STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

# LIETUVOS EDUKOLOGIJOS UNIVERSITETO PROGRAMOS *TECHNOLOGIJŲ EDUKOLOGIJA* (621X20018) VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

---

# EVALUATION REPORT OF *EDUCOLOGY OF TECHNOLOGIES* (621X20018) STUDY PROGRAMME AT LITHUANIAN UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES


| | |
|---|---|
| Grupės vadovas:<br>Team leader: | Dr. Terence Clifford-Amos |
| Grupės nariai:<br>Team members: | Prof. dr. Jesus Maria Angélica Fernandes Sousa |
| | Ilze Vitola |
| | Prof. dr. Tomas Kačerauskas |
| | Ariadna Čiurlionytė |
| | Meda Keleckaitė |


Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English


Vilnius
2013

## DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

| | |
|---|---|
| Studijų programos pavadinimas | *Technologijų edukologija* |
| Valstybinis kodas | 612X20018 |
| Studijų sritis | socialiniai mokslai |
| Studijų kryptis | Edukologija |
| Studijų programos rūšis | universitetinės studijos |
| Studijų pakopa | antroji |
| Studijų forma (trukmė metais) | nuolatinė (2) |
| Studijų programos apimtis kreditais | 120 ECTS |
| Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija | Edukologijos magistras |
| Studijų programos įregistravimo data | **2002-06-14** |

## INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

| | |
|---|---|
| Title of the study programme | ***Educology of Technologies*** |
| State code | 621X20018 |
| Study area | Social Sciences |
| Study field | Educational Sciences |
| Kind 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 ECTS |
| Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded | Master's degree in Educology |
| Date of registration of the study programme | **2002-06-14** |

CONTENTS

# I. INTRODUCTION

This report evaluates the *Educology of Technologies* programme established and delivered at the Department of Technologies and Technological Education, at the Faculty of Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Technologies (one of the seven Faculties of LUES), Vilnius.

The study subjects in general university, pedagogical and psychological education are implemented by the Faculties of Education, Lithuanian Philology, Social Sciences and Philology. Involving different units, under the coordination of the Academic Affairs Office, the Self-Assessment Report (hereafter referred to as SAR) indicates that there is cooperation among the faculties in the use of facilities and human resources.

The programme was registered on 14th June 2002 and the previous external assessment was carried out in 2010, accrediting it until 30 June 2014.

The programme‘s self-evaluation schedule and the preparation of the SAR began on 25 September 2012, following the establishment of a review and writing team, comprising seven members. This self-assessment group is headed by Associate Prof. Dr. Birutė Žygaitienė, who is also the Head of the Department of Technologies and Technological Education, and includes a stakeholder and a student.

The team‘s activities closed with a presentation of the drafted SAR at a meeting of the Department on 26th March 2013. The final text and annexes, as well as its electronic version were completed on 27th March 2013.

The site visit by the Reviewers took place on October 9th 2013. Following the visit, the Reviewers finalised their report, detailing the findings and outcomes on the *Educology of Technologies* programme (Master) at the Faculty of Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Technologies of LUES, Vilnius.

# II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

## *1. Programme aims and learning outcomes*

The programme aim is short and clear: “*to improve the training of teachers of technologies*”.
Or in a more detailed ways: “*to train highly qualified Masters of ET, possessing a teacher’s qualification, able to self-dependently conduct scientific research in the field of education, creatively design innovative and research-based strategies of technological (self-)education in the light of new challenges to education, as well as implement them in all forms and levels in the learning communities*” (SAR, p.8, para.2.1.3).

This aim is very well grounded: the SAR mentions particular strategic education documents, at European, national and institutional levels.

In the SAR, strategic EU documents, calling for the acquisition of abilities essential for the knowledge society and for the new demands in teacher education programmes at academic levels of Master and Doctorate are solidly interweaved to justify this study programme, such as the council resolution on *Lifelong Learning*, on 2002; the joint interim report of the council and the commission on *Education & Training 2010. The Success of the Lisbon Strategy Hinges on Urgent Reforms*, on 2004; the decision of the European parliament and of the council for *Lifelong Learning*, on 2006; the communiqué on *Improving the Quality of Teacher Education*,

on 2007; the Leuven communiqué, signed by the European Ministers of the Bologna process, on 2009; the *Common European Principles for Teacher Competences and Qualifications*, on 2010; the joint report of the European council and the commission for the implementation of the *Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training (ET2020)*, on 2012; and finally the communiqué of *EC Rethinking Education: Investing in Skills for Better Socio-Economic Outcome*, on 2012 (SAR, p.6, para.2.1.1).

At the national level, particular attention is given to the document *Lithuania's Progress Strategy "Lithuania 2030"* and the draft *The Framework of Teacher Qualification Requirements*, prepared by the Ministry of Education and Science, in 2012, anticipating that "*teachers working in gymnasiums that implement secondary education programmes should have Master's degree or a correspondent qualification degree in higher education*" (SAR, p.6, para.2.1.1).

At the institutional level, both the LUES Statute and the Strategic Plan for 2012-2020 are mentioned in the SAR. (p.7, para.2.1.1).

The SAR stresses the interest of Bachelor's graduates to enter this second-cycle study programme, the fact that LUES is the only institution in Lithuania offering it; and the social need for highly qualified teachers is expressed by social partners (representatives of the Ministry of Education and Science and 420 school headmasters). Analysis of data of The Teachers' Registry of the Centre of Education Information Technologies in 2012 has shown that "*out of 1534 teachers of technologies, 100 are of retirement age, 8 teachers have only secondary education, 63 teachers have vocational education, 80 teachers have higher education but lack professional (subject-specific) qualification, and 4 teachers have non-university higher education but lack professional (subject-specific) qualification*" (SAR, p.29, para.2.5.10). This makes evident the public need for teachers of technologies.

Eight learning outcomes (LO) are defined and are consistent with the type (university studies), the level of studies (second cycle) and the level of qualifications offered (Master level), according to the following key-words that can be drawn from the SAR, from which a content analysis: development of own theories, independent work, innovation, critical thinking, active participation in changing, global knowledge society, problem solving (in non-typical and new situations), complexity, cultural and ethnic diversity, learning communities, integration of knowledge from different areas, research (sometimes action-research, when the SAR refers to a possible influence on social, economic, cultural development, welfare or the environment), ethical and civic responsibility in decision-making, communication and life-long learning. These concepts demonstrate that the SAR's writers are aware of new pedagogical trends.

Beyond these carefully designed learning competences, the Reviewers would like to underline a specific vision about the technology they found on the site-visit: on the one side, there is the technology as a means of social development when used in favour of Special Needs; on the other side, there is the technology that develops an attitude of awareness of environmental sustainability, alerting students against the undesirable consumerism that technology may bring.

The formulation of LO is based on European, national and institutional legal orientations: *Shared 'Dublin' Descriptors for Short Cycle, First Cycle, Second Cycle and Third Cycle Awards (2004)*; *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (2008)*; *Descriptor of Lithuanian Qualification Framework*; *Law on Higher Education and Research of RL*; *The Description of Study Cycles*; *Description of General Requirements for Master Study Programmes*; *The Description of Professional Competences of Teachers* (SAR, pp.9-10, para.2.1.4).

The aim and learning outcomes are well formulated and published on websites, Facebook of the study programme, publications, booklets and leaflets of the University. The SAR mentions that they are also presented in conferences, the Fair of Higher Education Institutions, Open Days of the University, Fair of Technological Ideas, Olympiad of Technologies (mentioned in different meetings the Reviewers had), and Methodological Days, organized by the Department and discussed with teachers of technologies. The Department also gives out information to interested parties by telephone or e-mail.

In short, the Reviewers consider the programme aims and learning outcomes are very well defined, clear and publicly accessible, based on academic and professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market and consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered. When the Reviewers on the site visit questioned the self-assessment group about the difference between the names of Pedagogy and Educology, respectively used for Bachelor's and Master's programmes, the answer was satisfactorily given by its members. So, the name of the study programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other.

The field illustrated above is exceptionally good.

***2. Curriculum design***

The curriculum design meets legal requirements. The number of credits corresponds to the duration of the Master's degree study programme, with 2 years organized in semesters 1 to 4.

There is a logical arrangement of subjects and modules: they are evenly spread along the semesters, with 5 subjects per semester, except for the final one, with 2 subjects, which is understandable in considering research work and students' investment in it.

The study field subjects are given 64 credits, general university subjects have 8 credits, and the remaining 48 credits are dedicated to the preparation for and writing of Master's Dissertation.

General university subjects are evenly distributed between semesters 1 and 2. In semester 1, students may choose between *Culture Studies* and *Philosophy of Science*. In semester 2, they may choose between *Modern Didactics* and *Modern Psychology*.
Beyond this possibility of optional study subjects, the students may choose modules within certain subjects. From the subject *Educational Research*, with 8 credits, 3 credits are allotted to optional modules: either *Research Communication,* or *Social Research in the Education System.* In the subject *Modern Conceptions of Nutrition and Food*, also with 8 credits, students may draw 3 credits to study either *Vegetarian Nutrition,* or *Dietetic Nutrition.* In the subject *Andragogy,* with 8 credits as well, students may choose one of the following alternatives: *Comparative Andragogy* (3 credits), or *Non-Formal Adult Education* (3 credits).

Optional subjects are chosen by at least 8 students. Students collectively agree upon the choice of the elective study subjects.

The study field subjects, according to the SAR and the comments received in the meeting with the self-assessment group, are related both to education and technology:
*Education and Equal Opportunities*, *Social Competence Development,* and *Education Project Management,* in semester 1;
*Modern Conception of Nutrition*, *Business Communication,* and *Behaviour of Educational Organizations,* in semester 2.

*Ecological Education*, *Andragogy*, and *Innovative Methods of Technological Education*, in semester 3.

In the meeting with the self-assessment group, the Reviewers asked why they chose some technologies and not others for the subjects related to the study field. The explanation given was that the ones offered at Master level resulted from a survey applied to students, in which they pointed out their preferences for Nutrition. The Reviewers consider that the programme could be further enhanced if there were more alternatives, even as optional subjects, in the study field related to technology. This would make the most of the variety of technologies offered at Bachelor's level.

Concerning the progression of subjects along the two years, the Reviewers were pleased to confirm that the preparation for the research starts in the very beginning of the programme with a subject on *Educational Research* in semester 1, moving on to the elaboration of the Project (*MA Paper Projects I and II*) in semesters 2 and 3, respectively dedicated to the definition of the research object and the research methodology, and ending in the last semester with the *Scientific Research Practice* of 6 credits, and *MA Paper Writing* and its defence, with 24 credits. In the meeting with the teachers, during the site-visit, it was explained that the research itself begins with the *Paper Project I*, and not only in *Scientific Research Practice*. This was misunderstood at first sight, according to the titles attributed to the subjects. One phase concerns the project (the idea, the plan), and another phase concerns the research itself (the practice).

Having clarifying this misunderstanding, the Reviewers consider that there is a solid and logical sequence aiming at the final paper, but that the names of the subjects should reflect what is expected to be achieved during them. The Reviewers also agree that it is a good policy that the Master's paper is defended in a Defence Board, headed by a visiting professor.

The proportion of contact versus independent hours of work seems to be adequate for this level of university studies according to the Bologna philosophy, which focuses on learning and the learners' work, rather than on teaching and teacher's work. The link between learning outcomes with the subject modules are well explained in the SAR, through a table (Table 2.1), para. 2.2.4. on page 13.

There is a small error paragraph 2.2.6, related to the Logical arrangement of preparation for and writing of Master's Paper, where it states that "*Students are provided with a possibility to develop the acquired competences of a researcher by choosing one of the elective study subjects*: *Business Communication* (3 cr.) or *Social Research in the Education System* (3 cr.)." This should be *Research Communication* (3 cr.) instead of *Business Communication* (3 cr.).

Despite the fact that the subjects do not repeat themselves and some subjects are up-to-date with the latest trends in science and technology (e.g. Ecological Education; Modern Conception of Nutrition and Food; Innovative Methods of Technological Education), more recent and foreign authors and references could be included in the programmes in order to attain such important learning outcomes positively appraised by the Reviewers earlier in this report. Taking some of the key-words mentioned above, it would be important for the students to know something about Edgar Morin's Complexity paradigm to understand "complexity", or that they knew something about critical and post-critical trends (getting back to Frankfurt's School and other contemporaneous authors) to enhance "critical thinking". These examples justify why the Reviewers consider the curriculum design is not quite at the exceptional level attained by the previous category (aims and learning outcomes).

The Reviewers consider that the focus in Psychology, for example, should be directed towards Educational Psychology and Theories of Learning, in articulation with (and expansion of) the corresponding programme at Bachelor's level; that Modern Didactics should go beyond Bloom and Marzanos's taxonomies, which are certainly important as a basis to graduate to other teaching theories.

In short, the Reviewers consider that the curriculum design meets legal requirements, that the study subjects and modules are spread evenly, that their themes are not repetitive, that the content of the subjects and modules, in general, is consistent with the type and level of the studies, that the content and methods of the subjects/modules could be more appropriate for the achievement of ambitious ILO (intended learning outcomes) defined by this programme, that the scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure learning outcomes and that the content of the programme reasonably reflects the latest achievements in science and technologies.

The field illustrated above develops systematically and has distinctive features.

***3. Staff***

Academic staff are recruited through public competition for a period of 3 to 5 years, at the end of which teachers are assessed. For teachers' assessment their classes are observed by other colleagues.

12 teachers are responsible for this programme: 4 professors, Doctors Habilitatus; 1 professor, Doctor; 4 associate professors; and 3 lecturers with a doctoral degree (the academic establishment goes beyond the legal requirement of a minimum of 20% of professors). The Reviewers positively underline the fact that all academic colleagues have a PhD and that the areas of scientific interest and research are the same of the subjects they teach.

The ratio is 1:2, as there are currently 21 students. Usually one teacher supervises two students.

All the teachers are full-time teachers at LUES, except one invited from Vilnius University to work part-time. The SAR says that "*teachers working in this study programme are active researchers: they conduct research, participate in international scientific conferences, go on study trips in Lithuania and abroad, implement national and international scientific projects, write and publish research papers; most of them have published methodological, teaching aids, and participate in training doctors of science*". (SAR, p.19, para.2.3.4)

Turnover in academic staffing has occurred due to the improvement of the programme and also because of retirement or maternity leave.

The Reviewers confirmed in the meeting with the Administrative staff and in the meeting with the teachers what the SAR says on page 20, para.2.3.6: "*the Department (Faculty, University) encourages teachers to participate in events of professional development and, according to financial possibilities, covers travelling and accommodation expenses and seminar fees, sends teachers to study trips.*" And that "*after conferences, seminars, trainings, the teachers are encouraged to share their acquired experience….*" The Reviewers consider this is a very positive facet of the academic culture.

The Reviewers are also impressed by the participation of some teachers of this programme in scientific events abroad in recent years. These include: Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Turkey, Finland, Great Britain, Italy, Bulgaria, Malta and Spain, and in India and Australia. This

aspect was referred in the SAR (p.21, para.2.3.8) and the Reviewers had the opportunity to meet some of those teachers during the on-site meetings.

The SAR also says that "*After the last accreditation, the process of informal learning by sharing the good experience has been significantly activated, since the Resolution of the Department provides that internal seminars on qualification improvement should be organized one in three months*" (SAR, p.20, para. 2.3.6). This shows that there is great care taken with teachers' professional development.

Some teachers are involved in important scientific projects: the Reviewers positively mention 4 projects financed by the European Structural Funds and the project "Science-Teacher Education Advanced Methods (S-TEAM)" (2009-2012), where 25 research institutions from 14 Europeans countries took part.

In short, the Reviewers consider that the study programme is provided by staff with a profile that exceeds the legal requirements, that the number and the qualifications of the teaching staff are more than adequate to ensure learning outcomes, that the teaching staff turnover is able to ensure an adequate provision of the programme, that the institution does its best ("whenever possible" the Dean concluded, at the meeting with the Administrative staff), that the Department has created conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff and that the teaching staff of the programme are involved in research directly concerned with the study programme, according to what is written in the Annex 3.3, related to the Curricula Vitae of Teachers.

The field illustrated above is exceptionally good.

***4. Facilities and learning resources***

The major part of Master's degree study programme of ET is implemented in the Faculty of Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Technologies in the Central Building of LUES.

The site visit confirmed that "*the number of workplaces in the classrooms, equipment and conditions are sufficient to implement the study process. Classes where academic flows of students are taught are technically equipped with stationary video, audio and computer equipment*" (SAR, p.22. para.2.4.1).

Next to the teaching laboratories, there are preparatory and subject-related methodological rooms with methodological literature, teaching aids and computers. There is a reading room with 15 computers, for 12 students to work simultaneously, or to work with their academic supervisor. Students can consult teachers' methodological and other publications, as well as stored final papers of former students. There is a specialized reading room dedicated to Pedagogy and a study laboratory of Psychology where students may find the latest literature on education in both Lithuanian and foreign languages.

The site visit also confirmed "*there are 4 laptop computers and 2 portable computer video projectors, 2 video projector screens, 2 overhead projectors, and 2 conference boards, all of which are mobile*." And "*there is also 1 stationary and 10 laptop computers, an interactive board and student questioning system in Room for Didactics. Besides video and audio software, the computers in the classroom are equipped with "SMART Notebook" and "Prometheus ActivInspire" software, which are intended to create teaching objects for the smart boards. There is a photo-copier in the reading room, as well as some personal computers available to students in methodological rooms.*" (SAR, p.22. para.2.4.2)

The site visit confirmed as well that "*the University has a Wi-Fi system installed; hence, all the computers have constant wireless Internet access and are connected to the local University Intranet* (SAR, p.2, para.2.4.2). The SAR also says that "*The teaching material is stored on the e-learning software platform MOODLE. Teachers and students use open-access electronic publications and the archive of video recordings, as well as digital teaching tools*" (p.23. para.2.4.2).

Concerning students' practice, the subject *scientific research practice* takes place at the university as well as in comprehensive schools and other educational institutions, with which cooperation agreements have been signed. During on-site interviews with stakeholders, the Reviewers learned that schools greatly appreciate and benefit from student research visits.

Students have services of printing, scanning, binding and lamination, the Reviewers were able to see in their visit. Students can borrow books and other documents to take home; should the Library not have the document requested, students can order it from other libraries in Lithuania and abroad through the Interlibrary Loan. Students also have access to the Lithuanian Virtual Library. The University Library, which holds membership with the Association of European Academic Libraries, has arranged 259 workplaces; 33 of these are equipped with computers. The Library also stores methodological publications of teachers of the Master's degree study programme of Educology of Technologies.

The SAR, which expresses pride in the university library, considers that this is one of the most innovative libraries in Eastern Europe. The Reviewers had the opportunity to see the journals of the Library and the enormous stocks of books waiting to be moved to the new building expected to be inaugurated next year. The good relations established between the Library and the teachers of this programme were attested by a small exhibition the Reviewers saw at the main corridor of the Library, celebrating a senior colleague's birthday.

The Reviewers had the opportunity to see teaching and learning equipment related to technological subject-matters (as referred in the point 2: Curriculum design). And in this matter the Reviewers could attest the quality of the laboratory for Nutrition with all its equipment, materials and consumables. Also relevant for this programme in particular, are the Green House and its philosophy around environmental sustainability. The award of Green University mentioned during the on-site visit and confirmed by the stakeholders in the corresponding meeting is positively underlined.

In short, the Reviewers consider that the premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality, that the teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are adequate both in size and quality, that the institution has excellent arrangements for students' practice, and that the teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible.

The field illustrated above is exceptionally good.

***5. Study process and student assessment***

Only first-cycle graduates in Social Sciences (Educology) are admitted to this study programme, according to the SAR (p.25, para.2.5.1). The Reviewers consider that as the Master's programme enhances the Pedagogy of Technology (Bachelor) some entrants coming from other Social Sciences without comparable knowledge of technologies, may have difficulties demonstrating the same level of initial competence as their peers.

Applications to the programme have varied: 2010 was the poorest year with 7 entrants in 8 applicants. Drop-outs are not significant, except for 2009 in which 5 students from 17 were unsuccessful.

The Reviewers have already remarked on the positive and progressive preparation for the Master dissertation. And they agree that it is very important to stimulate students to participate in scientific events (e.g. the annual conference of young scientists where 30 presentations were delivered in the last five years) and also in exhibitions.

During the meetings, students and alumni were enthusiastic about the way they were taught and assessed, which underlined the good relations established between them and the academic teaching staff. They mentioned teachers' openness towards consultation and their availability to welcome students' suggestions to change methods, or even subjects. Every teacher consults students at least five hours per week. Students also engage in consultation via *Moodle*, e-mail or personally.

Students receive continuous academic and social support, and are informed about many issues to their interest - (the study programme, timetables, possibilities of mobility for Erasmus, career prospects, job vacancies) through announcements boards at Faculty, on the Intranet, Internet, or they are personally informed by their teachers and Head of the Department. However, they do not use the possibilities created by Erasmus, alleging they are working students and cannot leave their work. So, currently, there is no mobility of students through Erasmus programmes.

There is a Centre of Psychological Consultancy for assistance to those students in need of psychological counselling. There is also a Culture Centre where students can participate in various artistic activities and organization of events related to their studies. The Reviewers learned about students' regular participation in a TV programme about Ecological Education.

Assessment results are discussed with the teachers individually and in groups, and they consider they are fairly assessed, in being able to identify their strengths and weaknesses. The assessment of students' achievements is regulated by the Study Regulations, and at the beginning of each semester, a teacher informs students about the assessment procedures. Self-assessment is encouraged and the assessment criteria are discussed with the students, not the results solely, but the whole process.

Students' knowledge, abilities and skills are assessed in cumulative marks (from 1 to 10 points). 50% of the final mark is reserved for other examinations, which does not solely mean written forms, but other aspects, including presentations, project results, exhibitions and articles.

Assessments for the Master's paper have clear criteria in the following aspects: content, structure, written presentation and oral presentations; each one is appropriately explained in detail.

Students are eligible for social and incentive grants as well as one-time allowances. State-financed students with good results can gain scholarships.

In summary, the Reviewers consider that the admission requirements could be better founded and explained, (though the organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes), that students are encouraged to participate in research and applied research activities, that students are unable use the opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes, that the higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support, that the assessment system of students'

performance is clear, adequate and publicly available and that the professional activities of the majority of graduates meets the programme providers' expectations.

The field illustrated above develops systematically and has distinctive features.

***6. Programme management***

Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the programme are clear (SAR, pp. 30-35, para. 2.6.1-2.6.9) and are assured by the following levels of quality assurance:

*The level of the Study Programme Committee:* the Study Programme Committee monitors the implementation of the study programme, conducts opinion surveys of students, graduates and employers, and analyses information regarding the problems occurred during the studies. The Head of the Study Programme Committee gives feedback to students, teachers and social partners on the decisions taken by the Committee. The Committee is responsible not only for the SAR, but also for the preparation and monitoring of the implementation of the programme, according to *The Regulations of the Study Programme Committees of the University*. The Reviewers consider it is wise for same committee to coordinate the implementation of the programme and coordinate its self-assessment.

*The level of the Department:* Teachers' individual plans as well as Department's activity plans are discussed with the Head of the Department. The teachers are personally responsible for the quality of the subjects taught. There is an Attestation Commission who analyse the assessment of the teacher's activity, taking into consideration students' opinions and the opinions of two colleagues who have observed his/her lessons. The studies of a study subject are coordinated and controlled by the coordinating teacher of the study subject. Questionnaires are delivered to students asking about the quality of the study subjects and are also given to teachers in respect of their involvement in the study programme development and administration of Department activities; questionnaires are also delivered to graduates asking about the adequacy of the workplace and the length of time they waited before taking up employment and the application of studies in relation to work; and to employers concerning the demand for the ET study programme and assessment of graduates' competences.

*The level of the Faculty:* The Faculty Council, which involves 2 student representatives, analyses the proposals submitted by the Study Programme Committee and submits them, in turn, to the Studies Committee of the Senate. The Dean responsible for the study process in the Faculty is supported by expertise of the Deputy Dean for Studies Affairs.

*The level of the University:* The Studies Committee of the Senate analyses the various proposals of the Faculties and, after approval, sends them to the Rector for final decision. The Academic Affairs Office ensures the organization of studies and quality monitoring, carrying out opinion surveys of students and employers. The general coordination, management and administration of University studies are implemented by the Vice-Rector for Studies. In 2011, the position of Chief specialist for Studies Quality was created. The main function of the postholder is to analyse legal acts regulating studies quality at national and European level. This is reflected in the adequate and precise legal framework of this SAR. The Centre for Academic Quality Assurance, established in 2012, organizes and coordinates the assurance of academic quality.

The organization of programme management is based on the Deming Quality Cycle and the European Common Quality Assurance Framework (2003).

For this study programme in particular, social partners, administrative staff, teachers of the Department, representatives of the Ministry of Education and Science, specialists of Education Development Centre, headmasters of comprehensive schools and teachers of technologies, members of the methodological council for teachers of technologies of Vilnius City, as well as Master students and graduates participated in the renewal of the programme. The meetings with social partners take place 1-2 times per year.

The Reviewers had the opportunity to speak with representatives of the students and of the stakeholders actively participating in the meeting with the team responsible for the SAR.

So there is a functional internal QA system in place for the assessment of the programmes in which data is regularly collected, compiled and analyzed, but it could be clearer in terms of day-to-day performance and the managerial strategies employed in relation to vision and longer-term planning. This is especially important in relation to future changes and any anticipated changes in staff profiles.

In short, the Reviewers consider that the responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are well allocated, (though the longer-term vision and a day-to-day QA management are difficult to locate), that information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed, that outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used in general for the improvement of the programme, that evaluation and improvement processes involve stakeholders and that the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient.

The field illustrated above develops systematically and has distinctive features.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Intensify efforts towards internationalization, perhaps through the establishment of a joint or (where feasible) double degree;
2. Be sure that students have access to the most recent texts and on-line resources;
3. Explore as much as possible EU/EC funding;
4. Develop robust and colourful marketing strategies and booklets;
5. Continue to update technologies, in tune with national/international developments;
6. Continue to broaden the appeal of the Master programme;
7. Continue to intensify the research elements of the Master programme;
8. Broaden the possibilities of study field subjects, related to technologies, at the Master level;
9. Create conditions of achievement of those ambitious and well-defined learning outcomes, through the learning of some contemporaneous authors;
10. Reconsider the names of MA Paper Project I and MA Paper Project II;
11. Refocus Psychology onto the Educational Psychology and Learning Theories;
12. Update Teaching Theories in Modern Didactics;
13. Rethink the programme in terms of long-distance future and the needs of the region and the country.

IV. SUMMARY

The Reviewers consider the SAR is legally well-founded, revealing good mastery of programme management, with copious quantitative and qualitative data, using quotations of students' opinions. It reveals openness in frankly pointing out any weaknesses detected within the programme;

The aims and learning outcomes are succinct, comprehensive and appropriately overarching, revealing knowledge and understanding of real Bologna philosophy and are well-grounded in legal strategic documents at European, national and institutional levels;

The curriculum design is adequately research-based, with logical arrangement of subjects and modules, which are evenly spread along the year, aiming at preparing students for the Master paper.

Students present the findings of their research in the Annual Conference of young scientists, organized by the FNSMT.

The Reviewers consider the teaching staff have relevant scientific and pedagogical qualification, with impressive participation in events abroad, and that their curricula vitae are adequate to the subjects for which they are responsible;

The Library, stacks and journal provision are good; the laboratory for Nutrition and the Green House for Ecological Education are excellent, and underline the belief in technology as an integrative subject in terms of ecology, sustainability, humanism and special needs; the Green University award and television coverage (students) are both positive endorsements;

The assessment strategies are well balanced leading to convincing and appreciable student achievement, which reflects the high-level of student satisfaction;

Teaching staff satisfaction, and their engagement in projects, is also evident, since there is a positive university/faculty/department environment for teachers' development;

There is also an excellent support from graduates and tremendous support from stakeholders, attesting the connection between the academy and the outside world and special reference is made to the excellent forum, that is the November Conference, organised every second year. This year two hundred technology teachers are registered to attend it.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Educology of Technologies* (state code – 621X20018) at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences is given **positive** evaluation.

*Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.*

| No. | Evaluation Area | Evaluation Area in Points* |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Programme aims and learning outcomes | 4 |
| 2. | Curriculum design | 3 |
| 3. | Staff | 4 |
| 4. | Material resources | 4 |
| 5. | Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment) | 3 |
| 6. | Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance) | 3 |
| | **Total:** | **21** |

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader: Dr. Terrence Clifford-Amos

Grupės nariai:
Team members: Prof. dr. Jesus Maria Angélica Fernandes Sousa

Ilze Vitola

Prof. dr. Tomas Kačerauskas

Ariadna Čiurlionytė

Meda Keleckaitė

**Santraukos vertimas iš anglų kalbos**

<...>

## V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto studijų programa *Technologijų edukologija* (valstybinis kodas – 621X20018) vertinama **teigiamai**.

| Eil. Nr. | Vertinimo sritis | Srities įvertinimas, balais* |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai | 4 |
| 2. | Programos sandara | 3 |
| 3. | Personalas | 4 |
| 4. | Materialieji ištekliai | 4 |
| 5. | Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas | 3 |
| 6. | Programos vadyba | 3 |
| | **Iš viso:** | **21** |

* 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)

## IV. SANTRAUKA

Vertintojai mano, kad savianalizės suvestinė yra teisiškai pagrįsta, atskleidžianti programos vadovų meistriškumą, joje gausu kiekybinių ir kokybinių duomenų, cituojamos studentų nuomonės. Savianalizės suvestinėje atvirai ir nuoširdžiai nurodomos pastebėtos programos silpnybės;

Tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai suformuluoti glaustai, yra išsamūs ir visapusiški, pagristi teisiniais strateginiais dokumentais, Europos, nacionalinio ir institucinio lygmens; jie rodo, kad Bolonijos proceso filosofija yra gerai žinoma ir suprantama;

Programos sandara yra tinkamai pagrįsta moksliniais tyrimais, dalykai ir moduliai išdėstyti nuosekliai ir tolygiai paskirstyti per metus, siekiant parengti studentus magistro darbui.

Studentai metinėje jaunųjų mokslininkų konferencijoje, kurią organizuoja *FNSMT*, pateikia savo mokslinių tyrimų išvadas;

Vertintojai mano, kad akademinis personalas turi reikalingą mokslinę ir pedagoginę kvalifikaciją, gausiai dalyvauja užsienyje organizuojamuose renginiuose, o jų CV nurodyti būtent tie dalykai, kuriuos jie dėsto;

Biblioteka gerai aprūpinta literatūra ir kitais ištekliais, yra puiki Mitybos laboratorija ir Ekologiniam mokymui skirta oranžerija: tai rodo įsitikinimą, kad technologija yra integralus dalykas ekologijos, tvarumo, humanizmo ir specialiųjų poreikių atžvilgiu; Žaliojo universiteto vardas ir studentų dalyvavimas televizijoje yra puikus to patvirtinimas;

Vertinimo strategijos gerai subalansuotos, jos atspindi įtikinamus ir pastebimus studentų pasiekimus ir didelį studentų pasitenkinimą;

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

Dėstytojų pasitenkinimas, jų dalyvavimas projektuose taip pat akivaizdus, kadangi universiteto / fakulteto / katedros aplinka yra palanki dėstytojų tobulėjimui;

Stipri absolventų ir socialinių dalininkų parama rodo šios aukštojo mokslo įstaigos ryšį su išoriniu pasauliu; reikėtų atskirai paminėti puikų forumą, t. y. lapkričio konferenciją, organizuojamą kas dveji metai. Šiais metais į ją atvykti užsiregistravo du šimtai technologijų dėstytojų.

## III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Labiau stengtis internacionalizuoti programą, galbūt suteikiant jungtinį arba (kai įmanoma) dvigubą laipsnį;
2. Užtikrinti studentams galimybę naudotis naujausiais tekstais ir internetiniais ištekliais;
3. Kuo labiau pasinaudoti ES/EK finansavimu;
4. Sukurti stiprią ir patrauklią rinkodaros strategiją ir gaminti reklaminius lankstinukus;
5. Toliau atnaujinti technologijas atsižvelgiant į nacionalinę / tarptautinę pažangą;
6. Toliau didinti magistrantūros programos patrauklumą;
7. Toliau stiprinti magistrantūros programos mokslinių tyrimų dalį;
8. Išplėsti studijų krypties dalykus, susijusius su technologijomis, magistrantūros lygmeniu.
9. Kurti sąlygas, kurios padėtų pasiekti šiuos pretenzingus ir apibrėžtus studijų rezultatus studijuojant kai kuriuos šiuolaikinius autorius;
10. Persvarstyti pavadinimus „Magistro darbo projektas Nr. 1“ ir „Magistro darbo projektas Nr. 2“;
11. Psichologijos disciplinos dėmesį perkelti į edukacinę psichologiją ir mokymosi teorijas;
12. Atnaujinti moderniosios didaktikos teorijų dėstymą;
13. Permąstyti programą siekiant, kad ji būtų ilgalaikė ir tenkintų regiono bei šalies poreikius.

<…>