



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETO PROGRAMOS
TEISĖS PSICHOLOGIJA (621S10002)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF STUDY PROGRAMME
PSYCHOLOGY OF LAW (621S10002)
at **VILNIUS UNIVERSITY**

Grupės vadovas:
Team Leader:

Prof. dr. Stephen Edward Newstead

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Doc. dr. Lena Adamson

Prof. dr. Peter J. van Koppen

Doc. dr. Junona Silvija Almonaitienė

Domas Bukauskas

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2014

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Teisės psichologija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621S10002
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Psichologija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Psichologijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1999-04-23 (LR švietimo ir mokslo ministro įsakymo Nr. 560)

INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme	<i>Psychology of Law</i>
State code	621S10002
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Psychology
Kind of the study programme	University Studies
Level of studies	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Scope of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of Psychology
Date of registration of the study programme	23-04-1999 (order No. 560 of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania)

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

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2. Curriculum design	6
3. Staff	7
4. Facilities and learning resources	8
5. Study process and student assessment.....	8
6. Programme management	9
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	10
IV. SUMMARY	11
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	12

I. INTRODUCTION

This masters programme is a two-year programme in forensic psychology which began in 1999 at Vilnius University. The study language is Lithuanian.

This evaluation is based on the Self-evaluation Report (hereinafter – SER) prepared in 2013 and finalized on 30th December 2013 and on the work done by an expert group headed by professor Stephen Edward Newstead. The expert group carried out a site visit in the last week of February 2014. Next to reading the material that was provided to the expert team, the site visit was particularly relevant to assessing the qualities of the programme. The expert team wishes to thank the faculty for the hospitality and for the administration, the staff, the students, and the social partners of the programme for their frank remarks and interesting inputs into the work of the expert team.

The masters programme is situated in the Faculty of Philosophy that was re-established in 1989 after a period of absence of more than 200 years at Vilnius University. The faculty has seven departments and 112 employees, of whom 79 are academics. That gives a good ratio of academic and non-academic personnel. Two of the departments of the faculty are of a psychological nature: General psychology and Clinical and organizational psychology.

There are some 1400 students enrolled at the faculty, 1050 in undergraduate programmes, 300 in masters programmes and 67 in doctoral programmes. For the Department of General Psychology these figures are 430, 140 and 23, respectively.

The faculty offers twelve masters programmes, of which four are of a psychological nature: Clinical psychology, Organizational psychology, Psychology (health and educational psychology specializations), and Forensic psychology.

The department provided the evaluation team with a well-written and clear self-evaluation. The site-visit gave the opportunity to clarify most of the points that remained unclear after reading the self-evaluation report. It was a pleasure to read the self-evaluation and it was a pleasure to be the guests of the department and meet the staff, students and others involved in the programme.

In the Self-evaluation report it is written: ‘The departments provide programmes that enable students to develop skills in the area of communication, information collection, critical thinking, problem solving, and quantitative as well as qualitative methods.’ Nowhere is it written that the departments just want to educate good psychologists. However, from the meetings with the various people in and around the department, it became clear that efforts are taken to indeed deliver good legal psychologists. It did, however, not become clear that among all involved there is a straightforward notion of what a good forensic psychologist is. That may be caused by the fact that the field in Lithuania is still in development.

The government structure of the faculty does not deviate from what is common at continental university faculties.

The most recent external evaluation took place in 2011, by an expert group that was also headed by professor Stephen Edward Newstead. It did lead to recommendations that were implemented after that evaluation. The present evaluation shows that all recommendations – to be discussed below -- have been acted upon. As to recommendation 3 it should be said that criminology now forms a smaller part of the masters programme. Also the attention to management skills has de-

creased. Psychology is now taking up a larger part of the masters programme, and the name of the programme has changed (see the discussion below).

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

This masters programme is situated in a diverse field. The relevant fields that can be identified are criminology, legal psychology and forensic psychology. The first field is usually aimed at policy makers, where criminologists work in crime prevention. The second and third fields are typically named forensic psychology in the Anglo-Saxon world, although on continental Europe a division is made between the two. The second field is typically for psychologists and the like who do research or work in agencies concerning areas such as witness behaviour, offender behaviour (offender profiling), behaviour of people who work in the field of crime, law enforcement, and criminal law. The third field is typically concerned with the evaluation of offenders and the treatment of offenders in prison and asylums. The forensic psychology masters programme at VU seems to divide its attention almost equally between these three fields. In that sense, it seems to be too little focussed on one of the fields. But note the following.

After the evaluation in 2011, the name of the programme was changed from Psychology and Criminology to – we literally translate the Lithuanian name – Legal Psychology. In much of continental Europe that indeed covers the aim of the masters. In the Anglo-Saxon countries one would rather use Forensic Psychology, that typically covers both the forensic psychology mentioned above (evaluating suspects) and what is called Legal Psychology or Psychology and Law elsewhere. In the international hotchpotch of names, the Lithuanian name seems to be quite well chosen.

To the three fields mentioned, it should be added that in almost all cases the future employment of the graduates will be in a field where knowledge of law or at least criminal law is essential. Thus, the masters programme is covering no less than four fields. The masters programme is there for future psychologists who want to work in criminal investigation, forensic psychology, expert examination, developing crime prevention programmes, and adjacent fields. These are many fields that indeed warrant a wide array of subjects to be covered in the masters. Nevertheless it was suggested during the site visit to the expert team that some more attention to issues in civil law – especially relevant for alumni who work with children in situations of divorce – might be needed.

It is the only masters programme of its kind in Lithuania, the expert team discovered during the site visit. That puts a heavy burden on the programme management to make the best of it without having any competition to help to direct the aims of the programme. It should also be noted that the psychologists who graduate from this master enter into fields where psychologists often have to justify their appointment and where it can be expected that in the near future changes will take place that may require consequences for the curriculum of the masters.

After the previous evaluation the admission policy was changed in the sense that now holders from a psychology bachelor degree from other universities are admitted without being required to do an exam. The expert team welcomes that change.

The programme is very much tied to practice and has good ties with agencies that might employ graduates from the programme, as was exemplified in the discussions with the external stakeholders. External stakeholders are involved in the programme and provide for practical experience placements at their agencies. All these agencies, however, are government-based. In that sense the masters programme seems to be aimed at a future in government employment. The self-

evaluation, however, shows that not more than a quarter of the graduates of the programme enter into jobs at these government-based agencies. It might be useful to expand the social partners of the programme and have them, more than now, actively involved in the shaping of the programme.

A strength of the aims and learning outcomes of the masters programme is that the students are introduced to a very diverse field with a wide variety of courses and subjects. In that sense it is truly an academic masters, as was demonstrated in discussions with students and alumni. That may, at the same time, be a weakness of the programme. Teaching students too much means that there is relatively little time devoted to individual subjects. The expert team considers this the right approach in fields where psychologists are just starting to make a contribution and where they have to develop their place and stature. At the same time it puts a burden on the programme management to develop the content of the masters following developments that take place in the field.

One issue should be of extra concern, and may be a potential weakness of the programme. Part of the programme seems to aim at preparing the graduates for a role as experts in court where they report on evaluations of suspects as to, for instance, their competency to stand trial or the Lithuanian version of the insanity defence. The staff in particular mentioned this during the site visit. It seems that at present the programme does not serve that purpose. One cause may be that too little attention in the masters is paid to teaching psychopathology. In that vein alumni suggested putting more psychology into the programme rather than less and especially paying special attention to psychopathology.

Another cause may be that in practice clinical psychology graduates are preferred for this kind of work. Why that is so did not become completely clear to the expert team. It may be that alumni from this masters still have to fight for their place in the field. It may also be that experts in court on the psyche of suspects are expected to have experience in treatment institutions. It may also be that these experts need extensive training in assessment and the use of psychological tests. It was suggested to the expert team that indeed hands-on use of psychological tests should be more practised, either during a course in the masters or during the practical periods.

The expert team suggests that in general developments in the field should be monitored to help in developing the content of the masters, but that especially the role of alumni as experts in evaluating suspects should be of concern.

The programme has a good website; it is clear, easy to use, and exemplifies programme aims and learning outcomes. These also closely fit the level of qualifications offered.

2. Curriculum design

The programme offers a number of compulsory courses and optional courses that in a very sensible way cover the whole fields of criminology, legal psychology, and forensic psychology. There are no separate law courses, but most of the law is taught in two courses: Problems of criminal justice (I and II). Also, students conduct part of their studies in the law faculty, working together with law students.

Going over the content of all courses, it is demonstrated that all relevant areas of the fields in the masters programme are covered. Since the masters programme covers so many fields, however, it is difficult to assess how in-depth the courses are.

In the masters programme 'meta' courses seem to be absent. There is no course in legal philosophy, and there is no course in the philosophy of science, or the like, the staff told the expert team

during the site visit. All the courses seem to be made to prepare the graduates as adequately as possible for working in the field, rather than preparing them for a career in doing research.

The expert team noted that the course on Modern Research Methods and Statistical Methods in Psychology is in part concerned with rather basic methodology and statistics. The expert team understood from the staff that this is done to bring bachelors students with too little background in this respect up to the same level as students who have had enough statistics in earlier courses. At a masters level, however, a more in depth course in methodology should be expected. Also, the course is more concerned with statistics than it is with methodology. The students thus have too little methodological training, while training in the philosophy of science is absent. This seems to be reflected in the theses, which are discussed below. The expert team recommends teaching less basic statistics at the masters level, and paying more attention to methodology and to the philosophy of science.

The strength of the curriculum is that it covers the whole field of legal psychology. A second strength is that the programme gives the students a strong theoretical background. As mentioned above, it is suggested that the curriculum will need to adapt in the coming years to developments in the field. That especially holds for the part of the field in which suspects are evaluated by psychologists to aid courts in taking decisions.

A weakness of the curriculum is that it discourages the mobility of students. For master students it is hardly possible to spend a semester abroad, with the possible exception of the practical period. The expert team believes that experience abroad would benefit the graduates in several ways. If this cannot be achieved within the masters programme, it may be possible within the bachelor programme.

The alumni of the programme impressed the expert team. It was good to see how supportive they are of the masters programme. At the same time, the present students, who appeared in great number at the meeting, seemed rather shy. That leads to a recommendation to enhance, during the masters, the communication skills of the students. That of course is not necessary just for meeting expert teams: it is necessary because the graduates from the masters typically work in surroundings where communication skills are imperative, for instance in working among inmates or with children and their divorcing parents.

It was suggested to the expert team by alumni and social partners that more attention in the programme should be paid to issues of threat assessment, victim psychology, and to more practice. The team considered that such changes would require a reduction of other parts of the programme and decided against a recommendation of this sort, though these are issues that the course team may wish to consider when developing the programme in the future.

3. Staff

The structure of the staff in terms of full professors, associate professors and lecturers (where the latter seem equivalent to assistant professors), seems quite adequate and conforms to international practice. The staff produces enough research and publications, although it seems sensible to aim more at publications in international journals. The division of individual expertise among the various fields seems quite appropriate for the programme in the sense that a broad array of expertises are connected to the programme and available to the students.

There are two aspects of the staffing of the masters programme that warrant attention. First, mobility: the majority of the staff spend their whole academic career or almost their whole academic career at Vilnius University. In general, it seems preferable to hire more people who come from other Lithuanian universities or from universities abroad. Given that all the staff have contracts

for five years that need to be renewed after advice from an attestation committee, one would expect a greater mobility, unless of course appointments are almost automatically renewed. The expert team would like to stress that mobility is not an asset in itself, but serves to enhance the general knowledge and experience available within the department. If not by refreshing the staff, mobility can be attained by having the staff have contact with their colleagues abroad. It seems that staff does not attend the most important conferences in the field on a regular, preferably annual, basis.

Thus, the internationalization of the staff, in terms of working and visiting abroad or having foreign colleagues to come over, should be enhanced.

The expert team learned that staff are accessible for the students, in terms of open to appointments and meetings and are supportive of the students, even after they have graduated. That is a particular strength of the staffing found by the expert team.

4. Facilities and learning resources

The university facilities seem adequate but not very luxurious in terms of available space. However, the building of the department is particular agreeable, as are the surroundings of the facilities. The faculty is a nice place to study. The facilities in terms of book, periodicals and databases are adequate.

In the masters programme the support from government agencies, from the military medical service to the VIP protection department, seems important, both for facilities and for providing practical training to students.

Within the faculty, there is a psychological laboratory that is primarily used by bachelor students. For the master students, the expert team would suggest having a room with a one-way screen and adequate recording facilities that can be used for a course in, for instance, training communication skills. A strength of the facilities is that the building of the faculty is particular agreeable. In terms of the library, laboratory facilities, and rooms for teaching and meeting, nothing really has changed since the previous evaluation. Students have reasonable access to books, journals and databases. A weakness is that laboratory facilities are there mostly for bachelor students. More assessment tests and hands-on use of them is necessary.

The set of psychological tests available at the programme seems not particularly aimed at testing in a forensic setting. Missing are, for instance, typical reoffending appraisal instruments, neuropsychological tests, and psychopathy checklists. It appeared that Lithuanian translations of many common assessment instruments do not exist. That is a handicap for training students but is not a thing that can easily be amended by the department. In our discussion with the alumni, however, it was a matter of concern that they had had insufficient training in assessment.

5. Study process and student assessment

Since only psychology bachelors are admitted, there are no entry problems. As a consequence, the masters is very psychological. Interdisciplinary fields often gain by admitting students from a variety of fields. The decision has been taken that the masters should essentially be a psychological masters and rightly so. In the programme there is ample space to work with other disciplines, especially with lawyers. That could be a good solution to the problem.

The students are routinely assessed with exams. It is not clear how many papers they write and that has not become clear during the site visit.

An important role in the masters is taken by the thesis. The theses that were consulted by the expert team (based primarily on looking at the summary, the reference list, and the tables showed that a few theses were well outside the field of forensic psychology. It is suggested that students should be required to write a thesis on a subject within rather than outside the field.

In the theses a wide variety of research methods were employed. On the one hand it demonstrates that students have been taught that there are many methodological possibilities. On the other hand, several theses employ correlation designs where a more experimental design should have been used. The theses showed that the form of the text, the references and especially the tables did not conform to what is internationally the norm. It is recommended to have the students use APA format for their papers and theses.

6. Programme management

The programme management seems adequate for the type and size of the masters programme. Given the small number of students who enrolled on the programme, it is not always clear why a structure – with separate courses, lectures, exams, and the like – was chosen that would equally be suited for a far larger number of students. With this number of students there would be benefit in a greater opportunity for direct interaction.

The recommendations regarding the programme management in 2011 were the following:

1. The title of the study programme could be changed to give more recognition to students and to better reflect the content of the study programme.
2. More responsibility should be given to the Department of General Psychology, especially in taking decisions about the programme aims and objectives, curriculum development and in deciding on the title of the study programme to ensure that it reflects the content of the programme.
3. A better balance between subjects in psychology and criminology is needed if the course retains its current title.
4. All course outlines need to be reviewed with regards to learning outcomes with a new template clearly describing aims, objectives and learning outcomes.
5. The list of elective courses should be reviewed to ensure they fulfil the programme aims, learning objectives and outcomes.
6. Review the admission requirements to ensure that equal rules are applied for incoming students. If examination is needed, it is advised to apply the entrance examination for all students who applied for the MA programme.
7. More recent literature should be recommended for students in order to assure up-to-date knowledge.

The present evaluation shows that all recommendations have been acted upon. As to recommendation 3 it should be said that criminology now forms a smaller part of the masters programme.

It is very positive to include a social partner in the Study Programme Committee, although his or her role is not very clear. There seems to be no role for the agencies that are cooperated with, although for a practice-oriented programme, such may be helpful especially since the social partners are all practice-oriented agencies.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In principle the masters programme is too diverse, but given the present situation in the field, there is good reason for that. It is recommended that developments in the field are monitored in the coming years to adapt the masters programme accordingly.
2. The department should make available to the programme the use of space with a one-way screen and adequate recording facilities to be used to enhance the communication skills of the students.
3. Inspection of the theses showed that more attention should be paid to the development of the methodological skills of the students, preferably with the development of skills in the philosophy of science and methodological design. It also showed that the presentation of the results could benefit from the introduction of the students to international standards for writing articles, as for instance the APA standards.
4. It is recommended that the mobility of both the staff and the students be enhanced as much as possible given the financial possibilities for doing so. It is suggested that students are encouraged to do their practical period abroad or to write their thesis at another foreign university. For the staff, mobility could be enhanced by having them go on sabbatical and/or attend international conferences abroad.
5. The discussion showed that there are good examples of development of the pedagogic skills of the staff. It is recommended to introduce these for a larger part of the staff, especially on the writing of programme learning outcomes, module (course) learning outcomes and constructive alignment, preferably in a learning-by-doing way, for instance in workshop formats.
6. Active learning by students should be encouraged. That can be done in many ways, but it was especially felt that hands-on experience in the use of assessment instruments was too sparse. Such training could be done either in a practice period, or during courses, or both. Additional possibilities are spending more time at relevant institutions, as for instance police stations and in court.
7. The expert team did not get a good picture of the student-staff-ratio. It is recommended that these kinds of number are realistically and consistently computed and used to divide work fairly among the staff.

IV. SUMMARY

As to the aims of the programme the diverse nature of what the students learn during the masters is identified as both a strength and a potential weakness of the programme. Future developments need to be monitored closely to keep the programme aligned with the field.

The strength of the curriculum is that it covers the whole field of legal psychology. A second strength is that the programme gives the student a strong theoretical background. A weakness of the curriculum is that it discourages the mobility of students. For master students it is hardly possible to spend a semester abroad, with the possible exception of the practical period. An additional weakness is that too little methodology and too little philosophy of science is brought to the students. Additionally the communication skills of the students should be enhanced and require additional material resources.

A strength of the staff is its compositions in terms of the numbers of various types of positions. As is their accessibility to students. A weakness is that the mobility of the staff is limited. It is limited both in terms of their past experience at other places than Vilnius and in terms of their attendance at international conferences abroad and contacts and collaboration with colleagues at foreign universities.

A strength of the facilities is that the building of the faculty is particularly agreeable. In terms of the library, laboratory facilities, and rooms for teaching and meeting, nothing really has changed since the previous evaluation. A weakness is that laboratory facilities are there mostly for bachelors students and that a facility with a one-way mirror and recording facilities is missing to teach students communication skills. More assessment tests and hands-on use of them is necessary.

A strength of the study process is that, although it is a psychological masters, particular attention is given to working together with people from other disciplines. The expert team found theses that were sometimes outside the scope of the field of legal psychology, almost always did not comply to international standards of presenting the text, tables, and references, and did not always use the right methodology for the research question.

The programme management involves both internal and external stakeholders and is appropriate to this programme.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Psychology of Law* (state code – 621S10002) at Vilnius university, is given a **positive** evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by fields of assessment.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	3
2.	Curriculum design	3
3.	Staff	3
4.	Material resources	3
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	3
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	3
	Total:	18

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

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

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

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

Grupės vadovas:
Team Leader:

Prof. dr. Stephen Edwards Newstead

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Doc. dr. Lena Adamson

Prof. dr. Peter Johannes van Koppen

Doc. dr. Junona Silvija Almonaitienė

Domas Bukauskas

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *TESĖS PSICHOLOGIJA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621S10002) 2014-05-22 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-251-1 IŠRAŠAS

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Vilniaus universiteto studijų programa *Psichologija* (valstybinis kodas – 621S10002) vertinama **teigiamai**.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	3
2.	Programos sandara	3
3.	Personalas	3
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	3
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	3
6.	Programos vadyba	3
	Iš viso:	18

* 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

Kalbant apie programos tikslus, įvairovė to, ką studentai mokosi šioje magistrantūros studijų programoje yra laikoma ir programos stipriąja puse, ir galima silpnąja puse. Būtina atidžiai sekti ateities pokyčius tam, kad pagal juos būtų galima pritaikyti programą.

Programos sandaros stipriosios pusės yra tos, kad ji apima visą teisės psichologijos kryptį. Antroji stipriybė yra ta, kad programa suteikia studentams tvirtą teorinį pagrindą. Programos silpnoji pusė yra ta, kad neskatinamas studentų judumas. Magistrantūros studentams nelabai įmanoma praleisti vieną semestrą užsienyje, nebent išskyrus praktikai skirtą laikotarpį. Dar viena silpnoji pusė – studentai nepakankamai gauna metodikos ir mokslo filosofijos žinių. Be to, reikėtų stiprinti studentų komunikacinius gebėjimus ir skirti tam daugiau materialiuųjų išteklių.

Dėstytojų stiprioji pusė yra jų sudėtis, turint omenyje daugybę įvairių pareigybių, taip pat ir jų prieinamumas studentams; silpnoji pusė – nedidelis dėstytojų judumas, turint omeny jų ankstesnę praktiką ne Vilniuje ir lankymąsi užsienyje vykstančiose tarptautinėse konferencijose ir ryšius bei bendradarbiavimą su užsienio universitetų studentais.

Su materialiaisiais ištekliais susijusi stiprioji pusė yra ypač jaukus pastatas, kuriame įsikūręs fakultetas. Biblioteka, laboratorijos įranga ir mokymui bei posėdžiams skirtos patalpos nuo paskutiniojo vertinimo grupės vizito nepasikeitė. Trūkumas tas, kad laboratorijų įranga daugiau tinka bakalauro studijoms, nėra patalpos, kurios vienoje sienoje būtų įrengtas vienpusio matymo stik-

las, taip pat būtų įrašymo priemonių, reikalingų ugdyti studentų komunikacinius gebėjimus. Turėtų būti atliekama daugiau įvertinimo testų ir mokoma praktiškai juos atlikti.

Studijų proceso stiprioji pusė yra ta, kad, nors ši programa yra psichologijos magistrantūros programa, ypač daug dėmesio skiriama bendram darbui su kitus dalykus studijuojančiais studentais. Vertinimo grupė pastebėjo, kad kai kurie baigiamieji darbai nebuvo iš teisės psichologijos srities, beveik visi neatitiko tarptautinių reikalavimų dėl teksto, lentelių ir nuorodų pateikimo, ne visada taikyta tinkama mokslinių tyrimų metodika.

Programos vadybos procese dalyvauja vidaus ir išorės socialiniai dalininkai, vadyba atitinka šios rūšies programoms taikomus reikalavimus.

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Iš esmės *Teisės psichologijos* magistrantūros programa apima daug įvairių dalykų, bet, atsižvelgiant į dabartinę šios srities padėtį, tam yra pagrindo. Rekomenduojama ateinančiais metais stebėti pokyčius šioje srityje ir atlikti atitinkamus šios magistrantūros programos pakeitimus.
2. Katedra turi pasirūpinti, kad šios programos studentams būtų prieinama patalpa, kurios vienoje sienoje įrengtas vienpusio matymo stiklas, taip pat būtų atitinkamų įrašymo priemonių, skirtų studentų komunikaciniams gebėjimams ugdyti.
3. Tikrinant baigiamuosius darbus paaiškėjo, kad daugiau dėmesio reikėtų skirti studentų metodologiniams gebėjimams lavinti, pageidautina kartu ugdyti mokslo filosofijos ir metodologijos pasirinkimo gebėjimus. Dar paaiškėjo, kad rezultatai būtų pateikiami geriau, jei studentai būtų supažindinti su tarptautiniais straipsnių rašymo reikalavimais, pavyzdžiui, APA standartais.
4. Rekomenduojama, kad, atsižvelgiant į finansines galimybes, būtų kuo labiau skatinamas dėstytojų ir studentų judumas. Patariama raginti studentus atlikti praktiką užsienyje arba rašyti baigiamuosius darbus užsienio universitetuose. Dėstytojų judumą būtų galima didinti suteikiant jiems mokslines atostogas ir (arba) skatinant vykti į konferencijas užsienyje.
5. Iš pokalbių paaiškėjo, kad yra gerų dėstytojų pedagoginių gebėjimų tobulinimo pavyzdžių. Rekomenduojama, kad šiuos įgūdžius tobulintų daugiau dėstytojų, ypač formuluodami numatomus programos studijų rezultatus, modulių (dalykų) studijų rezultatus ir mokytūsi konstruktyvaus išdėstymo, pageidautina, praktiniu būdu, pavyzdžiui, seminaruose.
6. Reikėtų skatinti aktyvius studentų mokymosi metodus. Tai galima padaryti įvairiais būdais, bet ypač buvo jaučiama, kad praktinė naudojimosi vertinimo instrumentais patirtis yra nedidelė. To mokyti būtų galima praktikos laikotarpiu arba studijuojant kursą, arba abiem atvejais. Dar viena galimybė – daugiau laiko praleisti atitinkamose institucijose, pavyzdžiui, policijos nuovadose ar teismuose.

7. Vertinimo grupė tiksliai nesužinojo, koks yra dėstytojų ir studentų santykis. Rekomenduojama nuolat įtraukti šiuos skaičius į kompiuterį ir jais remiantis sąžiningai skirstyti darbą dėstytojams.

<...>

Paslaugos teikėjas patvirtina, jog yra susipažinęs su Lietuvos Respublikos baudžiamojo kodekso¹ 235 straipsnio, numatančio atsakomybę už melagingą ar žinomai neteisingai atliktą vertimą, reikalavimais.

¹ Žin., 2002, Nr.37-1341.