

STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

**PANEVĖŽIO KOLEGIJOS ROKIŠKIO FILIALO**

***ANGLŲ IR VOKIEČIŲ KALBŲ PEDAGOGIKA* PROGRAMOS (65304H113)**

**VERTINIMO** **IŠVADOS**

––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

**EVALUATION REPORT**

of ***PEDAGOGY OF THE ENGLISH AND GERMAN LANGUAGES*** **(65304H113)**  
**STUDY PROGRAMME**

at Panevezys College Rokiškis branch

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grupės vadovas:  Team leader: | Prof. dr. Brian Robinson |
|  |  |
| Grupės nariai:  Team members: | Jolita Butkienė |
| dr. Irina Moore |
|  | Prof. dr. Janis Silis |
|  | Prof. dr. Wolfgang Viereck |

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba

Report language - English

**DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Studijų programos pavadinimas | ***Anglų ir vokiečių kalbų pedagogika*** |
| Valstybinis kodas | 65304H113 |
| Studijų sritis | humanitariniai mokslai |
| Studijų kryptis | filologija |
| Studijų programos rūšis | koleginės studijos |
| Studijų pakopa | pirmoji |
| Studijų forma (trukmė metais) | nuolatinė (4), ištęstinė (5) |
| Studijų programos apimtis kreditais1 | 160 |
| Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija | filologijos profesinis bakalauras, mokytojas |
| Studijų programos įregistravimo data | 2002 m. rugpjūčio 30 d. |

–––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

1 – vienas kreditas laikomas lygiu 40 studento darbo valandų

–––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

**INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of the study programme | ***Pedagogy of the English and German Languages*** |
| State code | 65304H113 |
| Study area | humanities |
| Study field | philology |
| Kind of the study programme | college studies |
| Level of studies | first |
| Study mode (length in years) | full-time (4), part-time (5) |
| Scope of the study programme in national credits1 | 160 |
| Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded | professional bachelor of philology, teacher |
| Date of registration of the study programme | 30 August 2002 |

1 – one credit is equal to 40 hours of student work

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

# CONTENTS

[I. INTRODUCTION 4](#_Toc255803623)

[II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS 5](#_Toc255803624)

[1. Programme aims and learning outcomes 5](#_Toc255803625)

[1.1. Programme demand, purpose and aims 5](#_Toc255803626)

[1.2. Learning outcomes of the programme 6](#_Toc255803627)

[2. Curriculum design 6](#_Toc255803628)

[2.1. Programme structure 6](#_Toc255803629)

[2.2. Programme content 7](#_Toc255803630)

[3. Staff 8](#_Toc255803631)

[3.1. Staff composition and turnover 8](#_Toc255803632)

[3.2. Staff competence 9](#_Toc255803633)

[4. Facilities and learning resources 9](#_Toc255803634)

[4.1. Facilities 9](#_Toc255803635)

[4.2. Learning resources 10](#_Toc255803636)

[5. Study process and student assessment 10](#_Toc255803637)

[5.1. Student admission 10](#_Toc255803638)

[5.2. Study process 10](#_Toc255803639)

[5.3. Student support 11](#_Toc255803640)

[5.4. Student achievement assessment 11](#_Toc255803641)

[5.5. Graduates placement 12](#_Toc255803642)

[6. Programme management 12](#_Toc255803643)

[6.1. Programme administration 12](#_Toc255803644)

[6.2. Internal quality assurance 13](#_Toc255803645)

[III. RECOMMENDATIONS 13](#_Toc255803646)

[IV. GENERAL ASSESSMENT](#_Toc255803647)…………………………………………………………...…….14

# I. INTRODUCTION

# 

The self-assessment group designated by the Panevezys College was constituted by the following members:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nr. | Teaching status, degree, name, surname | Position | Telephone | e-mail address |
| 1. | Lecturer (equivalent to MA) Stanislava Juškienė | Executive of Rokiskis Branch, Panevezys College | 8 458 52497  8 682 45030 | rf-vadove@panko.lt |
| 2. | Assistant (MA) Aušra Gudgalienė | Head of Studies Unit, Head ad interim of Languages and Tourism Department | 8 458 51649  8 646 04519 | rf-studijos@panko.lt |
| 3. | Lecturer (equivalent to MA) Janina Vaičionienė | Lecturer | 8 601 74461 | janinava@gmail.com |
| 4. | Assistant (MA) Rasa Pletaitė-Junokienė | Head of Teaching Practice | 8 458 51235  8 679 95095 | junokienerasa@inbox.lt |
| 5. | Assistant Jevgeni Kudrin | Lecturer | 8 675 84090 | onutenka@yahoo.com |
| 6. | Jekaterina Šliominienė | Fourth – year Student | 8-656-04565 | jsliominiene@yahoo.co.uk |
| 7. | Egidijus Vilimas | Rokiskis J.Tumas-Vaizgantas secondary school Principal | 8-458 51593  8 687 52869 | [vilgidis@gmail.com](mailto:vilgidis@gmail.com) |

On the side of the external evaluators the following members of the expert group were present on the occasion of the all-day visit to the college on 19 April, 2010:

Prof. dr. Brian Robinson

Jolita Butkienė

dr. Irina Motore

Prof. dr. Janis Silis

Prof. dr. Wolfgang Viereck

The external evaluation of the programme under consideration had been carried out in 2008 and received a conditional accreditation. The previous expert group had given the following recommendations for the improvement of the programme:

1. The number of courses devoted to areas of studies not directly relevant to English and German should be reduced.

2. The number of courses devoted to the English and German languages should be increased, e.g., there are no courses devoted to the history of English and German or pragmatics.

3. The contents of some of the courses should be redesigned with the view to the available time and the area of coverage, e.g., English literature, which should also be renamed as “Literature in English” to include American and Commonwealth writers. Furthermore, the course as it is described now is over-ambitious. Likewise the course on German literature is also over-ambitious. The courses on English and German grammar should concentrate more on syntax than they do now. There is no course, brief as it might be, on general linguistics (an introductory one).

4. Although it is not required by law, the College should attempt to employ lecturers with a PhD degree and should not bring in any more MA students or BA holders as lecturers. The lowest degree for a teacher at the college should be MA otherwise the standard of teaching will suffer.

5. The library requires an immediate and drastic expansion for both English and German; e.g., for English in the area of both language and literature as well as reference works (encyclopedias and lexicons) , larger monolingual dictionaries (at least *The shorter Oxford English dictionary*) and journals (e.g., *English Language Teaching, TESOL Quarterly, Language Learning, IRAL, Journal of Applied Linguistics,* etc.). Those should be purchased or subscribed to as soon as possible.

6. The system of critical internal evaluation should be immediately introduced as suggested in item 6 (p.8).

7. The College should attempt to establish permanent relationships with foreign universities and colleges (particularly in English and German speaking countries).

The present evaluation is based on the analysis of the self-assessment document available to the expert group, direct contact and interviews with students, teachers, administrative staff, graduates and employers. The self-assessment report (SAR) was valuable but not critical enough and would have benefited from a close reading and correcting by a native speaker or a near-native speaker of English. It contains numerous language errors, translation errors and is difficult to understand in many places.

# II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

## 1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

### 1.1. Programme demand, purpose and aims

*1.1.1. Uniqueness and rationale of the need for the programme*

The programme was set up as a response to the necessity of preparing qualified teachers in English and a second foreign language (German) in Rokiskis region. There is a shortage of teachers of English in the basic school and teachers will also be needed in the future to teach English at primary schools. The need for qualified teachers (teachers with a BA in English language teaching) was confirmed by employers, students, teachers, and administration. However, the need for teachers of German has been decreasing as stated by the students, employers and graduates during the meeting with the expert group.

*1.1.2. Conformity of the programme purpose with institutional, state and international directives*

The SAR states that the Programme was developed taking into account international and national directives. However, many of the documents cited in the SAR (*Law on Higher Education, 2000*, *Higher Education Development Plan 2006-2010,* *Long term Development Strategy of the State 2002,* *Lisbon Strategy up to 2010)* seem to be outdated*.* The external evaluators would like to suggest to refer to more recent national and international documents in order to reach the standards valid in the field of Philology and higher education generally.

*1.1.3.* *Relevance of the programme aims*

The Programme aims are defined and listed in fairly general terms, but with no reference to the linguistic skills and competences, e.g. “The objective of the English / German language training course is to prepare the elementary school teachers who would speak two foreign languages and be able to teach them, who will be able to put their skills and knowledge into the educational process, communicate and collaborate with the other participants of this process, improve their professional competence, develop and improve their style of teaching, implement the requirements of the educational programmes, organize the extra-curricular activities, express their thoughts both in native and foreign language, apply various achievement and progress evaluation methods, use the IT technologies, develop valuable, ethical and professional attitude.” (p. 6).

These aims are somewhat confusing since they hardly contribute to the clarification of the qualification degree. The study area is not clearly defined: Philology or Education? Accordingly the professional identity is rather fuzzy.

### 1.2. Learning outcomes of the programme

*1.2.1. Comprehensibility and attainability of the learning outcomes*

The expert group got an impression that the Self-assessment group was not clear about the concept of learning outcomes. SAR states: *“Teachers acquire the following professional core competencies: listening/observing; speaking; reading; writing; and computation for daily living needs; methods teaching, management of educational process, principles of collaboration through cooperation, and the trends of professional development” (p.9), „ English and German language programme is created for the college level, therefore it is focused on practical rather than academic activities. The most of study programme is commited to the practical application of knowledge based activities, development of skills and creativity.“* (p. 10). The Programme learning outcomes seem to be very general, they do not define qualification and could be applicable to any higher education programme.

*1.2.2. Consistency of the learning outcomes*

In the list of knowledge and competencies to be acquired, linguistic competencies do not show up, several aims are not precisely represented and the confusion in this respect made it difficult to see to what extent the aims and goals were reflected in the knowledge and skills the students are supposed to acquire.

*1.2.3. Transformation of the learning outcomes*

The expert team fined that there are many courses which do not or to quite a limited extent only contribute to the competences of the teachers of the English and the German language. Core courses referring to professional qualification are not sufficient. Since this programme includes **two languages**, the number of credits allocated to subjects relevant for professional qualification (English+ German) might not be in conformity with the level of knowledge and skills in the area.

## 2. Curriculum design

### 2.1. Programme structure

*2.1.1. Sufficiency of the study volume*

It should be pointed out that it was quite confusing for the experts to analyze SAR since the number of credits presented in the appendices and in the programme grids in the main part of the Report in many cases do not coincide. Thus the logic of the construction of the Programme raised many questions which were not answered during the visit to the institution.

The volume of the Programme remained unclear. The programme grid states that it is 160 credits. However, 2 credits for Translation Basics and 320 hours for Physical education have not been calculated into the programme.

The division into the *general education, study field basics, and subject specific subjects* is faulty, e.g., *Information technology, Rhetoric Primers (?), Methodology of Self-Study and Term Paper, Educational Research Primers (?), History of Culture, Introduction to Linguistics, Text Analysis, Outline (?) of German Literature, Outline of English Literature, German Life and Institutions, British Life and Institutions* are placed under the Pedagogical subjects group, *Basics of Education Management* under General University subjects group.

*The Basics of Education Management, Labour and Civic Safety, English/ German Grammar, Comprehensive English/German* are 1 credit courses which is against the Requirements for Study Programmes (ISAK-1551).

It seems that the staff of the Programme do not fully understand the concept of the credit – in all subject descriptions in SAR the total credit hours correspond to the contact hours, the length of the study semesters differs (SAR, p.17), the structure of the programme needs revising :

**Table 4**. Full-time studies load

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Full-time studies | Terms (amount of weeks) | | | | | | | |
| I (18) | II (18) | III (18) | IV (18) | V (18) | VI (11) | VII (12) | VIII (13) |
| Examinations | 3 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| Number of subjects per term | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 |

*2.1.2. Consistency of the study subjects*

It was difficult to understand the content of the programme, how the courses are sequenced, and what the logical links between the parts of the programme are. The titles of the courses, the learning outcomes and the content in many cases are inconsistent. The description and titles of the courses need to be revised, e.g., *Rhetoric Primers (?), Methodology of Self-Study and Term Paper, Educational Research Primers (?),Text Analysis, Outline (?) of German Literature, Outline (?) of English Literature* ( non-transparent terms).

### 2.2. Programme content

*2.2.1. Compliance of the contents of the studies with legal acts*

As stated in the SAR (p.7), the programme had been developed according to the standards of the foreign language teaching requirements in an elementary school (the Republic of Lithuania, the Ministry of Education and Science, 2002, 17 September, Nr.1673), English and German language teachers training programme standards (the Republic of Lithuania, the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ministry of Health, 2008-06-26 ISAK-1872 (A), -209), Teachers Training Regulation (the Republic of Lithuania, Ministry of Education and Science, 2008 December 5, No. ISAK-3363), Teacher Training Concept (Official News, 2004, Nr.186-6940), Teachers' professional competence inventory (the News, 2007, no. 12-511). However, the coherence and integrity of the programme suffered while translating the directives into the aims and the content of the programme. Also, as it has been stated in the previous chapter of the report, the content of the programme does not comply with national legal acts concerning:

* Study volume expressed in credit points;
* Structure of the programme in terms of division of subjects into general education, field basics and subject specific.

*2.2.2. Comprehensiveness and rationality of programme content*

The courses dealing with the more theoretical topics within English linguistics and literature should be made more comprehensive. The contents and reading lists of these courses would need revision. As future teachers of English and German language the students should acquire better competences of these two languages. The profiles of the many courses in the programme are coverage-oriented, e.g., Comprehensive English/German, the textbooks used ( *Headway)* are not an adequate level resources. English/German pronunciation is dealt with only in the third semester, and the content of the course has to be critically revised.

Too many courses are of limited value for future teachers of English/German language .While it is useful to have pedagogy and psychology in the programme of a future teacher there is too much emphasis on general psychology and pedagogy, the content of these courses in many cases overlap, even the course in Ethics includes readings in psychology that are not relevant to the aims of the course (*Butkienė S., Kepalaitė A. (1996) Mokymasis ir asmenybės brendimas, Gage N.L., Berliner D. (1993) Pedagoginė psichologija,).* The learning outcomes and the content of *Rhetoric Primers* and *Art of Speaking*, *Methodology of Self study and Primer of Educational research* courses should be revised to avoid the overlap and to save time for the linguistic subjects.

*Introduction to Linguistics course should be revised and should* concentrate on mono and diachronic linguistics.

The overall number of optional courses is very low, particularly for a multi-purpose programme. It should also be considered whether some optional courses which are central to English Philology (e.g., *English/German Stylistics, Introduction to the History of English and German Languages*) could be made compulsory.

Although it is stated that plus 15 credits allocated for students who had not had English/German at school would help to close the gap, the students admitted that it does not happen.

The term papers presented during the visit basically are in the field of pedagogy, not to mention the descriptive character and a lack of somewhat more analytical approach.

The structure of the final examination takes care of the foreign language skills requirements. However, many topics of essays are not adequate level and are similar to those given to pupils at the examination on leaving their secondary schools.

SAR stated that currently 17 graduates continue their studies at a university to get a BA. In order to facilitate this transfer the students should be better trained in linguistic skills.

Both students and graduates mentioned pedagogical practice as a positive feature of the programme.

## 3. Staff

### 3.1. Staff composition and turnover

*3.1.1. Rationality of the staff composition*

There is 18 academic staff involved in delivering the programme: 11 are full-time teachers, 3 from other higher education institutions, 4 from schools. The programme employs two native speakers, English and German. Two assistants who teach *English Language*, *English Idiomatics, English Lexicology, British Life and Institutions* (SAR, p. 80) have only Bachelor’s degree. Thus, the qualifications of teaching staff could be improved and new staff members are essential for the future perspective of the programme.

*3.1.2. Turnover of teachers*

Although it was difficult to understand (the text on page 19 was unintelligible), the expert group got the impression (SAR, Appendix No. 2 and 3) that there had been some movements as to the staff structure, the part time teachers decreased by two, 2 native speakers employed.

**3.2. Staff competence**

*3.2.1. Compliance of staff experience with the study programme*

The lack ofteachers whose **research area** covers English and German language makes this programme less competitive. The teaching load (27 hours per week) seems quite high. Judging from the CVs that were available to the experts, very few teachers have higher academic qualification in the required research area concerning these foreign languages or go for internship abroad. Only **2 part time teachers** involved in the teaching of philological and pedagogical disciplines hold PhD degrees. **According to the regulations for Non-university study programmes (No. 21) ‘*No less than 10 per cent of the study foundation part should be taught by the higher education institution regular teachers and no less then 10 per cent by the teachers having a scientific degree...‘.***

*3.2.2. Consistency of teachers’ professional development*

The College operates a formal system of regularly evaluating staff competence, every five years teachers have to undergo accreditation procedures as specified in the document Director of the Chamber of Panevezys 2004-03-26 Nr.V1 orders - 68 and 2006-02-28 Nr.V1 - 75, “On teachers' certification and competitions duties regulations” (SAR, 19).

The Programme staff has possibility to attend seminars, workshops, conferences; Self-assessment report indicates progress in the area of teachers’ professional development. The expert group, however, found no evidence of active qualification enhancement, transfer to delivering the programme of knowledge gained from training courses or of existing career- development plans.

## 4. Facilities and learning resources

### 4.1. Facilities

*4.1.1. Sufficiency and suitability of premises for studies*

Philology students work in 7 classrooms, which is sufficient for the number of students enrolled. Some of the classrooms have a computer, TV, VCR, screens and other multimedia. The College has IT room where students can use free Internet access. Library is open from 8 only to 5p.m. which might be not convenient for the working students. However, the students do seem to be encouraged to use the library and to do a lot of self-study.

*4.1.2. Suitability and sufficiency of equipment for studies*

The equipment for studies is very basic, the College does not have a language lab where students could master their language skills and it seems that students rarely use the library or data bases.

*4.1.3. Suitability and accessibility of the resources for practical training*

The College has agreements with schools and gymnasiums for the practical training. The support provided by the school and College teachers seems to be adequate: students are provided support during the practice and given feedback on their performance.

**4.2. Learning resources**

*4.2.1.* *Suitability and accessibility of books, textbooks and periodical publications*

Investment into library resources over the last two years has resulted in the improvement of the stocks („300 copies of books in English and German language, one foreign language student have an average of 4 newly purchased books, SAR, p. 23),measures had been taken to acquire some full text sources and data bases, e.g., EBSCO. However, the acquisition of new books and journals does not reflect in the programme content, reading lists or written student work.

*4.2.2. Suitability and accessibility of learning materials*

More books and academic periodicals in English and German are needed. The collection of journals is seriously inadequate and that is reflected in the students’ written papers.

## 5. Study process and student assessment

### 5.1. Student admission

*5.1.1. Rationality of requirements for admission to the studies*

Student admission to the programme is regulated by the College Academic Council and the Director in line with the procedures of Ministry of Education (SAR, p.24). The students can apply for the state funded (with the highest competition score) or self-financed places.

In 2009 admissions, the highest competition score was 18.62, the lowest -5.2. The students’ different academic backgrounds and experiences when they start the programme can prove a challenge for the programme management in needing to ensure equal opportunities for students to progress.

Another issue which concerned the expert group was the statement in the SAR that : „The opportunity to apply for the admission can be conceded to a person with no GCSE. In this case, his / her competitive grade will be decreased as well as an opportunity to access to the state-funded place (p.24), which is against the Law on Higher Education and Research. During the visit the College management assured that no student without GCSE had been admitted to the programme.

*5.1.2. Efficiency of enhancing the motivation of applicants and new students*

The activities to enhance the motivation of applicants and new students seem to be adequate: College holds open days, participates in the study fairs, periodically publishes news releases about the study progremme in the local and regional newspapers, holds meetings with high school graduates, publish information on the website (SAR, p.25).

### 5.2. Study process

*5.2.1. Rationality of the programme schedule*

As it has been stated in the previous chapters of the report, the composition of the semesters is faulty and violates the requirements set in the Law on Education and Research (2009) and Requirements for Study Programmes (2005).

The contact hour load is extremely high (70% of the total hours), on average 7 lectures a day, there is little time left for the self-study.

*5.2.2. Student academic performance*

Student drop out rate is relatively high, especially in the first year. Students quit studies because of different reasons: illnesses, financial difficulties, and family problems. Another reason could be that students with very low admission scores are simply unable to follow the programme requirements. It would be recommendable to reconsider the admission procedure or to provide additional support for underperforming students.

*5.2.3. Mobility of teachers and students*

There are very few formalized relations with the HEI abroad. Very few students and teachers have participated in the Socrates/Erasmus programmes. Students receive information about international exchange possibilities, but due to high work loads and financial considerations (many of the students combine work and studies), the mobility is very restricted.

### 5.3. Student support

*5.3.1. Usefulness of academic support*

Teachers are readily available to students and communicate freely with them, advising in respect of study and careers. The small number of students and the general availability of staff mean that one-to-one consultations about progress are normal features of student support. SAR states, that all the information about the programme (course descriptions) are available to students in the form of course catalogues or on www.panko.lt / teachers. When the expert group asked for the programme catalogue during the visit, a few course descriptions dating back 1999 and 2003 were provided. The experts tried to check the website recommended by the staff of the Programme *www.panko.lt / teachers but* failed to find any information related to the programme under evaluation.

*5.3.2. Efficiency of social support*

Basic social support is readily available for students. The college provides social stipends (for special needs students), incentive grants, awarded for study results (from 50 to 500 Lt.), scholarships for achievements in science, creativity, sport, active participation in student self-governance are granted by the college. Social support seems to be adequate in the view of the present financial constraints.

### 5.4. Student achievement assessment

*5.4.1. Suitability of assessment criteria and their publicity*

SAR states that “students achievements are measured using pre-defined evaluation criteria” (p. 29), however types of assessment or assessment criteria are not specified in the course outlines, there is only indication that an accumulative system of assessment is practiced: mid-term evaluation component makes up 30 percent, final evaluation – 70 percent of the total grade.

5.4.2. *Feedback efficiency*

Staff delivers feedback to students on their achievements only in an oral form, there is no formalized and structured written feedback in place. SAR states that students are involved in setting up evaluation criteria (p. 30), however it remained unclear how it works in practice. The Programme should consider publishing a set of grade criteria to allow the students to understand the marking process.

*5.4.3. Efficiency of final thesis assessment*

Student final qualifying exam is worth 6 credits. It consists of three parts: the English Language (0.3), the German Language (0.3), and Pedagogy and Psychology (0.4). According to the Self- report “the criteria of the final qualification examinations, term papers and creative works are placed in the library, and the College website, in the methodological guidance "Study papers" (2007), "Vocational Bachelor Final Paper" (2007), "Tests and how not to be afraid of them" (2006)’” (p. 29), none of the documents was included into SAR or presented to the expert group during the visit.

*5.4.4. Functionality of the system for assessment and recognition of achievements acquired in non-formal and self-education*

There was no information provided on the recognition of study periods abroad and recognition of the credits from other institutions. During the meeting the Staff of the Programme confirmed that the college operates a system for assessment and recognition of achievements by students during student mobility programmes. SAR stated that recognition of informal learning was in place but no information on the procedure was available.

### 5.5. Graduates placement

*5.5.1. Expediency of graduate placement*

The expert group met a number of graduates and employers who confirmed that the programme had been aligned with labour market demands. A common observation, both of graduates and employers, was that the programme would improve its alignment with professional needs by increased attention to the development of students language skills and deepening the knowledge in early language acquisition. Not many graduates who met with the expert group are looking to continue their academic career at university in the existing economic situation. Majority of the graduates are employed as foreign language teachers at primary schools. It should be noted that the employment level of the graduates is very high.

## 6. Programme management

### 6.1. Programme administration

*6.1.1. Efficiency of the programme management activities*

Although SAR states that the Programme has a Programme Committee with the employer, student and graduate representatives on board, the expert team felt that the programme was managed only on the course level ( excessive overlaps in the course content, absence of the explicit grading criteria). The expert group was of the opinion that the procedures for the programme management should be reviewed.

### 6.2. Internal quality assurance

*6.2.1. Suitability of the programme quality evaluation*

SAR states that the Programme quality is assessed annually by surveying students, teachers, employers, alumni and other social partners. The analysis of staff and student mobility, academic and applied research is analysed. Although the elements of quality assurance system are in place, the expert team felt that the follow up activities are missing - students and staff do not receive feedback about their evaluations and the decisions and actions stemming from this information.

*6.2.2. Efficiency of the programme quality improvement*

Although there has been an attempt to improve the programme based on the recommendations of the experts (2008), it seems that the staff lacks competencies to do that.

*6.2.3. Efficiency of stakeholders participation*

Feedback as reported to the expert group by both graduate students and employers was generally positive. The graduates did not report of any problems in finding jobs in accordance to their education. Majority of the graduates are employed as teachers, translators, specialists at the Municipality or local cheese factory.

Although the SAR states that one employer and one graduate is on the programme committee, the employer representatives admitted that no formalized procedures are in place to participate in the development of program curriculum, or to provide the feedback. Usually this is done informally during the pedagogical practice, or during the final examination, when employer representatives are invited to sit on the examination board. The Programme might like to consider ways in which it could improve the stakeholders‘ feedback process. The expert group felt however that more formal systems should be put in place and that the results of stakeholders‘feedback should be systematically reviewed.

# 

# III. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1. A revision of the aims and learning outcomes of the Programme should be considered to make clearer the relevance of the programme for developing students language skills and the needs of the labour market;

3.2. The Programme should be restructured in compliance with the requirements of the legal acts (Law on Education and Research (2009), Requirements for Study Programmes, 2010);

3.3. The focus of the programme should be considered - ***Pedagogy Of the English and German Languages*** does not fit into the framework of the Bachelor of Philology since Pedagogy is not within the field of philology;

3.4. Linguistic courses should be made more comprehensive in order to keep up with the standards of the field, excessive overlapping should be avoided;

3.5. Balance between compulsory and elective courses should be revised;

3.6. An effort should be made to improve language specific competence of the academic staff;

3.7. The Programme should establish a set of grade criteria to make student assessment more transparent;

3.8. The level and the structure of the final exam should be reconsidered;

3.9. Students and staff should be encouraged more to use academic mobility possibilities;

3.10. The Programme team should consider strengthening the Programme management and internal quality control procedures.

# IV. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Pedagogy of the English and German Languages* (state code –65304H113 (653X13004) is given **negative** evaluation.

Table. *Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Evaluation area | Assessment in points\* |
| 1 | Programme aims and learning outcomes | 1 |
| 2 | Curriculum design | 1 |
| 3 | Staff | 2 |
| 4 | Facilities and learning resources | 2 |
| 5 | Study process and student assessment (student admission, student support, student achievement assessment) | 1 |
| 6 | Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance) | 1 |
|  | **Total:** | 8 |

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

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

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

4 (very good) - the area is exceptionally good

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grupės vadovas:  Team leader: | Prof. dr. Brian Robinson |
|  |  |
| Grupės nariai:  Team members: | Jolita Butkienė |
| dr. Irina Moore |
|  | Prof. dr. Janis Silis |
|  | Prof. dr. Wolfgang Viereck |

Assessment Form

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Assessment \*** | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **1. Programme aims and learning outcomes** | | | | | |
| *1.1. Programme demand, purpose and aims* | | | | | |
| 1.1.1. Uniqueness and rationale of the need for the programme |  | X |  |  |  |
| 1.1.2. Conformity of the programme purpose with the institutional, state and international directives |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.1.3. Relevance of the programme aims | X |  |  |  |  |
| *1.2. Learning outcomes of the programme* | | | | | |
| 1.2.1. The comprehensibility and attainability of the learning outcomes | X |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2.2. Consistency of the intended learning outcomes | X |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2.3. Transformation of the learning outcomes |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2.Curriculum design** | | | | | |
| *2.1. Programme structure* | | | | | |
| 2.1.1. Sufficiency of the study volume | X |  |  |  |  |
| 2.1.2. Consistency of the study subjects | X |  |  |  |  |
| *2.2. Programme content* | | | | | |
| 2.2.1. Compliance of the contents of the studies with legal acts |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2.2. Comprehensiveness and rationality of the programme content | X |  |  |  |  |
| **3. Staff** | | | | | |
| *3.1. Staff composition and turnover* | | | | | |
| 3.1.1. Rationality of the staff composition |  | X |  |  |  |
| 3.1.2. Turnover of teachers |  | X |  |  |  |
| *3.2. Staff competence* | | | | | |
| 3.2.1. Compliance of staff experience with the study programme | X |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2.2. Consistency of teachers’ professional development |  | X |  |  |  |
| **4. Facilities and learning resources** | | | | | |
| *4.1. Facilities* | | | | | |
| 4.1.1. Sufficiency and suitability of premises for studies |  | X |  |  |  |
| 4.1.2. Suitability and sufficiency of equipment for studies |  | X |  |  |  |
| 4.1.3. Suitability and accessibility of the resources for practical training | X |  |  |  |  |
| *4.2. Learning resources* | | | | | |
| 4.2.1. Suitability and accessibility of books, textbooks and periodic publications | X |  |  |  |  |
| 4.2.2. Suitability and accessibility of learning materials |  | X |  |  |  |
| **5. Study process and student assessment** | | | | | |
| *5.1. Student admission* | | | | | |
| 5.1.1. Rationality of requirements for admission to the studies |  |  | X |  |  |
| 5.1.2. Efficiency of enhancing the motivation of applicants and new students | X |  |  |  |  |
| *5.2. Study process* | | | | | |
| 5.2.1. Rationality of the programme schedule | X |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2.2. Student academic performance |  | X |  |  |  |
| 5.2.3. Mobility of teachers and students |  | X |  |  |  |
| *5.3. Student support* | | | | | |
| 5.3.1. Usefulness of academic support |  | X |  |  |  |
| 5.3.2. Efficiency of social support |  | X |  |  |  |
| *5.4. Achievement assessment* | | | | | |
| 5.4.1. Suitability of assessment criteria and their publicity | X |  |  |  |  |
| 5.4.2. Feedback efficiency | X |  |  |  |  |
| 5.4.3. Efficiency of graduation papers assessment | X |  |  |  |  |
| 5.4.4. Functionality of the system for assessment and recognition of achievements acquired in a non-formal and self-study way. | X |  |  |  |  |
| *5.5 Graduate placement* | | | | | |
| 5.5.1 Expediency of graduate placement |  | X |  |  |  |
| **6. Programme management** | | | | | |
| *6.1. Programme administration* | | | | | |
| 6.1.1. Efficiency of the programme management activities | X |  |  |  |  |
| *6.2. Internal quality assurance* | | | | | |
| 6.2.1. Suitability of the programme quality assessment | X |  |  |  |  |
| 6.2.2. Efficiency of the programme quality improvement | X |  |  |  |  |
| 6.2.3. Efficiency of stakeholders’ participation |  | X |  |  |  |