STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus universiteto
**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *KLINIKINĖ PSICHOLOGIJA (valstybinis kodas – 621S16001, 6211JX039)*
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**
––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

**EVALUATION REPORT
OF *CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY* (*state code - 621S16001, 6211JX039*)
STUDY PROGRAMME**
at Vilnius University

Review' team:

1. **Prof. Dr. Chantal Martin Sölch (team leader)** *academic,*

2. **Dr. Inga Millere,** *academic,*

3. **Prof. Vizek Vidović Vlasta,** *academic,*

4. **Ms Žydrė Arlauskaitė,** *representavive of social partners,*

5. **Ms Meda Vaitonytė,** *students' representative.*

Evaluation coordinator –

Ms Ieva Batėnaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

Vilnius
2017

<div align="center">**DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ**</div>

Studijų programos pavadinimas	***Klinikinė psichologija***
Valstybinis kodas	621S16001, (6211JX039)
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų krypčių grupė	Psichologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120 ECTC
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Klinikinės psichologijos magistras (Socialinių mokslų magistras)
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2007-02-19 Nr. ISAK-225

<div align="center">————————————————————————</div>

<div align="center">**INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME**</div>

Title of the study programme	***Clinical Psychology***
State code	621S16001, (6211JX039)
Study area	Social Sciences
Group of Study field	Psychology
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 ECTS
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Clinical Psychology (Master of Social Sciences)
Date of registration of the study programme	No ISAK-225 of February 19, 2007

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

The evaluation of on-going study programmes is based on the **Methodology for evaluation of Higher Education study programmes,** approved by Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (hereafter – SKVC).

The evaluation is intended to help higher education institutions to constantly improve their study programmes and to inform the public about the quality of studies.

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: *1) self-evaluation and self-evaluation report prepared by Higher Education Institution (hereafter – HEI); 2) visit of the review team at the higher education institution; 3) production of the evaluation report by the review team and its publication; 4) follow-up activities.*

On the basis of external evaluation report of the study programme 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. Along with the self-evaluation report and annexes, the following additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit:

No.	Name of the document
1.	Final thesis (2015, 2016)
2.	Psychology research in Lithuania. Global context and future directions (2007)

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

The second cycle study programme in Clinical Psychology is implemented at the Department of Clinical and Organizational Psychology at the Vilnius University, in Vilnius. The programme has been implemented since 1992; and went through external assessment by national experts in 2011. The programme was accredited for 6 years (SER, p. 6).

Vilnius University is the oldest and largest institution of higher education in Lithuania with 20864 students. The University management structure is defined in the Statute of Vilnius University. The University is managed according to the principle of self-governance through the bodies of governance of the University: the Senate, the Council and the Rector (SER, p.5). The University implements study programmes of three study cycles. The University comprises twelve faculties. The programme is hosted at the Faculty of Philosophy. This Faculty comprises 7 Departments, among them 2 Psychology Departments, i.e. the Department of General Psychology and the Department of Clinical and Organisational Psychology, the latest being responsible for the programme. The Faculty of Philosophy is headed by the Faculty Council and the Dean (SER, p. 5).

1.4. The Review Team

The Review Team was completed according *Description of experts' recruitment*, approved by order No. 1-01-151 of Acting Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on *12ᵗʰ October, 2017.*

1. **Prof. Dr. Phil Chantal Martin Sölch** (team leader), Professor in Clinical and Health Psychology, Department of Psychology, University Fribourg, Switzerland.
2. **Dr. Inga Millere** - Dean of the Faculty of Public Health and Social Welfare, Rīga Stradiņš University, Latvia.
3. **Prof. Vlasta Vizek Vidović,** Head of the Centre for Educational Research and Development, Institute for Social Research, Croatia.
4. **Žydrė Arlauskaitė,** assistant of Department of Development and Educational Psychology in Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, Lithuania.
5. **Meda Vaitonytė**, student of the Mykolas Romeris University, study programme *Psychology,* Lithuania.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

According to the self-evaluation report (SER), the aims of the programme are:

"to develop a scientific oriented professional in clinical psychology, with an in-depth systematic knowledge of clinical psychology, psychopathology, and psychotherapy; with skills in clinical evaluation, counselling and psychotherapy; well versed in scientific research methods; capable of conducting research and implementing its results into everyday practice; with strong professional ethics values, who is able to start independent professional career in both scientific and clinical institutions." (SER, p. 6).

The programme objectives are well-defined, clear and publicly announced on the webpage of the Vilnius University, on the official website of the Open System of Providing Information, Tutoring and Vocational Orientation (AIKOS), and can also be found in a publication that the Vilnius University publishes for the dissemination of information about second cycle study programmes. All information related to the programme is in Lithuanian. This small limitation is also discussed in the SER (p. 9). However, since the programme is offered only in Lithuanian, there is mandatory need for a publication in English. During the site visit, the Review Team could evidence that the teachers and students were familiar with the aims of the programme. However, the social partners involved in practice supervision did not exactly know the aims of the programme (site visit). On the basis of the programme objectives, 19 learning outcomes were formulated. The learning outcomes are directly related to specific competences (i.e. knowledge and implementation, conducting research, subject-specific competences, social competences and personal competences, SER, p. 6-7, Table 1), which are in turn associated with the objectives of the study programme.

The objectives of the program are linked to state, societal and labour market needs, based on an analysis of the official descriptors for psychology (Psychology study field descriptor, approved by the Republic of Lithuania Minister of Education and Science Order No V-9232 of August 27, 2015) and of the qualification frameworks as reported in the self-evaluation report (SER p. 7-8). The specific competences associated with the learning outcomes are in line with the official requirements for the field of psychology (SER p. 7). In response to the recommendations of the previous evaluation, a representative of the social partner has been integrated in the study programme's committee (site visit and SER, p. 8). In addition, a new descriptor of professional practice (internship) was developed, new course units were introduced, and the list of optional course units was extended in response to the recommendations of the previous evaluation (SER

p.8 and site visit). Analyses of labour market needs are performed on an informal level, with punctual, but no systematic discussions with the social partner according to the interviews with the representatives of the programme committee and to the social partners during site visit. In the SER (p. 8), the high value of the suggestions of the social partner is strongly emphasized. However, during the site visit, the information which was provided showed discrepancies, when the interview partners describe how this exchange takes place concretely (site visit, interviews with SER group, teacher and social partners). Since this study programme is the only MA programme in Clinical Psychology at national level, and because it is directly related to a professional activity in the field of mental health, it is particularly important that the exchanges with the social partners are well-regulated. Therefore, Review Panel recommend that the labour market needs are taken into consideration on a more formalized and systematical fashion, for instance with the organization of events and workshops with and for the social partners, or with regular surveys. This point was also identified as a weakness and area of improvement in the SER (p. 9).

The objectives of the programme clearly correspond to the mission of the higher education institution with their strong emphasis on research competences. They are formulated in agreement of the professional field descriptor (see above) and on the basis of the national and European (Euro-Psy regulation) legislation and documents regulating the requirements of second-cycle studies and the education of psychologists (SER, p. 8). The program is the only MA programme in clinical psychology at national level. According to coming changes in the law, master programmes in Clinical Psychology will be one way to work as medical psychologist. This programme is one of the most popular programme at Vilnius University, according the Dean of the Faculty (site visit). The programme and the professors involved in the programme committee both have a strong reputation at national level as evidenced during the site visit (interviews with students and alumni). This was evidenced as an area of excellence.

The link between the programme's objectives and intended learning outcomes with the academic requirement is therefore clearly given. Knowledge about professional requirements comes additionally from the strong engagement of members of the programme committee in the development of national policies (as evidenced in the site visit). However, the Review Team sees improvements possibilities in the linkage with the professional requirements, especially with a more systematic integration of the exchanges with social partners.

The programme objectives correspond to master level and are based on the national requirements for second-level studies in psychology (SER, p. 8). They focus on competences that are more specialized and on the deepening of contents developed at bachelor level. The students indicated during the interviews (site visit) that in specific lectures, there was a repetition of bachelor

contents, diminishing in consequence the acquisition of new and more specialized knowledge. The teacher of this specific course indicated however in the interview, that she did the necessary changes in response to the students' comments.

There is a strong coherence between the title of the programme, the objectives, the intended learning outcomes and the contents of the subjects' courses that are designed to acquire the competences related to the learning outcomes. The learning outcome matrix presented in the self-evaluation report (p. 6-7, Table 1) clearly illustrates the link between the intended learning outcomes and the competences to be acquired. These specific competences are in turn related to the objectives of the programme.

In summary, the criteria related to the programme aims and learning outcomes are very well fulfilled. This evaluation is based on the very good tuning between the formulation of the learning outcomes and the competences to be acquired, and between the competences and the programme's objectives. In addition, the formulated objectives and competences are based on the national professional field descriptor and legislations for psychology studies. The objectives and outcomes are publicly available, however only in Lithuanian language. The very good reputation of the programme at national level can be identified as an **area of excellence.** There is room for improvement with regard to the linkage between the professional requirement and the programme objectives and learning outcomes.

Recommendation:

- Formalization of the exchanges with the social partners to assess the needs of the labour market, for instance with the use of regular surveys or organization of events.

2.2. Curriculum design

The programme structure is in line with the legislative requirements of the second cycle study programmes, offering 120 credits. It includes significantly more practice credits (23 ECTS) than the prescribed minimum (15 ECTS). This was changes in response to the previous external evaluation in 2011. Special attention has also been given to the preparation of the final thesis, to which 30 credits have been assigned in the current study plan (SER, p.10 and Appendix 1). A specificity of the curriculum design is the organization of the whole program into 3 distinct modules: a) main theoretical paradigms in clinical psychology and psychopathology, b) research in clinical psychology, c) skills for the professional practise. These 3 modules address the main domains of the study field, which are a) theoretical knowledge, b) research approaches and c) applied practical skills (SER, p.13). Each module consists of 3 to 4 obligatory courses that are

accompanied with a large list of complementary optional courses, in which students can choose 1 or 2 courses (SER, p. 13). The combination of obligatory and optional courses allows two possible specialisations: 1) work with children and 2) work with adults (SER). During the study visit, the students reported that they would like to have the possibility to choose even more optional courses than the prescribed minimum. Those extra choices could have the status of so called facultative courses. A special interest was expressed for the optional courses of the module „*Skills for the Professional Practise*". In the current curriculum structure, it is not possible for all the students to participate in all courses.

The curriculum design is clearly related to the competence domains, which are in turn transformed in the well-defined programme learning outcomes (Appendix 1). The competence domains are explicitly linked to a wide range of study skills facilitating the higher order cognitive functioning and attainment of complex professional skills (Appendix 1). The curriculum design also includes support to the fourth competence domain, namely personal and social competences, which are spread across the other 3 domains, with a strong emphasis on the development of personal goals and reflective practice (SER and Appendix 1).

However, the elaboration of the subject learning outcomes is not done according to the recommendation of the Bologna experts nor to the recommendations of the previous external evaluation. First, the formulation of the course learning outcomes does not have a common format, so that the students might have difficulty to understand what is expected from them with regard to the scope and level of academic achievements. Secondly, some learning outcome formulations support discipline-centered approach to teaching. Most of them state that "students will understand", "get knowledge", "be exposed to certain type of experience", instead of using concrete statements, describing what the students are supposed to do in order to achieve the specific learning outcome (Appendix 1). Such formulations are too broad and vague. They don't fulfil the category of the so called SMART learning outcomes (ECTS guide 2015), which are specific in terms of students' level of cognitive process (compare to the Bloom taxonomy, source: *Bloom, B. S. et. A. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: David McKay Company*; *Anderson, Lorin W.; Krathwohl, David R., eds. (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon).* SMART learning outcomes are described by (one) active verb, by clearly measurable learning outcomes that relevant to the programme, and that are commonly agreed among stakeholders, and timely, i.e. of such scope that can be appropriately achieved in given time. In that respect, the learning outcomes formulated at the programme level better comply with this format than the learning outcomes formulated at the course level. In relation with the issue of the unclear formulation of courses learning outcomes, there are also issues in the

attribution of the credits to the courses. For instance, the learning outcomes in course designs are in some cases too vaguely and broadly formulated, and in other cases very concretely and specifically formulated, what in turn does not clearly and coherently reflect the student workload in the respective courses (Appendix 1.)

The main recommendation for the improvement of the course design is to achieve greater conformity across courses in the formulation of learning outcomes in accordance with the EU Bologna experts guidelines. (i.e. ECTS user's guides 2009, 2015), and to check the compliance of the course learning outcomes with the requirements of LTQF for the level 7. Although it is visible from SER (in Appendix 1) that teachers are responsible for providing course descriptions, in direct communication with the teacher representatives, during the interviews, the teachers showed modest knowledge about the concept of competence-based curricula and about the role of learning outcomes as foundation building blocks in curriculum development (evidenced in the site visit). According to the teachers' statements, the number of ECTS attributed to each course is decided by the Program committee, and the teachers are not involved in this decision. So, it was observed during the site visit, that both teachers and students have little understanding of the ECTS concept and its role in curriculum design.

In addition, it was noticed, that - for some courses - the list of recommended sources contains rather old literature, which is not easy available to students, and that they actually skip it. In this context, students reported that the teachers "wanted to share with them, the literature they had read during their studies". However, the knowledge transmitted in the programme should correspond to the latest state of the art. In addition, several "classical" books have new and more recent editions. Therefore, the Review team recommends to refresh the list of recommended literature in some courses.

Overall, the program content corresponds to the type and cycle of studies. Study methods are sufficiently diversified to achieve the intended learning outcomes. But as pointed out by the students during the interviews, some professional methods (i.e. counselling techniques) are optional and are not accessible to all students. The students and Alumni also indicate the lack of flexibility in the choice of optional courses, in general (site visit).

Two special strengths of the program should be emphasised. The first one is the attention paid to the gradual and consistent development of research competences during the curriculum, highlighted with the student research conference (Conference for Young Scientist in Psychology) and the opportunity to publish papers in the conference proceeding. The higher demands on research achievements than required by national regulations are well-accepted, and research is well-integrated in learning. This assumption was confirmed by inspection of master theses in at least two generations of students, which revealed the use of more complex research designs,

involving quantitative and qualitative approaches, and solid methodological approach to the data collecting and processing.

The second strength is the good integration of the recommendations given during the last evaluation, regarding the extension and improvement in the organization and supervision of the student practices. The requirements and outcomes for the practice in the current study programme are very well-defined, the agreements and practice plan are transparent, the coordinated supervision of the university and placement supervisors is safely steering student professional socialization and professional skills acquisitions as revealed during the interviews with the social partners, the teachers, the students and alumni during the site visit (SER. page 17) The research domain of the program is strongly focused on the specialization of the research groups, which are getting international recognition (SER, page 15). Students can however choose to work on their thesis outside of the research groups' projects. Content of the programme corresponds to the latest academic achievements; especially the ones related to the internal research groups are well up-to-date. However, for some lectures, the list of recommended lectures contains old literature.

In summary, the curriculum design has some clear strengths related to very good integration of research in the programme and the gradual and consistent development of research competences during the curriculum. Another strength is related to the increase of credits associated with practice credits and very good organization and supervision of the practice. Both were improved according to the recommendations of the previous evaluation. However, there are several areas for improvement. One is related to the formulation of the learning outcomes at subject's level, that is not conform to the formal standards. A second issue concerns the attribution of ECTS to the courses and the lack of knowledge of the teachers and the students about the meaning and value of ECTS. In that matter, the curriculum is not using a student-centered approach. Finally, the flexibility in the choice of the optional courses is limited and not all courses are accessible to all students. The criteria related to curriculum design were therefore scored with good, because there are clear strengths and some areas of improvements.

Recommendations:

- Improve the elaboration of learning outcomes at course level in accordance with the recommendations of the EU Bologna experts.
- Organize for the whole academic staff and students refreshment seminars about Bologna latest developments (Bologna beyond Bologna trends, new ESG requirement).
- Achieve more flexibility in the choice of optional courses.

- Refresh the list of recommended literature in some courses where it goes back to 60-ties and 70-ties.

2.3. Teaching staff

Teaching staff meet legal requirements. More specifically, the percentage of teaching staff with a doctoral degree is 94.4%, while the General Requirements for the Master Degree Study Programmes (Order of the Minister for Education and Science of Republic of Lithuania, 3 June 2010 No V-826) request that no less than 80% of all study subjects teachers must have a scientific degree. In addition, 27.7% of teaching staff have a professor degree, which is fully conform with the requirement that *no less than 20% of major study field subjects' volume has to be taught by teachers holding a Professors academic degree".*(SER, p.20). Finally, the teaching staff also comply with the requirement that "*no less than 60% of academic staff teaching course units in the study field shall do research in the same field*" (General Requirements for the Master Degree Study Programmes, Appendix 2, SER p.19) and the requirement from Regulations of Study Programmes of the Vilnius University stating that "*all staff involved in lecturing (reading theoretical courses) shall have a doctoral degree"* (SER, p.19).

Academic, scientific qualifications of the staff are very high. They are successful in publications and in acquisition of competitive funding. During the five year evaluation period, 212 publications related to researches performed by teaching staff were published; 16 research projects were funded by the research council of Lithuania, from which 8 of them were initiated by Programme staff (SER, p. 22). During self evaluation period academic staff participated at 8 international projects (SER, p.23). The teachers are very committed and engaged for the programme as evidenced in the site visit. In addition to their engagement in scientific activities, the teaching staff is also engaged in clinical work, ensuring therefore the necessary competences to meet the learning outcomes (evidenced in the site visit). The distribution of age and professional experience among teachers is well-balanced. Academic staff has very good working experience (average of all staff is 24 years), and teaching experience (average of all staff is 18 years). Broad age distribution (from 25 to 65 and more years) provides opportunities for synergy of experience and innovations (SER, p.21, table 9). The criteria of acquiring teaching competences is well-achieved for the young teachers, since mandatory courses in didactics are included in the doctoral studies; and the younger teachers for the clinical psychology programme mostly came from clinical doctoral studies. Yet, there is not clear system for acquiring teaching competences for senior teachers. Vilnius University ensures quality of studies by providing possibility for all teachers to develop teaching skill at organized courses and seminars. However,

these courses are not obligatory. With exception of the PhD-students, none of the present teaching staff or member of the programme committee reported using this possibility, or reported participating in continuous education in didactics (evidenced at site visit). The experts' team identified this point as an area of improvement, especially with regard to the lack of knowledge related to the meaning of ECTS reported in the previous section.

There is enough staff to ensure learning outcomes. This can be measured by the lecturer / students ratio. For instance, in year 2016/2017, the ratio was one lecturer to six students (SER, p.25). Such ratio guarantees high level of Programme delivery and allows expecting desirable learning outcomes. Teaching staff turnover is suitable to provide the programme at the required level. Turnover is very low: during self evaluation period one teacher left for retirement, one – reduced workload, but basically turnover happened between positions (3 lecturers with doctoral degree became associated professors, 2 associate professors were appointed as full time professors (SER p.21, table 8). The turnover is also supported with the participation of visiting international professors. However, this is still rare (SER, p. 24, Table 13), and the senior staff expressed their wish to get more visiting professors for longer period during the site visit. Staff mobility is very low (SER, p. 24, Table 12). There is no clear system for teachers' personal development, promotion or incentives as evidenced during the study visit.

The senior staff, the member of the SER committee and teachers described a close relationship between teachers and students during the site visit. This was however not confirmed by the students and the Alumni. And very low representation of graduates (N=3) and students during the site visit indicates either a lack of information or a very formal communication. For the experts' team, it was therefore not possible to evaluate the quality and openness of the communication between teaching staff and students.

The strong and active involvement of the teachers of this programme in the public policy making in Lithuania, especially with regard to topics related to suicide prevention, psychological trauma, and the importance of early childhood developmental factors was identified as a strength of the programme. The professors associated with the programme have a very strong reputation at national level (see also point related to professors' reputation under 2.1). This was also mentioned by students as one reason to choose this programme. In addition, teachers of the programme are actively involved in the preparation of law regulating the work of psychologist in Lithuania.

In summary, the teachers are very well-engaged and educated at scientific and clinical levels. However, after their PhD, they don't engage in continued education for the development of their teaching skills and didactic knowledge. The staff meets the legal requirement and the number of staff is sufficient to achieve the learning outcomes. The quality and openness of the

communication with the students could be however improved. The strong reputation and engagement of the teachers associated with the programme at national level was identified as an area of excellence (already mentioned under 2.1). Because of this combination between strengths and areas of improvement, the criteria related to the teaching staff is evaluated as good.

Recommendations:
- Better promotion of benefits of teacher mobility and continued education in didactics, for instance through the organization of a system for personal development of teachers, including questions of career, mobility, and incentives.
- Improvement of the communication with the students.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The Faculty of Philosophy is located in the Vilnius city center, which makes it easily accessible to the students. The premises of the faculty are very old, its oldest premises were established back in the 16th century, allowing students special experience to attend the lectures in medieval buildings. Due to its unique architecture the faculty has rather small auditoriums, but taking in to account the number of the students per class (28 – 30), it is adequate in size. However, the furniture provided for the auditoriums is not new and it causes trouble having a roundtable discussions or practice oriented courses, as some furniture is not movable (as reported by the teachers during the site visit). Also, as noted by the teaching staff, having a clock in the class hanging on the wall would be very helpful for them to organize their time in a more convenient way. Lastly, multimedia projectors in the auditoriums are rather old and not completely corresponding to the modern standards in this field (for instance uniboards or HDMI connections (evidenced in the site visit).

Laboratory facilities are very well established and having a great number of equipment (as evidenced during the site visit). Observation laboratories are provided with built - in cameras, speakers and computers with software needed for data analysis. In addition, there is access to questionnaires and tests for research. These facilities are at disposal of the Department of Psychology. It is however not clear whether the experimental labs - with exception of labs for consulting - are used by the programme in Clinical Psychology. Students can choose practice in various institutions, including Vilnius University Hospital Santaros clinics, Vilnius Center of Mental Health, Republican Vilnius Psychiatric Hospital, and etc. These opportunities were introduced by the social partners and the handouts given during the meeting. Both the quality of the laboratories and the practice opportunities are evidenced as strengths.

The old University library is located on the same campus as the Faculty of Philosophy, which is very convenient for the students. It has several working spaces, some of them are equipped with computers. There is also a space provided for resting and having a meal. The databases provided to the students are good in amount and quality. Nevertheless, the books offered in the library are not new (evidenced during the site visit). Students have emphasized that they do not have an equal accessibility to the textbooks due to limited amount hold in the library, so they have to share a book or copy it. They also report, not having access to all the requested literature with the provided databases during the interviews. Only the first floor of the library is adjusted for people with mobility disabilities. In the main building of the Faculty of Philosophy, the last floor, where laboratories are located is also difficult to access for persons with reduced mobility. Improvement areas identified by the SER committee includes the increase of office space for research staff (at the moment research staff members have not specified desktops), the development of open access resources and the acquisition of mobile lab material for field studies (SER, p. 30).

In summary, the criteria for facilities were evaluated as good. This evaluation reflects the combination of strengths and areas needing more improvement. The number of rooms is adequate in size and number. There are very well equipped laboratories at disposal. Practice possibilities are offered. The library is conveniently located. The Faculty of Philosophy is located in the historical buildings of the Vilnius University, whcih offers a unique and great setting on one hand; and also have some inherent limitations for changes on the other hand. Areas of improvement were identified with regard to the accessibility of the literature, and to the accessibility for persons with motor disabilities. This last point is however not specific to the study programme, but related to the buildings. The Review Team recommends to develop open access resources, and to consider small structural changes to accommodate courses teaching practical skills and, or if not possible in the historical buildings to use rooms located in other buildings of the University if this is possible.

Recommendations:

- Consider structural changes to allow for practice-oriented courses and roundtable discussions, for instance with the addition of movable pieces of furniture. If this is not possible in the historical buildings, one option could be to use rooms located in other buildings of the University for these courses.

- Improve accessibility to literature resources, for instance with the development of open access resources.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

There is a lack of transparency with regard to the entrance requirements. For instance, the entrance requirements are not known by the members of the program committee (site visit). They are not described in detail in the self-evaluation reports (SER, p.31). The entrance requirements correspond to the requirement for second-level studies at Vilnius University. However, because of the strong competition among students to be accepted in this programme (between 140-200 applicants and 24 to 32 accepted, SER p. 31), it is desirable to have transparent entrance requirements, based on the need of the program, and also communicated to the program committee. This is especially important to allow equitable entrance conditions. This point was already a recommendation in the previous evaluation's report. There is no statement in the SER on the improvements done with regard to this point. And the interviewed member of the programme committee during the site visit were not aware of / or informed about this point. This point is evaluated as an area of improvement by the experts' team.

The organization of the study process allows in a sufficient way the implementation of the programme and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. Drop-out rates for the evaluation period were situated between 4% and 9% (SER, p. 32, Table 18). No students dropped out because of financial or academic problems (SER, p.32). In addition, the social partner reported that the interns and graduates of this programme show adequate competences during practices and at work (study visit). However, the Review Team sees need for improvements with regard to the transparency of the processes and to the communication between the different levels of the programme. For instance, as discussed in the curriculum's design section, the teachers have no influence on the ECTS attribution of their course, and on the other side have little information on the value of ECTS, hindering them to apply adequate workload for the students. The students reported during the site visit being able to produce changes through discussions with their direct teachers at course levels. However, when they expressed concerns and criticisms at programme level (for instance questions related to the attribution of ECTS), these were not heard. While the SER group and members of the programme committee reported having discussions with the students about their concerns, the students were not aware of such discussions. Furthermore, during the site visit, Review Panel could evidence that the different interview partners often could not identify who is responsible for what. The fact that few students came for the interview, and reported having been informed only few days before the site visit and not informed that the interviews would take place in English, reflects also the difficulties in communication. This aspect was identified as a major area for improvement.

With regard to the engagement in scientific activities, students are clearly encouraged to participate in research activities. This is formalized and recognized at the study plan level, since the master thesis has to be empirical, and is mostly performed in research projects of the staff (site visit). This aspect was identified as clear strength of the programme. Vilnius University offers a broad range of sports, arts and music activities that are open to all students. Students can participate in self-governing activities and are represented at all levels of the University respectively of the Faculty. However it is not clear, whether students from the study programme are engaging in such activities (none of the interviewed students did it or knew someone doing it). Students enrolled in the study programme can participate at the conferences, seminars, and invited lectures organized by the scientists of the Faculty of Philosophy. They can also present their research results at the Conference for Young Scientists in Psychology (JMPK). Notably, only between 2 and 5 students of the programme per year presented their research at the Conference during the evaluation period (SER, p. 34).

With regard to mobility, students have little information about mobility programs and are not aware of benefits associated to them. At the contrary, during the site visit, they report being afraid that the credits obtained abroad will not be recognized. The structure of the master study is also not facilitating participation in exchange programmes, what was also corroborated by the programme committee during the site visit. During the evaluation period, only one student participated in a mobility programme (SER, p. 35). There is a clear need for improvement in this area and the Review Team strongly suggest the promotion of benefits associated with mobility programs, the adaptation of the programme structure and the possibility of flexible solutions for interested students.

The procedure of assessments of the student's achievements is in general clearly communicated by the teachers in the description of the courses, at the beginning of each course (SER, p.35 and confirmed at site visit). The students report being well-informed about assessment procedures. The formulation of the learning outcomes could be however more precise (see discussion in the curriculums' design section). With regard to the professional activities of the graduate students, they are in compliance with the expectations of the social partners. The students wish more deepening in practice and in intervention methods as evidenced in the interviews. The programme corresponds to the state economic and social needs, and a large majority of the graduate (76%) was employed after graduation (SER, p. 35). With regard to future needs, especially in the framework of a possible change of legislation in the field of psychology profession, the programme will need adjustment to prepare students to an independent practice after their study. Neither in the self-evaluation report, nor in the interviews, the Review Team could find the evidence of systematic analyses of the changes to be done and of the new

requirements. Fair learning is provided in general, however the accessibility for persons with reduced mobility is not granted everywhere and the needs of students with disabilities should receive more attention.

Students can complain, and at teacher's level the complaints are heard and lead to changes. More structural complaints did not lead to any feedbacks. Communication and climate is generally reported as being good, but with a clear distance between students and teachers.

In summary, several areas of improvement were identified with regard to the study processes, especially, with regard to the transparency of the processes, the entrance requirements and the conditions facilitating mobility. The adequation with the market and social needs is given, but the study programme should take into account the changes in professional requirements that will come with the new legislation for psychology professions. Although some criteria are well-fulfilled, for instance the integration of research activities in the study plan and the communication of the intended learning outcomes and assessment procedures, the general criteria for the study processes and student performance assessment were evaluated as satisfactory. The Review Team estimated that the observed lack of transparency in several domains of the study processes is a major threat for the quality of the programme. This is particularly important since this programme is the only possibility for students to study clinical psychology at master level in Lithuania. And clinical psychology is directly linked with professional activities in Health care, especially with mental health, and will be even more important with the planned changes in legislation.

<u>Recommendations:</u>

- To clarify the entrance requirements, especially with regard to aspects related to equity and transparency.
- To analyze the changes in professional requirements and include them in the programme.
- To increase the efforts of the student international services regarding the mobility of both outgoing and incoming students and staff; and to better promote the benefits of mobility and provide better conditions for mobility at the programme level.
- To make the processes more transparent and improve the communication.

2.6. Programme management

The master programme of Clinical Psychology belongs to the Faculty of Philosophy. The Faculty is headed by the Faculty Council and the Dean. The study programme of Clinical Psychology is implemented by the Department of Clinical and Organizational Psychology (SER p.6.).

According to the SER (p.38.), in Vilnius University, all study programmes and their implementation are administered by the administration of studies, which is also responsible for ensuring the quality of functioning of the units at different levels in Vilnius University. The main document concerned with the internal quality insurance of studies is: Vilnius University Quality Manual (SER p.38). In accordance with the regulation of study programmes of Vilnius University, assuring and improving the study programme quality is the responsibility of the study programme committee, which operates in accordance with the regulations of the study programme committee (SER p.38.). According to SER, the study programme committee meets every semester to discuss all of the related issues: student feedback and insights of lecturers, new demands arising during the internships (SER p.8.). In accordance with the regulation, the main goal of the study programme committee is to seek the high quality of the programme so that its purpose is attained, its learning competences are developed, its content is compatible with the teaching, learning and assessment methods and the programme is competitive and relevant to the society (SER p.39.). However, on site visit during discussions at all levels, the Review Team did not hear consistent and systematic means of how this was undertaken and what indicators are used. There is insufficient evident reliance on the outcomes of the study programme committee process, and although the study programme committee is mentioned in the SER (p.39) as the key unit responsible for the high quality of the programme, on site visit the Review Team found limited evidence at the program level of the contribution of study programme committee to improving quality.

During site visit, it was noticed that there is no common understanding of what student-centered learning means. The Review Team noted disparate and often incorrect understandings of these terms at all levels, which led to incorrect implementation. It is therefore necessary to create a common strategy of implementation across the programme. This would include an increased emphasis on the role of learning outcomes in the study programmes. Such a strategy should be supported by the study programme committee and administration of studies.

It is noted that the University has established obligations and responsibilities for its staff and has established methods and means for student involvement, both in giving feedback and in decision making. On site visit, during the interview, some students indicated that they had given feedback

that had been acted upon and many indicated that they had given feedback but did not know the outcome. In meetings with students, the Review Team noted a marked lack of critical analysis related to the study process.

At all discussions level, the participants mentioned the University launched questionnaires, but that there were no evidence about the analysis of these questionnaires and the use of data (as evidenced during the site visit).

The employers with whom the Review Team met all indicated a high level of satisfaction with graduates. Employers valued the approaches and attitudes of graduates and made few comments on how students could be better prepared for the labour market. This, however, was inconsistent across the programme and generally lacked a systematic, formalized and structured approach to efficiently and consequently have an influence on the programme.

The Review Team considered the issue of democratic education as problematic. A common denominator of democratic education and student-Centred Learning is a way for preserving democracy with the active participation by all those involved in classrooms and educational institutions.

It is not clear from the SER and from the discussions held with programme managers, teachers, students, graduates and employers if all internal involved stakeholders have implemented the policy of making changes in their teaching, learning and assessment approaches according to the results of quality surveys.

In summary, the criteria related to programme management were evaluated as satisfactory; and most specific criteria related to programme management need improvement. This concerns particularly the lack of clarity about how the programme committee ensures the quality of the programme and about how the results of quality surveys are implemented in the programme. In addition, students' feedbacks and comments are not always heard. The Review Team evaluated these issues as a threat for the observation of democrative principles in the management of the study programme.

Recommendations

- Implement systematic and structured strategies for quality control at the level of the programme committee.
- Implement systematic integration of resp. systematic feedbacks on the results of quality surveys.
- Formalize and provide a structured procedure for the implementation of the feedbacks of the students, and the suggestions of the social partners in the programme.

- Create a common strategy accross the programme to implement student-centered approach.

2.7. Examples of excellence

- Strong reputation of the professors associated with the programme and the strong reputation of the study programme.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To improve the linkage with the market needs, in particular by:
    a) formalizing the exchanges with the social partners, in order to assess the needs of the labour market, for instance with the use of regular surveys or organization of events; and b) by including the changes in professional requirements, for instance with an analysis of the new professional requirements and their integration in the programme.

2. To implement a student-centered learning approach in the programme, in particular by:
    a) improving the formulation of the learning outcomes at course level in accordance with the recommendations of the EU Bologna experts; b) organizing for the whole academic staff and students refreshment seminars about Bologna latest developments (Bologna beyond Bologna trends, new ESG requirements); and c) by creating a common strategy accross the programme to implement student-centered approach.

3. To ameliorate specific points in curriculum design, in particular:
    a) to achieve more flexibility in the choice of optional courses; b) and to upgrade the recommended literature.

4. To better promote the benefits of mobility and continued education in didactics for teachers, for instance through the organization of a system for personal development of teachers, including questions of career, mobility, and incentives.

5. To increase the efforts of the student international services regarding the mobility of both outgoing and incoming students and staff; and to better promote the benefits of mobility and provide better conditions for mobility at the programme level.

6. To improve the communication and the transparency of the processes, in particular by:
    a) improving the communication with the students; b) making the processes more transparent and improving the communication between the levels, and c) by clarifying the entrance requirements with regard to equity and transparency aspects.

7. To perform structural changes in the classrooms to allow for practice-oriented courses and roundtable discussions, for instance with the addition of movable pieces of furniture (or use rooms in other buildings of the University if possible); and to improve the accessibility to literature resources, for instance with the development of open access resources.

8. To implement systematic and structured strategies for quality control at the level of the programme committee, for instance by defining quality indicators and the means and the frequency to assess them.

9. To implement a system for the integration of feedbacks, in particular by a) implementing a systematic integration of and systematic feedbacks on the results of quality surveys, for instance by instructing teachers to report about the changes done as a result of the feedbacks and / or to discuss them with the students; and b) by formalizing and providing a structured procedure for the implementation of the feedbacks of the students, and of the suggestions of the social partners in the programme.

IV. SUMMARY

Overall, the programme was evaluated with mixed grades from very good for some criteria (e.g. the criteria related to the programme learning outcomes) to satisfactory for other criteria (e.g. for the criteria related to the study processes and to the programme management). The recommendations made in the previous evaluations were only partly implemented. More specifically, the previous recommendations related to the programme contents, such as the requested integration of the different theoretical orientations and the increase of practice duration were very well integrated. However, with regard to the recommendations related to structural aspects, such as the formulation of learning outcomes at course level, and the entrance requirements, there were no clear improvements.

In the current evaluation, the criteria related to the programme aims and learning outcomes are evaluated as very well fulfilled. This evaluation is based on the very good tuning between the formulation of the learning outcomes and the competences to be acquired, and between the competences and the programme's objectives. In addition, the formulated objectives and competences are based on the national professional field descriptor and the legislation for psychology studies. The objectives and outcomes are publicly available (only in Lithuanian). And the very good reputation of the programme at national level was identified as an area of excellence. However, there is room for improvement with regard to the linkage between the programme objectives and the market needs. The Review Team recommends to formalize the exchanges with the social partners, for instance with the use of regular surveys or organization of events; and also to include the changes in professional requirements, for instance with an analysis of the new professional requirements and their integration in the programme.

The criteria related to curriculum design were evaluated as good. On one hand, the very good integration of research the programme and the gradual and consistent development of research competences during the curriculum were evidenced as clear strengths. Another strength is related to the increase of credits associated with practice credits and the very good organization and supervision of the practice. Both were improved according to the recommendations of the previous evaluation. However, there are several areas for improvement. For instance, the formulation of the learning outcomes at subject's level is not conforming to the formal standards, and should be formulated according the recommendations of the EU Bologna experts. A second issue concerns the attribution of ECTS to the courses and the lack of knowledge of the teachers and the students about the meaning and value of ECTS. In that matter, the curriculum is not using a student-centered approach. This was also evidenced in the evaluation of the criteria

related to the study processes and to the programme management. For all three evaluation domains (i.e. curriculum design, study processes and programme management), the Review Team formulated recommendations with regard to the development of a student-centered approach. This includes the organization for the whole academic staff and students refreshment seminars about Bologna latest developments, and the creation of a common strategy across the programme to implement student-centered approach. Still with regard to the evaluation of the curriculum design, the flexibility in the choice of the optional courses is limited and not all courses are accessible to all students. And finally, in some courses, the recommended literature is rather old and should be updated.

The criteria related to the teaching staff were evaluated as good. The teachers are strongly engaged and very well educated at scientific and clinical levels. However, after their PhD, they do not engage in continued education for the development of their teaching skills and/ or didactic knowledge. Teacher mobility is also very low. The staff meets the legal requirement and the number of staff is sufficient to achieve the learning outcomes. The strong reputation and engagement of the teachers associated with the programme at national level was identified as an area of excellence. The Review Team recommends to better promote the benefits of teacher mobility and of continued education in didactics, for instance through the organization of a system for personal development of teachers.

The criteria for facilities were evaluated as good. The number of rooms is adequate is size and number. There are very well equipped laboratories at disposal. Practice possibilities are offered. The library is conveniently located. Recommendations concern the development of open access resources and the consideration of small structural changes to accommodate courses teaching practical skills.

The criteria related to the study processes were evaluated as satisfactory. Although some criteria are well fulfilled, for instance the integration of research activities in the study plan and the communication of the intended learning outcomes and assessment procedures, several areas for major improvement, especially, with regard to the transparency of the processes, the entrance requirements and the conditions facilitating mobility. The Review Team estimated that the observed lack of transparency in several domains of the study processes is a major threat for the quality of the programme. There are strong recommendations that include 1) to make the processes more transparent and improve the communication between levels and to improve the communication with the students; and to clarify the entrance requirements with regard to equity and transparency. Finally, students' mobility is an issue the benefits of mobility should be promoted and better conditions for mobility should be provided at the programme level. Finally, the criteria related to programme management were also evaluated as satisfactory. Here, the lack

of clarity about how the programme committee ensures the quality of the programme and about how the results of quality surveys are implemented in the programme was evaluated as a major area for improvement. In addition, students' feedbacks and comments are not always heard and / or implemented. The Review team evaluated these issues as a threat for the observation of democrative principles in the management of the study programme, and formulated therefore strong recommendations. They include a) the implementation of systematic and structured strategies for quality control at the level of the programme committee, b) the implemention of a systematic integration of systematic feedbacks on the results of quality surveys; and c) the creation of a formal and structured procedure to implement the feedbacks and complaints of the students, and of the social partners in the programme.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Clinical Psychology* (state code – 621S16001, 6211JX039) at Vilnius University 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	3
3.	Teaching staff	3
4.	Facilities and learning resources	3
5.	Study process and students' performance assessment	2
6.	Programme management	2
	Total:	**17**

*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:	Chantal Martin Sölch
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Inga Millere
	Vizek Vidović Vlasta
	Žydrė Arlauskaitė
	Meda Vaitonytė

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
KLINIKINĖ PSICHOLOGIJA **(VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 6211JX039) 2018-01-05**
EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-272 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Vilniaus universiteto studijų programa *Klinikinė psichologija* (valstybinis kodas – 6211JX039) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	4
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	**17**

* 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

Studijų programa buvo įvertinta skirtingais balais, nuo labai aukšto kai kuriems kriterijams (pvz., tai kriterijai, susiję su programos studijų rezultatais) iki patenkinamo kitiems kriterijams (pvz., kriterijai, susiję su studijų procesais ir programos vadyba). Ankstesnio vertinimo metu pateiktos rekomendacijos buvo tik iš dalies įgyvendintos. Konkrečiau, anksčiau pateiktos rekomendacijos, susijusios su programos turiniu, tokios kaip prašomos integruoti skirtingos teorinės orientacijos

ir praktikos trukmės pailginimas, buvo puikiai integruotos. Tačiau rekomendacijos, susijusios su struktūriniais aspektais, tokiais kaip studijų dalyko lygio studijų rezultatų formulavimas ir reikalavimai stojantiesiems, nebuvo įgyvendintos.

Per šį vertinimą su programos tikslais ir studijų rezultatais susiję kriterijai vertinami kaip puikiai įgyvendinti. Šis vertinimas grindžiamas tuo, kad suformuluoti studijų rezultatai bei įgyjama kompetencija yra puikiai suderinta su programos tikslais. Be to, suformuluoti tikslai ir kompetencijos sudaryti vadovaujantis nacionaliniu profesinės srities aprašu ir psichologijos studijas apibrėžiančiais teisės aktais. Tikslai ir studijų rezultatai skelbiami viešai (tik lietuvių kalba). Puiki programos reputacija nacionaliniu lygiu buvo įvardyta kaip išskirtinis gerosios praktikos pavyzdys. Vis dėlto programos tikslai galėtų geriau atitikti rinkos poreikius. Vertinimo grupė rekomenduoja formalizuoti mainus su socialiniais partneriais, pavyzdžiui, atlikti įprastinius tyrimus ar organizuoti renginius, pokyčius įtraukti į profesinius reikalavimus, pavyzdžiui, kartu analizuojant naujus profesinius reikalavimus ir jų integravimą į programą.

Kriterijai, susiję su programos sandara, buvo įvertinti gerai. Iš vienos pusės, itin gera programos metu vykdomų mokslinių tyrimų integracija ir laipsniškas bei nuoseklus mokslinių tyrimų kompetencijų tobulinimas studijų turinyje buvo įvardytas kaip aiški stiprybė. Kita stiprybė yra didesnis praktikai skiriamų kreditų skaičius ir labai geras praktikos organizavimas bei priežiūra. Abu šie aspektai buvo patobulinti atsižvelgiant į ankstesnio įvertinimo metu pateiktas rekomendacijas. Tačiau keletą sričių dar reikia tobulinti. Pavyzdžiui, studijų dalykų studijų rezultatų formuluotės neatitinka formalių standartų ir jas reikėtų suformuluoti pagal ES Bolonijos proceso ekspertų rekomendacijas. Antroji problema – ECTS kreditų skyrimas studijų dalykams ir dėstytojų bei studentų žinių apie ECTS reikšmę ir vertę trūkumas. Šiuo atžvilgiu studijų turinys nėra nukreiptas į studentus. Tuo taip pat buvo galima įsitikinti vertinant kriterijus, susijusius su studijų procesais ir programos vadyba. Vertinimo ekspertų grupė visoms trims vertinamoms sritims (t. y. studijų sandarai, studijų procesams ir programos vadybai) suformulavo rekomendacijas, susijusias su į studentus nukreipto metodo kūrimu, įĮskaitant visam akademiniam personalui ir studentams organizuojamus žinių apie paskutinius Bolonijos proceso atnaujinimus ir visai programai taikomos bendros strategijos kriterijų atnaujinimo seminarus, kad būtų galima įgyvendinti į studentus nukreiptą metodą. Visgi, kalbant apie studijų programos sandaros vertinimą, lankstumas pasirenkant pasirenkamuosius studijų dalykus yra ribotas ir ne visi studijų dalykai prieinami visiems studentams. Galiausiai, kai kurių studijų dalykų rekomenduojama literatūra yra pasenusi ir ją reikėtų atnaujinti.

Kriterijai, susiję su dėstančiuoju personalu, buvo įvertinti gerai. Dėstytojai aktyviai dalyvauja studijų programoje ir turi puikų mokslinį bei klinikinį išsilavinimą. Tačiau gavę daktaro laipsnį dėstytojai toliau nedalyvauja tęstiniame švietime, skirtame dėstymo įgūdžiams tobulinti ir (ar)

didaktinėms žinioms atnaujinti. Dėstytojų judumas taip pat labai mažas. Personalas atitinka teisinius reikalavimus, personalo narių skaičius yra pakankamas studijų rezultatams pasiekti. Gera reputacija ir su studijų programa susijusių dėstytojų aktyvus dalyvavimas nacionaliniu lygiu buvo įvardyti kaip išskirtinės kokybės pavyzdys. Vertinimo ekspertai rekomenduoja labiau skatinti dėstytojų judumą, plačiau kalbėti apie jo teikiamą naudą ir tęsti didaktikos principų mokymą, pavyzdžiui, sukuriant sistemą, skirtą asmeniniam dėstytojų tobulėjimui.

Materialiųjų išteklių kriterijus buvo įvertintas gerai. Auditorijų skaičius ir dydis yra tinkami. Galima naudotis labai gerai įrengtomis laboratorijomis. Siūlomos praktikos galimybės. Biblioteka įrengta patogioje vietoje. Rekomenduojama tobulinti atvirosios prieigos išteklius ir apsvarstyti nedidelius struktūrinius pokyčius, kad būtų galima pritaikyti studijų dalykų dėstymo praktinius įgūdžius.

Studijų procesų kriterijai buvo įvertinti patenkinamai. Nors kai kurie kriterijai yra puikiai įgyvendinami, pavyzdžiui, mokslinių tyrimų veiklos integravimas į studijų planą ir informavimas apie numatomus studijų rezultatus bei vertinimo procedūras, rimtus pakeitimus siūloma atlikti keliose srityse, būtent susijusiose su procesų skaidrumu, reikalavimais stojantiesiems ir judumą lengvinančiomis sąlygomis. Vertinimo grupės manymu, nustatytas skaidrumo trūkumas keliose studijų programos srityse kelia didelę grėsmę studijų programos kokybei. Rekomenduojama: 1) šiuos procesus padaryti skaidresnius, gerinti komunikaciją tarp lygių ir su studentais, taip pat aiškiau pateikti reikalavimus stojantiesiems, atsižvelgiant į nešališkumą bei skaidrumą. Dar viena problema – studentų judumas. Reikėtų skelbti, kokią naudą duoda judumas, ir sudaryti geresnes sąlygas judumui programos lygmeniu. Programos vadybos kriterijai taip pat buvo įvertinti patenkinamai. Nepakankamai aišku, kaip programos komitetas užtikrina programos kokybę, kaip apklausų dėl kokybės rezultatai yra įgyvendinami programoje – tai labiausiai tobulintina sritis. Taip pat ne visada girdimi ir (ar) įgyvendinami studentų atsiliepimai ir komentarai. Vertinimo grupė įvertino šias problemas kaip demokratinių principų laikymosi grėsmę studijų programos vadybos srityje ir pateikė konkrečių rekomendacijų, kaip tobulinti šią sritį. Jose skatinama: a) įgyvendinti sistemines ir struktūrines strategijas dėl kokybės kontrolės programos komiteto lygmeniu, b) sistemiškai integruoti kokybės apklausų rezultatų grįžtamąjį ryšį, c) sukurti formalią struktūrinę procedūrą studentų ir programos socialinių partnerių grįžtamajam ryšiui įgyvendinti bei skundams nagrinėti.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Geriau tenkinti rinkos poreikius, būtent:

   a) siekiant įvertinti darbo rinkos poreikius, reikėtų formalizuoti mainus su socialiniais partneriais, pavyzdžiui, rengiant įprastas apklausas ar organizuojant renginius;

   b) keičiant profesinius reikalavimus, pavyzdžiui, analizuojant naujus profesinius reikalavimus ir jų integravimą į studijų programą.

2. Gerinti į studentus orientuotą šios studijų programos mokymosi metodą, ypač:

   a) gerinant studijų dalykų studijų rezultatų formulavimą pagal ES Bolonijos ekspertų rekomendacijas;

   b) organizuojant viso akademinio personalo ir studentų žinių tobulinimo seminarus apie paskutinius Bolonijos proceso atnaujinimus (nauji ESG reikalavimai); ir

   c) numatant bendrą visos studijų programos strategiją, kad būtų sukurtas į studentus orientuotas metodas.

3. Tobulinti specifines programos sandaros sritis:
   a) suteikti daugiau lankstumo renkantis pasirenkamuosius studijų dalykus; b) atnaujinti rekomenduojamą literatūrą.

4. Aktyviau informuoti apie judumo ir tęstinio švietimo privalumus dėstytojams skirtoje didaktikoje, pavyzdžiui, sukuriant sistemą, skirtą asmeniniam dėstytojų tobulėjimui, įtraukiant klausimus apie karjerą, judumą ir skatinamąsias priemones.

5. Tarptautines paslaugas studentams teikiantiems padaliniams dėti daugiau pastangų siekiant atvykstančių ir išvykstančių studentų bei personalo judumo, taip pat vertėtų aktyviau informuoti apie judumo privalumus bei sudaryti geresnes sąlygas judumui programos lygmeniu.

6. Tobulinti komunikaciją ir procesų skaidrumą, ypač:

   a) tobulinant komunikaciją su studentais; b) vykdant procesus skaidriau bei tobulinant komunikaciją tarp lygių ir c) aiškiau išdėstant stojimo į programą reikalavimus, atsižvelgiant į nešališkumo ir skaidrumo aspektus.

7. Įgyvendinti struktūrinius pokyčius auditorijose, kad jose galėtų vykti į praktiką orientuoti mokymai bei apskritojo stalo diskusijos, pavyzdžiui, pristačius judančius baldus (arba, jei įmanoma, naudojantis kituose universiteto pastatuose esančiomis patalpomis); gerinti priėjimą prie literatūros išteklių, pavyzdžiui, plėtojant atvirosios prieigos išteklius.

8. Įgyvendinti sistemines ir struktūrines kokybės kontrolės strategijas programos komiteto lygmeniu, pavyzdžiui, nurodant kokybės rodiklius ir priemones bei kaip dažnai jas bus galima vertinti.

9. Įgyvendinti grįžtamojo ryšio integravimo sistemą, ypač: a) įgyvendinant sisteminę kokybės apklausų rezultatų integraciją ir jų sisteminį grįžtamąjį ryšį, pavyzdžiui, mokant dėstytojus pranešti apie pokyčius, atliktus dėl gauto grįžtamojo ryšio, ir (arba) aptarti juos su studentais; b) formalizuoti ir atlikti struktūrines procedūras, siekiant įgyvendinti studentų grįžtamąjį ryšį bei studijų programos socialinių partnerių pasiūlymus.

<…>

_____

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

Vertėjos rekvizitai (vardas, pavardė, parašas)