



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Vilniaus universiteto
**PROGRAMOS *FILOSOFIJA* (621V50001, ankstesnis –
62401H102)**
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF *PHILOSOPHY* (621V50001, previous – 62401H102)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at Vilnius University

Grupės vadovas:
Team Leader:

Prof. dr. Krister Segerberg

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. dr. Olli Loukola
Prof. dr. Tomas Kačerauskas
Prof. dr. Anna Estany
Dr. Michael Brady
Mindaugas Grajauskas

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2011

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Filosofija</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621V50001 (ankstesnis – 62401H102)
Studijų sritis	Humanitariniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Filosofija
Studijų programos rūšis	Universitetinės
Studijų pakopa	Antroji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nulatinės (2)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	120
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Filosofijos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	1989 09 01

INFORMATION ON ASSESSED STUDY PROGRAMME

Name of the study programme	<i>Philosophy</i>
State code	621V50001 (previous – 62401H102)
Study area	Humanities
Study field	Philosophy
Kind of the study programme	University
Level of studies	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full – time (2)
Scope of the study programme	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master of philosophy
Date of registration of the study programme	01 September 1989

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

CONTENTS

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

I. INTRODUCTION

The programme being evaluated is the Masters in Philosophy at Vilnius University. The aim of the programme is to educate students in Philosophy at the Masters level. The programme of Philosophy is taught by the Department of Philosophy and the Department of History of Philosophy and Logic which are in the Faculty of Philosophy, and it involves the integration of courses from other programmes – such as sociology.

The expert panel met administrators of the Faculty, the authors of the self-assessment report, academic staff, students, and employers. The panel asked questions and received feedback from all of the groups. The self-assessment report provided a suitable basis for the evaluation. The panel members were shown the teaching rooms, computer facilities, and library. The panel would like to thank all involved at VU for their hospitality and consideration.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme aims and learning outcomes are well defined, clear and publicly accessible. The panel thought that the learning outcomes in particular were very detailed and clear, and that the specification of the skills and abilities to be acquired was helpful. The one criticism here mirrors that of the BA programme, namely one of the aims seems excessively general. That is, the goal of enabling students to adequately ‘analyze and assess the fundamental trends of the cultural, scientific, informational and social development of modern globalized world’ is rather too broad and too general, and in any case overly optimistic if it implies that students are supposed to address *all* fundamental trends, etc.

The aims and learning outcomes are based upon the academic requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market; and the programme aims and learning outcomes are consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered. The name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered are compatible with each other.

Main strengths and weaknesses

- + The aims and learning objectives are clear and well-defined.
- One of the aims is overly broad and general.

2. Curriculum design

The panel thought that the curriculum was on the whole good. One of the strengths was a high number of optional courses; another was a welcome focus on contemporary philosophical issues and figures. The panel did think that the programme lacked content related to the philosophy of technology, and issues regarding the relationship between science, technology and society. As a result, the content of the programme did not reflect the latest research in technology.

Main strengths and weaknesses

- + The subjects and modules are clearly defined.
- + The curriculum has a high number of optional courses.
- The programme lacks content related to the philosophy of technology.

3. Staff

The study programme is provided by the staff meeting legal requirements, and the qualifications of the teaching staff are adequate to ensure learning outcomes. There are a good number of established and respected teachers and researchers on the staff. The staff are very research active, and this is a major strength of the programme. This means that the teaching staff on the programme are involved in research that is directly related to the study programme. There were, unfortunately, no MA students in attendance at the meeting with students, so the panel could not ask questions about teaching at the MA level. This was unfortunate, and perhaps the Department could do more to encourage attendance and representation at this level. The number of teaching staff seems adequate to ensure learning outcomes.

The panel thought that the University did a good job in providing conditions for the professional development of staff. There were formal mechanisms for staff development in place, such as sabbatical schemes, teacher training schemes, and other forms of support. These were well-advertised and widely-available to staff free of charge. This is all very welcome. Although there were no individual staff offices, there was very good library space for staff to work in, and feedback from staff indicated that they did not think the lack of offices detrimental to their teaching and research. (It might have some negative impact on availability of staff for students, so perhaps the Department might give this some thought.) The panel also thought that the Department and University could think of ways of improving the international relations and connections between VU and other universities. This might involve inviting more international professors to the University, or facilitating the travel of VU staff to other countries.

Main strengths and weaknesses

- + The staff are very research active
- + The conditions for the professional development of staff are very good.
- International relations could be improved.

4. Facilities and learning resources

The premises for studies seem to be suitable and adequate for their purposes, although the prestigious environment, the old and historical buildings of University of Vilnius, does impose its limitations to the use and availability of facilities. This is apparent especially in the lack of workspaces for the staff; on the other hand the problem is clearly acknowledged, improvements will be made, and the students and staff have well adapted to the situation. There is sufficient number of lecture rooms and seminar rooms for various kinds of audiences, they are mostly well located, and their quality enables efficient and productive teaching and learning. The facilities are provided with appropriate teaching and presentation equipment, and the computer equipment available is sufficient for all the present teaching purposes. The library collection, supervised by committed staff, is unique with its historical amenities, yet at the same time it presents good European standards, with the central electronic databases and philosophical publications on offer for the students and staff. Given these circumstances, the program is providing the facilities and resources as well as can be expected.

Main strengths and weaknesses

- + The premises, facilities and equipment are suitable and sufficient for the purposes of the program
- + The library collections and electronic databases are adequate.
- + The programme operates in a unique historical surrounding, with all its pros and cons.

5. Study process and student assessment

The study process and student assessment were on the whole good. As noted above, there was however no MA students present at the meeting, which was unfortunate. The panel also thought that the high drop-out rate was worrying. Although the panel realises that there are a number of different reasons for this, perhaps the Department would like to think about admissions requirements, and formal structures for supporting, students who are coming from other universities and programmes.

An important point of improvement concerns the student mobility and exchange. There is no data of any outgoing or incoming students in the SE-report. Attention should be paid to the quality and relevance of the existing exchange universities, and other measures needed to motivate students to exchange. This problem, which was already noted in the 2001 evaluation report, is recognized still to persist.

Main strengths and weaknesses

- + The study process and student assessment on the whole is good.
- The high drop-out rate within the programme is worrying.
- Improvements are needed within international cooperation, especially in mobility and exchange.

6. Programme management

The panel thought that the programme management was on the whole good. There was regular and straightforward communication between staff and administration, which is praiseworthy. Having said this, the panel thought that there might be more formal mechanisms for feedback from students to the administrators. Furthermore, even though the administration recognises that international cooperation needs to be improved, specific plans have yet to be put in place to remedy this. So the panel would like the Department and Administration to continue to think of ways in which this might be done.

Main strengths and weaknesses

- + Monitoring the implementation of the programme is clearly allocated.
- + Data on the implementation of the programme is regularly collected and analyzed.
- The outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are not used enough for the improvement of the programme.
- The evaluation and improvement process does not involve enough the students and stakeholders.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) The Department should think of ways to improve international activities at all levels, from students to teachers. Special attention should be paid to establishing contacts and to creating networks with high quality international universities.
- (2) The panel thought that the students should be more involved at all levels of the programme, but especially in setting programme goals and in planning the curriculum. Student feedback might be used more efficiently at all stages of the programme.

- (3) The panel would like the teaching staff to reflect upon, and be willing to employ, new teaching methods and technologies. Similarly, the panel would like staff to reflect further on pedagogical and didactic methods.

IV. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Philosophy* (state code – 621V50001, (previous code – 62401H102)) is given **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	4
3.	Staff	3
4.	Material resources	4
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, achievement assessment)	3
6.	Programme management (programme administration, internal quality assurance)	3
	Total:	20

*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. Krister Segerberg

Dr. Michael Brady

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Mindaugas Grajauskas

Prof. dr. Tomas Kačerauskas

Prof. dr. Olli Loukola

Prof. dr. Anna Estany Profitós