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# INTRODUCTION

The external evaluation of English and Russian languages study programme was initiated by the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education of Lithuania.

The evaluation of the study programme made use of the following documents: External Assessment of Study Programmes: Methodological Guidelines for Experts; Regulations and Description of General Requirements for Master’s Study Programmes; Description of Study Programme Accreditation Order.

The basis for the evaluation of the study programme is the Self-Assessment Report, written in 2010, its annexes and the site visit of the expert group to Siauliai University in April 2010. The visit incorporated all required meetings with different groups: the administrative staff of the Faculty of Humanities, staff responsible for preparing the self-assessment documents, teaching staff, students of all years of study, graduates, and employers. The expert group inspected various support services (classrooms, library, computer facilities), examined students’ final works, and various other materials.

# II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

## Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme have been defined in line with the university’s vision, mission and strategic plans, due attention is payed to the demands of the region. The lists of the aims and objectives of the undergraduate programme included in the self-assessment report cover the development of the linguistic skills in two languages, pedagogical skills as well as general competences and transferable skills.

There is no question, thus, that the aim is clearly articulated, coherent, and fully justified, the only possible reservation is whether such a rich and complex academic profile (English+ Russian + teacher’s qualification) is attainable within a single BA programme with rather strict limits as to duration and credit load. There is more emphasis in this bachelor degree on preparation for a teaching career than as a general purpose BA and this perhaps should be made clearer in the documentation. Having said this the accreditation team were satisfied that the learning outcomes demonstrated by the students were appropriate to national educational strategies and the labour market.

###  1.1. Programme demand, purpose and aims

Both students and employers stated that the bilingual nature of the programme is an enormous advantage. Students informed the Accreditation Team that this profile of the programme was very suitable to those who like learning languages, as well as those who work as translators and even interpreters.

Headteachers pointed out that due to the decreasing number of school students it is good to have a qualified teacher with 2 languages and appropriate pedagogical specializations.

However, interest in the programme in terms of recruitment has diminished, and the Accreditation Team was informed during the meetings with the administration and programme team, that in a few months time the programme would be re-profiled from a philological study field to the study field of pedagogics. The accreditation team felt that in the light of the present curriculum and its learning outcomes this would be appropriate.

There is a certain degree of tension in the situation when a pedagogical study programme largely providing teacher training is placed in the study field of philology. However, this has not been the decision of the Lithuanian universities and colleges themselves, but rather a position of the central educational authorities. The Assessment Team was informed by the University that the existing pattern will be changed starting with September, 2010.

###  1.2. Learning outcomes of the programme

According to the Self-assessment report, the intended learning outcomes of the programme are defined taking into account international and national directives and documents.

The formulation of learning outcomes found in the Self-assessment report, is generally sound, but the practical implementation of the programme makes the attainability of the whole range of outcomes difficult. Some intended competencies and skills have been marginalised in practice, e.g. provision of balanced knowledge in linguistic theory and practice, application of theoretical general didactic knowledge in the practice of language teaching.

The dual – philological and pedagogical, orientation of the learning outcomes presents an ongoing tension within the curriculum.

The wide gap between the ideal intentions and the numerous problems of their practical realization (see the remarks on curriculum design, learning resources, study process and programme management below) have sometimes resulted in variability in the depth to which outcomes have been achieved.

## 2. Curriculum design

###  2.1. Programme structure

In the meeting with administration the Accreditation Team was informed that during the above-mentioned period study courses were re-planned, as well as changes in the allottment of course credits were made.

The programme design and logic still needs some improvement. Thus, the structure of the English language component is still not entirely consistent, as it was in 2008. Partly this could be explained by the teachers‘ opinion that the initiative related to the programme structure and content usually comes from the Russian Department (particularly, from the Head of the Department, who unfortunately was absent on the day of the Accreditation Team‘s visit), and the English Department and its leadership is less proactive in curriculum changes. Teaching staff‘s input in the programme design is only on the module level. It would be useful if all stakeholders were involved in the design of the programme as a whole rather than in designing individual sections related specifically to academic study areas.

The programme team might also like to decide on an overall strategy for the choice of the instruction language of the various parts of the curriculum: general courses are read in Lithuanian, but, for example, Introduction into Linguistics is read in Russian, Introduction into the Literary Science – in English. The Accreditation Team has an impression that the instruction languages are not always chosen from the point of view of the programme needs, but decided by the reality of the situation – languages skills of the lecturer reading the particular course. It does not seem advisable to read some of the rather sophisticated Term 1 and 2 courses in a foreign language when the students may not have a fully adequate level of language proficiency.

Another aspect of the structure of the programme which might be re-visited is the placing of courses like *Phonetics, Stylistics, Syntax, Lexicology* etc. in the terms 6 – 8 and not earlier. The explanation of the Programme management group was that, for example, practical phonetics was taught in the first terms, the same concerns practical courses of syntax, stylistics, and lexicology. The Accreditation Team felt that the more practical courses would be better theoretically underpinned by an earlier introduction to theory.

###  2.2. Programme content

According to the Self-assessment report, the programme has been compiled on the basis of Regulations of Basic (non-university and university), Special Vocational and Integrated Study Programmes approved by the Order of the Minister of Education and Science No. ISAK-1551 of the 22nd July 2005 and Teacher Training Regulations (approved by the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania on 5th December 2008, No.ISAK-3363), Šiauliai University Regulations of Studies and other regulations of the Senate concerning the study programmes. 4/4 of the Assessment Team had to take this information for granted after getting acquainted with the mentioned legal acts.

The programme management group explained that general subjects were much the same. In pedagogical courses changes were introduced according to the regulations for training teachers. The special education components were Phonetics and Phonology, Syntax, Lexicology and Academic Writing. The Accreditation Team noted that there still exists a certain quantitative imbalance between the English and Russian courses and would encourage the programme team to reconsider the balance between the two subject areas.

Didactics are read by lecturers of the Department of Education and in some cases seemed rather general in nature and not sufficiently related to the context of foreign language teaching.

## 3. Staff

###  3.1. Staff composition and turnover

Composition of the staff of the Programme leaves a somewhat is somewhat variable. it meets national requirements, but there is room for improvement improvement. Having said that there were excellent examples of professional and dedicated staff throughout the programme.

There is an appropriate turnover of the staff members.

**3.2. Staff competence**

As it mentioned above, several staff members are very experienced, especially in the Russian part of the programme, but a number of lecturers have still much to do to reach the level of professionalism of their more experienced colleagues. The Accreditation team was satisfied however that such staff would play an important role in the training of their less experienced colleagues.

There is a pre-planned and regularly executed development programme of the staff teaching Russian language-related courses, as well as cooperation with educational authorities of Russian Federation.

However, there was no clear evidence of a similarly strong programme concerning the staff involved in teaching the courses of the English component, the evaluation team was told that lecturers participate with papers in linguistic conferences, but none of these was specified. There was an indirect indication that 2 Doctoral dissertations have been defended in 2009. The Accreditation Team would encourage the Programme to develop stronger staff development processes in the study field of English

## 4. Facilities and learning resources

###  4.1. Facilities

Study premises are well maintained, but the lack of recent financial resources has limited their full development.

A priority should now be given to ensure that more lecture rooms and classrooms are equipped with multimedia projectors. According to the table of programme content (ibid., p. 11-12) presentation facilities are needed in approximately 19 study courses of the programme (ideally – in all of them). As the faculty of Humanities has 8 departments in which, according to the University home page http://www.hu.su.lt/ at least 14 study programmes are simultaneously implemented, even the most optimal composition of the timetable would not allow these multimedia equipment rooms to be sufficient.

The situation with the practical training resources could also do with improvement. Although the Self-assessment report states on p. 18 that computer classrooms (the number of these is not mentioned) can be used for independent work, a programme in the study field of philology certainly needs specific languages-oriented training, which is not fully available at present, because, as it is mentioned on p. 19 of the Report, a “project providing for a Language Laboratory with minimum 10 seats and all the necessary equipment is *in preparatory stage*”, Again the improvement of such provision is now a priority.

###  4.2. Learning resources

The up-to-date University library serves the general needs of the whole University and although it is an extremely good resource it does not provide enough specialized resources needed by this programme. The Accreditation Team would encourage the University to look at ways in which the particular needs of programmes might be supported both centrally and by the provision of localized resources.

## 5. Study process and student assessment

###  5.1. Student admission

There is a problem in the recruitment of students to this Programme. The Team felt that part of the problem might be related to a lack of both central and local marketing by the Institution. There is a need for teachers and the employment records of graduates is generally good so that there ought to be ways in which recruitment could be improved.

Russian philology has been given a strong impetus because Russian has been introduced as an optional course in the senior forms of secondary schools. There has also been some marketing of Russian Philology by visits of academic and career staff to schools. The region is also one where there is a higher concentration of Russian speakers than in other areas of Lithuania..

The lack of motivation to study in the English philology specialization of the programme may be the result of combined factors both internal and external to the Institution but the situation could certainly be improved by more co-ordination between all stakeholders and a more concerted effor in terms of marketing.

The redesign of the programme to have a more pedagogical emphasis which is being planned for September 2010 may be an excellent opportunity to re-brand and re-launch the Programme as an effective recruiter.

###  5.2. Study process

The rationality of the programme’s schedule should also be re-evaluated when it is redesigned to ensure that the balance between the subject areas is improved. Student academic performance level is in line with national expectations but although some students perform very well there is room for improvement in overall levels of attainment..

There is a regular mobility programme of the staff teaching Russian language-related courses, as well as cooperation with educational authorities of Russian Federation. A similar programme concerning the staff involved in teaching the courses of the English component should also be developed.

The level of students‘ mobility is still rather low in absolute figures and could be further improved.

###  5.3. Student support

The level of academic information is appropriate. Academic information is spread via Intranet and Internet, first year students obtain the necessary information already on the first day of studies. Students have the opportunity of regular consultations with the academic staff. Consultations about career possibilities are given by Šiauliai University Career Centre.

There are social student grants and the student grants according to studies results allocated from the Faculty’s disposed fund. In case of social support students can apply to the Dean’s Office and if the case is valid and there are enough funds, social payments are allocated.

Unfortunately, due to the national-scale economic problems, during the recent years few students get student grants. The situation with social grants has been even more problematic in recent years.

###  5.4. Student achievement assessment

 The academic staff of the programme uses the 10 point assessment scale common to all educational institutions in Lithuania. There is a need however to make this system more transparent by ensuring students are made aware of the criteria for achieving these marks. There is also a need in the programme to develop a system of ensuring that all staff are using the same criteria otherwise, according to the students’ opinion, there is a danger of a lack of consistency in the marking process.

The criteria of the lecturers‘ feedbak to students concerning assessment of their progress is mainly informal, common criteria have been developed at the module level, but not at course level. This is something which needs to be developed.

There also appears to be a lack of transparency in terms of whether the non-formal studies component of the curriculum is part of the assessment process. This needs to be clarified as soon as possible.

###  5.5. Graduates placement

Graduate placement is not always as good as comparable programmes , although the employers, especially headmasters of secondary schools and gymnasiums, did underline the need for teachers with knowledge of two foreign languages.

## 6. Programme management

###  6.1. Programme administration

There is a need for a more coherent system for the management of the programme. The Accreditation team felt that at present the programme consisted of various parts which did not always communicate fully with each other. The Programme needs a corporate identity. This is something which could be established in September 2010 when the programme is redesigned. All stakeholders should work together to develop a new programme which has clearly articulated aims and learning outcomes and where there are clear lines of management responsibility between programme, faculty and institution. At present the management structure is unclear and is in danger of inhibiting the successful running of the Programme. The management structure should also make sure that all fields of study; English, Russian, Education and Psychology are represented and have ownership of the Programme.

### 6.2. Internal quality assurance

The internal quality assurance will be strengthened by a stronger management structure.

At present quality assurance is conducted at informal levels and there is a lack of accountability in terms of the processes used.

Recommendations in terms of better communication between interested parties should be implemented and systems of assessment and feedback could be improved.

# III. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1. The documentation needs to be reviewed to ensure that overlap of aims, objectives and content in some of the study areas eliminated.

3.2. The structure of the English language component needs more overall coherence

3.3. All stakeholders should be involved in the design of the Programme

3.4. A certain quantitative imbalance between the English and Russian courses should be done away with.

3.5. The Didactics elements of the Programme need to be integrated into the language nature of the Programme.

3.6. Staff development needs improvement by making use of the experience and expertise of the more senior staff.

3.7. The Prgramme should be more effectively marketed.

3.8. The Programme needs to establish a corporate identity where all stakeholders have ownership.

3.9. There is a need to establish a more coherent management structure for the Programme.

3.10. There is a need for a consistent and transparent system of assessment used by all staff on the Programme.

Assessment Form

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

# IV. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *English and Russian Languages* (state code –61204H168 (612X10014) is given **positive** evaluation.

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Evaluation area | Assessment in points\*    |
| 1 | Programme aims and learning outcomes  | 2 |
| 2 | Curriculum design | 2 |
| 3 | Staff | 2 |
| 4 | Facilities and learning resources | 2 |
| 5 | Study process and student assessment (student admission, student support, student achievement assessment)  | 2 |
| 6 | Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance) | 2 |
|   | **Total:**  | 12 |

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

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

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

4 (very good) - the area is exceptionally good

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