



STUDIJŲ KOKYBĖS VERTINIMO CENTRAS

KLAIPĖDOS VALSTYBINĖS KOLEGIJOS
STUDIJŲ PROGRAMOS
IKIMOKYKLINIO UGDYMO PEDAGOGIKA (653X11005)
VERTINIMO IŠVADOS

EVALUATION REPORT OF
PEDAGOGY OF PRESCHOOL EDUCATION (653X11005)
STUDY PROGRAMME
AT KLAIPĖDA STATE COLLEGE

Grupės vadovas:
Team leader:

Dr. Gillian Lesley Scott Hilton

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. dr. Peadar Cremin

Kelly Van Driessche

Assoc. prof. dr. Tomas Butvilas

Sandra Kaleininkaitė

Išvados parengtos anglų kalba
Report language - English

Vilnius
2013

DUOMENYS APIE ĮVERTINTĄ PROGRAMĄ

Studijų programos pavadinimas	Ikimokyklinio ugdymo pedagogika
Valstybinis kodas	653X11005
Studijų sritis	Socialiniai mokslai
Studijų kryptis	Pedagogika
Studijų programos rūšis	Kolegijinės studijos
Studijų pakopa	Pirmoji
Studijų forma (trukmė metais)	Nuolatinė (3), iššęstinė (4)
Studijų programos apimtis kreditais	180
Suteikiamas laipsnis ir (ar) profesinė kvalifikacija	Ikimokyklinio ugdymo pedagogikos profesinis bakalauras; Pedagogas
Studijų programos įregistravimo data	2004-11-25 m. Nr. ISAK-1848

INFORMATION ON EVALUATED STUDY PROGRAMME

Title of the study programme	Pedagogy of preschool education
State code	653X11005
Study area	Social sciences
Study field	Pedagogy
Kind of the study programme	College studies
Study Cycle	First
Study mode (length in years)	Full-time (3), part-time (4)
Volume of the study programme in credits	180
Degree and (or) professional qualifications awarded	Professional Bachelor in Pedagogy of Preschool Education; Pedagogue
Date of registration of the study programme	25/11/2004 No ISAK-1848

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

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	4
I. INTRODUCTION.....	5
II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS	5
1. Programme aims and learning outcomes.....	5
2. Curriculum design	8
3. Staff	10
4. Facilities and learning resources	12
5. Study process and student assessment.....	13
6. Programme management	16
III. RECOMMENDATIONS	18
IV. SUMMARY	19
V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT	21

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This evaluation is conducted in accordance with the Law on Higher Education and Research of the Republic of Lithuania (30 April 2009 No XI-242) which established the “principles of quality assurance in higher education and research” and in accordance with the “Procedure for the External Evaluation and Accreditation of Study Programmes” approved by Order No ISAK-1652 of 24 July 2009 of the Minister for Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania (*Official Gazette*, 2009, No 96-4083). It takes due cognisance of the Order of the Minister for Education and Science approving the general requirements of the first degree and integrated study programmes (9 April 2010 No V-501) pursuant to Articles 47.8, 48.3 and 48.7 of the Law on Research and Higher Education of the Republic of Lithuania (*Official Gazette*, 2009, No. 54-2140) and also takes due account of the Order of the Minister of Education and Science “Concerning Approval of the Pedagogues’ Training Regulations” No. V-54 of 8 January 2010 and subsequent amendments (12 December 2012 No. V-1742).

An External Evaluation Team (hereinafter EET) has conducted an Evaluation of the Pedagogy of Pre-school Education Study Programme (state code 653X11005) at Klaipeda State College. In conducting their evaluation of the Study Programme, the EET have acted in compliance with the “Methodology for Evaluation of Higher Education Study Programmes” (Order No 1-01-162 of 20 December 2010 of the Director of the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education) as well as being guided by the *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*.

The External Evaluation was conducted in the period August 2013 to October 2013 with in-country evaluation taking place during the period 14 September 2013 to 21 September 2013. The Evaluation included a one-day field visit to Klaipeda State College on Wednesday, 18 September 2013.

This report does not paraphrase or re-present the range of information presented in the Report of the Self-Assessment Group (hereinafter SAG). Instead, it focuses on issues raised in the Self-Assessment Report (hereinafter SER that is self-evaluation report) as well as raising some issues not addressed in the SAR but which came to the attention of the EET during the course of the Team’s time in Lithuania, and, specifically, during the course of the field visit.

In addition to its examination of the SER, the EET collected information, data and evidence on which to base its conclusions in the course of the field visit through meetings and other means:

- Meeting with administrative staff of Klaipeda State College
- Meeting with the staff responsible for the preparation of the Self-Assessment Report
- Meeting with teaching staff
- Meeting with students
- Meeting with graduates
- Meeting with employers of those who have graduated from the programme
- Visiting and observing various support services (classrooms, library, computer services, staff developments, laboratories, etc.)
- Examination and familiarization with students’ final works, examination material.

At the end of the field visit, the initial impressions of the team were conveyed to the teaching staff of the programme.

We would like to express our appreciation to the authorities of Klaipeda State College for the manner in which we were made welcome and for the manner in which our queries and our exploration of various key issues were addressed in a professional and positive way by those with whom we came in contact at the College.

The EET would like to pay tribute to the Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education in Lithuania and most especially to Agnė Tamošiūnaitė for all of the support given to EET before and throughout the visit to Lithuania.

I. INTRODUCTION

As it is stated in the SER, activities at Klaipeda State College (hereinafter College) are performed in four faculties – Faculties of Pedagogy, Social Sciences, Health Sciences, and Technologies. The College offers 32 college study programmes in various fields of humanities, social and biomedical sciences, technologies, and physics. In 2011, the Faculty of Pedagogy was dissolved by integrating the Faculty's departments into the structure of the Faculty of Social Sciences. In 2012, three departments implementing pedagogical study programmes (Primary Education, Social Pedagogy, and Foreign Languages) were integrated into one Department of *Educology*.

When the EET visited the College to make its evaluation of the Study Programme, it found that the Faculty was housed and the programme was offered in a building that was rather suitable with all its material and environmental possibilities. IT rooms are well equipped with computers; however, generally neither staff nor students seemed to have awareness on where IT systems could be put to educational use at the pre-school level, partly for lack of appropriate software. Also recently less investment has been put into the College Library, i.e. renovation of data bases. Books on Early Childhood are mainly by Lithuanian authors, just a very few and rather old ones are in English.

EET is pleased to note that stakeholders (an employer and a student) were included in the Self-evaluation Group (hereinafter SEG). In relation to the distribution of the responsibilities among members of the SEG, it is obvious that different specialists would cover their own fields and not intervene into another colleague's duties and responsibilities, which is really good and shows rather reasonable distribution of work among staff. However, less needed to be included about national needs and more about the local conditions for the employment of graduates from this programme. In addition the considerable drop in numbers of students over the last few years needed more explanation in the SER.

During the visit to the College on the 18th of September 2013 and meeting with the SEG, the EET had the opportunity to see the staff members involved in the SER and how they have conducted their work with all available assistance. The EET was pleased to note that almost all members of the Faculty were engaged with the process. On the other hand, it is clear that many of the teaching staff were mainly unaware of the detailed contents of the SER – only a few members could talk about the SER's data and text.

II. PROGRAMME ANALYSIS

2. Programme aims and learning outcomes

2.1.1. In terms of *the programme aims and learning outcomes being well defined, clear and publicly accessible*, we find in SER that the aim of this study programme Pedagogy of preschool education is *“to prepare preschool and pre-primary school teachers with higher*

collegial education who are awarded bachelor's qualification degree in education, professional qualification of an educator, preschool and pre-primary school teacher upon successful completion of the programme" (see paragraph 4). In order to fulfil this aim, three areas of professional activities and eight learning outcomes were defined. The aim of the study programme and learning outcomes are clear enough, quite specific and understandable. Also EET finds further in the report that: "Study programme Pedagogy of preschool education is publicly available in the Open Information Counselling and Guidance System (AIKOS), Lithuanian Association of Higher Education Institutions for the organisation of single admission (LAMA BPO), and website of the College. Study programme is presented in the information material of the studies and career office, KSC career and entrepreneurship fairs, exhibitions at LITEXPO Teaching. Studies. Career (2007–2012), KSC information publication Where to Study? (Lith. Kur stoti?)" (see paragraph 4). Even though the learning outcomes are reflected within modules and assessment but still it is not quite clear on how they are linked to each module in particular, especially when it comes to the assessment part (for instance, looking in the table 2 in the SER).

2.1.2. In terms of the programme aims and learning outcomes being based on the academic and/or professional requirements, public needs and the needs of the labour market, EET, in the course of the visit at the College and meetings with SEG members, found the following – that on the one hand, it is good that the SER points out that the learning outcomes of the study programme, Pedagogy of preschool education, are to be constantly monitored to match labour market needs – "The need for the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education is being systematically analysed and results of employer surveys continuously indicate that there always are possibilities to employ specialists in preschool and pre-primary school education in the regional market" (see paragraph 5). On the other hand, - no updated information on the recent or current situation within the labour market is mentioned. Most of the surveys refer to the years of 2005, 2007 or at best 2009.

Also reading the SER, we may find a contradiction when it says that: "Current situation on the Lithuanian labour market and its outlook are favourable to future preschool teachers but analysis of general trends on the labour market shows little demand for these specialists" (see paragraph 10). To EET this is strange, that is, how the current situation in the labour market could be favourable, when there is little demand for these specialists in the surrounding area.

Besides, having in mind the professional activities and learning outcomes of the study programme, Pedagogy of preschool education, (shown in table 2 of the SER), EET did find some missed areas, according to what was observed during the visit at College and what is said in the SER:

Area of professional activities	Learning outcomes of the study programme
Knowledge of the child and their individuality	1. Will demonstrate knowledge and understanding in recognizing general and individual patterns of child development (physical, cognitive and psychosocial), frequently occurring developmental disorders and their causes, will be able to personalize education process by creating conditions for every child to feel their worth and possibilities.
	2. Will demonstrate knowledge and professional attitude to key needs of preschool and pre-primary school age children and will be able to meet those needs individually.
	3. Will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of health of preschool and pre-primary school age children and will be able to administer first aid.
Ability to design education content	4. Will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of contents of education, will be knowledgeable in the reflection, interpretation and adaptation of theoretical knowledge and practical experience, and will be able to design education content with focus on the needs of every child.
	5. Will be knowledgeable in the planning of child activities, will be able to assess soundly and analyze, create environment that stimulates physical and mental powers of the child, will be knowledgeable in the ways of creating educational environment appropriate to both a group of children and every child individually.

	6. Will be knowledgeable in the concept of family as an equal partner in the educational process, will be able to recognize particulars of a child's family and will know how to get the family involved in active and productive interaction.
<i>Development of professional competences of a preschool teacher</i>	7. Will be able to assess own powers in professional life in an objective and sound manner, and will acquire the skills of reflection and lifelong learning.
	8. Will have sufficiently developed skills of using latest Information and Communications Technology, speaking correctly in the mother tongue in real and virtual professional environment.

Therefore EET members have observed some shortages in the study programme's aim and learning outcomes, such as:

- the lack of study modules on child's psychology, health, development issues and patterns, age peculiarities demonstrate the existing gaps between SER and these deficiencies were underlined in discussions with students/graduates;
- no reflection is implemented either in the study process, students' assessment procedures nor in educational practice activities, especially examining practical/professional competences. Family issues are not discussed or studied as a separate module/course. The educational environment is mainly oriented towards the classroom physical setting with limited emphasis on other social, technological, cultural aspects within the child's education processes;
- EET has real concerns about the lack of critical reflection within the studies. Examinations of written work, including practice work showed rather shallow lists of what students had done with no critical reflection as to why things had occurred, or why children had behaved in a particular way. There was no link to the theory studied in the programme. EET made this conclusion following the meetings with students and graduates, and also observing final theses with practice portfolios where there was nothing about the students' reflection on what theory and empirical evidence show to the given educational issues. Whilst examining written evidence provided (students' practice folders and final work EET saw descriptions of events rather than careful reflection based on evaluation of performance in relation to theoretical issues provided in the taught modules. Possibilities for life-long learning remain as theoretical statements but not practical actions for those who graduate. It was hard to detect even some tiny links between graduates' intentions to continue their education further.

Therefore from the information obtained it is not yet clear how the professed learning outcomes of the programme are linked to the modules and more importantly to the assessment in the modules.

2.1.3. In regard of *the programme aims and learning outcomes to be consistent with the type and level of studies and the level of qualifications offered*, it becomes obvious from annexes, when analysing each module, that learning outcomes remain very knowledge-based and less focussed on cognitive skills or the development of a person. The SER declares that the programme meets the requirements, both in relation to training standards and qualifications, especially following official State documents. Moreover, programme description and learning outcomes were guided by the Bologna Process, the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) implementation guidelines, the Dublin descriptors and other European documents. But still EET remains concerned whether learning outcomes of the study programme are really at Level 6 (according to Bologna), especially in relation to the absence of critical reflection in educational practice performance and defending the final theses.

It is stated that *“social partners are involved in activities of the Study Programme Committee and sit on thesis defence commissions. If appropriate, social partners make proposals on how to improve knowledge and practical skills of future preschool and pre-primary school teachers”* (see paragraph 5). However, when discussed with social partners during the meeting,

it was clear enough that decisions made by College administration do not always match with ideas suggested by social partners, as few of them, when asked about their participation in decision-making, said that they only offer ideas, but the implementation of these suggestions lies on the shoulders of the Faculty administration. Also some of the social partners were even surprised by such a question.

2.1.4. Having in mind the *name of the programme, its learning outcomes, content and the qualifications offered being compatible with each other*, EET suggests that it would be best if the title of this and similar programmes (e.g. in the cases of other visited colleges) were to define itself in terms of its focus, for instance, as “Early Childhood Studies”, “Early Years Education” or so. In relation to the *compatibility of learning outcomes with content*, the EET is very concerned about what seems to be a mismatch between the learning outcomes presented and the subject content through which these outcomes are to be achieved.

After discussing with staff members, especially SEG, and reading the SER about programme’s strengths and weaknesses, EET found it rather strange that in many reports of visited colleges, particularly Klaipeda State College, no real (except those to be too general and broad with no requirement for further changes/improvements) weaknesses were described in much detail or ways to overcome them presented. The massive drop in numbers of admitted students is very worrying as to whether this programme is sustainable. Surprisingly for EET no weaknesses were identified and explored in the document having in mind all those concerns and doubts that experts would raise after reading the SER and visiting the College. Only strengths are stressed, especially for example: „*The aim and intended learning outcomes of the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education are formulated as to allow purposeful acquisition of professional competences of a preschool and pre-primary school teacher*“ (see strengths section in SER). However, lack of practice reflection and the final theses do not show the possibilities for that purposeful acquisition of professional competences.

2. Curriculum design

2.2.1 As to whether *the curriculum design meets legal requirements*, it becomes clear enough that such a design meets all legal documents and State requirements. Besides, the scope of all subjects in the study programme complies with ECTS requirements and is the same irrespective of the mode of studies (full-time or part-time). SER in this regard states that: “*Study programme Pedagogy of preschool education at KSC was updated in accordance with the Law on Research and Higher Education, and Description of General Requirements for Degree-Awarding First Cycle and Integrated Study Programmes. Scope of the study programme is 180 credits (4.800 hours)*” (see paragraph 12).

2.2.2. Speaking about the *study subjects and/or modules being spread evenly, their themes are not repetitive*, SER indicates the following: “*The study programme is comprised of general subjects, study field subjects and elective subjects. Subject units in the study plan are distributed in an integrated manner by taking intended learning outcomes into consideration: study field-subjects focused on developing subject-specific and professional competences are taught only when students have already been taught in the fundamentals required for a specific subject*” (see paragraph 13). However, EET finds that there is still a lack of specific modules on family issues, special education and psychology, early childhood psychology, developmental aspects and studies etc. All of these areas fit only in courses such as Family Pedagogy, Special Pedagogy, Developmental Psychology and Special Child Psychology, which is not a sufficient amount of preparation for future teacher formation.

In all the modules, mentioned in the SER, there are only a few that place the child as a central figure within the Study Programme. The titles of the modules are more broad and less

specific. As a result the programme appears to be a collection of modules as opposed to a programme focussed totally on the needs of the young child.

2.2.3. As to whether *the content of the subjects and/or modules is consistent with the type and level of the studies*, experts would highly stress the fact that, following the curriculum of this programme, we did not find the root concept of child-centred education, i.e. all different courses seem to be as a collage that, only in limited ways, are related to early childhood education. A more holistic programme design, based on the original aims and learning outcomes needs to be discussed by staff, so that the modules are all relevant and related to the programmes aims and this is achieved through programme and module learning outcomes and through their assessment.

2.2.4. Having in mind the *content and methods of the subjects/modules are appropriate for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes*, SER (see paragraph 14) indicates that “*When defining subject learning outcomes various levels of complexity are applied, i.e. knowledge, understanding, application, analysis, synthesis and assessment. This is reflected in learning outcomes of the subjects, for example, knowledge – to describe, to recognize; understanding – to illustrate, to explain; application – to analyse; analysis – to compare; synthesis – to sum up, to make a plan; assessment – to compare, to assess. For each level of knowledge different learning and assessment methods are defined (for example, to assess knowledge – written and oral quiz, a test; to assess level of analysis – case analysis, project activity). Learning outcomes of the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education are immediately linked to learning outcomes and learning methods*”. However, reading the annexes about modules, it became more clear that this programme is oriented towards knowledge rather than to students’ practical skills formation and a child-centred philosophy. Putting this in other words, the programme appears to be theoretically based rather than starting from practice, which should be at the heart of the programme, particularly for college graduates. EET suggests that more consideration should be given to educational practice supervision/reflections; how to work with troubled children; social risk families and inclusion of a child with special needs; creating equal opportunities for all.

The following statement in the SER that the “*lecture is a classic form of teaching students*” (see in paragraph 15) creates some concerns about implementing new didactic methods when working with students. Even though EET finds many other methods mentioned in the report, after reading each module description, we see more traditional didactic approaches, rather than new ways of spreading information during the classes. To some degree, this fact is quite understandable, as a lecture is a traditional way of teaching, but on the other hand – the new didactic approach is missed in this regard. It is particularly important that student teachers on teacher education programmes see models of teaching being implemented by their own lecturers and teachers, so that they can then use them in their professional settings. EET, in this regard, would highly recommend the need for more pedagogical use of ICT: web cameras, play/software robots as well as games in all modules related to learning in young children.

2.2.5. In terms of *the scope of the programme being sufficient to ensure learning outcomes*, on the one hand, it is obvious that offered modules with numbers of credits are related to learning outcomes and that the balance between given theory and practice activities link also to learning outcomes and methods used for achieving them. On the other hand, SER points out the distribution of hours in the study plan for the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education, which is rather sufficient (see paragraph 16):

Curriculum design for the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education	Lectures (percentage)	Practical training, seminars (percentage)	Consultations (percentage)	Independent work (percentage)	Total (percentage)

I. General subjects	0.67	3.5	0.33	4.56	9.06
II. Study field subjects:					
<i>Study field subjects</i>	10.33	15.58	2.5	31.93	60.34
<i>Professional activity practice</i>	-	9.38	0.96	10.5	20.84
<i>Final thesis</i>	-	-	0.42	4.65	5.07
Elective subjects	0.63	2.21	0.25	1.6	4.69
Total	11.63	30.67	4.46	53.24	100

However, it seems to be quite uneven that only 20.84 % of professional activity practice is given, while study field subjects take much of the study time. Also this fact contradicts the evaluation situation of the final thesis (that is given only 5.07 %) and educational practice assessment. The final thesis is defended in front of a solid committee but practice, which should be at the heart of the programme, is passed by presenting some general reflections via PPT and a small report on the completed tasks.

The EET is concerned about some negative parts within curriculum design – most especially in regard to the lack of foreign language classes. Putting this in other words, the programme has to be more internationalized, especially bearing in mind Erasmus exchange agreements among partner institutions etc. Also during the meeting with students and graduates, the idea on *theory does not match the practice* was highly stressed. That mainly means that students do not get, in classes, a good preparation for the tasks in educational practice settings, and that theory taught in classes in some ways is not tightly related to what students’ observe and face in practice.

2.2.6. While analysing whether *the content of the programme reflects the latest achievements in science, art and technologies*, SER’s paragraph 17 says that “*The innovative and contemporary nature of the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education is evident in the list of scientific literature by national and international authors used to deliver the curriculum and to be used by students for their independent works and in particular final thesis. Content (curriculum) of the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education was developed with a focus on literature that covers best the latest achievements in science and technology. More than two thirds of bibliographic titles used in the curriculum were published between 2002 and 2012*”. EET is pleased to find at least one match on what is written in the report, and what we have observed during the visit at the College that “*sources in foreign languages are insufficient*” (see paragraph 17). It is worth to notice that most of the literature is not directly dealing with early childhood issues, developmental challenges and learning processes. Moreover, no modern sources on children’s play were found during the visit in the Library settings. More also needs to be done to introduce students to a wider range of ICT pedagogy relevant to pre-school children.

Also it is important to mention some other flaws of this part of the programme: when reading the SER – *not much is said as well as in other parts of this document, or too broad remarks are made on the weaknesses for the curriculum design*; during the meeting with programme students – they would not *point out areas that need to be improved*; in the SER and discussing with teaching staff the *assessment of the modules is not specific, quite few methods are used, e.g. discussion, analysis of a few cases*.

3. Staff

2.3.1. In terms of *the study programme is being provided by the staff meeting legal requirements*, SER in paragraph 28 indicates that “*The number of teaching staff, their qualification, salary, vacation, and recruitment and dismissal procedure meet legal requirements. The foundation of the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education is competent and qualified teaching staff able to transfer knowledge to students and develop abilities needed in future professional activities*”.

2.3.2. Speaking about that *the qualifications of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure learning outcomes*, SER does not point directly to the teachers' qualifications, except for: "*Qualification of the teaching staff is adequate to achieve the aim and intended learning outcomes of the study programme*" (see paragraph 28). However, in the course of the meeting with teaching staff it became clear that only few of the staff members are qualified as specialists of pre-school education, which raises high concerns for EET. Thus it is worrying for EET that in SER, even though lecturers experience is somewhat sufficient, it does not say anything about what experience they might have in the field of pre-school education. On the other hand, teachers have experience of at least 3 yrs. in teaching but not necessarily in the field of pre-school. This raises some doubts about the sufficiency of specific work experience with young children.– "*All teachers have at least 3 years of pedagogical work experience and experience in the subject taught*" (see paragraph 28).

2.3.3. As about *the number of the teaching staff is adequate to ensure learning outcomes* EET finds in SER that: "*Subjects in the study field are taught by 16 teachers: 3 doctors, 1 docent, 10 lecturers and 2 assistants. General subjects of collegial studies are taught by 4 teachers: 1 doctor, 1 lecturer and 2 assistants. 3 teachers are from other educational establishments. Permanent staff account for 85 per cent of all teachers in the programme*" (see paragraph 26). It seems rather adequate number and the ratio of teachers delivering the programme to students in the programme stands at 10.45. However, for EET to make a correct judgement the ratio needs to be expressed as hours taught and given to supporting students by teaching staff, in relation to the numbers of students on the programme.

2.3.4. In terms of *teaching staff turnover is able to ensure an adequate provision of the programme*, EET, after the visit at the College, finds that teaching staff turnover is not one to ensure the effectiveness of adequate provision of the programme. The SER does not give any specific details on the qualifications of the more recently recruited staff, particularly in the field of Early Childhood Education. Clearly, new staff has potential to generate new ideas, didactics and approaches to the programme, but nothing is said as to how these new staff help to grow the level of professional expertise in the pre-school education area.

2.3.5. Analysing the criteria about *the higher education institution creates conditions for the professional development of the teaching staff necessary for the provision of the programme*, it is declared in SER paragraphs 22-24 that College administration creates all conditions necessary for the professional development, but very few (especially working at Klaipeda University) of the teaching staff have used those opportunities (i.e. having in mind both international exchange (5 teachers, see paragraph 31) possibilities and academic activities in the country, (mainly S. Gertienė, A.Varneckienė and D. Martišauskienė), though we may find a listing of projects/conferences in which only some individual staff members have become involved.

2.3.6. In terms of *the teaching staff of the programme is involved in research (art) directly related to the study programme being reviewed*, EET, after the visit at the College and meeting with SEG, and teachers, firstly finds the statement in SER that: „*In order to strengthen teachers' competences as researchers and teachers and improve the quality of subjects taught teaching staff of the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education (PSE) are actively engaged in research activities, conduct scientific research and prepare publications*“ (see paragraph 20). However, in reality, few of the staff are engaged in scientific activities or academic work (especially those who work at Klaipeda University as well). Thus EET would raise a question on the research experiences of the teaching staff to be less adequate for ensuring learning outcomes. Besides, in the reading list for students' individual work none of the material

is prepared by College teachers, except for a few references in the module of “Folklore and Children’s Literature”.

Also it is worth to mention that the findings of applied research, done by the teaching staff, were presented back in 2011, which show that the academic activity of teachers is not very dynamic at the moment. The SER states that teaching staff are members of a variety of organizations, but it is not shown clearly in what particular organizations they are involved. Paragraphs 20, 21 and 22 deal mainly with teaching staff activities in various projects, writing papers, and participating in different conferences, but mostly none of those relate closely to Early Child Education or early childhood sociology, education or psychology. A tighter focus on research aligned to the pre-school area is needed.

4. Facilities and learning resources

2.4.1. Observing and analysing *the premises for studies are adequate both in their size and quality*, it is stated in the SER that: “*Quality implementation of the aim of the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education is determined by sound and rational structure of intellectual resources and facilities and learning resources. Students enrolled in the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education may use the following facilities: learning facilities (at Jaunystės g. 1), an events hall, sport courts, a wellness complex and student dormitories located at Jaunystės g. 4, Taikos pr. 16, Taikos pr. 20, Gulbių g. 8, Debreceno g. 25, classroom area of the Faculty of Social Sciences which is 1,813.25 m² and a gym of 530 m². Classrooms are located in the daylight basement and 1–4 floors and accommodate between 14 and 86 work places. Classrooms are adapted to various forms of study process organization: lectures, stream lectures, practical training and information technologies, and other additional activities*” (see paragraph 34).

2.4.2. Dealing with *the teaching and learning equipment (laboratory and computer equipment, consumables) are adequate both in size and quality*, the EET was pleased to note that, after visiting the premises and other facilities at Klaipėda State College, learning resources and educational environment used to deliver the study programme are sufficient; software used is adequate and sufficient. However, there is still a huge gap in using ICT within the study process, e.g. practicing new computer games, i-phone/smart-phone software etc. More work needs to be done on the pedagogical use of ICT in the programme and this requires adequate access to requisite hard and software. Work and study conditions in the library and the reading room are quite good. Also EET members were delighted by visiting a museum in the College that mainly serves as practice environment for students when they learn national traditions, cultural heritage etc.

On the other hand, EET has noted that even though in the SER it is said that “*there is also statistical software SPSS 19.0. (Statistical Package for Social Sciences)*” (see paragraph 37), but there were no real evidence of the use of such statistical software in the final thesis, especially when it comes to quantitative researches and their rather shallow analysis (after reading final thesis and their empirical parts). Also SER indicates that “*in 2010 the College updated its virtual learning environment Moodle which gives the possibility of remotely consolidating or deepening material studied and performing assignments of independent or practical work*” (see paragraph 37), however, after meeting with teaching staff and students, no detailed explanations or examples on that were not given to EET members. Besides, using Moodle platform is not shown in modules description either.

2.4.3. In terms of that *the higher education institution has adequate arrangements for students’ practice*, SER indicates that: “*Educational internships are based on the cooperation*

between the higher education institution and stakeholders. College signs tripartite agreements for internships to be done at facilities of various organizations. In the period analyzed (2007–2012) a total of 17 cooperation agreements were signed and another 9 were concluded in 2012 with nurseries/kindergartens operating in Klaipėda District” (see paragraph 39). This fact closely matches the following lines in SER that: “All organizations where students perform their internships are adequate in terms of features specific to the work of a preschool teacher in preschool educational establishments and create opportunities to achieve intended learning outcomes of the study programme” (see paragraph 39). Even though mentors in the school setting are not trained specifically, the College has a specified group of those teachers who are helping students in their practice. EET would prefer to see a programme to prepare and update mentors being instigated by the College. Also there is nothing said about how schools are chosen for the practice, so it remains rather unclear for the EET how the procedure of picking the right schools looks like. Again there is not much said about how the practice place is chosen and how supervising lectures/mentors are prepared each year by the Practical Teaching Centre. It seems that this mentioned Centre only deals with preparing the right documents. More active involvement in the process by programme staff would be preferable.

2.4.4. When it comes to the part of *teaching materials (textbooks, books, periodical publications, databases) are adequate and accessible*, we may find in the report that: “All students studying at the College may use the following libraries: libraries of Faculties of Social Sciences (located at Jaunystės g.1), Technologies (located at Bijūnų g.10), and Health Sciences (located at K. Donelaičio g. 8 – library/reading room)” (see paragraph 40). While scrolling further through the SER, there is nothing said about educational textbooks, monographs, periodicals related to early childhood studies. EET would hardly find real evidence on that either. Besides, students tend not to use up-to-date sources in their final papers/theses, especially in regard of foreign literature.

Speaking about the programme weakness points, having in mind facilities and learning resources, EET only reads the following “in order to improve knowledge students acquire and professional competences of a preschool teacher more printed publications in original (foreign) languages are needed”. This fact only shows the manner of how SER was written – too generally and broadly. The SEG did not put much critique in regard of teachers and students accessibility to all those premises and resources that College would offer.

5. Study process and student assessment

2.5.1. As to whether *the admission requirements are well-founded*, the SER (see paragraph 42) outlines the rules that “everyone with at least secondary education may be admitted to the study programme. There is no limit on the age of applicants. College rules of admission were developed by deputy director for academic affairs and approved with the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Lithuania. Approved rules of admission were adopted by director of the College. Admission to the College takes place by way of competition. Priority is given to an applicant with a higher score. As of 2009 student admission to KSC is done centrally through the single admission system of Lithuanian Association of Higher Education Institutions in accordance with admission rules of LAMA BPO”. However, among the strengths, it is stated that “the study programme admits truly motivated students with a rather clear career vision. Student achievement assessment system meets assessment criteria and students receive feedback on their achievements. A survey of the demand for specialist of preschool education shows that specialists in this field are in demand on the labour market”. But on the other hand, EET observed and noted that neither admission procedure, nor students’ achievement assessment are clear enough. For instance, no real evidence/example is given about

the admission procedure to the College, except of that that is mentioned in the State regulations. Also there is a serious problem with recruitment to the programme at present in common with many other colleges, due to low salaries, lack of employment demographics and emigration, in addition the college is in competition with Klaipeda University which offers a 4 year degree programme in Pre-School Education. Paragraph 53 indicates the numbers of students:

Year	Number of students in the 1st year	Number of students in the 2nd year	Number of students in the 3rd year
2012-2013	9	5	15
2011-2012	6	16	-
2010-2011	18	-	-

Even though it is said that change in student numbers by year is not high and the change that does take place is not related to poor performance of students, it still stays quite unclear as for what reasons students would really quit study.

Also in the SER's paragraph 63 the EET witnesses the following part-time students' numbers:

Year admitted	Number of admitted students	Number of successful graduates
2009/10–2012/13	20	Expected to complete studies in January of 2013
2007/08–2010/11	20	17

Still the EET would like to see in the SER more about what the students' admission grades were (i.e. the lowest and the highest), what is the balance between applications and admitted students to the Programme.

2.5.2. In terms of *the organisation of the study process ensures an adequate provision of the programme and the achievement of the learning outcomes*, paragraph 47 of the SER notes that "*Learning outcomes of the study programme are assessed using KSC's Study Regulation which governs the assessment system of student knowledge and skills by applying an individual accumulative assessment*". There is a lack of understanding with regard to the practice element of this degree which should be paramount i.e. that it should hold the highest importance, as the degree is intended to produce a professional teacher. To do this successfully means that the focus of the programme, both practical and theoretical should be on how the student performs with children in the classroom, not how they write about it.

Students' educational practice assessment is based on the triangle principle – tutor, teacher (50%), and student's report, which in most cases does not have any meaning for the assessment of the practice activities and student's personality. Therefore it is rather unclear for the EET what percentage weight is given to the students' work and what is the meaning of tutors at school evaluation. All the numbers and equations provided later raise no doubts, however, during the meetings with students, social partners and teaching staff (especially practice supervisors) the importance of mentors' role while evaluating the practice remained quite unclear and the social partners were not able to answer straightforwardly about their role in assessing students' practical work. Even, as was stated by one of the teachers during the meeting that practice evaluation is mainly "*based on a simple assessment sheet*". This fact would raise many other concerns as to how educational practice is organized, observed, and measured. Also EET members noticed that teaching staff do not have any specific/official regulation for visits to practice settings – only 3-4 times per period. Another issue is that nobody fails the practice – it seems that everyone is suitable. The main reason of dropout would be academic weaknesses and incapability of a student and that is rarely, if ever decided upon by the staff. Possibly the low numbers mean that retaining students on the programme is the first priority for the staff.

The final thesis is another problem as EET was not able to note the presence of reflection, discussion, ethical considerations on neither research practice nor tight relations with practical activities in the final thesis. The reference lists are mainly too old and need to be updated; very few foreign sources are used while arguing the research relevance and theoretical findings. The final section needs to be a comprehensive discussion of the research findings in relation to the literature and research referred to in the first part of the thesis and careful consideration and reflection upon the actual research process undertaken and how it could have been improved.

2.5.3. Speaking about that the *students are encouraged to participate in research, artistic and applied research activities*, SER states that “*students are encouraged to participate in research, artistic, sporting and applied research activities. Involvement of students may be discussed in several aspects: (1) research done by students: depending on the topic of chosen pedagogical studies and final thesis all students of Pedagogy of preschool education study programme perform research during their internship and heads of preschool educational establishments and representatives of universities are invited to attend defence of theses; (2) in 2001 a student science fellowship (SSF) was established in the former Faculty of Pedagogy*” (see paragraph 45). However, EET, while meeting with students, could not find any significant academic work done by students, except their quite routine annual participations in students’ conferences, poor helping their teachers to complete scientific papers or rather active participation in folklore theatre group “Aitvaras” (12 students). Thus observing research/academic activities of the students within 3 years, it is still a missing spot in this Programme.

Also, in regard to the new evidence presented by SEG on December 3rd, 2013, the EET is not now in a position to assess to the titles of given presentations by 9 students in this mentioned conference in May 5th 2013, as well as papers’ titles with the names of co-authors.

2.5.4. In terms of that the *students have opportunities to participate in student mobility programmes*, even though it stated that students have equal opportunities to participate in mobility programmes, but only 2 students have chosen this option and went to Turkey back in the academic year of 2010-2011. Obviously, this is not a sufficient number within students’ international mobility.

2.5.5. As about the *higher education institution ensures an adequate level of academic and social support*, EET is rather pleased to know that the College offers to students quite good academic and social support, as it is stated in SER that “*For achievements in science, applied research and active public life students of the College may be awarded bursaries established by the Antanas Vizbaras Foundation. Upon suggestion by the dean and by order of director students may be awarded letter of gratitude, Christmas bonuses, payment of conference attendance fees and transport services. Students or their parents may make use of exemptions from personal income tax or apply for tax refund on tuition fees. Based on admission results 14 students enrolled in the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education received incentive-type bursaries in the period between 01/2010 and 12/2011*” (see paragraph 46). But the College statistics do not show the situation on today’s reality – within academic years of 2012 and partly of 2013.

2.5.6. *The assessment system of students’ performance*, written in SER’s paragraph 47, is quite clear and publicly available. However, during the visit in the College and having meetings with teachers and students the assessment system remains rather shady as the main method for assessing students’ knowledge and skills is final written or oral examination. Especially in relation to educational practice (*internship*, as it is called in the SER) part, - EET members could not find any evidence of deeper reflections. A more thorough analysis of

performance in the classroom is required not just a short report by the school staff and students' presentations and final reports/theses. The pedagogical practice report should be renamed as *the teaching portfolio* and include a list with examples of a student's strengths and weaknesses, which are to help an employer see where additional development of student skills, knowledge or experience are required when undertaking a first job.

2.5.7. *Professional activities of the majority of graduates meets the programme providers' expectations* in most cases meet the College administration expectation and labour market needs, as in the meeting with social partners it was stressed that almost all graduates of the programme find jobs in Klaipeda city and region kindergartens. This fact is loudly articulated in SER as well "A survey of the demand for specialist of preschool education shows that specialists in this field are in demand on the labour market" (see strengths section). In this regard paragraph 73 of the SER shows that: "Based on the findings of a survey done by the Department of Primary Education at KSC in 2011 almost half (47.1 per cent) of graduates from the Pedagogy of preschool education programme worked by profession they acquired upon graduation from this programme. Only a small portion, i.e. 5.9 per cent of graduates, worked in a different line of work. More than a tenth (11.8 per cent) of graduates live and work abroad, i.e. in a variety of EU countries. Employment figures for students admitted in 2012/13 will be available only in the winter/spring of 2013".

Moreover, the EET could not find any real action taken in order to overcome the programme's obstacles (i.e. weaknesses in regard of the study process and student assessment). Even though SER points out that the following actions need to be done for making some improvements: "To encourage students to get more actively involved with applied research and ensure their participation in mobility programmes", but it remains too general, lack specific suggestions as to how to improve it and so is probably never achievable.

6. Programme management

2.6.1. In terms of the *responsibilities for decisions and monitoring of the implementation of the programme are clearly allocated*, while reading the SER, we may find that programme management, in terms of subordination hierarchy, lies on "study programme committee, department (head of the department), faculty (dean), Committee on Quality of Studies at the College and Academic Council" (see paragraph 74). Furthermore EET is pleased to follow the other line, that states that "Functions of the programme's management and decision-making structure are defined and do not overlap, there is a clear distribution of responsibilities for the delivery and supervision of the programme. An important aspect to this system is constant interaction and feedback" (see in SER). Thus, according to the report, distribution of responsibilities in the delivery of the study programme is systemic and consistent, taking into account the programme management and the decision-making structure.

Also SER indicates that "Quality delivery of the programme is ensured by activities of programme's management and decision-making structure on all levels through the application of certain management tools: legal regulation, management, learning and human resources" (see paragraph 75). This fact shows that responsibilities are rather clearly allocated. However, even though it is stated that "Students, just like teachers, directly participate in the management of studies: they provide feedback in surveys on curriculum, quality of teachers' work, Satisfaction of their own expectations and needs at the College" (see further in paragraph 75), but in the course of meeting with students and asking them about their input in study programme's management, just very few and quite slackly would say that they do participate with no evidence how and where exactly.

2.6.2. Having in mind the *information and data on the implementation of the programme are regularly collected and analysed*, on the one hand, information collection, analysis and promotion of the study programme among the general population and social partners is done continuously, but on the other hand, the participation of social partners is mainly seen and could be defined as more *well written in the document* situation, because, when talking to social partners, it was obvious that their ideas and suggestions are not commonly integrated in changes done by College administration or teaching staff. For instance, one of the social partners would say that even though they have opportunities to share the ideas with HEI, all important decisions are mostly taken by College administration itself. This fact implies the idea that social partners' activity is limited by possibilities to implement their remarks, suggestions, and the ways of good practices. Also in SER paragraph 81 it is said that *“In the beginning of 2012 a meeting was held with social partners to discuss matters of the need for preschool teacher and quality of training, and organization of pedagogical internships”*, however, no detailed explanation (giving names and institutions) was declared in the document. It appears that there needs to be a more partnership approach, with schools and the college working together to improve the degree.

2.6.3. In terms of *the outcomes of internal and external evaluations of the programme are used for the improvement of the programme*, SER provides with a fact that *“The study programme Pedagogy of preschool education has never been subjected to external review”* (see paragraph 76). On the other hand, it is stated that the outcomes of internal evaluations are used for the improvement of the programme as *“Improvements to the study programme Pedagogy of preschool education are done in accordance with the latest international, national documents and documents adopted by Klaipėda State College governing organization of studies: Regulation of the Committee on Quality in Studies, Description of the Procedure for Quality Assessment and Certification of Study Subjects, Regulation of the Academic Council at KSC, Description of the Procedure for the Recognition of Learning Outcomes of Studies at KSC, Description for the Procedure of Organization and Assessment of Internships at KSC, KSC Manual on Quality of Studies and Teacher Training Regulation”* (see paragraph 79). Following this, EET, during the meeting with teachers, did not find evidence of staff having knowledge of those outcomes of internal evaluation or even documents, according to which improvements are done.

2.6.4. The criterion on *the evaluation and improvement processes involve stakeholders*, in SER we find the following: *“The Department cooperates with the following stakeholders: Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, Šiauliai University; State College of Šiauliai, Vilnius, Kaunas and Utena; Vydūnas Foundation, etc.; attends in joint seminars, conferences and projects. In 2011 the Department held a scientific/practical conference Pedagogų kūrybiškumo raiška ir galimybės planuojant, kuriant ir tobulinant modernią ugdymo aplinką (Creative Expression of a Teacher and Possibilities in Planning, Creating and Improving Modern Educational Environment). Scientific articles of the conference based on the presentations given at the conference were published in a reviewed conference publication”* (see paragraph 81). However, when asking both SEG members and teachers about cooperation with other Colleges or Universities, that have almost the same study programmes, it was stated that the study programme searches for new forms of cooperation in the area of quality improvement in studies, but, in what EET members have observed and witnessed, such a cooperation is mainly framed by organizing conferences, inviting teachers for a short visits etc.

2.6.5. In terms of *the internal quality assurance measures are effective and efficient*, EET during the visit at the College and also analysing SER, would find that *“The process of quality management in studies encompasses several stages: management, assessment and improvement. Internal quality assessment in studies means a continuous examination and analysis of internal processes of studies, requirements, criteria and standards”* (see paragraph

79). Even though in SER it is said that “*Attempts are made to motivate teachers to participate in quality assurance in studies*” (see paragraph 79), but no practical ways of such attempts are given neither in written form nor in the discussion were reviewed.

Besides, dealing with actions for making improvements in this study programme, again EET did not find any reasonable and arguable way of doing so, except one general statement on that that “*There is a need to search for international partners, stimulate development of relations with academic institutions and stakeholders through new forms of cooperation*”.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1. EET recommends that KSC consider changing the title of the study programme and relate the aim with learning outcomes in more specific and practical ways, pointing directly what students do in the classes and what competences they upgrade. Design a much tighter link the learning outcomes to modules and to methods of assessments.

3.2. In all teaching modules the main point should be a child-centred education concept and all educational issues have to be related to early childhood phenomenon, especially through different courses and their material.

3.3. EET recommends greater clarity about the setting for which pedagogues are being prepared (preschool and pre-primary education).

3.4. Teaching staff should be more engaged with their students in academic activities as well as in scientific work disseminating their empirical data and theoretical observations from practical point of view.

3.5. Teaching staff of the College should make their research work/papers in the field of Pedagogy and Early Childhood Education not only generally of Education.

3.6. Include both graduates (alumni) and social partners in College decision making and changes within study programme.

3.7. The final thesis should be examined in order to improve the quality and effectiveness of the research undertaken, make use of more foreign references, include research ethics, use a wider range of data collection methods and thoroughly discuss the research findings, in comparison to the findings of research discussed in the literature search. EET also strongly recommends that there needs to be a sharper focus on research, a longer engagement in the research topic and the drawing of conclusions from empirical findings.

3.8. When considering strengths and weaknesses of the programme, the SEG have not commented on what needs to be done to improve any noted weaknesses showing little evidence of reflective practice themselves. Every effort to say HOW this is to be achieved should be made.

3.9 EET recommends that KSC review the place and importance of the educational practice within the study programme, especially in regard to its assessment, the role of the College supervisors and of the institutional mentors in its assessment.

IV. SUMMARY

Programme Aims and Learning Outcomes

Programme aims and learning outcomes are formulated in rather clear form and arguable manner, but still have to be more specific, pointing out real evidence from the teaching area on how students' competences are upgraded and how class activities and assessments relate to learning outcomes.

Also it is very important to present the case of the demand for the programme using up-to-date statistical evidence or even initiate own surveys among members of society in the Klaipeda region. EET was pleased to see a good detail about the need for programme nationally, but not so much saying about the local area situation.

Learning outcomes seem to be very knowledge-based and less on cognitive skills or the development of a person.. Again no weaknesses are described or ways to overcome them and the massive drop in admitted people is very worrying as to whether this study programme is sustainable/viable.

Curriculum Design

The EET raises much concern about this study programme being rather content-oriented and lacking the child-centred focus. The curriculum design has to be restructured as lots of modules are put as too broad/general or rather narrow, for instance *psychology* subjects, *family issues*, *children's rights protection and management* etc. Also used assessment methods for measuring students' skills in many cases are not satisfied as they do not allow appropriate evaluation, whether or not a student has mastered the intended learning outcome.

It is worrying that the assessment of educational practice has such a strong focus on a report/presentation rather than on the quality of professional practice. Much more needs to be said about practice in how it is assessed and who takes part in that assessment. Students in this regard should have more opportunities and options for a greater diversity both in their learning environments and practice settings, especially stressing supervisors' and tutors' importance in the learning by doing process.

Staff

Even though EET finds that the level of involvement of staff in mobility, seminars, various national and international projects are quite sufficient in numbers, but mainly these activities are often not specifically related to early childhood period and researches on that.

Teachers should be more engaged in academic activities and offer students to use their published material while studying and preparing for separate modules.

Another issue raised during the meeting with teachers is a foreign language barrier that limits teaching staff mobility in other countries and benefiting from existing exchange programmes at the College. Teachers' lack of specific qualifications in pre-school education is considered as a weakness within this programme as well.

Facilities and Learning Resources

There are a large number of signed agreements that undoubtedly help students learn and practice as future professionals in the area of pre-primary education both in kindergartens and institutions for children with special needs. Also the facilities are sufficient for the implementation of this programme, especially having own museum where students practice how to teach children on cultural heritage etc.

However, the use of ICT as a pedagogical tool with children is not done appropriately as well as using the Moodle platform in the study process. Library resources seem to be more oriented for other study programmes than for this one, as there were very few updated literature sources in foreign languages on Child's education and Lithuanian material does not relate directly to Early childhood phenomenon.

Study Process and Student Assessment

EET has found that College administration gives quite a good both financial and social support for students in need and also for those who show their high study results and competitiveness.

On the other hand, EET realised the fact that the College does not have an academic tradition to fail students for being not suitable in this programme. The main reason of students' dropout remains their insufficient academic results showed in the examinations. Thus EET would consider the fact that the academic and professional standards demanded in other European countries are not applied fully in Klaipeda State College.

Another quite significant weakness of the programme is the titles and structure of the Final Theses, where neither theoretical background nor empirical data is linked to one another. No ethical considerations presented and reference lists are too old fashioned with very few foreign sources. EET is worried about high grades being awarded for mostly all final theses.

Speaking about the educational practice evaluation, EET is much concerned as the main point within evaluation goes to presentations not professional skills and abilities assessment/examination. Practice with its supervising and evaluation system has to be reformed.

Programme Management

It is stated and was found that the whole range of assessments is conducted annually as a way of improving quality, which is a good practice that consequently leads to the assurance of study process quality.

However, one of the weaknesses could be seen in the fact that the majority of the staff is not introduced regularly to the achievements and especially actions that have to be taken for the programme's improvement. Also, no practical ways or methods of actions for the improvements are given, neither in written form, nor in the discussion with the SEG, staff, students, and social partners. Strengths and weaknesses are presented too generally and broadl in the SER as well as in the discussions during the meetings at the College.

V. GENERAL ASSESSMENT

The study programme *Pedagogy of preschool education* (state code – 653X11005) at Klaipeda State College is given positive evaluation.

Study programme assessment in points by evaluation areas.

No.	Evaluation Area	Evaluation Area in Points*
1.	Programme aims and learning outcomes	2
2.	Curriculum design	2
3.	Staff	2
4.	Material resources	2
5.	Study process and assessment (student admission, study process student support, 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 (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:

Dr. Gillian Lesley Scott Hilton

Grupės nariai:
Team members:

Prof. dr. Peadar Cremin

Kelly Van Driessche

Doc. dr. Tomas Butvilas

Sandra Kaleininkaitė

<...>

V. APIBENDRINAMASIS ĮVERTINIMAS

Klaipėdos valstybinės kolegijos studijų programa *Ikimokyklinio ugdymo pedagogika* (valstybinis kodas – 653X11005) vertinama teigiamai.

Eil. Nr.	Vertinimo sritis	Srities įvertinimas, balais*
1.	Programos tikslai ir numatomi studijų rezultatai	2
2.	Programos sandara	2
3.	Personalas	2
4.	Materialieji ištekliai	2
5.	Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas	2
6.	Programos vadyba	2
	Iš viso:	12

* 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*Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai*

Programos tikslai ir studijų rezultatai yra suformuluoti gana aiškiai ir tiksliai, tačiau turėtų būti dar konkretesni, nurodant realius pavyzdžius iš mokymo srities, kaip tobulinamos studentų kompetencijos ir kaip užsiėmimai paskaitų metu bei vertinimas yra susijęs su studijų rezultatais.

Taip pat labai svarbu atskleisti programos paklausumą vadovaujantis naujausiais statistiniais duomenimis ar net inicijuoti savo apklausas tarp Klaipėdos bendruomenės narių. EG džiaugėsi galėdami susipažinti su išsamia analize apie programos paklausą nacionaliniu lygiu, tačiau trūko informacijos apie situaciją vietos lygmeniu.

Atrodo, kad studijų rezultatai yra labiau pagrįsti žiniomis, o ne pažintiniais ar asmeniniais gebėjimais. Vėl nėra nurodyta silpnybių ar būdų, kaip jas pašalinti, o masinis

iškrentančių studentų skaičius palyginus su įstojusiujų skaičiumi kelia nerimą dėl to, ar ši studijų programa yra tvari / perspektyvi.

Programos sandara

EG nemažai susirūpinimo kelia tai, jog ši programa veikia yra orientuota į turinį ir stokoja į vaiką nukreipto požiūrio. Programos sandarą reiktų restruktūrizuoti, kadangi daug modulių yra per platūs / bendri arba gana siauro pobūdžio, pavyzdžiui, *Psichologijos* dalykas, *Šeimos problemos*, *Vaikų teisių apsauga ir valdymas* ir kt. Taip pat naudojami studentų įgūdžių vertinimo metodai daugeliu atvejų nėra patenkinami, nes jie neleidžia tinkamai įvertinti, ar studentas pasiekė numatytus studijų rezultatus.

Nerimą kelia tai, kad pedagoginės praktikos vertinimas labai priklauso nuo ataskaitos / pristatymo, o ne nuo profesinės praktikos kokybės. Reiktų daugiau pasakyti apie tai, kaip vertinama praktika ir kas tame vertinime dalyvauja. Šiuo atveju studentams reiktų suteikti daugiau galimybių ir pasirinkimo variantų, susijusių tiek su studijų aplinkos, tiek su praktikos vietų įvairove, atskirai pabrėžiant vadovo ir kuratoriaus svarbą mokymosi darant (*learning by doing*) procese.

Personalas

Nors, EG manymu, pakankamai personalo atstovų dalyvauja judumo programose, seminaruose, įvairiuose nacionaliniuose ir tarptautiniuose projektuose, bet dažniausiai ši veikla nėra konkrečiai susijusi su ankstyvosios vaikystės laikotarpiu ar moksliniais tyrimais šioje srityje.

Dėstytojai turėtų aktyviau dalyvauti akademinėje veikloje ir siūlyti studentams besimokant bei ruošiantis atskiriems moduliams naudotis jų publikuojama medžiaga.

Kitas per susitikimą su dėstytojais iškeltas klausimas – užsienio kalbų barjeras, kuris riboja dėstančiojo personalo judumą į kitas šalis ir neleidžia dalyvauti Kolegijoje siūlomose mainų programose. Tai, kad dėstytojams trūksta specifinės ikimokyklinio ugdymo kvalifikacijos, taip pat laikoma šios programos silpnybe.

Materialieji ištekliai

Kolegija yra pasirašiusi daug sutarčių, kurios suteikia galimybę studentams mokytis ir kaip būsimiems ikimokyklinio ugdymo specialistams atlikti praktiką tiek vaikų darželiuose, tiek institucijose vaikams su specialiaisiais poreikiais. Patalpos šiai programai dėstyti yra pakankamos, ypač nuosavas muziejus, kur studentai gali praktikuotis, kaip mokyti vaikus kultūrinio paveldo, ir kt.

Tačiau informacinės komunikacinės technologijos (IKT), kaip pedagoginė priemonė, dirbant su vaikais nėra tinkamai naudojamos, taip pat ir „Moodle“ platforma studijų eigoje. Atrodo, jog bibliotekos ištekliai labiau orientuoti kitoms studijų programoms, o ne šiai, kadangi joje yra labai mažai naujausios literatūros apie vaikų ugdymą užsienio kalbomis, o lietuviška medžiaga nėra tiesiogiai susijusi su ankstyvąja vaikyste.

Studijų eiga ir jos vertinimas

EG nustatė, kad Kolegijos administracija suteikia gana gerą finansinę ir socialinę paramą studentams, kuriems to reikia, o taip pat tiems, kurie demonstruoja aukštus studijų rezultatus ir konkurencingumą.

Kita vertus, EG suprato, kad Kolegijoje nėra akademinės tradicijos išbraukti studentus už tai, kad jie gali būti netinkami šiai programai. Pagrindinė priežastis, kodėl studentai iškrenta – nepakankami akademiniai rezultatai per egzaminus. Todėl EG mano, kad akademiniai ir profesiniai standartai, kurių reikalaujama kitose Europos šalyse, Klaipėdos valstybinėje kolegijoje nėra nuodugniai taikomi.

Kita gana reikšminga programos silpnybė yra baigiamųjų darbų temos ir struktūra, kuriuose teorinės žinios nėra sujungiamos su empiriniais duomenimis. Juose neaprašytos etikos nuostatos, o šaltinių sąrašas yra pasenęs, jame labai mažai užsienio šaltinių. EG reiškia susirūpinimą dėl beveik visiems baigiamiesiems darbams skiriamų aukštų pažymių.

Kalbant apie pedagoginės praktikos vertinimą, EG kelia didelį susirūpinimą tai, jog pagrindinis vertinimas skiriamas už pristatymus, o ne profesinių įgūdžių ir sugebėjimų įvertinimui / išegzaminavimui. Reikia pertvarkyti vadovavimo praktikai ir jos vertinimo sistemą.

Programos vadyba

Buvo teigiama ir nustatyta, kad kasmet Kolegijoje vykdomi įvairūs vertinimai siekiant gerinti kokybę, o tai yra gera praktika, kuri nuosekliai veda į studijų proceso kokybės užtikrinimą.

Tačiau viena iš silpnybių yra ta, kad dauguma personalo nėra reguliariai supažindinama su pasiekimais ir ypač su veiksmais, kurių reikia imtis programai gerinti. Taip pat nei raštu, nei diskusijos su SRG, personalu, studentais ir socialiniais partneriais metu nebuvo pateikta jokių praktinių būdų ar veiklos metodų, kurių būtų galima imtis programai gerinti. Tiek Savianalizės suvestinėje, tiek diskusijų su Kolegijos atstovais metu, stiprybės ir silpnybės buvo pristatytos per abstrakčiai ir bendrai.

III. REKOMENDACIJOS

3.1. Ekspertų grupė (toliau EG) rekomenduoja KVK svarstyti galimybę keisti studijų programos pavadinimą ir konkrečiau bei praktiškiau susieti tikslą su studijų rezultatais tiesiogiai nurodant, ką studentai daro paskaitų metu ir kokias kompetencijas jie tobulina. Rekomenduojama sukurti glaudesnes sąsajas tarp studijų rezultatų ir modulių bei vertinimo metodų.

3.2. Visų mokymo modulių pagrindas turėtų būti į vaiką nukreipta ugdymo koncepcija, ir visi ugdymo klausimai turi būti susieti su ankstyvosios vaikystės fenomenu, ypač skirtinguose dalykuose ir jų medžiagoje.

3.3. EG rekomenduoja aiškiau apibrėžti, kokio tipo pedagogai yra ruošiami (ikimokyklinio ir priešmokyklinio ugdymo).

3.4. Dėstytojai turėtų labiau bendradarbiauti su studentais akademinėje veikloje, taip pat atliekant mokslinius tyrimus, skleidžiant gautus empirinius duomenis ir teorinius pastebėjimus praktiniu požiūriu.

3.5. Kolegijos dėstytojai turėtų atlikti mokslinius tyrimus/publikuoti mokslinius straipsnius ankstyvosios vaikystės pedagogikos bei ugdymo srityje, ne tik ugdymo srityje apskritai.

3.6. Kolegijai priimant sprendimus ir įgyvendinant studijų programos pokyčius turėtų dalyvauti absolventai (buvę studentai) ir socialiniai partneriai.

3.7. Baigiamieji darbai turėtų būti išnagrinėti siekiant gerinti mokslinių tyrimų kokybę ir efektyvumą, reikėtų naudoti daugiau užsienio šaltinių, įtraukti mokslinių tyrimų etiką, naudoti įvairesnius duomenų rinkimo metodus ir išsamiai analizuoti mokslinių tyrimų rezultatus lyginant juos su aptartų mokslinių tyrimų išvadomis, pateiktomis literatūros apžvalgoje. EG taip pat labai rekomenduoja daugiau dėmesio skirti moksliniams tyrimams, daugiau laiko skirti mokslinės tyrimo temos nagrinėjimui bei išvadų formulavimui remiantis empiriniais tyrimo rezultatais.

3.8. Svarstydamą programos stiprybes ir silpnybes, Savianalizės rengimo grupė (toliau SRG) nekommentavo to, kaip reiktų šalinti visas pastebėtas silpnybes, tokiu būdu parodydami savo pačių nepakankamą gebėjimą reflektuoti. Turėtų būti dedamos visos pastangos stengtis paaikškinti, KAIP tai bus pasiekta.

3.10 EG rekomenduoja KVK peržiūrėti pedagoginės praktikos vietą ir svarbą studijų programoje, ypač – jos vertinimą bei praktikos vadovų iš kolegijos ir institucijos mentorių vaidmenį vertinime.

<...>