



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

KAUNO TECHNOLOGIJOS UNIVERSITETO
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *EDUKACINĖS TECHNOLOGIJOS*
(valstybinis kodas –621X20003)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGIES* (state code –621X20003)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at **KAUNAS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY**

1. **Prof. dr. Pertti Kansanen (team leader)** *academic.*
2. **Prof. dr. Ilze Ivanova,** *academic.*
3. **Prof. dr. Fuensanta Hernandez Pina,** *academic.*
4. **Dr. Marian McCarthy,** *academic.*
5. **Ms. Žaneta Savickienė,** *social partner's representative.*
6. **Andrius Ledas,** *students' representative.*

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba

Vilnius
2014

Report language - English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Edukacinės technologijos</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621X20003
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Edukologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinės (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Edukologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2001 m gegužės 24 d., Nr. ISAK-877

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Educational Technologies</i>
State code	621X20003
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Educology
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Educology
Date of registration of the study programme	May 24, 2001 No. ISAK-877

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
1.1. Background of the evaluation process.....	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
1.2. General.....	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information.....	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
1.4. The Review Panel.....	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
2.2. Curriculum design	8
2.3. Teaching staff.....	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
2.6. Programme management	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
IV. EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE*	17
V. SUMMARY.....	Klaida! Žymelė neapibrėžta.
VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT.....	21

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

The evaluation of on-going study programme is based on **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 (further – 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 following main stages: *1) self-evaluation and self-evaluation report (further- SER), prepared by Higher Education Institution (further - HEI); 2) visit of the review panel to the higher education institution; 3) preparation of the evaluation report by the expert panel and its publication; 4) follow-up activities.*

On the basis of external evaluation report of the study programme, the 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. In addition to the SER, the evaluation is based on the field visits and meetings at the institution:

- Meeting with administrative staff of the University and of the Faculty
- Meeting with the staff responsible for the preparation of the SER
- Meeting with teaching staff
- Meeting with students
- Meeting with graduates
- Meeting with employers of those who have graduated from the programme

- Visiting and observing various support services (classrooms, library, computer services, staff developments, laboratories, etc.)
- Acquaintance with students' final works, examination material.

At the end of the field visit, the initial impressions of the panel were presented to the programme staff and administration.

The review panel also paid attention to the conclusions and recommendations presented by the former expert group. Along with the SER and annexes, the following additional documents were provided by Kaunas University of Technology (further – KTU) before, during and/or after the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	A written presentation in PowerPoint format charting the Self Evaluation Process of the Existing Study Programmes at KTU.
2.	A written presentation in PowerPoint format charting the Registration of a New Study Module and Assessment of a Study Module.

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

It is important to note that, since 2011, this University has become a public institution. Another shift in focus relates to the renaming of the Faculty; until the 2nd January 2014, it was called The Faculty of Social Sciences. It is now called The Faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities. The second cycle, masters of education programme, has been running at KTU since 1993 and the master's degree study programme on Educational Technologies has been in existence since 2001 and was accredited in 2008 for six years. Also of note is KTU's leadership in developing Kaunas as an e-city, a Learning City. This is a significant contribution to the development of the city and should be used more as leverage for funding and international recognition.

1.4. *The Review Panel*

1. **Prof. dr. Pertti Kansanen (team leader)**, *Professor Emeritus of Education, Department of Teacher Education, University of Helsinki, Finland.*
2. **Prof. dr. Ilze Ivanova**, *Head of the Department of Education at Faculty of Education, Psychology and Art, University of Latvia, Latvia.*
3. **Prof. dr. Fuensanta Hernandez Pina**, *Professor of Methods of Research and Diagnosis in Education at the University of Murcia, Spain.*
4. **Dr. Marian McCarthy**, *Senior lecturer in Education, Co-director of the Teaching and Learning Centre, University College Cork, Ireland.*
5. **Ms. Živilė Savickienė**, *Director of Vilnius Educational Information Centre, Lithuania.*
6. **Mr. Andrius Ledas**, *Student of Vilnius University study programme English Philology,*

The review panel was completed according to the *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. 11/11/2011 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the panel on *15th October, 2014*.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. *Programme aims and learning outcomes*

The programme aims and learning outcomes meet the criteria laid down by this quality assurance process. The programme aims are well defined, clear and accessible. This master's degree programme focuses on producing creative graduates who will be able to perform at the interface of educational science and educational technology and who will be able to independently and responsibly apply such knowledge in new situations – a real test of understanding. Table 2, *Partial Aims and Expected Learning Outcomes of Master's Study Programme 'Educational Technologies'*, page 7 of the SER, shows that these aims are comprehensively aligned under key aims regarding A) Knowledge and its Application, B) Research Abilities and Skills, C) Subject-Specific Abilities and Skills, D) Social Abilities and Skills and E) Personal Abilities and Skills. Of particular note is the detailed, aligned work provided which grasps the complexity of the discipline and the technology and uses the scope of Bloom's taxonomy to challenge students in the variety and scale of learning outcomes provided. This is particularly evidence in C) Subject – Specific Abilities and Skills. The aims and learning

outcomes also meet the needs of the labour market, taking into account the ability of the master's student to apply knowledge in creative and flexible ways as part of a career trajectory.

The aim of the study programme is publically available on AIKOS and on the KTU website and reviewed annually, along with the intended learning outcomes. The latter are reviewed and coordinated with teachers, social partners and students at the beginning of each academic year, which the panel felt ensures rigour and direction. The aims of the programme also relate strategically to the findings of the European Commission research on ICT in Education, which, again, provides evidence of developing ICT and communication infrastructure in schools and, consequently, on enhancing young people's digital competencies.

Table 3, *The Compatibility of the KTU mission, strategy and the mission of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities*, page 9 of the SER, provides a holistic picture of where the programme fits in to the mission of KTU – which embeds and aligns the programme very well. The aims of this programme also relate to the goals of developing Kaunas city and region into an e-city, fitting into Kaunas City Strategic plan for 2005-2015 regarding the development of high – technology in the region.

Table 4, *The Compatibility of Learning Outcomes of the Study Programme Educational Technologies to the Study Cycle*, page 11 of the SER, shows clearly that the programme is at second cycle level, aligning throughout with the Study Cycle Description and international standards regarding the Bologna process and Master's programmes. Table 5, *Connection of Programme Aims, Learning Outcomes and Study Subjects of the Study Programme 'Educational Technologies'*, page 12 of the SER, provides another layer of cross-reference and cohesion. Such detail and alignment speaks to the embedded nature of the programme and the hard work and meticulousness of the SER team and the broader academic and administrative teams. This is excellent work on the macro and micro levels. The SER team have also drawn the programme together in their *Conclusions*, highlighting their key strengths and pointing to the unique nature of the programme, the only one of its kind in Lithuania whose aim is to develop student competence regarding “the understanding, application and implementation of educational and information technologies in educational space”. Hence, the ability of the graduates of the programme to “apply information and communication technologies at educational institutions”, verified by the review panel's discussion with students and graduates of the programme. The SER team is also conscious of the fact that the new faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities is still in its infancy and that the mission and vision of the new faculty is still emergent and will have implications for the further alignment and refinement of the Educational

Technologies' programme. This is to be expected and it is good that the SER team anticipate such modifications.

In the panel's discussions with the SER team and with administrators and academic staff, it became clear that there should be an English version of the programme, and that plans for this are underway since the last review process. Such a programme is now urgently needed to attract more students and to facilitate the future development of blended and online learning. Such a programme would also enhance Kaunas as an e-city.

Strengths:

- The programme aims and learning outcomes show much clarity, alignment and cohesion and are meticulously documented and sustained throughout.
- That KTU has a reputation as a Centre of Excellence is significant locally and internationally.
- The contribution of KTU to the development of Kaunas as a Learning City is significant and far reaching for the city and the university and adds much strength to this programme.

Areas to improve:

- An English version of the programme is now overdue and would greatly enhance the international reputation of KTU and of Kaunas as an e-city. It would also bring significant funding into the University.

2.2. Curriculum design

The review panel notes that the approach to Curriculum Design/Programme Design is again comprehensive and very well aligned, meeting all defined criteria regarding the general requirements for master's study programmes. Table 6, *The Structure of the Study Programme 'Educational Technologies'*, page 14 of the SER, provides a detailed tabulation of the study subjects and their optional alternatives, their credit weighting, the contact hours of each subject and the semesters in which students can take the subject. In total, studies last two years and students accumulate 120 credits, 30 credits of which are aimed at the final degree project preparation and its defence. The review panel agrees that such a structure is appropriate for students to successfully achieve the learning outcomes. Figure 1, which outlines *The Place of Study Subjects in the Study Programme*, shows the balance necessary between *curriculum and technologies* and *educational management and technologies* when constructing the Final Degree Project.

There is much work done in Table 7, *Matrix of Relations of Study Subjects and Learning Outcomes*, for example, on aligning learning outcomes and ensuring that each module picks up key learning outcomes. The latter span the scale of Bloom's Taxonomy, ultimately prioritising higher order thinking and synthesis, and are not repetitive. The review panel, however, suggest that it would also be worthwhile to chart the alignment of the learning outcomes and the specific assessment modes and processes of the programme. The assessment aspect needs to be more explicit regarding its variety and inclusiveness (for example, the use of modes of continuous assessment needs to be stated, along with those of the summative, terminal assessment and final degree project. Such methods are indeed implicit in the variety of teaching methods and of ways of learning that make up the programme. It is just a question of making them more explicit in tabular form. Overall, however, the Curriculum Design section shows very promising work in the area of alignment and cohesion.

Table 8, *The study subjects of the study programme 'Educational Technologies' aimed to develop research skills and abilities*, page 17 of the SER, is revealing in charting the research skills and abilities of the programme and concentrates on making explicit the volume and nature of the master's final degree project. The panel found this most helpful in articulating the journey from Research Project 1 to the final iteration of the research. The public defence of the project, in the presence of members of the qualification commission, provides the student with the opportunity to prove that s/he has met the learning outcomes and merited the degree.

The *Conclusion* section outlines the strengths of the programme and points to its richness in its variety of innovative study subjects, which speak to the complexity of the field of Educational Technology, which, by definition, is forever emergent. The conclusion highlights the fact that the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary dimensions of the programme are catered for in the integration of researchers from two other National Research Centres in the Social Sciences field; hence, the outward looking and collaborative nature of the research work and the field. The SER team acknowledges the need to keep the context of the programme up to date in the light of rapid developments in educational technology- this is at once a strength and a challenge and points to the nature of the discipline and its constant state of flux. In contemplating such a challenge, the panel supports the SER's suggestion to introduce a new subject on educational management which would allow students to develop competencies in educational organisation.

Strengths:

- The content and methods of the modules are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.
- The programme is open to the need to constantly evolve in the ever-changing world of educational technology.

Areas of Improvement:

- Though there is excellent alignment in the programme, there is an opportunity to make more explicit the alignment between learning outcomes, learning activities and assessment.
- The SER's acknowledgement of the possible need for a new subject /module re educational management /educational organisation should be considered.

2.3. Teaching staff

The programme is run by 2 professors and 10 associate professors. The staff is legally and appropriately qualified and is a highly experienced group of researchers – the extent of their publications and the various genres of these is most impressive, as is their contribution to the European Educational Research Association (EERA) and other international scholarly bodies. The fact that the KTU research school of educational sciences was designated a Centre of Excellence speaks for itself regarding the teaching staff's ability to meet the legal and professional requirements necessary to ensure the fulfilment of the intended learning outcomes of this programme. The SER defines clearly, on page 5, the beneficial effects of being a Centre of Excellence, highlighting how the centre acts as a bridge between researchers of educational sciences in Lithuania and Europe and focusing on how the centre has acted as a catalyst in the establishment of the Lithuanian Education Research Association (LERA), leading to its involvement in EERA, which provides a platform for Lithuanian researchers and doctoral students to present their work at conferences. Such initiatives have also led to further alliances, such as the Baltic Initiatives Programme (BIP). Staff have, therefore, involved themselves in international research contexts and collaborated, for example, with researchers from the University of Cambridge and London University, to write the book: *Universities and Societies in Transition: Higher Education and the Development of Countries and Regions*. Two researchers from the KTU Department of Educational Sciences have also been elected by the Science Council of the University of Cambridge as members of the College and are visiting professors

there. The KTU research group of educational sciences is also recognised by the European Educational Research Association (EERA), and by the International Social Work and Society Academy (TISSA). The professional development of the staff is ensured, therefore, in their international profiles and their internships and opportunities harnessed to work in other European and global contexts. The SER's own concern in the Conclusion to the section, regarding the demands of the research and of the teaching programme, is understandable and, as suggested below by the panel, the teaching – research balance needs to be regularly revisited. A concern is expressed in section 69, page 19 of the SER, for example, regarding the workload of the staff, which is more in the range of 1000 hours per year, than the recommended 800 hours. The review panel agrees that such concerns are legitimate and pervasive in the university sector.

The competencies of the staff, as defined in section 3.2, the SER are not in question and provide an excellent bed-rock for the success of the programme. The review panel agree that one of the key strengths of the programme is the quality of the academic staff and the great number of PhD students in the broader context –about 73– which bodes well for the academic and professional standing of staff and students of KTU. The staff is also outward looking, embracing the views of their external stakeholders and alumni. Again, one of the challenges identified relates, particularly, to the balance between teaching and research, which will need continual monitoring – the teaching also needing as much attention as the research. Perhaps a way forward is to give further consideration to the international Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) movement, originally emergent in the work of Ernest Boyer (1990) and the Carnegie Foundation in the USA, which focuses on the integration of research, teaching and learning and, hence, on researching student learning as a legitimate research area? Given that the staff of this programme are avid researchers, a SoTL research profile might facilitate more action research, thus integrating teaching and research. The review panel suggests that academic staff could, therefore, broaden their remit by presenting at international SoTL conferences in the USA or Canada, for example. EuroSoTL has also been founded in 2014 and will meet in University College Cork, Ireland, for example, in June 2015, and in other European contexts in the future, and would provide a good forum to take stock of how faculty can integrate research, teaching and learning. However, the panel acknowledges the excellent educational research profiles of the staff of the programme and mentions SoTL only as one way of answering the teaching versus research dilemma. Another suggestion from the review panel, in this regard, is that staff could focus on Classroom Assessment Techniques (Angelo and Cross, 1993, for example) and on researching the evidence for student learning in this context, again providing an action research context, where staff look for the evidence of student learning in their own classrooms and

research this, as a way of bridging the research –teaching gap. Such an approach can also be seen as an application of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Strengths:

- The staff are a key strength and resource of the programme –their research profiles and energy and commitment in developing their teaching and research are exemplary.
- The fact that the KTU research school of educational sciences was designated a Centre of Excellence, by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education in 2007, speaks for itself as a strength and has brought international standing and resources to the faculty.

Areas of improvement :

- Staff need to be vigilant regarding the teaching – research balance, a universal problem for academic staff. The panel made some suggestions regarding the development of a scholarship of teaching and learning ethos that might address this.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

This area is of particular interest in the context of provision regarding educational technology. The University provides auditoria with modern audio and video equipment, meeting health and safety standards, to date. Students have comfortable and diverse spaces in which to work and their learning is also facilitated in community projects. The Library space is attractive and spacious and is now part of the building – such new facilities greatly enhance the learning experience. Though the premises are indeed adequate and attractive, and the equipment adequate in this context, it is important to continue to be vigilant in catering even more for all students – including those with a disability. The panel recommend more lifts and access for such students- indeed, any student, or staff member, could be incapacitated and need such access temporarily.

More access for all is a key recommendation for the future development of the programme. The assistive technology laboratory, while available, will need further development to keep abreast of new technologies, learning approaches and student needs, particularly when the focus of this programme is on educational technology. More computer stations are necessary in this context, for example, to cater for the different types of students so that they can become independent learners. Some students need speech software; the blind student, for example, can read independently with the appropriate software; while others, who might be dyslexic, need

more visual clues to help them decode text. Hence, the need for a variety of computers with such assistive technology.

It is interesting to keep future challenges in mind here given the rapid changes in technology. A key question which the SER itself asks is in regard to future proofing the programme by keeping up with the constant advances in technology. Such a critique is welcome and given the very nature of the field of Educational Technologies, it will be important to constantly critique and to create a learning environment that is inclusive of all students. Given the nature of Educational Technologies and the flexible learning approaches it begets, the panel recommends that it is important to make the most of the technology for all students and to embrace the world wide movement towards Universal Design for Learning (UDL), both in the design of the buildings and the technology. The panel recommends the work of the work of David Rose and the Centre for Assistive Technology (www.cast.org) as an example of excellence in this context. The work of AHEAD (The Association for Higher Education Access and Disability) in Ireland at www.ahead.ie also provides examples of good practices and will host an international conference on UDL in March 2015, in which faculty might be interested.

Regarding textual resources, though there is a provision of English texts, the panel recommends that it is important to get Master's students to cite the English literature more and to develop further resources in English. The challenge of providing and continuously upgrading library resources is acknowledged in the SER and would help to extend the international focus of the programme. Such a move will also be necessary if the programme is to be available in English.

Strengths:

- The Library space is attractive and spacious and is now part of the building – such new facilities greatly enhance the learning experience.

Areas of improvement:

- It is important to get Master's students to cite the English literature more and to develop further resources in English. This is also a necessary step in fast tracking the English version of the programme.
- More access is necessary for students with disabilities through the provision of more lifts and points of access in this attractive space.
- The development of the assistive technology lab is very important if KTU is to be democratic and include all students as independent learners.

- The faculty should work towards embedding the principles of Universal Design for Learning in the building and in the teaching – learning experience.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The admission to the second- level study programme ' Educational Technologies' is carried out according to the General Regulations for General Admission to second- level studies and is, therefore, well founded. The admission process is performed by the Faculty Student Admission Commission established by order of the KTU rector. The requirements for admission are reasonable and transparent and publically available. Admission to the Master's programme takes place in two stages. Stage 1 relates to the general admission, the applicants submitting documents to the Selection Committee of the Faculty. The Committee then calculates the competitive score and ranks the entrants. Stage 2 is an extra admission process relating to the filling of vacant positions in the study programme. The SER provides a detailed account of the admission process and procedures, as indicated above.

The SER provides a series of detailed Tables (10, 11 and 12) charting the number of applicants and their increase/decrease. Currently, there are 8 students in the first grade and 8 in the second. Since 2009, due to a directive from the Government regarding quotas, the numbers of state funded places has decreased and students are not always able to take up a place on the course due to the necessity to gain employment or to continue working. The economic crisis is also a key factor in defining student participation and performance, but this is a common problem globally. The programme team address the 'drop out' issue by providing a flexible timetable in the evening time, a fact commented on favourably by students and graduates of the course.

There is a keen research ethos and focus in the postgraduate culture at KTU. The number of PhDs (there are 73 doctoral dissertations since 1993) in the faculty is impressive and bodes well for the profile of all programmes at Master's level, providing research role models and a culture of participation and collaboration. There is, therefore, a culture of getting students to publish research in their Master's projects; there is much partnership with the faculty here and excellent role –modelling of the research process and its dissemination. The final degree project is an analytical project based on independent research but is well scaffolded/prepared over the four semesters of the programme. Key to the development of a master's research culture here is the public presentaton and defence of the project. Hence, programme learning outcomes at master's level are achievable in this way.

There is also a connection with the community and the market place that gives a practical and cutting edge to the research, pointing to the importance too of applied, action research – this ties in well with the Scholarship of Application, key to the SoTL model discussed earlier on which KTU could build. The panel's discussions with stakeholders of the programme speak to their overall satisfaction and to the importance of KTU's contribution in the community and its scholarly standing. Students and graduates of the programme also spoke highly of community and school projects and being given the opportunity to conduct real research that was of use to the community and that made sense of research methods and approaches and linked theory to practice. Central to the panel's discussion with the students of the programme was how the concept of the e-city or the Learning City is emerging in such focused and applied projects. Perhaps the contribution of the university to the e-city could be acknowledged in better funding to support projects and development. The panel recommends that the social partners and graduates could identify such funding strategies.

Students also have the opportunity to participate in mobility programmes. However, many cannot avail of these, due to pressures of work, financial constraints and family commitments. The panel recommends that issues of funding should be looked at locally and, again, that the concept of the Learning City might provide some leverage here, since the university is addressing the needs of the community and the city and could, therefore, legitimately ask for more funding. However, both students and graduates of the programme speak well of the opportunities provided to them individually and of staff motivation and encouragement.

The assessment system of students' performance is indeed clear, adequate and publically available. The panel has noted earlier that the very most of the assessment process could be achieved by mapping out more explicitly the alignment between the learning outcomes and the various assessment modes and genres. However, the clarity throughout of programme and module learning outcomes and requirements is excellent and meticulously documented.

The professional activities of the majority of graduates meet the programme providers' expectations. In discussions with the graduates and social partners it is clear that the programme serves the needs of the professions and the community.

Strengths:

- The study process and students' performance assessment are transparent and cohesive.
- Students have the opportunity to present their research and to work collaboratively with staff to review and to publish.

- A culture of research excellence is embedded in the programme and the ethos of the faculty.

Areas of Improvement:

- Students need to write more and reference more in English.
- Funding needs to be prioritized to support students and to nurture the development of the new programme in English.

2.6 Programme management

Programme management is impressive. Responsibilities for decision making and monitoring mechanisms are clearly identified and allocated, as was clear from the panel's discussions with administrative and academic staff and with the SER team. It is clear from the interviews with staff and stakeholders that data regarding the evaluation and implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed and acted upon. The outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used to develop it, a point made clear by the presence of 7 stakeholders and 12 graduates of the programme whose views were sought and valued. Many of the graduates keep regular contact with the university and some stay on to complete doctoral studies. Though graduates were a little reticent in discussion, they were in agreement that they were given confidence and were encouraged to develop their own learning styles and to build on their research skills. One graduate talked of teaching in a pre-school and of the necessity to develop competencies in data processing. Another talked of introducing tablets in the classroom and of getting opportunities to develop a partnership with Microsoft, arising out of the applied nature of the programme. Another spoke of being able to move from a small to a big school and being able to work with children using IT and educational games. A few graduates spoke of how they could help the programme by sharing their experience in their capacity as mentors. The question of funding also arose in the context of the university's role in developing the Learning City and how this could be used to leverage funding.

The faculty's own summation of their strengths and weaknesses is insightful – there will always be challenges and they are conscious of these. Such critique is one of the mainstays of good programme management. From the review panel's discussions with a variety of stakeholders, it is clear that the programme management is in good hands. The programme team display an openness and willingness to learn and are very well motivated and hard working as teachers and researchers. The internal quality assurance measures are indeed working effectively and efficiently – there is much accountability, collaboration, alignment and cohesion.

Strengths:

- Programme management is in capable hands and is shared and distributed.
- The team look outwards to make the most of the programme.
- Students and graduates of the programme feel confident and competent and are appreciative of staff commitment and support.

Areas of improvement:

- There is a need to seek funding.
- Graduates and social partners could contribute more as mentors.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

- There needs to be more emphasis now on the English version of the programme which would add to student numbers and to the international standing of the programme.
- The faculty need to be more proactive regarding local funding. The fact that KTU is supporting Kaunas as a Learning City, should provide leverage for funding.
- More lifts for disabled people and more assistive technology needs to be considered as a matter of some urgency. The philosophy of Universal Design for Learning should become an integral part of the programme, in line with best practice internationally.
- The balance between research and teaching should be sustained, regarding workload and the value placed on teaching, as well as research. This balance needs to be constantly revisited with the idea of being teaching active having parity of esteem with being research active.
- Though alignment is a key strength of the programme, the panel recommend including a table on the alignment of learning outcomes, learning activities and assessment as a key aspect of curriculum design.

Further details regarding Recommendations are provided below under Summary.

IV. EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE*

- KTU's reputation as a Centre of Excellence emerges throughout in the research profiles and international publications of the staff and in the collaborative work of staff and students.

- It is clear that the review process was undertaken meticulously and openly. The SER is exemplary in providing a detailed description and analysis of the programme and its infrastructure, alignment and coherence.
- The scope of the research being conducted and the attention to detail regarding the matrices that make alignment across the programme visible are impressive.
- The qualifications, competence and research achievements of the faculty are a key strength of the programme, catalysed in particular in their acknowledgement as a Centre of Excellence.
- The faculty is also reflective, identifying key challenges themselves and is, therefore, critically aware of the work to be done. The staff is to be complemented on the ability to adapt and develop, given the recent changes to the faculty structure.
- In general, the programme itself is an example of excellence, providing a meticulous documentation of the teaching, learning and assessment of each module.

V. SUMMARY

In general, this Programme of Educational Technology reaches a very high standard, befitting a Centre of Excellence. Its ambitions in the wider community – of turning Kaunas into an e-city are commendable – ultimately, it is the master’s student as active citizen that matters. The exit presentation of the review panel identified the following strengths:

Positive Aspects:

- The programme has impact regarding its determination to mould Kaunas into a Learning City.
- KTU is a centre of excellence where research is valued and nurtured in the development of international research profiles, through LERA, EERA and other research bodies and collaborations. Staff are very well motivated and work hard to develop themselves and the programme and to meet challenges.
- Student research is making an impact and changing the community; the themes are real and link with practical life. Such work also speaks to the partnerships between staff and students in undertaking such research and in the modelling of excellent practice in this regard.
- The quality assurance system of the programme is really strong and the responsibilities are clearly distributed at the Administration level.

- The curriculum design of the programme is watertight and it is authentic and there is much alignment.
- Faculty are also willing to change and adapt and to work together. They were willing to merge, despite losing two posts, which shows a flexible management system and the capacity to reform.
- Overall, the review panel were very pleased with the self- evaluation report, its meticulous detail, rigor and accountability. The panel note the faculty's ability to present its strengths, identifying particularly with the theme of Kaunas as a Learning City and also growing KTU as a Centre of Excellence. The panel note the good relations with the broader community of graduates and stake holders too. The Learning City theme is a key building block in these relationships.

Negative Aspects: (as per the Recommendations above)

- There needs to be more emphasis now on the English version of the programme – this should be developed as a matter of urgency- since the English version is now 6 years in the making. This would improve the internationalisation aspect of the programme and answer the problem regarding numbers and funding.
- Perhaps more concrete resources regarding using English should also be considered? For example, perhaps intending students should study English in the Bachelor's degree? Such an approach could raise the bar regarding the Master's student and language proficiency. In the panel's review of Masters theses, the panel got a good impression of the work, but references regarding internationalization need to be cited more in English – more foreign literature needs consideration. Again, this would raise the profile of English on the programme.
- The faculty need to be more proactive regarding local funding. Perhaps the city could give more funding, in return for the productive projects that the programme provides in creating a Learning City? Additional funding would bring the programme to life. Also, perhaps staff and administration could try to find possibilities for more funding for study places to counteract declining student numbers? An English version of the programme, which would also attract international students and create an online /blended version of the programme, would generate funding.
- More lifts for disabled people and more assistive technology need to be considered as a matter of some urgency. Though it was good to see very basic assistive technology, this could be developed beyond accommodations and the deficit model. It is important to

consider moving in the direction of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) – so that all students (and staff) are included. The UDL model moves beyond the medical, and indeed, social models of disability, indicating that a universally designed approach benefits all students. See the excellent work of David Rose and CAST (www.cast.org) in the USA for direction here. The AHEAD movement in Ireland is also exemplary (www.ahead.ie).

- The balance between research and teaching is always a challenge regarding workload and the value placed on teaching, as well as research. Administration can control some of this balance. However, it is also important to keep abreast of international research, regarding the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), for example, which focuses on the inextricable link between teaching and research. The balance lies in being teaching active – as well as research active- and constantly negotiating this balance-and researching teaching by looking for the evidence of student learning across the disciplines, as suggested in the panel’s recommendation of SoTL approaches and Classroom Assessment Techniques.
- Though alignment is a key strength of the programme, the panel recommend including a table on the alignment of learning outcomes, learning activities and assessment as a key aspect of curriculum design.

In general, the panel encourage the programme team to continue with this strong programme, the future is indeed positive for the programme, but more energy is needed around providing an English version of it and around generating funding locally and internationally. Catering for the needs of all students, all of whom learn in different ways and bring different strengths to the learning, is also key in maximising KTU’s potential across all disciplines. Moving more in the direction of UDL will benefit all. Finally, maintaining the parity of esteem between teaching and research will enhance both.

** if there are any to be shared as a good practice*

VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Educational Technologies* (state code – 621X20003) at Kaunas University of Technology 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	4
4.	Facilities and learning resources	4
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	4
6.	Programme management	4
	Total:	24

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas: Team leader:	Prof. dr. Pertti Kansanen
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Prof. dr. Ilze Ivanova
	Prof. dr. Fuensanta Hernandez Pina
	Dr. Marian McCarthy
	Ms. Žaneta Savickienė
	Mr. Andrius Ledas