STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO**

**STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS *ANDRAGOGIKA***

***(valstybinis kodas – 612X30001)***

**VERTINIMO IŠVADOS**

––––––––––––––––––––––––––––––

**EVALUATION REPORT**

**OF *ANDRAGOGY* (*state code – 612X30001*)**

**STUDY PROGRAMME**

at *KLAIPĖDA UNIVERSITY*

1. **Prof. dr. Jesus Maria Angélica Fernandes Sousa (team leader)**, *academic.*
2. **Prof. dr. Sven Erik Hansen**, *academic.*
3. **Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi**, *academic.*
4. **Mrs. Romualda Juozaitienė**, *social partner's representative.*
5. **Mr. Gytis Valatka**, *students' representative*.

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2014

**DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ**

| | |
|---|---|
| Studijų programos pavadinimas | *Andragogika* |
| Valstybinis kodas | 612X30001 |
| Studijų sritis | Socialiniai mokslai |
| Studijų kryptis | Andragogika |
| Studijų programos rūšis | Universitetinės studijos |
| Studijų pakopa | Pirmoji |
| Studijų forma (trukmė metais) | Ištęstinės (5 metai) |
| Studijų programos apimtis kreditais | 240 |
| Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija | Andragogikos bakalauras, andragogo profesinė kvalifikacija |
| Studijų programos įregistravimo data | 2014-03-01, No. 4-135 |

―――――――――――――――――――――――――――――

**INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME**

| | |
|---|---|
| Title of the study programme | *Andragogy* |
| State code | 612X30001 |
| Study area | Social sciences |
| Study field | Andragogy |
| Type of the study programme | University studies |
| Study cycle | First |
| Study mode (length in years) | Part-time (5 years) |
| Volume of the study programme in credits | 240 |
| Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded | Bachelor of Andragogy, professional qualification of Andragogue |
| Date of registration of the study programme | No.4-135,01-03-2004 |

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

# CONTENTS

# I. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Background of the evaluation process

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

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

The evaluation process consists of the main following stages: *1) self-evaluation and self-evaluation report (further – SER)  prepared by the HEI; 2) visit of the review panel to the HEI; 3) preparing  the evaluation report by the review panel and its publication; 4) follow-up activities.*

On the basis of external evaluation report of the study programme SKVC makes a decision to accredit study programme either for 6 or for 3 years. If the evaluation of the programme is negative the 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 only as "satisfactory" (2 points).

The programme **is not accredited** if at least one of the 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 SER and annexes, the following additional documents provided by HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit:

| No. | Name of the document |
|-----|----------------------|
| 1.  | Updated CVs of teachers (Natalija Fečenkova, Regina Kontautienė, Audronė Liniauskaitė, Dalia Marija Staučienė, Aldona Žakaitienė, Povilas Žakaitis, Julius Žukas). |

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

This report evaluates the undergraduate programme of *Andragogy* established and delivered at the Department of Andragogy of the Institute of Continuous Studies, in Klaipeda University (ICS KU), since 2004. The Department of Andragogy was founded in 2002, aiming at linking research to practical activities (such as teaching) related to adult education on the basis of lifelong learning.

The graduates are awarded a Bachelor's Degree of Andragogy and a professional qualification of Andragogue, both required to provide professional services of adult education.

The programme was registered on 1st March 2004 and the previous external assessment was carried out in 2008, fully accrediting it for 6 years.

The programme's self-evaluation schedule and the preparation of the SER began in May 2013, following the establishment of a self-evaluation group, comprising eight members. This group is headed by Prof. Dr. Birutė Jatkauskienė, Head of the Department of Andragogy, and includes a social partner and a student.

The writing activities closed with a presentation of the drafted SER at a meeting of the Department in October 2013 and the approval of the final SER by the Council of the ICS KU in November 2013.

## 1.4.     The Review Panel

The review panel was completed according *Description of Experts' Recruitment*, approved by order No. 11/11/2011of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the panel on *30th October, 2014.*

---

1. **Prof. dr. Jesus Maria Angélica Fernandes Sousa (team leader)**, *Professor of Education at University of Madeira, Portugal.*

2. **Prof. dr. Sven Erik Hansen**, *Professor of Education, at Åbo Akademi University, Finland.*

3. **Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi**, *Professor of Andragogy at Tallinn University, External examiner of the Quality Assessment Council of Estonian Higher Education Quality Agency (EKKA), Estonia.*

4. **Mrs. Romualda Juozaitienė**, *Consultant of Adult Education and Self –esteem Development, Lithuania.*

5. **Mr. Gytis Valatka**, *Phd student of Vilnius University (Sociology), Lithuania.*

---

## II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

### 2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme aim is short and clear:

> *to ensure basic andragogical education in compliance with the EU standards which would enable one to continue in the 2nd cycle studies or to seek an andragogue's career in different adult education institutions and other organizations where andragogue's competences can be applied* (SER, p. 3).

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

The general aims are well developed and transferred into an exhaustive set of intended learning outcomes which are articulated with the four blocks mentioned in the *Descriptor of the First Cycle Study Outcomes*, approved by the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania: *Knowledge and its application* (A); *Research abilities* (B); *Special abilities* (C); *Social abilities* (D); and *Personal abilities* (E).

One by one the outcomes express relevant ambitions, showing the self-assessment group is aware of the responsibility of the role of the andragogue they are training.
An appreciation goes to the following examples of excerpts expressing personal abilities which, according to the panel's view, express fundamental life skills important to be emphasized in a higher education programme within the field of andragogy:

> *E2 To think critically and creatively, to reflect on one's own experience, and, on that basis, to accept responsibility for the improvement of professional and learning activity.*
> *E3 The ability of innovativeness, the ability of tolerance to adult learner's attitudes, values, views, beliefs, etc.* (SER, p. 4).

It evidences the consistency with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered. But all together, the learning outcomes appear as over detailed and unclear. One can ask whether this amount of outcomes on the whole can be reached and whether anybody is able to handle them in practice.
The programme aims and intended learning outcomes are publicly accessible in the AIKOS system, in the University website and in advertising booklets.

They are also grounded on particular strategic education documents, at international, national and institutional levels (SER, p. 5).

They are also grounded on the EU definition of andragogue, according to the document *Terminology of European Education and Training Policy: a selection of 100 key terms*, 2008:

> *it is an individual that performs one or several functions of adult education (of a theoretical or practical character) in an institution of adult education or outside it, e.g. in the job. Two categories of andragogues are identified:* **andragogues–professionals** *who have special education and work in institutions providing adult education services;* **andragogues-practitioners***, i.e. professionals of individual fields who become andragogues due to the possessed specific competences and who perform andragogue functions in their own organizations (e.g., peer training, adaptation of new employers, tutoring. apprenticeship, etc.) or outside it (e.g., trainings in other institution or organization)* (SER, p. 5).

One notices the study programme is aware of the identity of this professional (an identity under development), also based upon studies carried out in Lithuania and abroad, mentioned in the SER (page 6), supporting the idea of multifunctionality and heterogeneity of andragogue's activity. In fact, in Lithuania, like in other countries, andragogue's professional activity is not fully legally regulated (it is not included in the register of occupations), making them working on the principle of an in-construction professionalization, on the basis of the *Descriptor of Andragogue's Professional Activity*. So the prospective andragogues are trained, according to the presently identified, characterised, and existing fields of professional activity.

The monitoring is performed by the LSŠA (Lithuanian Association of Adult Education) and LUTSIA (Association of Institutions of Continuing Studies of Lithuanian Universities). And this is to be praised, due to the work of systematization of numerous andragogues activities existing under the names of other posts:

> *of lecturer, counsellor, education consultant, specialist of education methods, training specialist, advisor, mentor of practice or apprenticeship, manager of trainings, etc. After the*

*completion of the undergraduate studies of Andragogy, graduates can apply for the above named posts in formal and non-formal adult education institutions, business organizations that implement staff training, career designing, aprenticeships, practices, projects of competence assessment and recognition, consulting organizations, recreation, leisure, and sport clubs and centres, religious comunities, trade unions, the armed forces, prisons, etc., where adult education is implemented and an andragogical approach to learning is applied, or they can continue in the second cycle (Master's) studies* (SER, p. 6).

The panel, however, wants to stress the need for further efforts to make a clear conceptual distinction between this BA programme and the MA programme. As the learning outcomes are written they overlap each other in a way that makes the relationship diffuse.

The study programme presents itself as unique, saying that it does not duplicate any programme in the same field. KU is the only one University in Lithuania suggesting Andragogy studies in Lithuania.

The demand for specialists in this area is well founded, making use of EU recommendations on the development of HE, under the philosophy of lifelong learning; of an analysis of the context of social and economic environment insisting on the shortage of professional andragoques; mentioning strategic directions of national development appealing to the „*creation and development of a competitive, dynamic, knowledge-based, sustainable, and resourceful economy*"; and presenting an analysis of the labour market made in Lithuania in the period 2006-2010, proving the growth of the adult education sector and consequent greater demand of qualified andragogues. This was proved by graduates and social partners of the University.

In short, the panel consider the programme aims and learning outcomes are generally well defined, clear and publicly accessible, based on academic and professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market and consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered; However it would be of benefit for the quality of the programme and for carrying it out in practice to crystallize and simplify the description of learning outcomes and to clarify the conceptual relationship to the Master-programme of Andragogy. The name of the study programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other.


## *2.2. Curriculum design*

The curriculum design meets legal requirements according to the regulations being taken into account. The number of credits corresponds to the duration of a first cycle degree study programme, with 240 ECTS both for full-time and part-time formats. For the part-time programme under analysis, 10 semesters are organised, having each one from 18 to 26 ECTS, instead of 30.

There is some logical sequence of subjects. However, the flotation in the number of subjects per semester (6 subjects in semesters 1, 2 and 3; 5 subjects in semesters 4, 5 and 6; then 3 subjects in semester 7; 4 subjects in semester 8; 5 subjects in semester 9; and finally 2 subjects in the last semester) may cause different levels of efforts from the students, related to the number of assessments. It is understandable that the semesters with Practice 1 and Practice 2 may have fewer subjects, the same way as the last one, dedicated to the Final Thesis. But the previous ones could be more evenly harmonised in terms of number of subjects and ECTS.

Study field subjects are given 165 credits, general university subjects have 25 credits, and the remaining 50 credits are dedicated to free-choice electives.

For general university subjects, students have Foreign Language (they may have English, Russian, German or French), Professional Speech and Expression, Philosophy, and they can choose two electives in the fields of the humanities, biomedical, physical, or technological sciences. However students are not using sources (books, articles, etc.) in Foreign Languages and very few students are going for studies abroad.

Study field subjects intend to provide students with theoretical and practical fundamentals for professional training. The logic of starting from more general to more specific courses seems adequate (starting from Introducing subjects, such as *Intro to Andragogy* or *Intro to Psychology*). 14 subjects are available for virtual learning environment. Electives of the study field are chosen from a list of 18 subjects. Professional practice is implemented in Practice I and Practice II, each one with 12 ECTS, and other subjects as well, such as *Andragogy Technologies and Practicum, Tutorship and Practicum,* etc.

The ambition behind the stating of the learning outcomes is appreciable and reflects the staff's effort to live up to the new design of changing emphasis on students' achievements. One by one the outcomes express relevant expected outcomes but together they appear to be too many and difficult to handle in practice. The evaluation panel notes that the approach of learning outcomes is relatively newly introduced and suggests that the approach in the next revision should be simplified and made more transparent.

It would be preferable that Table 5 about *The structure of the study programme of Andragogy by the number of hours allotted to different methods*, on page 15-16, reflected the students' workload distribution among 10 semesters instead of 8 semesters, because we are dealing with the part-time studies.

The proportion of contact versus independent hours of work seems to be adequate for this level of university studies according to the Bologna philosophy, which focuses on learning and the learners' work, rather than on teaching and teacher's work. But the ratio of theory and practice classes for practical courses, such as "Didactic of Andragogy" (30/15), "IT application to Adult Education" (22/23), "Andragogy Technologies and Practicum" (80/70), "Project Management" (30/15), "Tutorship and Practicum" (35/25) seems to be questionable. Why so little practice for these courses?

It seems that practical aspect of the study programme starts quite late (in the 5th semester). Why not re-considering starting it earlier (for example in the 3rd semester)? "Project Management" course seems to be too lately introduced (just in the 9th semester). Starting earlier (for example in the 2nd semester) it could serve as a learning project method in many of the courses of the programme.

Lifelong learning policy is introduced in the teaching process basically (learning for learning is followed). According to students and graduates' reflections, andragogical teaching/learning methods are used during courses' delivering. But the panel considers latest achievements and tendencies in Andragogy should be reflected in the content of the programme in a broader scope. More recent and foreign authors and references could be included in the programmes in order to attain the learning outcomes. Unfortunately there are some subjects with no literature available in the library. Some course descriptions are already placed in the virtual learning space.

Students as well as graduates underlined the variety of teaching activities they have met and the possibilities of communicating and expressing their thoughts, ideas and suggestions for the teachers.

The procedure of writing, defending and assessing the Final Thesis is regulated by the *Descriptor of General Requirements for KU Student Independent Papers and Art Works* approved by Klaipėda University Senate. Topics and problems for Final Thesis are chosen by the needs and wishes of students (together with teachers' advices). Both the students and the graduates confirmed that the process of writing thesis has been and is well organized in terms of related methodological courses, supervision, and other forms of support.

In short, the panel consider that the curriculum design meets legal requirements, but the study subjects could be more evenly spread, and with more foreign literature; the content of the subjects, in general, is consistent with the type and level of the studies, their methods are appropriate and diversified, and the scope of the programme is sufficient to ensure the intended learning outcomes; The content of the programme reflects reasonably current achievements in this scientific area, mainly in Lithuania.

## 2.3. Teaching staff

19 teachers (6 from the Department of Andragogy), and others from 8 KU Departments (Psychology, Management, Law, Social Pedagogy, Foreign Languages, etc.) constitute the academic staff of this study programme. It includes 5 professors, 9 associate professors, 2 lecturers with PhD, and 2 lecturers and 1 assistant, who are doctoral students.

The description of staff participation in research, projects, and scientific activity directly related to the evaluated study programme was carefully written, separating the analysis of their work in research, in projects, in other activities and in the organization of scientific events. The ICS KU research programme *AMVIGA*: *Andragogy in the Lifelong Learning Context: Social-Educational-Managerial Aspects of Adult Education* has the participation of the whole staff, and the head of the research programme is the Head of the Department of Andragogy and the head of the self-evaluation group, which gives a greater cohesion to the programme under analysis.

The major part of research publications of the staff of the Department of Andragogy have been selected for the international research database *Lituanistika* (http://www.minfolit.lt). Since 2011, the Department of Andragogy has been publishing a research journal *Andragogy* (twice a year), and since 2011, it has been indexed by the *IndexCopernicus* database. Presently, 4 journals of *Andragogy* have been published.

The academic staff takes part in numerous national and international projects related to the aims of this study programme. Special attention was given to a project devoted to the development of common professional standards of 6 countries, and the project for updating the Undergraduate and Graduate Studies of Andragogy at Klaipeda University (2011–2013), mentioned on page 18. The academic staff are also members of the Lithuanian Association for Adult Education (LSŠA), and of the Association of Institutes of Continuing Studies of Lithuanian Universities (LUTSIA) and of international organizations. The establishment of the Third Age University in ICS KU fosters the development of the idea of andragogy as a professional activity and a science among the general public by gathering professionals, students, researchers, and community representatives. They actively participated in the organization of national and international conferences.

The professional development of the staff seems good in general, but international dimensions should to a higher extent be included. More lecturers-practitioners, guest teachers from other Lithuanian Universities and also from foreign countries should be invited. By the suggestions of students, young teachers, assistants could be involved into the teaching process. The staff's professional development seems, according to the discussions, to mainly rely on teachers' own initiatives. Various examples of plans or of measures being taken were mentioned but heavy teaching work load and various other factors, like financial constraints, restrict teachers' possibilities to utilize potential options. As a contrast to the problems of getting a systematized planned support for professional development, the panel encountered a committed and intensively working staff, highly appreciated by students, graduates and social partners. Taking into account that the teachers' turnover seems to secure stability, the staff, as the most important institutional resource, deserves firm support for further professional development. One concrete measure is to reduce the teaching obligations and to provide the staff real possibilities to do research.

Despite existing international contacts, research published in peer reviewed journals in other languages, for instance English, is still limited. In order to act as a fully recognized university within the research community research published internationally needs to be essentially expanded.

The standard ratio of teachers and students of Andragogy is 1:9 (year 1, 1:14, year 2, 1:11, year 3, 1:12, year 4, 1:10, year 5, 1:18). On the one hand, as the SER says on page 19, „*the ratio of the teachers and students of the study programme of Andragogy enables the staff to give quality lectures and classes, to supervise practices, to advise course papers and Bachelor's final theses, and to achieve the intended learning outcomes*".

The SER says that the staff selection observes the *Descriptor of the Procedures of Attestation and Competition for Tenure of KU Academic Staff, Heads of Departments, and Deans of Faculties* and *the Descriptor of General Requirements for Degree-Awarding First Cycle and Integrated Study Programmes,* of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania. Teachers are employed by the procedure of public competition for the period of five or one year(s) by the Rector's Order. The compliance of the applicants with the minimum qualifying requirements for academic and/or research activity is judged by Attestation Committees approved by the KU Senate.

Every 5 years, KU academic staff may be exempted from academic work for no longer than one year for conducting research or for research or professional development. In practice this possibility seems not to be realised as intended, due to financial and practical constraints.

The turnover of staff took place in the context of internal academic positions. All the staff of the undergraduate study programme of Andragogy who fulfilled higher qualification requirements changed their academic status: assistants were promoted to lecturers, lecturers to asssociate professors, and associate professors to professors. As the SER says, on page 19 (para. 33), „*the growth of the research potential reinforced the professionalism of the academic staff of the Department of Andragogy*".

In short, the panel consider that the study programme is provided by staff with an appropriate profile in compliance with the legal requirements, in general, that the number and the qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes, that the teaching staff turnover is acceptable, that the institution should create appropriate conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff. At the department level there is a good

understanding of the collaborative teaching practice. But the teaching staff should get possibilities to be engaged in research and to increase international publishing in peer review journals.

### *2.4. Facilities and learning resources*

The panel was offered possibilities to scrutinize the facilities and learning resources and made the following observations:

Classrooms are adequate both in their size and quality, and meet the requirements of hygiene and work security with modern audio and video equipment. They have wireless internet, data-show projectors, TV and interactive SMART boards. The available multimedia and computer equipment corresponds to the needs of the programme, including needs for extensive teleconferencing and interactive web-based distance learning activities. Classrooms are adapted to the needs of handicapped students.

All lectures take place in the building of the ICS, but students may use premises in other divisions of the university, such as the conference hall and two big classrooms with 250 seats each and others which can be used for lectures, scientific conferences, defences of final theses, etc. The institute has rooms to accommodate visiting professors, which is quite positive.

Library has good possibilities for accessing different data bases.The ICS KU is mainly provided with methodological resources and practical texts books. There are a small number of contemporary books from the fields of Andragogy and Adult Education. 51 databases are subscribed by the university with free access for teachers and students. The Methodological lab regularly receives the latest research periodicals (*Andragogika, Tiltai*, *Pedagogika, ATEE* Spring *University,* etc.).

Library cooperates with the libraries of other universities to ensure access to necessary study material available there. But the panel suggests more foreign language literature representing the latest concepts in the field of andragogy.

The services provided are computerized and students have possibilities to order and to use databases from their lap tops. Students confirmed the panel's view and pointed out the good service they receive from a service oriented library staff.

Agreements were signed with institutions for practices, such as St. Ignatius Loyola College, the Klaipeda City Municipality, the Municipal Library of Palanga City, the Palanga City Municipality, the Public Library of Šilalė City, etc. Students have the opportunity to give lectures to the Third Age University attenders.

In short, the panel consider that the premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality, that the teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are adequate both in size and quality, and that the teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible, but contemporary books, monographs from the field of adult education, lifelong learning and andragogy are limited in library. The panel encourages the management body to take measures in order to further improve the learning resources, particularly the library, to reach an international standard related to the field.

## 2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

Students' admission is carried out in accordance with the *General Rules of the Lithuanian Association of Higher Schools for Joint Admission* (LAMA BPO) and the admission rules approved by the KU Senate. It includes two stages: the general admission and the additional admission. Secondary education is necessary for a student to be admitted.

State-financed studies in a 1$^{st}$ cycle study programme can be claimed by individuals whose grades are not lower than the minimal grades established by the Minister of Education and Science. The SER says on page 23 (para. 44), that „*the 1$^{st}$ cycle study programme of Andragogy shall admit the applicants whose competition score is no lower than 6 points.*"

Students are encouraged to participate in research activities and to present papers in conferences and student forums, which usually take place in Klaipėda region, this way practising their research skills. The panel was told that these kinds of joint research and conference presentations have taken place but so far they seem to be very rare.

The panel appreciated that the assessment of motivation is compulsory. The reasons of dropping out are clearly explained in Table 9, about *The number of the admitted students and those who successfully graduated,* on page 24, demonstrating an adequate monitoring of the whole process. A careful analysis was also made about higher achievements in the senior years of studies.

Described in detail, by the SER, there are various forms of students' support organized in 3 types: a*cademic support, financial support* and *psychological support*. Information about the study programme is available in the website and the Department organises meetings on relevant issues of their interest. Each group has an academic curator and the teachers receive students for consultancy.

Related to the student achievement assessment (para. 49), the *KU Study Regulations* contains the essential guidelines of the assessment of student knowledge and abilities. Each course ends in an exam or a graded credit test. The study outcomes are assessed according to the principles of *justifiability, reliability, transparence, usefulness* and *objectivity*. Students are introduced to the form of the exam, its content, duration, and the assessment criteria. Literature necessary for students' preparation are also indicated as well as the content of the independent work assignments and their assessment criteria. The description of the syllabus of the course handed out during the first lecture includes the type of independent work assignments, the deadlines of their completion, and their impact on the final grade. So students are well informed about the process of assessment. Their knowledge is assessed on a ten point criteria-based scale and a cumulative assessment system. It is reasonable that the exam counts no less than 50% for the final grade. And it is good that the forms of assessment do not restrict themselves to written tests or exams but also includes projects, case studies, etc.

The panel had meetings with students and graduates. Their motivation and enthusiasm was self-evident and clearly expressed. They commented on the very good relations they have with the teaching staff. The students as well as the graduates underlined the variety of teaching activities they have met and the possibilities of communicating and expressing their thoughts, ideas and suggestions to the teachers.

The panel was also informed by the students that they are aware about the process and forms of assessment.

The ratio of the time allotted for lectures, classes, and independent work seems to be adequate: in each subject of the study programme, no less than 50% of the time is allotted for independent work (individually or in group).

Despite satisfying formal prerequisite very few students take the opportunity to go abroad. Reasons are related to work and family situation but the administration is encouraged to take the issue of students' low participation in exchange programmes into a consideration.

The SER says that during the assessed period (2009-2013), 156 students from the part time programme of Andragogy graduated. Most of them (70%) work in the fields of activity related to the andragogue's activities. 15% study in the graduate programe of Andragogy, 7% are on a maternal leave, and 8% went abroad (and worked abroad during their studies). No graduates have been registered in the Job Centre. Graduates mentioned that they are satisfied with the education and knowledge acquired in the University and it is helpful for their career development.

Measures are taken against students' academic misconduct but it would be motivated to stress this issue for instance by arranging an obligatory detecting system of plagiarism for all work and to have the students to sign agreements when starting their studies.

In summary, the panel consider that the admission requirements are well founded and explained, that students are encouraged to participate in research and applied research activities, that students are reluctant to use the opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes, due to their work and their family responsibilities, that the higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support, and that the assessment system of students' performance is clear, adequate and publicly available.

### 2.6. Programme management

Since 2012, KU has been implementing a project for *The Development and Implementation of the Quality Management System at Klaipeda University* the aim of which is to have the internal quality assurance at KU. Responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the programme are clear (SER, pp. 28-32) and are assured by the following levels of quality assurance:

*The level of the University:* The Senate and the Rector's Office (Vice-Rector of Science and Studies, the Department of Studies). KU study quality assurance is guaranteed by the Study Quality Committee constituted by the Rector's Order which includes 12 members from all the Faculties and responsible administrative staff. The Study Quality Committee belongs to the KU Department of Studies. It is assisted by the Academic Committee of the KU Senate.

*The level of the Institute of Continuous Studies:* the Council of the ICS KU, the Director's Office (which also includes the Head of the Andragogy Department), the Director, and the Deputy Director of Studies.

*The level of the Department:* The Department of Andragogy and its Head are directly responsible for the content of the study programme of Andragogy and its implementation.

For the management of the main processes, the responsibility is distributed between the KU Senate, the Council of the ICS KU, and the Dean's Office.

The management of the study programme of Andragogy and study quality assurance is regulated by documents mentioned in the SER (page 28, para. 60).

Data for the analysis of the study programme are formally and informally collected in the meetings and through the survey questionnaires to be used as feedback for the improvement of the programme management. The meetings of the Department take place approximately twice a month.

The SER says in paragraph 65, that the „*quality of the courses is systematically analysed; the courses are accredited for the period of three years*.“ And that „*In the spring semester of 2009, internal auditing of the KU Rector's Office took place in the Department of Andragogy*.“

Social partners systematically participate in the assessment and improvement of the quality of the programme.

The panel conducted a session with social partners and was impressed by the strong support the programme gets from different stakeholders. Social partners gave numerous examples of how appreciated the BA graduated from the programme are within different fields of the labour market. They are becoming more and more recognized and examples illustrated an expanding need of andragogues. Representatives from different organisations described their possibilities to influence the programme, namely as mentors for the students' practice. They also mentioned the need for the development of andragogical competences of practitioners provided by the Department staff.

There is a strong cooperation with employers and professional associations which is partially attested by the participation of the Director of King Mindaugas Vocational Training Centre in the self-evaluation group. Social partners participate in student practice assessment, acting as mentors, advisors and disseminators of the best practices. The SER says they are invited to the conferences organised by the Department and the staff of the Department of Andragogy give seminars and lectures in different institutions.

In accordance with the procedure of the teaching quality assessment, standardised assessment is carried out at the end of each semester: an anonymous student survey is conducted by means of questionnaires.

For the improvement of the quality of studies, students themselves can initiate surveys on the quality of staff performance, to inform the Head of the Department about the study organization and assessment, and to elect their representatives to the Council of the ICS KU. Students keep in touch with their academic curator, exchange information, and solve organizational problems. Student representatives participate in the meetings of the Director's Office of the ICS KU and its Council and in the self-assessment groups, as it is the case of a 2nd year student for the preaparation of the SER.

Students' feedback is crucial and the panel could note that students and graduates emphasized their good possibilities to express their opinions about the programme and about arrangement related to the conduction. Students also gave examples of participation in various kinds of feedback activities and of self-assessment groups and the panel considers their conceptions of being involved is indicative of the openness and inclusion of students' views. In all students, graduates and social partners assured that they are taken into consideration to improve the study programme.

The panel were pleased to see that a special attention was given to the previous external assessment responding to each one of the recommendations made at that time.

In short, the panel considers that the responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are well allocated, that information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed, that outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used in general for the improvement of the programme, that evaluation and improvement processes involve stakeholders and that the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient. But the faculty should pay more attention into a wider international orientation and cooperation, for instance in establishing networks, inviting guest lecturers and researchers and for participating in application for funding from international sources.

## III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1.
To define the learning outcomes in articulation with the programme aims, in a more realistic way;

2.
To improve the factual possibilities for the teaching staff to get engaged in a systematized plan for professional development, establishing a sound balance between teaching and higher level research activities;

3.
To create appropriate conditions for the teaching staff to live up to a university's responsibility to actively participate in the international research community, participating in staff mobility, with long term research periods abroad;

4.
To increase the publications of research results in peer reviewed international journals;

5.
To more systematically inform and encourage students to participate in exchange programmes and international research networks;

6.
To invite young research active scholars/teachers from other Lithuanian institutes and abroad for a longer period;

7.
To increase the availability of relevant up-to-date and contemporary literature and text books in the field of adult education and andragogy;

8.
To benchmark the study programme against other similar programmes in European Universities;

9.
To pay more attention into a wider international orientation and cooperation in the field of andragogy and adult education.

# IV. EXAMPLES OF EXCELLENCE *

*There is no examples of excellence.*

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

# V. SUMMARY

Main positive and negative quality aspects of each programme evaluation area.

## 2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

| | |
|---|---|
| Clear programme aim | Exhaustive set of learning outcomes |
| Ambitious learning outcomes | Over detailed and therefore unclear outcomes |
| Consistent with the type and level of qualifications offered | Need for a conceptual distinction between BA and MA programmes |
| Grounded on strategic education documents at international, national and institutional levels | |
| Strong identity (even if under development) of an andragogue | |
| Response to the needs of the region | |

## 2.2. Curriculum design

| | |
|---|---|
| Offer of 4 Foreign Languages | Uneven number of subjects per semester |
| Understandable logic in the curriculum design | Difficult in practice to handle with too many expected outcomes |
| Improved care with professional practice | Late initiation into practice |
| Adequate proportion of contact versus independent hours of work | Lack of more recent and foreign authors and references |
| Lifelong learning approach visible in the teaching/learning methodologies | |
| Virtual learning space | |

## 2.3. Teaching staff

| | |
|---|---|
| Staff participation in the research programme AMVIGA | Lack of a high standard international dimension in publications and research |
| Publications in the research database Lituanistika | Lack of long leaves abroad for research |
| Research journal Andragogyka | |
| Development of common professional standards within 6 countries | |
| Establishment of a Third Age University | |
| Members of associations of Adult Education and Continuing Studies | |
| Committed, enthusiastic and intensively working staff | |

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

## 2.4. Facilities and learning resources

| | |
|---|---|
| Adequate classrooms in size and quality, recently refurbished | Lack of more foreign language literature to reach an international standard in the field of andragogy |
| Institution and classrooms adapted to the needs of handicapped students | Lack of contemporary literature in the field of adult education |
| Wireless internet, data show projectors, interactive SMART boards, etc. | |
| Rooms for visiting professors | |
| Home access to library network and different data bases | |
| Service oriented library staff | |
| Agreements signed with institutions for practices | |

## 2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

| | |
|---|---|
| Admission according to legal determinations | Few students abroad in Erasmus programmes |
| Compulsory assessment of motivation | No foreign students |
| Students encouraged to participate in research activities | Study process not working the same way in all courses (not all courses share the same philosophy and openness characteristic of the Department of Andragogy) |
| Various forms of students support | |
| Clear information about the process of assessment | |
| Other forms of assessment beyond written tests and exams | |
| Open and good relationships with staff | |
| Most graduate students working in the field | |
| No graduates registered in the Job Centre | |

## 2.6. Programme management

| | |
|---|---|
| Different levels of responsibility for decisions clearly stated | Lack of benchmarking with other international similar programmes |
| Data formally and informally collected for the quality assurance | Lack of wider international orientation (networks, guest lecturers, funding for research from international sources) |
| Inclusion of social partners for the improvement of the programme | Lack of encouragement for teachers to take active research leaves after 5 years of teaching |
| Strong cooperation with employers and professional associations | |
| Students' voices heard | |
| Attention given to previous external evaluation | |

To summarize even more, we can detach two greatest strengths of this study programme, from a systemic point of view:

1. The sub-system of teaching staff, which expressed several expressions of enthusiasm, commitment and professionalism. This strength represents a fundamental potential for further development of the programme and should be taking good care of by the management body.
2. The communication and cooperation among different sub-systems aiming at the same aim (equifinality): departments, teaching staff, social partners, graduates and students, whose voices are listened to and taken into account.

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

The most visible weakness appeared to be the limited bold venture aiming at involvement in internationally oriented activities, such as study leaves abroad, inviting guest research and lecturers from abroad, encouraging students to participate in exchange programmes and to expand researchers' international publication.

## VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Andragogy* (state code – 612X30001) at Klaipėda 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 | 3 |
| 2. | Curriculum design | 3 |
| 3. | Teaching staff | 3 |
| 4. | Facilities and learning resources | 3 |
| 5. | Study process and students' performance assessment | 3 |
| 6. | Programme management | 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:<br>Team leader: | Prof. dr. Jesus Maria Angelica Fernandes Sousa |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Grupės nariai:<br>Team members: | Prof. dr. Sven Erik Hansen |
| | Prof. dr. Larissa Jogi |
| | Mrs. Romualda Juozaitienė |
| | Mr. Gytis Valatka |

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

**KLAIPĖDOS UNIVERSITETO PIRMOSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS**
*ANDRAGOGIKA* **(VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 612X30001) 2014-12-03 EKSPERTINIO**
**VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-586 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

## VI. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos universiteto studijų programa *Andragogika* (valstybinis kodas – 612X30001)
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)

<...>

## V. SANTRAUKA

Kiekvienos programos vertinimo srities pagrindiniai teigiami ir neigiami kokybės aspektai.

### 2.1. Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai

| | |
|---|---|
| Aiškus programos tikslas. | Numatomi studijų rezultatų yra pernelyg daug. |
| Ambicingi numatomi studijų rezultatai. | Numatomi studijų rezultatai neaiškūs, nes pernelyg detalūs. |
| Programa atitinka siūlomos profesinės kvalifikacijos studijų rūšį ir pakopą. | Reikia atskirti bakalauro ir magistrantūros studijų programas sąvokų prasme. |
| Programos tikslai ir rezultatai grindžiami | |

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

| | |
|---|---|
| strateginiais tarptautinio, valstybinio ir institucinio lygmens švietimo dokumentais. Programos tikslai ir numatomi rezultatai yra aiškiai susiję su andragogika (nors ir neišplėtoti). Atsižvelgiama į regiono poreikius. | |

## 2.2. Programos sandara

| | |
|---|---|
| Siūloma studijuoti keturias užsienio kalbas. Aiški programos sandaros logika. Geresnė mokomosios praktikos priežiūra. Atitinkanti reikalavimus kontaktinio darbo ir savarankiškų studijų laiko proporcija. Mokymo / mokymosi metodikose vyrauja akivaizdus mokymosi visą gyvenimą požiūris. Užtikrinama virtuali mokymosi erdvė. | Mokomieji dalykai semestruose paskirstyti netolygiai. Sunku įgyvendinti praktiškai dėl per daug numatomų studijų rezultatų. Per vėlai pradedama mokomoji praktika. Trūksta nuorodų į šiuolaikinius ir užsienio autorius. |

## 2.3. Dėstytojų personalas

| | |
|---|---|
| Personalas dalyvauja mokslinės veiklos programoje „AMVIGA". Publikacijos skelbiamos mokslinėje duomenų bazėje „Lituanistika". Leidžiamas mokslinių tyrimų žurnalas „Andragogika". Bendrai plėtojami profesiniai standartai su šešiomis šalimis. Trečiojo amžiaus universiteto įkūrimas. Suaugusiųjų mokymo ir Tęstinių studijų institucijų asociacijų narystė. | Per mažai yra aukštus tarptautinio lygio standartus atitinkančių publikacijų ir mokslinių tyrimų veiklos. Per mažai mokslinių ilgalaikių išvykų į užsienio šalis. |

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

| Kupinas entuziazmo, nuoširdžiai ir intensyviai dirbantis personalas. | |

## 2.4. Materialieji ištekliai

| | |
|---|---|
| Neseniai atnaujintos patalpos studijoms tiek dydžiu, tiek kokybe atitinka reikalavimus.<br>Įstaiga ir studijoms skirtos patalpos pritaikytos studentų su negalia poreikiams.<br>Yra bevielis internetas, vaizdo projektoriai, interaktyvios išmaniosios lentos ir t. t.<br>Įrengtos patalpos kviestiniams profesoriams.<br>Namuose yra prieiga prie bibliotekos tinklo ir įvairių duomenų bazių.<br>Paslaugus bibliotekos personalas.<br>Su institucijomis pasirašytos sutartys dėl mokomųjų praktikų atlikimo. | Pasigendama daugiau užsienio kalba išleistos literatūros, siekiant atitikti tarptautinius standartus andragogikos srityje.<br>Per mažai suaugusiųjų mokymui skirtos šiuolaikinės literatūros. |

## 2.5. Studijų eiga ir studentų darbo vertinimas

| | |
|---|---|
| Priėmimas vyksta įstatymų nustatyta tvarka.<br>Privalomai vertinama studijų programos pasirinkimo motyvacija.<br>Studentai skatinami dalyvauti moksliniuose tyrimuose.<br>Taikomos įvairios paramos studentams formos.<br>Aiškiai išdėstytas pasiekimų vertinimo procesas.<br>Be testų raštu ir egzaminų, taikomos ir kitos pasiekimų vertinimo formos.<br>Studentų ir personalo santykiai yra atviri ir geri.<br>Dauguma antrosios pakopos studijų studentų dirba su studijų programa susijusiose srityse. | Mažai studentų mokosi pagal *Erazmus* programą užsienyje.<br>Nėra studentų iš užsienio.<br>Nevienodas visų dėstomų dalykų studijų procesas (ne visi dalykai laikosi Andragogikos katedrai būdingos filosofijos ir atvirumo). |

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

| Darbo biržoje užregistruotų absolventų nėra. | |
|---|---|

## *2.6. Programos vadyba*

| | |
|---|---|
| Aiškiai nurodyta įvairių lygių atsakomybė priimant sprendimus. | Trūksta palyginimo su kitomis panašiomis tarptautinėmis programomis. |
| Oficialiai ir neoficialiai surinkti duomenys skirti studijų kokybei užtikrinti. | Trūksta platesnio tarptautinio orientavimo (tinklai, kviestiniai lektoriai, mokslinės veiklos finansavimas tarptautinėmis lėšomis). |
| Socialiniai dalininkai įtraukiami į programos kokybės gerinimo darbą. | Dėstytojai per mažai skatinami po penkerių darbo metų imti kūrybines atostogas. |
| Glaudžiai bendradarbiaujama su darbdaviais ir profesinėmis asociacijomis. | |
| Atsižvelgiama į studentų nuomonę. | |
| Atsižvelgta į ankstesnio išorinio vertinimo išvadas. | |

Apibendrinant dar glausčiau, sisteminio poveikio atžvilgiu galima išskirti dvi didžiausias šios studijų programos stiprybes. Tai:

1. Nuolatiniu entuziazmu, nuoširdžiu darbu ir profesionalumu pasižymintys dėstytojai. Ši stiprybė sudaro svarbiausią tolesnės programos raidos potencialą, todėl programos vadovybė šia sritimi turėtų tinkamai rūpintis.
2. Įvairių padalinių – katedrų, dėstytojų personalo, socialinių dalininkų, absolventų ir studentų – bendravimas ir bendradarbiavimas siekiant to paties tikslo (bendro tikslo turėjimas), visų nuomonės išklausomos ir į jas atsižvelgiama.

Akivaizdžiausia programos silpnybė – riboti bandymai įsitraukti į tarptautinę veiklą, tokią kaip išvykimas studijuoti į užsienį, kviestinių mokslininkų ir dėstytojų iš užsienio pritraukimas, studentų raginimas dalyvauti mainų programose ir mokslo darbų tarptautinių publikacijų plėtojimas.

<…>

### III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1.

Realistiškiau apibrėžti numatomus programos studijų rezultatus atsižvelgiant į sąsają su programos tikslais.

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

2.

Gerinti realias dėstytojų galimybes sistemingai dalyvauti profesinio tobulėjimo projektuose, kuriant tinkamą dėstymo ir aukštesnio lygio mokslinės veiklos pusiausvyrą.

3.

Sudaryti tinkamas sąlygas dėstytojams dalyvauti ilgalaikę mokslinių tyrimų veiklą užsienyje numatančiose darbuotojų judumo programose ir įgyvendinti universiteto įsipareigojimą įsitraukti į tarptautinę mokslinę veiklą.

4.

Didinti mokslinių tyrimų rezultatų publikacijų skaičių specialistų recenzuojamuose tarptautiniuose žurnaluose.

5.

Reguliariau informuoti ir raginti studentus dalyvauti mainų programose ir tarptautiniuose mokslinių tyrimų tinkluose.

6.

Kviesti ilgesniam laikotarpiui jaunus, mokslinių tyrimų veiklą aktyviai vykdančius mokslininkus / dėstytojus iš užsienio ir kitų Lietuvos mokymo institucijų padalinių.

7.

Didinti tinkamos naujos ir modernios literatūros bei suaugusiųjų mokymui skirtų vadovėlių ir andragogikos prieinamumą.

8.

Studijų programą palyginti su panašiomis Europos universitetų programomis.

9.

Daugiau dėmesio skirti platesniam tarptautiniam orientavimui ir bendradarbiavimui andragogikos ir suaugusiųjų mokymo srityje.

<...>

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

_____

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)