract impartial evidence about their satisfaction as regards the program. Also, experts delved into the subject of how concretely the program has confronted its main criticality, already singled out by the previous experts' visit, that is, the potential ambiguity of having a program with pedagogical learning outcomes that nevertheless is

administratively categorized as a program in the humanities, not specifically conducive to teaching professions. Interviews with stake-holders revealed that most participants in the program do not seek employment in traditional philosophical fields, such as teaching and research, but actually treasure the abstract skills that they acquire throughout the program in order to apply them in the most diverse professional environments.

As regards the program's internationalization, it has mainly consisted, thus far, in academic exchanges within the Baltic network (for both students and lecturers), as well as in the organisation of the "International Philosophy Olympics", involving 43 countries.

The master's program shows a low number of yearly enrolments and could, therefore, highly benefit from more systematic advertising, which is not sufficient at the moment. Also, increased focus on Lithuanian philosophy, systematic self-improvement through rigorous quality control, as well as accrued internationalization might make the master's program under evaluation more attractive.

The program objectives and intended learning outcomes are quite well defined, although prospective applicants and students could be given more information about the philosophical scope of the program, which is wide.

The programs objectives and intended learning outcomes are also sufficiently clear, and communicated through a reasonably effective array of traditional and new media. In particular, the program seems to benefit from an extensive and affectionate network of alumni, many of which work in schools as teachers or in media outlets as content producers.

Also, the program objectives and intended learning outcomes are linked to the state, societal, and labour market needs, although not always in a systematic way, meaning that personal relations with external stake holders, developed by the program key organizers over the years, appear to have played a central role, but sometimes to the detriment of the organization of a more structured relation between the program and the labour market.

In any case, program objectives and intended learning outcomes satisfactorily correspond to the mission, operational objectives, and strategy of the Institution, which has a preeminent position in providing education and training in ethics and applied philosophy in the Lithuanian capital city (also considering the mostly academic orientation of philosophical programmes at Vilnius University, the main competitor).

Program objectives and intended learning outcomes are, therefore, linked with academic and professional requirements, meaning that most graduates from the MA program under examination acquire useful knowledge and especially multi-applicable skills in terms of abstraction and conceptualization. As regards the ways in which the program could improve the professionalization of its participants, see the recommendations below.

The examination of the SER, together with the relevant national documentation, allows the evaluation team to reach the conclusion that objectives and intended learning outcomes of the program sufficiently correspond to the type and cycle of studies and the level of qualifications that are usually required to this kind of program.

The coherence between the title of the program (which might sound mysterious to non-philosophers, including some prospective applicants), its intended learning outcomes, and the content of the program itself, could be better specified, especially as regards the link between the particular philosophical field (and tradition) of philosophical anthropology and the clearly applicative nature of the program.

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

The study program of Contemporary Philosophical Anthropology was implemented by the Department of Philosophy at the Faculty of Social Sciences and later on at the Faculty of History at LEU. It was updated in 2016 and implemented at the Faculty of Education, Department of Education and Philosophy, from January 2017. Its structure complies with the

existing legal national regulations of Higher Education in Lithuania. It is also aligned with the Descriptor of the Study Procedure at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences (2014), the Description of Procedure of Study Program Renewal and Quality Assessment at LEU (2013), the Regulations of the Study Program Committees of LEU (2013), and some other documents of LEU. The structure of the program fits the standards established by those documents, including the duration and volume of the study program, its level, the number of subjects taught in one semester, and the preparation of the final thesis.

The curriculum is very well designed and matches the described outcomes of the program. The program as a whole concentrates on anthropological philosophical studies, combined with a practical approach (Philosophy as Therapy, Philosophy and Rational Behavioural Therapy). The choice of such problem-oriented approach is appropriate. The curriculum is commensurately related to the BA program in philosophy and ethics, but it has its own specific emphasis on anthropology. Thus, the study plan is optimal for both those who have completed the BA program in Philosophy and Ethics at LEU and for those who have completed another BA program. The balance between compulsory and optional courses is also adequate. So is the variety of learning methods. The meetings with students, alumni, and social partners showed that the program is highly esteemed by different groups of stakeholders. The MA final theses reflect an appropriate level of students' ability in discussing topical issues of philosophical anthropology as well as their ability to conduct interdisciplinary research.

The weaknesses pointed out in the assessment of 2011 (the lack of courses on scientific anthropology and the narrow focus on postmodern anthropology) have been taken into account, and the design of the curriculum and the content of courses have been improved. For example, to strengthen the aspect of scientific anthropology, several courses such as Human and Science and the abovementioned course of Philosophy and Rational Behavioural Therapy were introduced in the program.

The program is not explicitly designed for the training of teachers, but it would be desirable to include, in its study plan, some course for the development of public skills, such as a course on rhetoric (might be considered as elective). This might be helpful for students who do not have a teachers training background from BA programme.

The content of the program provides evidence of reflecting, through an appropriate level of analysis, the latest academic, artistic, and technological achievements, especially in modelling solutions to the current problems of philosophical anthropology, brainstorm, individual and group creative assignments, meta-cognitive kinesthetic research, and analysis of visual materials.

### **2.3. Teaching staff**

As highlighted by the previous evaluation panel in 2011 and underlined in the respective report, the teaching staff not only meets the legal requirements in place and is adequately qualified but seemingly stands out in terms of its considerable teaching experience, its documented research activity, and its track record in writing and publishing course texts/books and instructional material, much in use throughout schools on secondary level in Lithuania. In line with the respective Ministry's Order No V-825 of 2015 concerning the *Descriptor of the Study Field of Philosophy* (cf. 33.4), the second cycle studies entails that 90% of the teaching staff must hold a doctoral degree; furthermore, 20% of the scope of study field subjects must be taught by professors, carrying out scientific work in the same field they teach in. Documentary evidence is given (cf. SER 2017, p 220) that 100% of all the teachers have research degrees, 11 PhD-holders in total, out of which 7 are in the rank of professors. Published and on-going research activities are sufficiently documented (cf. SER 2017, pp 26-28).

The evaluation panel concluded that the successful completion of Master-studies, on the one hand, can be considered a topping-up in relation to the previous teacher training on undergraduate level. A number of graduates having taught for a while returns to go for an academic upgrade. On the other hand, since the MA program comprises a wide array of subjects,

it imparts a versatile qualification, conducive, e.g., to jobs in the media sector, to managerial positions in the private industry, and to human personnel management, to name but those fields in which several alumni are presently working. The teaching staff's personal academic and research interests blend successfully with the perspective to offer students an academic education, best characterized as a versatile qualification covering in particular 'modern philosophical thought' in subfields such as "Philosophy as Therapy", "Analytic Aesthetics", "Language Philosophy", "Cultural Psychology", and "Humans and Politics" (cf. SER 2017, pp. 223-285), which potentially serve as gateways to jobs for example in the media, the arts, counselling, language teaching, the public service, think-tanks etc. Since those who opt for the MA Program to a large extent bring along an undergraduate degree in teaching in the field and frequently also teaching experience gained on secondary school level, options for professional orientation are particularly versatile.

The teaching staff is internationally active to a certain extent, with joint publications with authors abroad or publications in English in foreign journals, as is documented in detail in the SER 2017 (cf. pp 26 -28). The teaching staff is also active with regard to conferences, as well as involved in drafting and designing national educational programs. The latter entails national curricula development for secondary schools or direct work for respective ministries or bodies in charge of education at the national level.

The turnover of staff, though not substantiated in numbers, is apparently an issue of concern, as was emphasized during the site visit. Since, at least to a large extent, the same staff teaches in the BA and in the MA-program, the mentioned concern may rather apply to the undergraduate program; this upon the background, that the Previous Evaluation Report clearly underpins that the turnover of staff for the MA-program is low (cf. Prev. Eva. Rep. 2011, p. 5). No further indication was made, whether, for example, the perceived and criticised absence of a more formal structure for professional development (cf. SER 2017, p. 34) within the LEU is seen as a dominant reason for the turnover of staff. On the other hand, such turnover was somehow 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 teaching load was considered to be too high by some of the teaching staff, who spoke out on this issue during the site visit. Furthermore, the load was seen as a result of downsizing staff, which, in turn, allegedly derives from the low enrolment numbers of students. However, in stark contrast and according to the self-evaluation (cf. SER, p. 25, 2.3.3), 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, 'teaching load' as well as the alleged 'downsizing of staff', could not be substantiated neither in the one nor in the other direction, it appears recommendable to clarify the matter in internal talks.

Concurrently, a prevailing tendency, on the national level, to highlight natural sciences and technology in line with the country's official development perspectives, is perceived as disheartening.

The previous evaluation report's recommendation to go for a more formal structure as for staff development is presently hard to live up to in the wake of the abovementioned, pending structural adjustment. It seems that all sides are hesitant to act prior to a decision on the future of LEU. To a certain extent, however, improvements were introduced along the way in regard to a newly established fund, beneficial for the staff. It supports international cooperation, international conferencing, and scientific rewards. Although such possibilities to augment individual teachers' scientific activities deserve praise, little information was given about the university's or the department's internal mechanisms presently in place so as to foster career



development within a formal scheme providing for career planning, promotion, sabbatical leaves, etc.

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

In general, the program's premises seem to be suitable and adequate for their purposes. There is sufficient number of lecture and seminar rooms for various kinds of audiences; these premises 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. The SER declares the availability of 517,777 copies of teaching documents. It is not clear, however, how many philosophical resources are included therein. It is not clear either to what extent both the staff and the students use some of the available software (including SPSS, Kokybinis, Promethean Planet, which do not pertain to the philosophical field). Neither teachers nor students could confirm that they use them in their philosophical studies.

The library has enough space reserved for various kinds of research activities. It holds basic philosophical books, generally complemented by electronic resources. The main reading room has on shelf the main Lithuanian and some international philosophical journals. The rooms of the library are not renovated. The new library has been under construction since 2004. Probably, the renovation of the library's premises has not been undertaken because of insecurity concerning the University's unclear future (vague projects of merging with other universities).

According to the SER, the library offers access to the main philosophical electronic databases. There is no access, however, to either Scopus and Clarivate Analytics. The SER declares the availability of 20,000 full-text electronic journals. It is not clear, though, how many of them are philosophical. The director of the library was very well acquainted about such databases and philosophical journals. Yet, both teachers and students hardly make any use of these databases in their work. Teachers also claim that they help to prepare the articles of the master's students for publication in the journal *Žmogus ir žodis*. Some of the master's students publish, indeed, their dissertations in this journal. According to the teachers, they sometimes share key philosophical texts with students in an unsystematic way, usually through Moodle. On the one hand, that shows that the resources have not been used enough. On the other hand, it indicates that the teachers use such interactive resources as Moodle.

There is a dedicated workplace for students wishing to consult electronic resources. According to the teachers, they have enough office space both for their research and for office hours and meeting with students. They also report, however, that their condition worsened after the fusion of the departments.

Both teachers and graduates mention the Baltic-Finnish philosophical network as suitable to improve their knowledge of both philosophical subjects and academic English through international mobility.

To summarize, on the plus side, the premises, facilities, and equipment of the program are suitable and sufficient for its purposes; the library collections and electronic databases, moreover, are adequate; the library is functional; there is also evidence of international mobility through the Baltic-Finnish network for philosophical studies, as well as of opportunities offered by teachers to the program's students for the publication of their academic articles. On the minus side, electronic databases are not used enough, and some office space should be renovated.

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

The team's overall evaluation is positive. The admission requires a BA diploma in the fields of Humanities and Social Sciences (Education). Those, who don't have it are supposed to take a bridging 30 credit course of lacking philosophical subjects (the tuition must be paid by the

students themselves). Applicants are admitted by their priorities listed in the application and the highest competition score which is calculated by weighting average score of study subjects in the study field, final examination mark or final mark for Bachelor's paper.

The numerous students interviewed by the evaluation team expressed their satisfaction with the program, mostly highlighting that the skills taught in the MA program in Contemporary Philosophical Anthropology relate to the problems they need to solve in 'real' life, mostly in their own professional fields or projects (most of them had chosen this program for self-improvement and not necessarily with the aim to find a job in the philosophical or pedagogical fields). Those who chose to work as teachers said that the philosophical and psychological skills taught in the program have helped them to better communicate with school pupils.

The general aims and assessment procedure are discussed in the introductory meetings and later continued during the seminars or lectures. The students' self-reflection is encouraged and is supported by the teachers who can provide additional feedback or help with the assignments, general progress, etc. Each student has the opportunity for the individual consultations with teachers or administration.

The academic honesty is regulated by the Statue and Code of Ethics of LEU. During the lectures, teachers emphasize the value of academic honesty and explaining the characteristics of plagiarism. The university can carry out one of the following penalties for students' violation of rules: 1) remark; 2) reprimand; 3) severe reprimand; 4) removal from the University.

Students are encouraged to take part in academic and applied research activities. Annual Day of Philosophy is organized in November where students' scientific conference takes place as a part of it and the students give their presentations. They are also encouraged to publish articles on their field of research in <http://aplinkkeliai.lt>.

Number of alumni and social partners from a variety of different professional spheres like news or TV production companies were happy to share their knowledge and experience with the students by organizing lectures and offering them internship opportunities.

The evaluation is somewhat concerned with the low level of internationalization of the MA program (in terms of students' exchanges) – none of the students who came to the interview had taken part in one of the mobility programs but that may be due to the fact that most of the MA students are either married or have jobs. The university, however, invites foreign guest lecturers and organizes short-term symposiums abroad to which the students take part.

The program has among its main strengths the fact that the university keeps a close relation with alumni and social partners; skills that are taught in the program, moreover, are applicable in the market. Also, the internationalization of the program might be improved.

## ***2.6. Program management***

What appeared likely when assessing the SER 2017 of the MA-program and the respective previous evaluation report as regards the program management became manifest during the site visit: a structure of its own, intended to ensure quality is formally in place, with a certain amount of overarching rules and regulations, in particular concerning the European Quality Assurance Framework, in which LEU's internal Strategy of Quality Assurance formally rests.

By and large, it seems that ensuring quality in terms of day-to-day operations depends to a large extent on dedicated individuals and less on systematic pursuance of the structure formally in place; that, in turn, could prove disadvantageous, once fluctuation of personnel occurs. Systemic pursuance should be given more attention.

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.

Apparently, quality assurance also encompasses an established mechanism to recruit and retain staff by means of competition and regular re-assessment. The recommendation of the previous evaluation to take more care of duly processing outcomes of internal and external evaluations has been lived up to but partially: formally, students are asked to assess their teachers and the learning process, the results of which enter personnel records but seemingly do not sufficiently lead to a guided process of improving or fine-tuning the study program. In general, the latter obviously depends to a large degree on individual person's commitment and less on a structured approach. A structured approach is advantageous in terms of seeing program improvement on sure ground, unaffected by personnel fluctuation. Students, in turn, did not speak out enthusiastically in regard to their impact on program improvement. A perceivable tendency prevails among them not to be overly concerned with such exercise. Hence, more involvement in the SP Committee does neither "ring a bell" nor does it feature prominently. A culture of commitment and involvement appears desirable to enhance students' identification with a study program they basically cherish and consider to be good.

External partners seem to be involved in terms of being available as reference sources but apparently less in a formalized, structured way but rather as information pools to be tapped whenever individual initiatives of either alumni and their business partners or present students and staff are taken to reach out for information and advice regarding the world of work. Since the alumni that were present during the site visit – some of them apparently successfully established in the private sector – appeared willing to become more involved, it seems recommendable to go for a more formal structure of exchange of information and, at the same time, to allow external partners to become genuine stakeholders as regards gradual adjustments and improvements of the program. For example, a regular forum held on the LEU's premises that would bring together potential employers (private, public, and governmental sector) and students not primarily opting for the teaching profession could be advantageous, thus concurrently enhancing the MA's program attractiveness due to this particular add-on feature. Although presently the study program seems to be known among potential future students throughout the country, the relevance, uniqueness and, above all, diversification of the program's focal points could be highlighted more systematically by means of improved public relation and marketing strategies, possibly carried out jointly with alumni external partners (cf. idea of a 'forum').

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

- (1) An active strategy to develop and market the study program's unique profile, along with intensified public relations. Irrespective of the future of the institution, such endeavours could be an advantage in terms of positioning the program early on;
- (2) University should consider re-assessment of teaching loads, presently considered to be too high;
- (3) More international twinning and running of joint MA-programs or, at least, integrated practical exposure to possible professions suitable for MA-students in the field appear recommendable (e.g.: internships at international organizations, foreign ministries, NGOs, research councils abroad). In this respect, a concerted effort to open up such possibilities should be considered, including alumni and social partners;
- (4) Measures to enhance students' identification with the program in terms of making them active stakeholders of their studies, for example, by encouraging more involvement at the level of the SP Committee;
- (5) A more structured approach to implementing the outcome of assessments and feedbacks.

#### **IV. SUMMARY**

The evaluation team positively assessed the Master's program teaching experience, didactic methodology, and unique selling point (a program with unique features leading to a versatile qualification and useful skills); the level of interaction with social partners; and the flexibility of formation. The program is also praiseworthy as regards its good relations with alumni and social partners, as well as regards the availability of an established fund to support the staff's international outreach.

On the other side, the master could definitely take advantage from more public relations outreach and marketing. Moreover, the program's and the University's unsecure future is detrimental to motivation and morale, leading also to low student enrolment. Programme should implement an active strategy to develop and market the study program's unique profile, along with intensified public relations. Irrespective of the future of the institution, such endeavours could be an advantage in terms of positioning the program early on. Also more international twinning and running of joint MA-programs or, at least, integrated practical exposure to possible professions suitable for MA-students in the field appear recommendable (e.g.: internships at international organizations, foreign ministries, NGOs, research councils abroad). In this respect, a concerted effort to open up such possibilities should be considered, including alumni and social partners.

## V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study program *Contemporary Philosophical Anthropology* (state code – 6211NX010 (till 2017 - 621V50003)) at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study program assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation of an area in points*
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: Team leader:	<b>Prof. Massimo Leone</b>
Grupės nariai: 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 ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ  
PROGRAMOS ŠIUOLAIKINĖ FILOSOFINĖ ANTROPOLOGIJA (VALSTYBINIS  
KODAS - 6211NX010, 621V50003) 2017-12-19 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ  
NR. SV4-240 IŠRAŠAS**

&lt;...&gt;

**V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS**

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Šiuolaikinė filosofinė antropologija* (valstybinis kodas - 6211NX010, 621V50003) 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**

Vertinimo grupė teigiamai įvertino magistrantūros programos dėstytojų patirtį, didaktinę metodiką ir programos išskirtinumą (unikaliomis savybėmis pasižyminti programa suteikia įvairialypę kvalifikaciją ir naudingus įgūdžius); sąveikos su socialiniais partneriais laipsnį bei sandaros lankstumą. Programa taip pat verta pagyrimo dėl gerų santykių su absolventais ir socialiniais partneriais ir fondo, įsteigto personalo tarptautinei veiklai remti.

Kita vertus, magistrantūros programai neabejotinai galėtų būti naudingi platesnio masto viešieji ryšiai ir rinkodara. Be to, programos ir universiteto ateities neaiškumas kenkia motyvacijai ir dvasinei būklei bei lemia mažą programą pasirinkusių studentų skaičių. Programos vykdytojai turėtų įgyvendinti aktyvią strategiją, skatinančią sukurti ir pasiūlyti unikalią studijų programą, kartu intensyviau plėtojant viešuosius ryšius. Kad ir kokia būtų aukštosios mokyklos ateitis, pastangos kuo anksčiau įtvirtinti programą suteiktų pranašumo. Taip pat rekomenduojama rengti tarptautines porines ir vykdyti bendras magistrantūros programas arba bent taikyti kompleksinį praktinį požiūrį į galimas magistrantūros studentams tinkamas šios srities profesijas (pvz.: stažuotės tarptautinėse organizacijose, užsienio šalių ministerijose, nevyriausybiniuose organizacijose, užsienio mokslinių tyrimų tarybose). Todėl reikėtų pagalvoti apie bendras pastangas atverti tokias galimybes, į veiklą įtraukiant absolventus ir socialinius partnerius.

<...>

### III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Aktyvi strategija, skatinanti sukurti ir pasiūlyti unikalią studijų programą, kartu intensyviau plėtojant viešuosius ryšius. Kad ir kokia būtų aukštosios mokyklos ateitis, pastangos kuo anksčiau įtvirtinti programą suteiktų pranašumo;
2. Universitetas turėtų apsvarstyti galimybę pakartotinai įvertinti dėstytojų darbo krūvį, kuris šiuo metu yra laikomas per dideliu;
3. Rekomenduojama rengti tarptautines porines ir vykdyti bendras magistrantūros programas arba bent taikyti kompleksinį praktinį požiūrį į galimas magistrantūros studentams tinkamas šios srities profesijas (pvz.: stažuotės tarptautinėse organizacijose, užsienio šalių ministerijose, nevyriausybinėse organizacijose, užsienio mokslinių tyrimų tarybose). Todėl reikėtų pagalvoti apie bendras pastangas atverti tokias galimybes, į veiklą taip pat įtraukiant absolventus ir socialinius partnerius;
4. Priemonės, padedančios studentams labiau susitapatinti su programa aktyviai dalyvaujant studijų procese, pavyzdžiui, skatinant juos daugiau dalyvauti SP komiteto lygmenyje;
5. Sistemingesnis požiūris į vertinimą ir grįžtamojo ryšio rezultatų įgyvendinimą.

<...>

---

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)