



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
SPECIALIOJI PEDAGOGIKA
(valstybinis kodas – 621X17003)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT
OF SPECIAL NEEDS EDUCATION (*state code – 621X17003*)
STUDY PROGRAMME
at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences

Expert team:

1. **Prof. Dr Hans (J. P.) van Ewijk** (team leader), *academic,*
2. **Asoc. Prof. Dr Mare Leino**, *academic,*
3. **Dr Margaret O'Donnell**, *academic,*
4. **Prof. Dr Rudi Roose**, *academic,*
5. **Ms Daiva Burkauskienė**, *representative of social partners,*
6. **Mr Augustinas Rotomskis**, *student representative.*

Evaluation coordinator -

Ms Tautvilė Tunaitienė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language – English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Specialioji pedagogika</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621X17003
Studijų sritis	socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	pedagogika
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	specialiosios pedagogikos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2012 m. sausio 19 d.

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Special Needs Education</i>
State code	621X17003
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Teachers' Training
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master in Special Needs Teacher Training
Date of registration of the study programme	19 January 2012

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

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
1.1. Background of the evaluation process	4
1.2. General.....	4
1.3. Background of the HEI/Faculty/Study field/ Additional information.....	4
1.4. The Review Team.....	4
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	6
2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	6
2.2. Curriculum design	7
2.3. Teaching staff	8
2.4. Facilities and learning resources	9
2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment.....	9
2.6. Programme management	10
2.7. Examples of excellence *	10
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	11
IV. SUMMARY.....	12
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	13

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the evaluation process

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

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

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

On the basis of external evaluation report of the study programme SKVC takes a decision to accredit the study programme either for 6 years or for 3 years. If the programme evaluation is negative such a programme is not accredited.

The programme is **accredited for 6 years** if all evaluation areas are evaluated as “very good” (4 points) or “good” (3 points).

The programme is **accredited for 3 years** if none of the areas was evaluated as “unsatisfactory” (1 point) and at least one evaluation area was evaluated as “satisfactory” (2 points).

The programme is **not accredited** if at least one of evaluation areas was evaluated as "unsatisfactory" (1 point).

1.2. General

The Application documentation submitted by the HEI follows the outline recommended by the SKVC. Along with the self-evaluation report and annexes, the no additional documents have been provided by the HEI before, during and/or after the site-visit.

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

Lithuanian University of Education Sciences prepares teachers for all stages of education (pre-school, primary, basic and secondary education). The range of study subjects span the content and learning objectives for formal and non-formal education settings, specialists in educational assistance (special educators, social educators and psychologists), and educational leaders and experts in ensuring quality educational provision. The Faculty of Education is the

core faculty of LEU, implements study programmes in the fields of education science, arts education and psychology.

The Study Programme of Special Needs Education, first implemented on September 1st, 2012, aims to prepare special needs teachers and researcher-practitioners, who are competent to assess and evaluate pupils' special educational needs and, on the basis of contemporary special needs education theories and research results, to support environments for education that increase the inclusion of pupils with special educational needs into mainstream educational institutions at all levels of education. This programme is implemented on a full time study basis. This is the first review of the programme.

1.4. The Review Team

The review team was assembled in accordance with the *Expert Selection Procedure*, approved by Order No 1-55 of 19 March 2007 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education, as amended on 11 November 2011. The Review Visit to HEI was conducted by the team on 8 October 2015.

- 1. Prof. Dr Hans (J. P.) van Ewijk**, *Emeritus Professor of Social Work Theory at the University for Humanistics, Utrecht, the Netherlands.*
- 2. Assoc. Prof. Dr Mare Leino**, *Associate Professor at the Institute of Social Work, Tallinn University, Estonia.*
- 3. Dr Margaret O'Donnell**, *lecturer in the field of special education at St Patrick's College, Dublin, coordinator of an online Certificate/Diploma in Inclusive Education, Ireland.*
- 4. Prof Dr Rudi Roose**, *Professor of Social Work at the Department of Social Work and Social Pedagogy, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Ghent University, Belgium.*
- 5. Ms Daiva Burkauskienė**, *Head of Division of Educational Assistance, Assessment and Consulting at the Educational Centre for Deaf and Hard of Hearing of Lithuania, Lithuania.*
- 6. Mr Augustinas Rotomskis**, *graduate in Clinical Psychology, Vilnius University, president of the Lithuanian Association of Psychology Students, Lithuania.*

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2.1. Programme aims and learning outcomes

The programme learning outcomes are well defined, clear, applicable and publicly accessible. The aim and learning outcomes of the Study Programme comply with the provisions of the Law on Research and Studies of the Republic of Lithuania. Programme aims and learning outcomes are predominantly consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered. As such, an important focus lies on research related competences relating to a masters level. However, the review team had some remarks concerning the curriculum design and the fact that the review team could consider some elements of the programme to refer to a Bachelor level rather than a Masters level (see further). The name of the program is compatible with the content, and the learning outcomes and qualifications of the program. However, a remark here is that the review team feels that the content of the program might focus more explicit on a broader perspective on ‘special needs’ (see further).

The programme has a clear link with the changing developments in Lithuanian society, especially the changing educational systems in which it becomes more important to adapt the environment to the child instead of the child to the environment. As such, stakeholders acknowledge the importance of the programme as they state they need experts to support and strengthen this development.

Despite the clear rationale for this programme and its importance in furthering inclusive practices in Lithuanian society, the question why the numbers enrolling in the programme are so low needs to be addressed.

The profile of the profession is diverse, as respondents refer to the graduates as teachers-researchers, helpers, managers of the process of inclusive education, etc. This is ambitious, and while there is a clear perspective on how to reach these ambitions, the review team feels that this profile should be made more coherent, more connected through a focus on the generic skills, knowledge and competences required to fulfil this role. The role of the teachers in special education is regarded as a specialist’s role to address, support and further inclusive education in Lithuanian society. However, this approach itself raises a tension with the importance of a generic approach to empowering all teachers as teachers of student with diverse needs in inclusive settings. The particular focus on training ‘the specialist’ in support of furthering inclusive education, can serve, as it has done in other jurisdictions, to limit the competences of other professionals (such as other teachers, psychologists, social pedagogues, etc.) to develop competencies to deal with special educational needs and to also support the process of inclusive education. In this respect, there is a danger of investing in one pronged approach to professional

development in the creation of specialists, instead of looking to the needs of the whole teaching body in times of significant change in relation to inclusive practices. While those involved in the programme state that the special education needs teacher also should have an impact on ‘other’ professionals involved, it is not clear how they are precisely competent in dealing with resistance, with other opinions, etc.

In light of the above observation, and to build teacher capacity in the schools to address the demands of meeting pupils’ diverse learning needs, it is advised that the role of the special needs trainee be extended to include some capacity building exercises in the schools and that this role be made more explicit in the programme aims and objectives.

The students who enrol on the programme are already qualified teachers with yet no knowledge of special educational needs. So the programme developed the view that they should start from the bottom up by teaching them about all categories of students’ special needs. As such, the review team could consider those elements of the programme to refer to a Bachelor level rather than a Masters level. However, the review team understands that this has to do with the Lithuanian educational regulations.

A more generic approach would impact positively on the programme and give more space for a more generic perspective on special needs rather than building up the programme as a combination of knowledge in relation to specific categories of pupils’ special needs. Overall, the review team advises that the programme be more clearly embedded in a broader perspective on inclusion, stemming from a more thorough theoretical perspective on inclusion, in which also generic debates are incorporated.

This would also serve to support the possibility for the programme and the Institute becoming a ‘leading’ Institute in the region with regard to leading and fostering inclusive policies and practices. We regard the Institute as being well placed to take on this leading role.

2.2. Curriculum design

The curriculum meets the legal requirements and the modules are continuous and evenly spread over the programme duration. There is a good relation between theory and practice and the research competences are adequately addressed mainly through meeting the criteria of the completion of a Masters’ thesis. The modules are of a high quality level and the staff members presented a clear and broad perspective on the programme, with the link to recent and relevant research.

The students are outplaced in interesting practices and this is really experienced as highly relevant by the students and by the practices. The students state to become stronger experts and

the practices refer to the relevance of the students as ‘researchers’, which strengthen the quality of the practice.

Despite this overall high quality of the curriculum, the review team sees room for even further improvement.

The review team feels that the module (titles) do not appear to reflect this broad perspective on special needs which was presented during the evaluation. Staff members referred to special needs children as not only being children with ‘mental’ or ‘physical’ impairments, but also children coming from poor families, refugees, etc. In recognition of the broad continuum of needs that exist in inclusive school settings, this broad perspective on the continuum of ‘special needs’ should be more visibly reflected in the programme.

The review team also noted an absence of a clear view on special educational needs and inclusive education when set against international theoretical and political debates. For instance, the review team missed a reference to the Salamanca declaration and to the Convention on the Rights of Disabled People. The review team also missed the explicit reference in the curriculum to the wider debates on inclusive education, the multiple definitions, the critiques on inclusive practice the challenges, attitudes, labelling etc.

A concern – also stated by the students – is the lack of knowledge of English for some students and staff members. Although there exists a wide body of literature outside of the English literature, having no access to this literature remains a challenge which needs to be addressed.

Also, the review team believes that the curriculum could become more interactive, by introducing more elements of blended learning (archiving live lectures so that students can revisit them and also that those who miss out, for one reason or another, can also access them on Moodle).

2.3. Teaching staff

The study programme has been implemented by 20 teachers and the composition of the staff meets the legal requirements. The teaching staff is highly competent and engaged and they have a good sense of purpose and direction as to what they want to achieve with this programme. Staff members have contacts with international partners and follow up on new debates and discussions. The team members have important forms of cooperation, with for instance Poland and Austria and they are also involved in research. And they intend to elaborate these collaborations further and with other partners in the future. Depending on the need of the program, guest lecturers from other institutes are invited (Krakow, Vilnius, Šiauliai). The teacher

staff also publishes nationally and internationally and presents in international and national conferences.

Despite this overall high quality of the teaching staff, the review team sees some challenges:

It was noted that the fact that many highly experienced teachers on the programme may be retiring in the near future. Therefore, it will be important to build capacity by supporting and preparing additional teaching staff so as to ensure the quality and continuity of the programme.

The review team also believes that more systematic attention should be paid to international contacts and networks. These contacts seem to emerge rather 'by accident' (personal contacts, the fact that lots of Polish people live in Lithuania) rather than 'by design'. Although these contacts are very important and interesting, more well considered networks or collaborations could be installed with institutions/professionals which are in the forefront of the academic debate on special needs and inclusive education.

2.4. Facilities and learning resources

The LEU premises are rather old but adequate. A new library is scheduled to be built soon. The classrooms are well equipped and modern technologies, the extensive use of Moodle is to be commended and it is recognised that there are further opportunities to about extend and enhance distance and blended learning approaches.

Computers, laboratories and places for study are available, varied in both in size and quality. The practical arrangements meet the required standards. Teaching materials are readily available in the libraries, the bookshop and partly in Moodle. The library gives access - also from home - to a whole range of databases.

The building is accessible for people with special needs and there are special computer programmes and facilities for special needs students and teachers. Students report that the personnel of the library, canteen, reception etc. are very helpful and supportive to them in all aspects of their engagement in college life.

2.5. Study process and students' performance assessment

The organisation of the study process ensures adequate provision for the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. In 2014, 70% of the students enrolled passed. As most are female students, maternity leave is the main reason for academic leave. As it is a full time program and most students work, this is a challenge for the program. However, students state that the program and teaching staff are highly flexible, which makes it manageable to graduate. As such, study progress was good (8,72 in 2013-2014). Adequate time is allocated to theory and practice. Students acknowledge that they become stronger and more self-aware throughout their

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

engagement with the programme. They also stated they become ‘researching professionals’ who have an impact on practice, although staff members suggest that this role as ‘researching professional’ could be strengthened even further. Also stakeholders refer to the fact that the graduates are ‘specialists’ and state that they feel supported already by the students and the research they do and a such promote the need for this program. Students have opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes. However, due to the fact that it is a full time program this is not so easy and rather limited. Three students took part in an educational internship in Krakow in 2014 and one student referred to a possibility to go to Finland in the future. Foreign students also come in to follow courses (e.g. from Kazakhstan, Turkey). Students also take part in research activities of the teachers and some of them publish together with the teachers (2 out of 7 in 2014). The assessment system is clear and well communicated to the students. Admission requirements are well founded, accessible and applied.

2.6. Programme management

The programme management plan is well-structured at all levels, with a clear line of communication and allocation of responsibilities between the university, the faculty, the department and the program committee. A system of monitoring quality is in place, which also includes the systematic improvement of the program through feedback of stakeholders and students and the assessment of staff members. Also, the programme regularly assesses needs and changes in the labour market.

The atmosphere between staff members, teachers, stakeholders and students is very positive and open. Students state that teachers and staff members are very accessible and open. This means that many issues can be discussed in an informal way and communication is excellent.

Students and stakeholders are also formally involved in the programme and can readily give feedback. Students and stakeholders are represented in the program committee. Also alumni are invited to give their views and to be involved in the programme. This for instance happens by inviting students to attend lecturers and discuss relevant topics and the meaning of these topics for the educational program.

Although there are elements of cooperation in and outside LEU, a point of attention might be to extend the communication and cooperation with other related programs, such as social pedagogy, social education and ethics and social work in LEU and with other educational institutes in Lithuania. This could mainly be interesting in the challenge to combine forces and increase the influx of students in different programs.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To embed the programme more thoroughly in international theoretical and practical debates about special educational needs and inclusive education.
2. To develop the programme more from a generic perspective, rather than adding additional modules to address new societal issues emerging for different groups.
3. To profile the programme more clearly from a broader perspective on special needs and inclusive education instead of the deficit focus on impairment.
4. To develop more explicitly designed international contacts and networks.
5. To build in more capacity building exercises at school level so as to share their knowledge, skills and competencies with all teachers in support of furthering inclusive practices.
6. To improve access to English literature and enhance the mastering of the English language.
7. To strengthen the role of the special needs trainee as a capacity builder in the schools and to make this role more explicit in the programme aims and objectives.
8. To build capacity by supporting and preparing additional teaching staff so as to ensure the quality and continuity of the programme.
9. To keep analysing and developing ways to improve the number of students which enrol in the program.
10. To extend the communication and cooperation with other related programs, such as social pedagogy, social education and ethics and social work in LEU and with other educational institutes in Lithuania. This could mainly be interesting in the challenge to combine forces and increase the influx of students in different programs.

IV. SUMMARY

'Special needs education' at Lithuanian university of Educational Sciences is a relatively new programme, developed in response to the demand in Lithuanian society, for a professional who is an expert in assessing, planning and supporting schools in meeting pupils' special educational needs so as to create a more inclusive learning environment for all pupils. The program has a clear rationale and while it is ambitious, there is a clear perspective on how to reach these ambitions. The curriculum meets the legal requirements and the modules are continuous and evenly spread over the programme duration. There is a good relation between theory and practice and the research competences are adequately addressed. The modules are of a high quality level and the staff members presented a clear and broad perspective on the programme. The teaching staff is highly competent and engaged and they have a good sense of purpose and direction as to what they want to achieve with this programme. The LEU premises are rather old but adequate. The organisation of the study process ensures adequate provision for the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. The assessment system is clear and well communicated to the students. Admission requirements are well founded, accessible and applied. The programme management plan is well-structured at all levels, with a clear line of communication between the university, the faculty, the department and the program committee.

The strength of the programme points to the conviction, commitment and engagement of the staff members and teachers towards the mission of a more inclusive society, the strong link established with various stakeholders in society and the connection of the programme to real life situations.

In addition, the positive atmosphere in relation to the programme is evident through the constructive and open relations that exist between staff members and students – this is a quality to be cherished.

The challenges of the programme point to different elements from which the most important are the possible gap between the 'stated' broad perspective on special educational needs and the more narrow profile of the modules, the lack of any explicit international theoretical underpinning of 'special needs education' to inform and guide practice.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Special Needs Education* (state code – 621X17003) at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences 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: Team leader:	Prof. Dr Hans (J. P.) van Ewijk
Grupės nariai: Team members:	Assoc. Prof. Dr Mare Leino
	Dr Margaret O'Donnell
	Prof. Dr Rudi Roose
	Ms Daiva Burkauskienė
	Mr Augustinas Rotomskis

**EXTRACT OF SECOND CYCLE STUDY PROGRAMME *SPECIAL NEEDS
PEDAGOGY* (STATE CODE – 621X17003) AT THE LITHUANIAN UNIVERSITY OF
EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES 17TH DECEMBER 2015 EVALUATION REPORT NO.
SV4-367**



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto

STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS

SPECIALIOJI PEDAGOGIKA

(valstybinis kodas – 621X17003)

VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

**EVALUATION REPORT
OF *SPECIAL NEEDS EDUCATION* (state code – 621X17003)
STUDY PROGRAMME**

at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences

- 7. Prof. Dr Hans (J. P.) van Ewijk (team leader), *academic,***
- 8. Asoc. Prof. Dr Mare Leino, *academic,***
- 9. Dr Margaret O'Donnell, *academic,***
- 10. Prof. Dr Rudi Roose, *academic,***
- 11. Ms Daiva Burkauskienė, *representative of social partners,***
- 12. Mr Augustinas Rotomskis, *student representative.***

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba

Report language - English

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	<i>Specialioji pedagogika</i>
Valstybinis kodas	621X17003
Studijų sritis	socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	pedagogika
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	specialiosios pedagogikos magistras
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2012 m. sausio 19 d.

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	<i>Special Needs Education</i>
State code	621X17003
Study area	Social Sciences
Study field	Teachers' Training
Type of the study programme	University studies
Study cycle	Second
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (2)
Volume of the study programme in credits	120
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Master in Special Needs Teacher Training
Date of registration of the study programme	19 January 2012

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

<...>

VI. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Special Needs Education* (state code – 621X17003) at the Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences 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.

<...>

IV. SUMMARY

'Special needs education' at Lithuanian university of Educational Sciences is a relatively new programme, developed in response to the demand in Lithuanian society, for a professional who is an expert in assessing, planning and supporting schools in meeting pupils' special educational needs so as to create a more inclusive learning environment for all pupils. The program has a clear rationale and while it is ambitious, there is a clear perspective on how to reach these ambitions. The curriculum meets the legal requirements and the modules are continuous and evenly spread over the programme duration. There is a good relation between theory and practice and the research competences are adequately addressed. The modules are of

a high quality level and the staff members presented a clear and broad perspective on the programme. The teaching staff is highly competent and engaged and they have a good sense of purpose and direction as to what they want to achieve with this programme. The LEU premises are rather old but adequate. The organisation of the study process ensures adequate provision for the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes. The assessment system is clear and well communicated to the students. Admission requirements are well founded, accessible and applied. The programme management plan is well-structured at all levels, with a clear line of communication between the university, the faculty, the department and the program committee.

The strength of the programme points to the conviction, commitment and engagement of the staff members and teachers towards the mission of a more inclusive society, the strong link established with various stakeholders in society and the connection of the programme to real life situations.

In addition, the positive atmosphere in relation to the programme is evident through the constructive and open relations that exist between staff members and students – this is a quality to be cherished.

The challenges of the programme point to different elements from which the most important are the possible gap between the ‘stated’ broad perspective on special educational needs and the more narrow profile of the modules, the lack of any explicit international theoretical underpinning of ‘special needs education’ to inform and guide practice.

<...>

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

11. To embed the programme more thoroughly in international theoretical and practical debates about special educational needs and inclusive education.
12. To develop the programme more from a generic perspective, rather than adding additional modules to address new societal issues emerging for different groups.
13. To profile the programme more clearly from a broader perspective on special needs and inclusive education instead of the deficit focus on impairment.
14. To develop more explicitly designed international contacts and networks.
15. To build in more capacity building exercises at school level so as to share their knowledge, skills and competencies with all teachers in support of furthering inclusive practices.

16. To improve access to English literature and enhance the mastering of the English language.
17. To strengthen the role of the special needs trainee as a capacity builder in the schools and to make this role more explicit in the programme aims and objectives.
18. To build capacity by supporting and preparing additional teaching staff so as to ensure the quality and continuity of the programme.
19. To keep analysing and developing ways to improve the number of students which enrol in the programme.
20. To extend the communication and cooperation with other related programs, such as social pedagogy, social education and ethics and social work in LEU and with other educational institutes in Lithuania. This could mainly be interesting in the challenge to combine forces and increase the influx of students in different programs.

<...>

**LIETUVOS EDUKOLOGIJOS UNIVERSITETO ANTROSIOS PAKOPOS STUDIJŲ
PROGRAMOS *SPECIALIOJI PEDAGOGIKA* (VALSTYBINIS KODAS – 621X17003)
2015-12-17 EKSPERTINIO VERTINIMO IŠVADŲ NR. SV4-367 IŠRAŠAS**

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto studijų programa *Specialioji pedagogika* (valstybinis kodas – 621X17003) 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

Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto studijų programa *Specialioji pedagogika* – santykinai nauja, sukurta atsiliepiant į Lietuvos visuomenės poreikius ir skirta rengti specialistams, kurie vertina, planuoja ir padeda mokykloms tenkinti vaikų specialiojo ugdymo poreikius ir kurti labiau integruotą lavinimo aplinką visiems vaikams. Studijų programos pagrindimas – aiškus ir

Studijų kokybės vertinimo centras

logiškas. Nors pati studijų programa ambicinga, perspektyva pasiekti šiuos ambicingus tikslus – visai šviesi. Studijų programa atitinka teisinius reikalavimus, o moduliai – tęstiniai ir tolygiai paskirstyti per visą studijų programos trukmę. Geras teorijos ir praktikos santykis, tinkamai atsižvelgiama į mokslinių tyrimų kompetencijas. Moduliai – aukšto lygio, darbuotojai pateikia aiškias ir plačias studijų programos perspektyvas. Dėstytojai – itin kompetentingi, aktyvūs, gerai jaučia tikslą, kurio siekiama šia studijų programa, ir jos kryptį. Nors LEU patalpos senos, jos tinka studijų procesui organizuoti. Pats studijų procesas organizuojamas taip, kad studijų programos vykdymas ir studijų rezultatų siekimas užtikrinami tinkamai. Vertinimo sistema – aiški ir studentams gerai komunikuojama. Priėmimo reikalavimai – pagrįsti ir prieinami, jų laikomasi. Gera visų lygių studijų programos vadybos plano struktūra, aiški universiteto, fakulteto, katedros ir studijų programos komiteto komunikacijos tvarka.

Studijų programos stiprybė – darbuotojų ir dėstytojų tvirtumas, įsipareigojimas ir aktyvus dalyvavimas siekiant įgyvendinti misiją sukurti labiau integruotą visuomenę, su įvairiais socialiniais dalininkais sukurtas tvirtas ryšys ir studijų programos sąsajos su realiomis gyvenimo situacijomis.

Be to, studijų programą gaubianti pozityvi atmosfera akivaizdžiai atsiskleidžia per tarp darbuotojų ir studentų užsimezgiusius konstruktyvius ir atvirus santykius – tai labai brangintina savybė.

Studijų programai tenkantys iššūkiai susiję su įvairiais elementais, iš kurių svarbiausi – galima takoskyra tarp stiprinamos plačios specialiosios pedagogikos perspektyvos ir siauresnio modulių profilio, taip pat tikslaus tarptautinio teorinio specialiosios pedagogikos pagrindimo, kuriuo remiantis būtų galima formuoti praktiką ir jai vadovauti, stoka.

<...>

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

1. Labiau grįsti studijų programą tarptautinėmis diskusijomis apie specialiosios pedagogikos ir integruoto ugdymo teoriją bei praktiką.
2. Studijų programą tobulinti vadovaujantis bendresne perspektyva, užuot pridėjus prie jos papildomų modulių, kuriais siekiama atliepti įvairiose visuomenės grupėse kylančius naujus socialinius iššūkius.
3. Aiškiau profiliuoti studijų programą, plačiau žvelgiant į vaikus, turinčius specialiuosius poreikius, ir jų įtraukijį ugdymą.
4. Plėtoti skaidresnius tarptautinius ryšius ir tinklus.

5. Kurti daugiau mokyklinio lygio kompetencijų ugdymo užduočių, kad būtų galima dalytis žiniomis, įgūdžiais ir kompetencijomis su visais mokytojais ir taip padėti skatinti integruotą praktiką.
6. Sudaryti geresnes sąlygas naudotis literatūra anglų kalba ir sustiprinti anglų kalbos dėstymą.
7. Stiprinti specialiųjų poreikių specialisto, kaip kompetencijų ugdytojo mokyklose, vaidmenį ir tiksliau apibrėžti jo vaidmenį studijų programos tiksluose.
8. Ugdyti kompetenciją, pedagogus papildomai remiant, kad būtų užtikrinama studijų kokybė ir tęstinumas.
9. Nuolat analizuoti ir tobulinti būdus, kaip padidinti stojančiųjų į šią studijų programą skaičių.
10. Plėtoti ryšius ir bendradarbiavimą su kitomis panašiomis studijų programomis, pavyzdžiui, LEU dėstomomis Socialinės pedagogikos ir etikos bei Socialinio darbo studijų programomis, taip pat su kitomis Lietuvos aukštojo mokslo institucijomis. Iš esmės tai būtų įdomus iššūkis – suvienyti jėgas ir įtraukti daugiau studentų į skirtingas studijų programas.

<...>

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)